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Abstract

Studies of Philippine historiography often trace the emergence of history books written by Filipinos—or, more simply, Filipino history books—to the influence of Spanish and American colonialism, and the rise of Filipino nationalism. In most cases, the names of historians and the titles of their works figure prominently in discussions devoted primarily to texts and/or their authors’ backgrounds, while the names of their publishers and other bibliographical details are either relegated to the footnotes or dispensed with altogether. This study proposes an alternative, complementary approach that seeks to enrich the study of Philippine historiography by reconstructing the history of the Filipino history book using the framework of the discipline known as “book history,” and Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of the field of cultural production.

The histories of three books, namely, Jose Rizal’s annotated edition of Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas (1890), Leandro Fernandez’s A Brief History of the Philippines (1919), and what is now commonly known as Teodoro Agoncillo’s History of the Filipino People (1960), are presented as case studies through which the evolution of the Filipino history book as a material object and commodity, and not merely as a text to be read or interpreted, may be better understood. Each book represents a different period in the evolution of the study of Philippine history by Filipinos, and was published in multiple editions over several decades.
By examining the prevailing conditions throughout each book’s life cycle, the contributions of agents other than their authors, the struggles that accompanied their publication and distribution, and the evidence that may be gleaned from the books themselves, this dissertation shows that Spanish and American colonialism, and Filipino nationalism, did shape the development of Philippine historiography from the late nineteenth century to the twentieth century, but it also reveals that the Catholic Church played an important role in the production and circulation of books regardless of who was in power, and that struggles between agents involved in the historical field have affected the history of the discipline in ways that have yet to be fully acknowledged.
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Chapter 1
Book History and the History Book

In some ways, the present textbook is a radical departure from any textbook on Philippine history. First, because it considers Philippine history before 1872, in the main, a lost history. Second, because the point of view taken is that of a Filipino.¹

The passage above is taken from the preface written by Teodoro Agoncillo for the mimeographed textbook he coauthored with Oscar Alfonso, which was used for the first time by college students at the University of the Philippines (UP) in 1960. More than 50 years later, with hundreds of thousands of copies of its eight editions in print, Agoncillo’s History of the Filipino People, as it is now more commonly known, remains the required textbook in many colleges and universities all over the Philippines. But except for occasional comments disputing assertions made in its original preface, the book is not often mentioned in surveys of Philippine historiography.² This neglect, however, is not unusual.

Aside from the fact that Filipino historians seldom allude to textbooks in their studies, they also rarely discuss—or even acknowledge—the materiality and longevity of any kind of history book, including scholarly monographs.³ “Most historiography,” according to Leslie Howsam, “examines the texts of historians’ narratives and arguments, while largely ignoring the books in which these texts first appeared and now survive.”⁴ Howsam was referring specifically to British historiography, but the same could very well be said of the history of the Filipino history book.

The Philippines was colonized twice: first by Spain, for more than three centuries, and second by the United States, for almost half a century. This history of colonization is evident in studies of Philippine historiography, not only in terms of the authors of history books and the

¹ Teodoro Agoncillo and Oscar Alfonso, “Preface,” A Short History of the Filipino People (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1960) iii.
² The history of Agoncillo’s book is discussed in full in Chapter Four of this dissertation.
languages in which they wrote, but also the name by which the Philippines is referenced. For most of the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries, for example, the lone Spanish colony in Asia was identified as “las Islas Filipinas”; from 1898 to 1946, the US territory was officially known as “the Philippine Islands”; and from 1946 onward, the independent republic has been known simply as “the Philippines.” In this study, the first two terms are used in connection with events that occurred during the appropriate colonial periods, while the third is used to refer to both the period after 1946 and the entirety of the archipelago’s history.

The first critical survey of historical works about the Philippines was written in 1908, but it was not until the 1960s that scholars began to review the development of Philippine historiography more rigorously.\(^5\) These studies propose various ways of classification, such as by date of publication, period or subject covered, and colonial or nationalist tendencies, and pronounce judgment on the significance of works selected according to criteria that are primarily subjective in nature. Wenceslao Retana, for instance, classifies and annotates 100 sources of historical information printed between 1569 and 1908 into 14 groups (the largest of which were “Historia del Clero Regular” [History of the Regular Clergy], “Historias particulares” [Special Histories], and “ Guerras. Revoluciones. Sublevaciones” [Wars. Insurrections. Uprisings]), indicating that only those texts with “verdadero valor histórico” [real historical value] are cited.\(^6\)

Bruce Cruikshank, meanwhile, discerns patterns from 47 “important works” written or published from 1955 to 1976 that “asked important or provocative questions, whose publication was hailed as breaking new ground, whose reference value has never been superseded, or that

---


\(^6\) Retana, “Historiografia Filipina,” 602-604. Translations are from the English version.
presented important new research on old questions.”

Agoncillo makes no attempt to classify the contributions of 20 Filipino “pioneers of Philippine historiography” in his survey of their works published between 1887 and 1939, but his critique of their writings is unique in that he had personally encountered many of the authors, which perhaps explains why he devotes almost as much attention to identifying biases in their texts as pointing out their individual shortcomings.

While Agoncillo’s approach may be somewhat extreme, references to a historian’s race, gender, or education (and how these must have influenced his or her writings) are not uncommon. Much of Philippine historiography before the 1950s was, in fact, written by Spanish and American colonial authors, and by a few Filipino nationalists educated at Spanish and American schools. These historians, most of whom were male, include the Spanish missionaries, who were among the very first to document events that occurred after 1521 in las Islas Filipinas; the American government officials and journalists, who began recording their impressions of the Philippine Islands almost immediately after the United States defeated Spain in 1898; and the early Filipino scholars who started recounting the history of the Philippines even before its independence was officially recognized in 1946. This emphasis on authors, however, creates the impression that their manuscripts were magically set in type, printed, bound, and delivered into the hands of readers without the help of publishers, editors, printers, and booksellers.

As Leslie Howsam and Gregory Pfitzer have noted in their books on history books, scholars have neglected the practical aspects of the production of historical works. Almost all their studies, Howsam observes, “tend to leave a reader with the impression that historians are self-published: their books appear to emerge without the agency of anyone but the author.” Pfitzer adds that “few are anchored in the day-to-day practical business of writing and publishing as experienced at all levels of the production history of popular books.” Studies of Philippine—and British and American—historiography were, of course, written in particular contexts with specific objectives, and so it would be unfair to expect them to address questions they did not seek to answer. But this further underlines the need for a more systematic examination of the production of history books about the Philippines.

This dissertation attempts to demonstrate how the study of Philippine historiography may be enriched by using the framework of the discipline now better known as “book history,” in

---

7 Cruikshank, 2.
8 Agoncillo, “Philippine Historiography,” 3.
9 Howsam, Past into Print, 2; Gregory Pfitzer, Popular History and the Literary Marketplace, 1840–1920 (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008) 15.
conjunction with Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of the field of cultural production, to reconstruct the history of the Filipino history book. Among the questions this study seeks to address are the following:

1. What were the prevailing political, economic, social, and cultural conditions in which history books by Filipinos were published?
2. Who were the agents, other than authors, involved in the production of history books, and what did they contribute to the process?
3. In what ways did prevailing conditions and interactions between authors and other agents influence the publication and circulation of history books?
4. What does the material form of history books, as well as evidence of their value as commodities, reveal about their own history?

These questions are answered through detailed examinations of various aspects of the life cycles of three history books by Filipinos, each of which, unlike most history books about the Philippines, was published in multiple editions over a period of at least four decades.

Their titles alone—namely, *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (1890), *A Brief History of the Philippines* (1919), and *History of the Filipino People* (1960)—suggest the political and social changes that occurred from the time of Jose Rizal’s commentary on “las Islas Filipinas,” which was written in Spanish, to Leandro Fernandez’s “Philippines” and Teodoro Agoncillo’s “Filipino people,” both of which are in English. Unlike Rizal’s *Sucesos* and most of the works discussed in studies of Philippine historiography, Fernandez’s *Brief History* and Agoncillo’s *History* are not scholarly monographs, but textbooks. The former was used by sixth and seventh graders until the late 1950s, while the latter remains required reading for college students to this day.10

Meanwhile, their places of publication, France for *Sucesos*, the US for *Brief History*, and the Philippines for *History*, reflect the reality that although printing was introduced in las Islas Filipinas in 1593, its publishing industry did not fully develop until the latter half of the twentieth century. It must be noted, however, that the titles, authors, and places and years of publication provided above are not as straightforward as they seem. What is often referred to as Rizal’s book, for instance, is more accurately an annotated edition of Antonio de Morga’s *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (1609), and *History of the Filipino People*’s title originally began with the phrase “*A Short*” and it was not until 1990 that Agoncillo was credited as its sole author.

An even more important clarification that needs to be made concerns the words “history” and “historiography,” which have been and are defined and interpreted in many ways, and the phrase “history book,” which is sometimes used as a synonym for history and historiography. To avoid confusion, this dissertation adopts the following definitions:

- history – a text-based representation of the past,
- historiography – the history of historical writing, and
- history book – a material object that contains writings about the past.

There is much more that has been said by historians and other scholars about how history and, to a lesser extent, historiography have been, can be, should be, or are understood—including the need to recognize multiple representations of the past—but while these are certainly important, they are not the concern of the present study, which focuses on the history book, and not history or historiography.

This dissertation, for example, acknowledges that Agoncillo’s claim in his preface to the first edition of *History of the Filipino People* that “Philippine history before 1872 is, in the main, a lost history,” is consistent with existing scholarship—namely, that no text-based accounts of the Philippine past were available before the Spanish arrived in 1521, and that the inhabitants of las Islas Filipinas began to write their own history books only after the Cavite mutiny of 1872, to which the beginnings of Filipino nationalism have been traced. It does not, however, seek to engage in debates regarding the possibility of piecing together the history of the Filipino people based on scattered textual and non-textual evidence produced prior to the late nineteenth century. Instead, this dissertation treats Agoncillo’s book and other history books written by Filipinos primarily as material objects and commodities, rather than texts, and investigates aspects of their production that have not been previously discussed in reviews of Philippine historiography, in accordance with questions, methods, and approaches associated with the interdisciplinary study of the history of the book.

---


12 The word “text” in this definition is limited to the more common understanding that involves words or characters, and not objects that may be interpreted as texts.


Book History

Books, print culture, publishing history, and other related fields have been the subjects of scholarly research in various forms and with different emphases since the advent of printing, but it was not until the publication of Robert Darnton’s “What Is the History of Books?” (1982) that the emerging discipline of book history was presented with a framework that systematized the relationships among the numerous individuals and institutions involved in the different phases in a book’s life cycle. In his widely-adopted “communications circuit,” Darnton paid special attention to the people responsible for the book—authors, publishers, printers, shippers, booksellers, and readers—and how they interacted with one another. The popularity of Darnton’s model spurred the conceptualization of other models, but it was the “map” (Figure 1.1) conceived by Thomas Adams and Nicolas Barker in “A New Model for the Study of the Book” (1993) that even Darnton himself later acknowledged was one of the best.

Figure 1.1
A new model for the study of the book
Source: Adams and Barker, “A New Model,” 11.

---

Adams and Barker focused not on people, but on the book itself and the different events in its life cycle—that is, publication, manufacture, distribution, reception, and survival—as well as the political, economic, and social forces that influence these events. Some of their more significant improvements on Darnton’s model made it possible for other book historians to use their map for different locations and periods, and acknowledge that books live on or survive beyond their first editions through reprints, new editions, and translations, and even as rare or used books.\(^{17}\)

The gaps in the known history of the first two books printed in las Islas Filipinas in 1593, for instance, are more easily identified when the available evidence is viewed within the context of the Adams and Barker model.\(^{18}\) Both imprints, one in Spanish and Tagalog, and the other in Chinese, became the subject of bibliographic inquiries toward the end of the nineteenth century, despite the absence of any copies that could be examined. After one copy of each book was found a few years after the Second World War ended, additional research and close scrutiny of the imprints revealed that both were catechisms written by Spanish missionaries (neither of which was a translation of the other), and printed by Chinese converts using woodblocks, not a printing press.

According to Adams and Barker, the creation of a book begins not with its writing, but the decision to publish, which in this case was accompanied by a license granted by the highest-ranking representative of the King of Spain in las Islas Filipinas. It is unknown how many copies were printed or how these were distributed, but the fact that one was sold at twice the price of the other (perhaps because the first had twice the number of leaves as the second) suggests that financial considerations, not just religious objectives, had an effect on book sales even then. No evidence has been found regarding contemporary reactions to the catechisms or who, if any, actually read them in las Islas Filipinas or China. Finally, the survival of one copy of each imprint, at the US Library of Congress and Spain’s Biblioteca Nacional, has not only made scholarly studies of the books possible, but also the completion of the circuit proposed by Adams

\(^{17}\) It must be noted, though, that the phrase “book history” does not fully convey the range of materials studied by its practitioners. As Leslie Howsam explains, “The book is not limited to print (it includes manuscripts and other written forms), or to the codex format (periodicals and electronic texts come under examination, as do scrolls and book rolls), or to material or literary culture.” Leslie Howsam, *Old Books & New Histories* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006) 3.

and Barker with the publication of facsimiles beginning in 1947, and more recently, the dissemination of digital copies.\(^{19}\)

This model, along with those proposed by Darnton and other scholars, has been used largely in relation to the study of books published in the West. It was not until the publication of “What Book?” by Patricia May Jurilla in 2003 that the formal study of Philippine book history may be said to have begun.\(^{20}\) Although scholars, journalists, and practitioners had by then written about different aspects of publishing and printing in the Philippines from the 1593 imprints to the first-ever national readership survey of 2003, Jurilla was the first to address the need to “situate history in the book and the book in history.”\(^{21}\) Filipino authors and publishers have attributed the problems ailing the Philippine publishing industry to the Filipinos’ lack of interest in books and a lack of government support, and some have suggested that poverty, an aversion to print, and the primacy of English over the numerous indigenous languages are to blame, but these hypotheses have yet to be proven empirically.\(^{22}\)

In *Tagalog Bestsellers of the Twentieth Century* (2008), which was based on her doctoral dissertation, Jurilla demonstrates that Filipinos have bought and read books voluntarily in significant numbers in the past and continue to do so today, just not the literary or scholarly books written in English that the literati believe constitute reading.\(^{23}\) She accomplishes this by examining the publication histories of the most popular literary forms in the Philippines, namely the novels, comic books, and romances—all written in Tagalog, one of the major languages of the Philippines. Instead of devoting her attention to literary criticism, as many Filipino scholars have, she turns to the lesser-known aspects of the publication and distribution of Tagalog bestsellers. Jurilla positions her study as “an initial effort at exploring the immense terrain of the history of the book in the Philippines,” and weaves her stories from the available threads found

\(^{19}\) The *Doctrina Christiana, en lengua española y tagala* (aka “Tagalog Doctrina”; Manila: 1593) may be accessed page by page through the website of the Library of Congress, http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collld=rbc3&fileName=rbc0001_2002rosen1302page.db&recNum=4; while the *Bian zheng jiao zhen chuan shi lu* (aka “Shih-lu”; Manila: 1593) may be downloaded as a PDF through the website of the Biblioteca Nacional de España, http://bibliotecadigitalhispanica.bne.es/webclient/DeliveryManager?pid=2532052&custom_att_2=simple_viewer.


\(^{23}\) Patricia May Jurilla, *Tagalog Bestsellers of the Twentieth Century* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2008) 72-79.
in the books themselves, hard-to-find published accounts, and the memories of those who consented to be interviewed.\textsuperscript{24}

Jurilla’s book provides a comprehensive introduction to many of the common themes running through Philippine history and Philippine book history. It reconstructs the history of the book in the Philippines, for instance, in relation to political realities: the Spanish colonial period that lasted until 1898, the American occupation from 1898 to 1946, the Japanese regime that interrupted American rule from 1942 to 1945, the postwar period from 1945 to 1972, the martial law era from 1972 to 1986, and the return to democracy from 1986 onward.\textsuperscript{25} This common periodization has been criticized by historians for being Manila-centric, and for putting too much emphasis on the breaks and interruptions in Philippine history, but it is actually a valid scheme when it comes to books because most Filipino publishers were and are based in or near the city of Manila, and the publication, manufacture, distribution, reception, and survival of books were greatly affected by the pivotal events that marked the end of one era and the beginning of another.\textsuperscript{26}

In the years immediately preceding the Philippine Revolution of 1896—which began as an act of resistance against the Spanish, evolved into a war against the Americans, and resulted in the deaths of hundreds of thousands—more books written by Filipinos were published in las Islas Filipinas and Spain than in the previous three centuries. After the Spanish lost to the Americans in 1898, even more Filipino-authored books appeared, this time courtesy of publishing houses in the United States, and a few newly established in the Philippine Islands. Many of these works were lost toward the end of the Second World War with the destruction of Manila in 1945, but the subsequent reconstruction that occurred saw the emergence of publishing and distribution firms that later became the backbone of the Philippine book industry.

More books were produced by Filipinos in the Philippines during the succeeding decades than the pre-war period, but when President Ferdinand Marcos declared martial law in 1972, the publication of books and newspapers became more difficult because of censorship, economic difficulties, and the persecution of Marcos’s critics, many of whom were authors and editors. Not surprisingly, the fall of Marcos in 1986, which was precipitated by a peaceful gathering of

\textsuperscript{24} Jurilla, Tagalog Bestsellers, 16.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 17-56.
hundreds of thousands of Filipinos that took place at Epifanio de los Santos Avenue over four days (now also known as the EDSA Revolution), reenergized the Philippine book industry.\(^\text{27}\)

It must be noted, however, that the demand for books written by Filipinos and published in the Philippines is minuscule compared to its population, which according to official censuses grew from 6 million in 1887 to 60 million in 1990.\(^\text{28}\) Reliable statistics or even estimates for the number of books produced locally during the same period are rare, but Jurilla’s observations on Philippine literary publishing (excluding textbooks and the Tagalog bestsellers that she features in her book) could very well apply to most books written by Filipinos since the late nineteenth century. For instance, print runs are generally small (several thousand copies or even fewer), distribution is limited to the more accessible urban areas, and books seldom have more than a few hundred readers.

Like Jurilla’s book, the pioneering works by Gregory Pfitzer and Leslie Howsam on the history of history books in the United States and England, respectively, discuss the intricacies of the publication and distribution of books, but each emphasizes certain aspects more than others. In *Popular History and the Literary Marketplace* (2008), Pfitzer traces the rise and fall of popular history as a genre from 1840 to 1920, and while he foregrounds the agency of American authors of books that often bore the words “popular history” or “people’s history” in their titles, he also explicitly recognizes the contributions of publishers and editors, as well as illustrations and promotional campaigns, to the production and success of such books.

Meanwhile, Howsam’s *Past into Print* (2009) balances her accounts of the tensions between academic and non-academic British historians who wrote history books from 1850 to 1950 with descriptions of the rivalries between and among the university and trade presses that competed to produce histories for readers of all ages and interests, from children’s school books to multi-volume works for enthusiasts. Their observations and conclusions are not necessarily applicable to the Filipino situation for various reasons—including the fact that “popular history,” as discussed later in this chapter, has never been as popular in the Philippines as it is in the United States and England—but their discussions of particular history books, told in relation to the development of history as an academic discipline and the growth of the publishing industry, do have parallels in the production of Filipino history books.

\(^{27}\) Jurilla, *Tagalog Bestsellers*, 17-56.

The present study further explores the “immense terrain” of Philippine book history, whose most prominent landmarks Jurilla has fortunately already mapped out, and travels paths similar to those Pfitzer and Howsam have traversed in plotting the landscape of the history of history books in the United States and England. Like their studies, this dissertation privileges the publication and distribution of books over their texts. But unlike the works of Jurilla, Pfitzer, and Howsam, this dissertation examines books within a specific theoretical framework.

Bourdieu and the Field of Historical Production

In this study, the analysis of the history of the Filipino history book is situated within Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of the field of cultural production, which was developed as an alternative to the theories of scholars who insisted either on the primacy of external analysis or internal readings of cultural texts. As he explains, “The theory of the field [leads] both to a rejection of the direct relating of individual biography to the work of literature (or the relating of the ‘social class’ of origin to the work) and also to a rejection of the internal analysis of an individual work or even of intertextual analysis. This is because what we have to do is all these things at the same time.”

Bourdieu distinguishes between material production and symbolic production by pointing out that the value of a book, for instance, is not limited to the aggregate cost of raw materials and labor, but includes the symbolic capital bestowed by its author’s charisma, publisher’s reputation, critics’ endorsements, and even ordinary readers’ assessments of its worth. In short, a book’s commercial value does not always reflect its cultural value.

Bourdieu uses the word “consecration” not in the context of religious belief, but in reference to the prestige accorded a work or the agents involved in its creation by “those who recognize no other criterion of legitimacy than recognition by those whom they recognize.” Idem, “The Field of Cultural Production,” Poetics 12 (1983) 318-320.

He also emphasizes that while a field is embedded in the broader field of power, where struggles are waged over real economic and political power, its structure, laws, and controversies are not necessarily
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influenced by changes in the larger field. Instead, a field’s relative autonomy is contingent on its ability to translate or “refract” external pressures into its own specific logic. This reality informs Bourdieu’s insistence that “The most disputed frontier of all is the one which separates the field of cultural production and the field of power.”

Since political and religious leaders have interfered with the publication and distribution of books in the Philippines throughout the twentieth century, it is unlikely that its field of cultural production has ever been fully autonomous. The study of the field, however, cannot be reduced, as more than a few scholars have done, to an analysis of the effects of external determinants or close readings of a few texts. Peter McDonald, who explicitated the relevance of Bourdieu’s field to book history, asserts that cultural analysis begins not by interpreting meaning, but by reconstructing the field. This field, he emphasizes, includes not only writers, but also “an integrated network… in which writers, publishers, printers, distributors, reviewers, and readers collaborate.”

The analysis of the production of Filipino history books, therefore, entails not only accurately recovering the titles of books, the names of their authors and publishers, and other bibliographic details, but also determining the status of history as a discipline and its evolution over time, the identities and influence of individuals and institutions engaged in the production and consecration of history books, and the struggles that occurred within the field. It must also be noted that many publications that were not originally intended to be history books—such as the works of Spanish missionaries, who were not really writing the history of las Islas Filipinas, but the history of their missions in the Spanish colony—are now regarded as such through various means of consecration. Reconstructing a field is not easy and may not even be entirely possible, but Bourdieu provides a framework to facilitate such an analysis.

The structure of the field of cultural production may be understood in terms of what Bourdieu calls “two fundamental and quite different oppositions; firstly, the opposition between
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the sub-field of restricted production and the sub-field of large-scale production… and, secondly, the opposition, within the sub-field of restricted production, between the consecrated avant-garde and the avant-garde, the established figures and the newcomers.”

McDonald disagrees with the unstated assumption that the elite have “a monopoly on the universal conflict between the young and the old,” and amends Bourdieu’s formulation so that the second opposition covers the sub-field of large-scale production as well. In addition, McDonald simplifies references to the two oppositions to the following: “the purists versus the profiteers, on the one hand, and the establishment versus the newcomers, on the other.”

These oppositions may be imagined as a four-quadrant matrix (Figure 1.2), representing a less complex version of a diagram that accompanies Bourdieu’s best-known article on the subject. Works written by *purists* (those who claim not to be interested in earning a profit) who, at the same time, are part of the *establishment* (those whose works are accorded a high degree of consecration) are more likely to occupy the quadrant that is identified in Bourdieu’s diagram as having an “intellectual audience.” In contrast, works by purists who may be considered *newcomers*, due in part to the low degree of consecration attached to their work, are said to have “no audience.” Meanwhile, *profiteers* whose works are consecrated by the establishment cater to a “bourgeois audience,” and profiteer-newcomers target the “mass audience.”

![Figure 1.2](image-url)

*Figure 1.2*
Simplified representation of the field of cultural production
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McDonald acknowledges, however, that these idealized oppositions are not as neat as they appear and that “few agents are ever exclusively committed to a single position in the field.”\textsuperscript{41} Purists are not necessarily unconcerned about profits, and Bourdieu himself notes that artists, “with a few illustrious exceptions... are deeply self-interested, calculating, obsessed with money and ready to do anything to succeed.”\textsuperscript{42} Profiteers also invest in works that are not obviously commercial for various reasons, including raising their own cultural profiles. The establishment is not, of course, composed only of greying veterans; newcomers are not always fresh and young, and some newcomers do eventually become part of the establishment. In addition, the different quadrants are likely not all equal in size because with so many titles published every year, it could very well be that the works with “no audience” occupy the most space. Finally, the audience for a book is neither fixed nor guaranteed; a purist-establishment work could, for instance, be embraced by a mass audience over time, and a text written by a profiteer-newcomer could still end up having no audience at all.

Bourdieu does not explicitly delineate the boundaries that separate the “intellectual audience,” the “bourgeois audience,” and the “mass audience,” but he does allude to these consumers in the context of the struggles between purists and profiteers, between establishment and newcomers, and argues that “what is at stake is the power to impose the dominant definition of the writer [for example] and therefore to delimit the population of those entitled to take part in the struggle to define the writer.”\textsuperscript{43} Aside from being neither precise nor prescriptive, the labels that Bourdieu assigns to the audiences to which he refers have been and are understood differently—and contested, even—in various parts of the world, as well as in various fields of study. He does indicate, however, that there are “three competing [sic] principles of legitimacy” that correspond to the consecration bestowed by:

1. “the set of producers who produce for other producers” or, presumably, the intellectual audience;
2. “the dominant fractions of the dominant class and by private tribunals... or public, state-guaranteed ones” or the bourgeois audience; and
3. “the choice of ordinary consumers, the ‘mass audience.’”\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{41} McDonald, 114.
\textsuperscript{42} Bourdieu, “The Production of Belief,” 266.
\textsuperscript{43} Idem, “The Field,” 323.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 331-332.
The struggles for legitimacy, or the power to impose the dominant definition of the historian, that take place between the competing poles of Bourdieu’s two oppositions, as well as the audiences that make the oppositions possible, are seldom examined or even acknowledged by the scholars who have written about the development of Philippine historiography. It is not surprising, therefore, that an attempt to identify the equivalents of Bourdieu’s oppositions in the field of Filipino cultural production can reveal rather obvious, but frequently unrecognized, aspects of the production and consecration of history books about the Philippines.

Purists and profiteers, for instance, must have existed in las Islas Filipinas during the nineteenth century, but the fact that no history books by Filipinos in any language were published until almost the end of Spanish rule could very well be due to the lack of an audience, whether intellectual or otherwise, rather than censorship or repression. In contrast, literary and religious works by Filipinos did find a receptive audience during the same period, despite the prevalence of oral cultures and traditions throughout the archipelago. If Filipinos produced any history books at all during that period, they must not have been considered worth consecrating even by those who endeavored to show in the late nineteenth century—as Jose Rizal did in his edition of Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas (1890)—that Filipinos had their own history before the Spanish arrived in 1521.

While some scholars recognize that the few historical works written by Filipinos during that time were mostly in Spanish and were part of efforts to demand reforms or gain independence, what they usually overlook is that there were no history departments offering courses on Philippine history or publishers seeking manuscripts on the subject. Many of the books were printed in Europe, and whatever copies made it past the censors in las Islas Filipinas were likely read by no more than a handful of the elite, Spanish-educated, Filipino minority. The field was, at best, in its infancy, and both geographic and linguistic constraints prevented Filipinos from communicating effectively with their fellow Filipinos. It is doubtful whether anyone ever made a profit on Filipino history books during the nineteenth century.

No such uncertainty surrounds the history books, especially the textbooks, published early in the twentieth century, most of which were written by Americans in English, printed in the United States, and sold in the Philippine Islands. Although Filipinos also began writing their own history books (mostly in English)—Leandro Fernandez’s A Brief History of the Philippines (1919) was among the very first—and some were even printed locally, there is not much use in
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distinguishing between purists and profiteers, and establishment and newcomers, because as late as 1931, so few history books about las Islas Filipinas and the Philippine Islands had been published that even school textbooks were among those consecrated by American historians as “excellent” and “generally dependable” short histories of the archipelago.46

The struggles over history books that occurred took place mostly in the field of power because the writing of Philippine history was so new that disputes within the field of historical production were not really between Spanish, American, or Filipino historians, but between amateurs who had only recently begun to make a name for themselves.47 There were, of course, academics and non-academics, but even the academics who began teaching at the newly-established history department of the University of the Philippines in the 1910s did not all have degrees in history, and those that did had earned them fairly recently. The field, in short, was in its adolescence, stimulated by increased opportunities for Filipinos to learn the language of their latest colonizer, to acquire degrees in higher education, and to engage in the business of book publishing.

It was only during the late 1940s and 1950s, when books on the history of the newly-independent Republic of the Philippines written by an increasing number of Filipinos and Americans with graduate degrees began to be issued by American and Filipino publishers, that significant oppositions in the field of historical production started taking place.48 These debates, conducted primarily in English, may be viewed to some extent as the establishment defending its turf from the newcomers, but they were in fact power struggles between leaders of the Catholic Church and nationalists in the Philippine government. With the growth of history departments, the establishment of historical associations, and the publication of scholarly journals in the next few decades, the field gained more autonomy and maturity.

Areas of disagreement progressed from questions of fact to the validity of methods and interpretations to the language used by historians, even as the publication of textbooks like Teodoro Agoncillo’s History of the Filipino People (1960) served to highlight the growing number of Filipino publishers willing to invest in history books. But what has not been acknowledged, whether in Bourdieu’s model or in studies of Philippine historiography, is that these struggles were never solely about cultural production, economic considerations, or

48 Owen, 1-17.
competing ideologies; individual interests also played an important role in, and sometimes even
influenced, the positions assumed by agents in the field. For example, the simultaneous existence
of at least two historical organizations in the Philippines from the 1950s onward may be traced to
conflicts between Filipino historians triggered not by theoretical or ideological differences, but
personal ambition.49

Another aspect that Bourdieu’s theory of the field does not account for, unlike the book
history frameworks proposed by Darnton, and Adams and Barker, is that cultural production is
not necessarily limited by geographic and linguistic boundaries. From the sixteenth century to
the present, the great majority of titles sold in the Philippines have been written in Spanish or
English, and imported from Spain and the United States, respectively. Whether written by
Filipinos or not, many of these books undoubtedly had an effect on the local field of historical
production, but the subject remains unexplored beyond critical analyses of a few texts. It is
important to note, however, that Bourdieu, like book historians who have devoted more attention
to the history of the book in the West, is not alone in neglecting to acknowledge that what is true
in Europe may not necessarily be true in other parts of the world.

A similar phenomenon may be observed in the way the role of government in the
development of history as a discipline has been overlooked in reviews of Philippine
historiography. A few scholars have foregrounded the ways in which the government has used
history to promote a largely political agenda, rather than a scholarly one, but very little attention
has been paid to how it has contributed to the growth of the discipline.50 While it may be
correctly argued that the government has not done nearly enough to stimulate historical literacy,
its continued support for the University of the Philippines and the National Historical
Commission (and its various incarnations since 1933), as well as the conduct of commemorative
celebrations and the occasional biography contests in the twentieth century, have undeniably
resulted in significant, if not necessarily consistently outstanding, contributions to the
popularization and study of Philippine history.51 The same is true of the output of journalists and
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the media companies for which they work, which have brought historical disputes to the attention of a wider audience, facilitated reflection regarding the importance of Philippine history to Filipinos, and spurred public debates. In some ways, government and media—not just authors, publishers, booksellers, and readers—have also made it possible for purists and profiteers, and establishment and newcomers, to turn the field of cultural production into a field of struggle.

The unstated assumption, therefore, in most studies of historiography that the historian is the only agent involved in the production of history books denies one of the most basic of Bourdieu’s propositions regarding the oppositions that define a field. If struggles for legitimacy are truly as prevalent as Bourdieu claims they are, then disagreements on what qualifies as history and the credibility of historians are inevitable, and the following questions must be addressed, “Which history?” and “Which historian?” The answers to these questions, as this study demonstrates, depends largely on another question that Bourdieu does not directly address: “Which audience?”

In *Past into Print*, Howsam introduces the “life-cycle approach” as an alternative model to Darnton’s communications circuit. She argues that the history books a reader encounters as a child, adolescent, and adult grow more complex at each stage, and are likely to be completely different from those consulted by historians or other scholars. No one-to-one correspondence may be drawn between Howsam’s alternative approach and Bourdieu’s three audiences, particularly in the British or American markets, but for the purposes of this dissertation, the mass audience for Filipino history books is defined as the group of children and adolescents who use prescribed textbooks in school; the bourgeois audience consists of educated adults who can buy or borrow books for leisure reading; and the intellectual audience is composed of the community of historians, publishers, editors, reviewers, and graduate students, who are expected to keep abreast of developments in their field.

This dissertation situates its discussion primarily in relation to the mass and intellectual audiences for Filipino history books, and discusses their demographic compositions at different points in Philippine history (to the extent that the available evidence makes it possible to do so) in the appropriate chapters of this study. It must be remembered, however, that these are intended audiences, and that there is no way of knowing exactly how many in a particular group actually read a specific book. At the same time, it is also important to note that these audiences are not
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necessarily mutually exclusive. It is highly probable that there have been and will always be individuals who read books they are not expected to read.

Filipino History Books

The overwhelming number of pages devoted by historians and other scholars to the analysis of narratives and arguments found in Philippine history books, as well as the biographies of their authors, suggests that no one else was involved in the publication, circulation, or reception of the books. Although it has become common to use phrases such as “the author wrote” and “the writer published” as if their meanings were exactly the same, writing and publishing are, in fact, two different undertakings. One scholar contends that “authors do not write books. Books are not written at all. They are manufactured by… mechanics and other engineers, and by printing presses and other machines.”\(^\text{53}\)

This study accepts that historians can be said to have written books, but asserts that unless a writer personally financed a book’s publication, only a publisher—and not its author—should be credited with having published the book. In other words, history is not just written, it is published. But history is not just what is published either. After all, history books are not all perceived equally. Some are required in schools, some are not. Some sell more copies than others, and some are read more than others. Some are lauded by historians as outstanding contributions and cited accordingly, while some not recognized as such are quoted more readily by students, journalists, and scholars from other fields.

The critical analyses of texts in relation to their authors’ backgrounds are important, of course, and the influence of Spanish and American colonialism, and the emergence of Filipino nationalism on Philippine historiography are undeniable, but these cannot fully explain why some history books are more influential than others. The lack of attention paid to the circumstances surrounding their production tends to convey the impression that their authors wrote in a vacuum—where there was no such thing as religious differences, economic difficulties, departmental politics, or personal animosities, and all publishers, editors, printers, booksellers, and reviewers were endowed with the exact same symbolic capital in their

professions—or that colonial officials alone were directly responsible for and completely in control of the writing, publication, and distribution of books. Evidence, however, of the existence and evolution of the field of historical production in the Philippines disproves such notions.

This dissertation attempts to recover the histories of three books using methods developed by book historians as an initial effort at reconstructing the history of the Filipino history book. Chapter Two argues that the publication and replication of history books, though often taken for granted by scholars, are in fact acts of consecration that ensure their survival many decades after they were initially printed. Jose Rizal’s 1890 edition of Antonio de Morga’s *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (1609) was essentially complete early in 1889, but it is the book published in Paris toward the end of the year—and not Rizal’s manuscript—to which the beginnings of history written by Filipinos have been traced. Other examples of manuscripts several years old that were widely recognized as outstanding works of history only after their publication were the original versions of Rafael Palma’s *Biografia de Rizal* (1949) and Agoncillo’s *The Revolt of the Masses* (1956). This chapter examines the history of Rizal’s *Sucesos* not only in relation to struggles and oppositions that occurred between colonizers and colonized, as well as Church and State, from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries, but also within the context of the emergence of Filipino historians and publishers, and the establishment of academic departments, professional associations, university presses, and government-created agencies that supported the development of the discipline throughout the twentieth century.

Chapter Three contends that scholarly assessments of an author’s contribution to the study of history as a discipline must not be regarded as the sole indicators of a history book’s influence. Leandro Fernandez’s *A Brief History of the Philippines* (1919) was a required textbook for public school students for almost four decades, but it has been all but forgotten. Instead, the few historians who have recognized the importance of such books have devoted their attention to those written by David Barrows (1905) and Conrado Benitez (1926), even though neither of their works was actually in the hands of as many students as the three editions of Fernandez’s book. This chapter complicates assumptions that American textbooks were responsible for the mis-education of Filipinos by showing that the Catholic Church played a larger role in the adoption and revision of history books than has been previously acknowledged, and that the Americans involved in the publication and distribution of Fernandez’s *Brief History*
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were motivated primarily by the desire to make a profit, and not necessarily to impose American culture on Filipino students.

Chapter Four reconstructs the field of historical production in the Philippines after the US finally recognized its independence in 1946 using the history of what is now known as Teodoro Agoncillo’s *History of the Filipino People* (1960) as a case study to fully illustrate and explore the contribution that a book history approach can introduce to the study of Philippine historiography. Whereas evidence of the publishing histories of Rizal’s *Sucesos*, Fernandez’s *Brief History*, and most Filipino history books is meager at best, the comparatively voluminous correspondence and other documents left behind by Agoncillo make it possible to trace the development of the historical field through details of the production and circulation of the various editions of Agoncillo’s *History* within the context of the political and economic crises that occurred in the field of power, as well as the professional and personal disagreements between and among authors and publishers that have shaped and continue to shape the production and reproduction of Filipino history books.

In each chapter, the available evidence is examined according to the model proposed by Adams and Barker. For publication, for instance, the reasons behind the initial decision to publish a particular history book are deduced from letters sent by authors to their publishers and/or friends. For manufacture, the book’s material form (including size and number of pages) is established by appraising multiple copies of different editions that have been preserved in libraries and archives or were acquired by this researcher, and the number of copies that were printed is estimated with the help of annual reports, financial records, and royalty statements. For distribution, the ways in which copies circulated or were prevented from circulating are reconstructed from archival documents, newspaper articles, and even handwritten comments in the margins of a few copies. For reception, statistics on the book’s intended audience and the opinions of scholars and journalists are gathered from census data, enrollment figures, and published reviews. And for survival, subsequent editions are examined in a manner similar to the earlier events.

Finally, the conclusion explores the ways by which a book history approach can inform current debates regarding the nature of history, as well as promote an appreciation of the practical aspects of the production and circulation of history books that can help stimulate interest in history as a discipline and a genre.
While it may be observed that the development of Philippine historiography is reflected in the links between the authors of the works featured in separate chapters of this dissertation—because Rizal, after all, was the subject of Fernandez’s graduate thesis, and Fernandez personally convinced Agoncillo to pursue a degree in history—it must be remembered that these coincidences were not directly responsible for the production of history books, and that these authors had different reasons for writing their books, which were received by their intended audiences in various ways at different times.

Rizal, for example, decided to self-publish a new edition of Morga’s *Sucesos* because he felt it was necessary to educate Filipinos about their past so they could “poder juzgar mejor el presente” [better judge the present] and “estudiar el porvenir” [study the future], but his motivation is more of an exception, rather than the rule. Fernandez and Agoncillo were recognized as nationalists during their lifetimes, but unlike Rizal, neither wrote his book to confront colonial injustice. Fernandez was hired by a publisher to author a textbook for seventh graders, and Agoncillo was instructed by his university’s president to do the same for college students. Agents other than historians, in short, can and do provide the initial impetus for the production of history books.

Once a book is published, other factors such as educational policies and literacy rates can affect the size of a book’s potential audience. When Rizal’s *Sucesos* (1890) was printed, very few of the 6 million inhabitants of las Islas Filipinas could afford to go to school, the Spanish discouraged Filipinos from learning Spanish, and data on literacy was not collected systematically. The 1903 Census indicates that approximately 20 percent of Filipinos 10 years of age and over in the early years of the American occupation were literate, with males outnumbering females 3 to 1, but the same source estimates that fewer than 10 percent of the population could speak Spanish, which meant that “the majority of the people reported as literate could read and write only the native tongues.”
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By the time Fernandez’s *Brief History* (1919) was published, the total population of the Philippine Islands had grown to 10 million, and free public school education for almost two decades, with English as the medium of instruction, ensured that about 30 percent of Filipinos could read and write in English, with the ratio of males to females improving to 3 to 2.\(^{59}\) When the 1st (1960) edition of Agoncillo’s *History* appeared 41 years later, the number of Filipinos had increased to 27 million, and the literacy rate, now measured regardless of language, had risen to 72 percent, with both genders represented almost equally (males, 73.6 percent; females, 70.6%).\(^{60}\) Three decades hence, when the 8th (1990) edition of Agoncillo’s *History* was released, the Philippine population was at 60 million, more than 93 percent of those over 10 years of age could read and write, and gender parity had been achieved in terms of literacy (males, 93.7; females, 93.4).\(^{61}\) More Filipinos, in short, could read toward the end of the twentieth century than at the beginning, but this did not mean, however, that they were reading history books.

This study’s three books were not necessarily the best or even the best-*selling* books of their time or genre. Neither were they chosen to illustrate a trend or to represent a particular school of thought. These Filipino history books were selected because each was the first of its kind published in multiple editions and reprinted over a period of at least four decades during different periods in Philippine history. Although almost any book may be considered “the first of its kind,” and more than a few history books have been favored with “multiple editions,” these two criteria when taken together effectively exclude any other titles that may be proposed.

Rizal’s *Sucesos* (1890), for instance, was not the very first history book by a Filipino, but none of the other candidates, such as Pedro Paterno’s *La Antigua Civilizacion Tagalog* (1887) or Isabelo de los Reyes’s *Historia de Filipinas* (1889), has ever been honored with multiple offset reprints or translations into English and a Philippine language. The three editions of Leandro Fernandez’s *Brief History* (1919) are matched by the three editions of Conrado Benitez’s *History of the Philippines* (1926), but the former was not only the first textbook on any subject written by a Filipino adopted for use in Philippine public schools, it was also used by more students than the latter over a comparable period. It is possible that one of Gregorio Zaide’s many textbooks may be construed as having introduced “the nationalistic approach to the writing and teaching of Philippine history” (or so his daughter claims), but more historians will probably agree that the initial edition of Agoncillo’s *History* (1960) was “the first major effort to rewrite… Philippine

\(^{59}\) Census of the Philippine Islands - 1918 (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1921) 2:63, 4.2:20.


history textbooks” from the Filipino point of view (by one who considered himself merely on “cordial terms” with its author).62

* * *

While this dissertation’s three history books could perhaps be classified as popular histories (as opposed to scholarly ones) because of their longevity in print, none may be considered as truly “popular” according to the various definitions that have been proposed. As David Greenberg, who considers himself an academic historian, notes in an online magazine, “although the chasm between popular and scholarly history is real, a number of historians, inside and outside the academy, have been able to develop a wide following with quality work.”63 Greenberg, in the same article, reviews the different ways in which the popular/scholarly divide has been portrayed—for example, amateurs versus professionals, narrative versus analysis, clear writing versus jargon—and shows that all these are either wrong or incomplete. Similarly, these dichotomies are not so easily applied to the books by Rizal, Fernandez, and Agoncillo.

In his review of popular histories, Pfitzer considers a book “popular” if it “identified itself in its title, description, or advertisements as ‘popular’ or ‘for the people.’”64 He employed the term specifically in relation to its usage in the United States in the late nineteenth century, and it is not surprising therefore that none of the three history books chosen for this study may be called popular histories according to his definition. In fact, the phrases “popular history” and “people’s history” have seldom been used to market history books about the Philippines. Even if the definition of “popular history” were broadened to include what Pfitzer calls “general historical narratives… produced by nonacademics for primarily lay audiences,” it would still be difficult to claim, for instance, that the closest Filipino equivalent of such works—that is, compilations of newspaper columns on history by Carmen Guerrero Nakpil and Ambeth Ocampo—are in the same genre as works by Barbara Tuchman and David McCullough.65
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While a comparison with Indian history books may also be made (because Filipinos, like Indians, learned English during the colonial period, among other impositions), the line drawn by Partha Chatterjee between “new scientific history” in English and “old social history” in modern Indian languages cannot really be applied to the Philippine situation because, as indicated in the next section, Filipinos do not have a tradition of writing history in any Filipino language, and the closest parallel—academic history in the national language—has not gained a wide following.\footnote{66} The reason Filipinos do not seem to be as interested in reading history books as Americans and the British may be due in part to the fact that even the most accessible of these works, like those by Guerrero and Ocampo, are written in English.

Designating a book as a popular history on the basis of sales is also problematic because, as Pfitzer notes, aside from the fact that it is difficult to ascertain how many copies of a book have been sold, the threshold for claiming that a book is popular is indeterminate and may vary depending on the target market or niche.\footnote{67} The same applies to histories that are said to have been written in a popular manner. How popular is popular? And popular for whom? Jurilla’s definition of a Philippine bestseller, or “a book that has sold out its print-run within one year,” is more easily measured (only if, however, evidence is available), but this dissertation’s three history books would not readily qualify as bestsellers either.\footnote{68} Copies of the first had to be smuggled into the Philippines and never sold out, and the second and third were required textbooks, so it would not really be appropriate to call them bestsellers. In short, none of the three books may be deemed popular without qualification, according to any definition.

Nevertheless, replication and longevity are privileged in the present study—and book history, in general—because the reprinting of a book suggests that a previous print run sold out, the publication of a new edition implies that corrections were made or new material was added, and the continuous production of several editions over a relatively long period of time indicates that different generations bought, if not read, the book. These claims are not always true for all cases, but they do provide a basis for asserting that a book whose various editions have been published over several decades may be considered more influential than a frequently-cited monograph that has never been reprinted.

\footnote{67} Pfitzer, 350-351, n. 19.
\footnote{68} Jurilla, Tagalog Bestsellers, 79.
This dissertation’s three books are not like most scholarly works published in the Philippines, of which one thousand copies or fewer are usually issued, reprints are rare, and new editions are practically unknown. Unlike the works of Fernandez and Agoncillo, the book by Rizal was not a textbook with guaranteed buyers, but all three have been in print far longer than comparable titles written by their contemporaries. True, the publication of multiple editions of each book could have been motivated by the desire to make a profit from students forced to buy the latest edition or prompted by a law that requires the publication and teaching of Rizal’s works in universities across the Philippines. But it is also true that these explanations are not completely valid because each of the books was produced during particular periods and in circumstances more complex than those suggested above. Such interpretations, as Bourdieu notes, “go directly from what happens in the world to what happens in the field,” thereby disregarding the internal dynamics of the field of cultural production, which is not always influenced by external pressure. The histories of the three books—as well as the history of the Filipino history book—must, therefore, be understood not merely in relation to prevailing political, economic, and social conditions, but also in the context of the oppositions and struggles that occurred within the field that produced them.

Limitations

In 1982, Robert Darnton compared the emerging discipline of book history to a “tropical rain forest” and characterized it as “interdisciplinarity run riot.” Since then, book historians have incorporated even more approaches and methodologies from other disciplines, prompting Leslie Howsam to propose a model (Figure 1.3) that identifies history, literature, and bibliography as “the core of historical studies of book culture,” and makes it possible to conceptualize the inherent interdisciplinarity of the study of book history not as a problem, but as an opportunity. The three disciplines are imagined as the vertices of a triangle, whose lines represent the different ways in which book history projects may be “located somewhere within the disciplinary
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69 Bourdieu, “Principles,” 188.
triangle.” It is along the “history/bibliography dimension,” as Howsam calls it, that this dissertation is positioned and its limitations are identified.\footnote{Howsam, \textit{Old Books}, 9, 16, 24-25.}

This study is primarily about the Filipino history \textit{book}. For this reason, history as represented in other forms of writing (such as stone tablets, archival documents, and journal articles) or in verbal, electronic, or visual media (including oral traditions, images, museums, and films) is not discussed in this dissertation. In addition, the focus is on the book as a material object and commodity, and not the history contained in its pages, which is the essence of the history/bibliography dimension. It is not the objective of the present study to prove or disprove contested interpretations of historical events, which is more properly within the purview of the study of history, or engage in literary criticism or discourse analysis, which is located along Howsam’s history/literature dimension.

Instead, this dissertation follows Bourdieu’s framework, which emphasizes the need to understand a book, for instance, within the context of the field in which it was produced, and rejects strictly internal or external modes of analysis. Although the theory of the field may also be construed as a form of discourse analysis, Bourdieu clearly disagrees and distinguishes his “field of cultural production” from Michel Foucault’s “field of strategic possibilities,” as well as
the intertextuality espoused by the Russian formalists, by pointing out that the former “refuses to look outside the ‘field of discourse’ for the explanatory principle of each of the discourses in the field,” and that the latter are “compelled to find in the system of texts itself the basis of its dynamics.”

This dissertation examines the history of the Filipino history book—not Philippine historiography—which means that the evidence presented in this study is related to the publication, circulation, and reception of material objects, and not to how individual historians’ interpretations of historic events have changed through time. In A Global History of History (2011), Daniel Woolf states that “Because history comes in various forms and shapes, we must not confuse the vessel with its content,” and affirms that the different ways in which different civilizations have preserved and recalled their past “must be taken on their own merits and judged by their own standards, not by the fairly narrow standards of modern professional historians.”

Unlike the authors of most studies of historiography, he explicitly recognizes the value of historical traditions from around the world by speaking not only of history written or printed in Europe or North America, but also of oral traditions and other non-scribal forms practiced in Asia and Africa. But like those other scholars, Woolf appears to assume that a history book is identical to its text, forgetting that a vessel must not be confused with its content and that authors are not the only agents involved in the production of history books. While authors are considered indispensable in this study, the roles played by other individuals and companies in the publication and distribution of books are also acknowledged, along with the political, religious, financial, and personal considerations that can influence the consecration of a specific history book.

More specifically, this study addresses the history of the Filipino—not Philippine—history book. There are no hard and fast rules governing the use of the adjectives Philippine and Filipino, which are often treated as synonyms. These terms, however, are used in specific ways in this dissertation. Whenever references to Philippine history books are made, for example, these include all books published on Philippine history, regardless of whether their authors were Filipino or otherwise. Meanwhile, Filipino history books are only those written by Filipinos,
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73 Woolf, 7-8.
74 See Breisach, Historiography; Iggers, Historiography in the Twentieth Century; and Burrow, A History of Histories.
whether in English or any other language. In addition, while references are occasionally made to the studies by Howsam and Pfitzer, this dissertation does not seek to undertake a comparative analysis of the field of historical production in the Philippines with those in England and the United States, or any other country.

It is also worth pointing out that while the word “Filipino” now officially refers to both the people of the Philippines and the Philippine national language, it was not until the late nineteenth century that inhabitants of las Islas Filipinas began to consistently identify themselves as Filipinos, and that it was only with the ratification of the 1987 Constitution that Filipino became the national language of the Philippines. Tagalog, which is used to describe both the Tagalog region’s inhabitants and their language, was selected in 1937 as the basis for the Philippine national language, and since then has been more likely to be identified as the national language. Meanwhile, the constitutionally-created “Filipino,” which is supposed to be a fusion of all the languages used in the Philippines, remains a dream, and Filipinos are still more likely to say that they are fluent in one of 40 to 90 languages or dialects—depending on how the distinction between the two is drawn—spoken in the Philippines today.75

* * *

Aside from delimitations specifically related to how the phrase “Filipino history book” is understood in this dissertation, certain realities must also be acknowledged because they account for, among others, the absence or scarcity of references in this study to (1) indigenous histories by pre-hispanic Filipinos, (2) history books written in Filipino languages, and (3) evidence of certain aspects of the production of Filipino history books.

First, the early Filipinos had no written histories of their own before Spanish missionaries and a few colonial officials began recording their impressions of las Islas Filipinas. Despite exposure to Chinese and Islamic traditions before and during the Spanish era, as well as evidence of indigenous writing systems, they are not known to have produced accounts of their past, except for a few orally-transmitted legends.76 Many scholars have blamed the Spanish missionaries for destroying evidence of the Filipinos’ ancient history and some have stated that
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the fragility of the materials used, including bamboo and palm leaves, may have contributed to the absence of specimens of early Filipino literature. The conclusion, however, that such materials must have existed is based primarily on a few Spanish sources—most written long after Magellan’s arrival in 1521, including the *Doctrina Christiana* of 1593—which indicate that almost all the natives were literate and could write using their own syllabary. But as Horacio de la Costa has suggested, perceptions of widespread literacy were probably based on the limited exposure of Spanish authors to the Filipino elite, and as Onofre Corpuz has argued, the literature produced could not have been significant in quantity if destruction or deterioration could so easily prevent the early Filipinos from producing other copies or at least recalling their existence in writing or oral tradition.\(^\text{77}\)

Second, the great majority of history books about the Philippine past have been written in Spanish and English. Most of those in Spanish (mainly by Spanish authors) were published before 1898, when the United States declared war on Spain, and those in English were mostly written (initially by Americans, who were later joined by Filipinos) after 1898. The small number of Filipino history books in Spanish appeared primarily during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, while those in English were published with increasing frequency only toward the latter half of the twentieth century. This reality may be traced to the fact that very few Filipinos learned the Spanish language during more than three centuries of Spanish rule; that many more Filipinos were educated in English during and after the American era; and that a culture developed wherein literature, in order to be taken seriously by the literary establishment, had to be in English, not the vernacular.\(^\text{78}\) This last observation applies not only to literature, but to Philippine scholarship in general. More history books written in Philippine languages were published toward the end of the twentieth century, but none has achieved the level of consecration accorded books in English that are widely recognized as among the best written for any audience.

Although Pantayong Pananaw (roughly translated as “our view for us”)—a movement advocating the use of Filipino, the so-called national language, in scholarly discourse related to history—has gained adherents from the 1970s onward, there is no evidence that reputable publishers consider their books worth publishing, or that the


\(^{78}\) Jurilla, *Tagalog Bestsellers*, 72-76.
books produced so far have had significant publishing histories with multiple editions.\textsuperscript{79} The relative obscurity of Pantayong Pananaw outside academic circles in the Philippines has been attributed to the refusal of its adherents to write in the language of their colonizers, unlike the members of the better-known Subaltern Studies Group, whose critiques of Indian historiography that ignores the voice of the majority are written, for the most part, in English.\textsuperscript{80}

This reasoning, however, overlooks the fact that even the Filipino intellectual audience, which presumably would welcome an indigenous approach to history, has not consecrated the movement’s books in a significant way. While objections to Pantayong Pananaw based on theoretical differences may also have prevented its adoption, another likely reason it is not more widely known is that the language its adherents employ—one constructed by academics, and not based on actual usage—is not easily accessible even to those fluent in Tagalog and other Philippine languages.

Third, evidence of the production of Filipino history books is either hard to find or non-existent. Like Jurilla’s study of Tagalog bestsellers, this dissertation has had to contend with the lack of accurate data on the Philippine publishing industry’s output, as well as the difficulty of obtaining sales figures from local and foreign publishers, many of whom have long been out of business, lost or disposed of their archives many years ago, or are simply unwilling to cooperate.\textsuperscript{81} In addition, despite the availability of newspapers, magazines, and scholarly journals in bound volumes and on microfilm, the inaccessibility of repositories and the dearth of comprehensive indexes to the material, especially for those published before the 1960s, make it difficult to identify and retrieve possible sources that may help in the reconstruction of the field of Philippine historical production amid the political, economic, and social changes that took place from the sixteenth century to the present. While it is possible that useful information may be found related to the subject of this study in films, television shows, and radio programs that were produced in the twentieth century, the need to preserve and index such resources has only recently begun to be appreciated and carried out.

\textsuperscript{79} The book \textit{Pantayong Pananaw}, for instance, was published in 1997, and reprinted in 2000, but copies of the latter were still being sold in a few bookstores as late as 2011. \textit{Pantayong Pananaw: Ugat at Kabuluhan}, ed. Atoy Navarro, Mary Jane Rodriguez and Vicente Villan (Mandaluyong: Palimbagang Kalawakan, 1997; Quezon City: Palimbagan ng Lahi, 2000).


\textsuperscript{81} Jurilla, \textit{Tagalog Bestsellers}, 14-16.
The evidence presented in this dissertation related to the publication, dissemination, and reception of history books is, therefore, limited to published and archival correspondence, financial statements, and other documents found in public and private collections in the Philippines, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Spain, as well as publishers’ existing records, electronic databases, and websites to which access could be obtained. In addition, publications that are usually regarded as secondary or tertiary sources, including book reviews, newspaper reports, and bibliographies, may also be treated as primary sources in this study, especially when they provide indications of the esteem with which particular books were viewed at specific times, or reveal unexplored oppositions within the field of cultural production when compared with one another.

One good example of the latter is a disagreement between Trinidad Pardo de Tavera and Wenceslao Retana in bibliographical works published during the late nineteenth century, where the former claimed that the first book printed in las Islas Filipinas was the one written by a Filipino in 1610, while the latter asserted that it was one of two books produced by Spanish missionaries and Chinese printers in 1593. Retana was proven right when copies of the first imprints were finally found five decades later, but what the scholars who have commented on the debate neglect to mention is that Pardo was Filipino and a friend of Rizal, while Retana was Spanish and was one of those who sought to undermine claims by Filipinos like Rizal to the existence of an ancient past. It was not, in short, a purely bibliographical dispute, but one that could very well have involved national pride.

* * *

The lack of evidence related to the reception of Filipino history books is the main reason that this study can do no more than speculate regarding their precise influence on Philippine nationalism and the importance of narrative to Filipino readers. While some scholars, for instance, have assumed that a manifesto attributed to Andres Bonifacio, the acknowledged leader of the
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82 T.H. Pardo de Tavera, Noticias Sobre la Imprenta y el Grabado en Filipinas (Madrid: Tipografia de los hijos de M.G. Hernandez, 1893); W.E. Retana, La Imprenta en Filipinas: Adiciones y Observaciones à La Imprenta en Manila de D.J.T. Medina (Madrid: Imprenta de la viuda de M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1897).

Philippine Revolution of 1896, was inspired by Rizal’s *Sucesos*, there is no concrete evidence that Bonifacio even had a copy of the book.\(^{84}\) Even if a link could be made, however, there is no way of proving that the Filipinos who read Bonifacio’s manifesto, which was published in a newspaper with no extant copies, took up arms *because* of Rizal’s ideas.

In addition, while it is much easier to estimate the extent to which Fernandez’s *Brief History* and Agoncillo’s *History* were read than to ascertain the influence of Rizal’s *Sucesos* on Filipino nationalism, the effect of these textbooks on the students who were required to use them is impossible to determine. Agoncillo, for instance, has acknowledged using Fernandez’s book in his younger years, but aside from observing that it was better organized than textbooks written by other Filipinos, and dismissing it as “a mere textbook for children,” he does not say much more.\(^{85}\) Agoncillo himself is probably the best-known nationalist historian in the Philippines, but any intensification in feelings of nationalism among Filipinos that followed the publication of the college textbook he coauthored cannot be directly attributed to its text.

The importance of narrative in the consecration of a history book is also difficult to prove. In his foreword to *The Revolt of the Masses* (1956), a Bonifacio biography, Agoncillo explains that he relegated arguments supporting his conclusions to the endnotes, instead of incorporating them in his narrative, because “To include the discussions of doubtful points and the footnotes in the main text would… make the book a dull and protracted law brief.”\(^{86}\) Agoncillo, who was already a recognized literary figure before gaining acclaim as a historian, was praised by an English professor for his “dramatic narrative” and criticized by a historian for resorting to “literary ‘license,’” but the extent to which one or the other contributed to or detracted from the book’s appeal is unknown.\(^{87}\) *Revolt*’s reception mirrors the struggles that had already occurred in England toward the end of the nineteenth century between commercially-successful men and women of letters, and university-based historians who sought to professionalize their ranks.
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In 1883, one Cambridge professor of history urged his British colleagues to “break the drowsy spell of narrative” in favor of an analytical approach, which a contemporary scholar characterized as making history “so dull and unattractive that the general public will not wish to meddle with it.”\(^88\) But whereas various forms of narrative history have flourished alongside analytical history elsewhere, the former cannot be said to have a counterpart in the Philippines, where the latter now predominates. Agoncillo’s *History* and Fernandez’s *Brief History* could perhaps be counted as narrative history, but it cannot be proven that their longevity as required textbooks is due to this factor alone. Rizal’s footnotes to Morga’s *Sucesos*, on the other hand, cannot be construed as a narrative at all.

**Significance**

The study of the history of the book in the Philippines has only just begun. As Patricia May Jurilla shows in her pioneering effort, authors rely on their publishers, editors, printers, distributors, and even readers to ensure that their writings are turned into and appreciated as books.\(^89\) This study makes a contribution to Philippine book history by focusing on another kind of book, the history book. Its significance is better appreciated in relation to the dearth of research on the histories of history books that are not published in the West, of history textbooks that are not considered controversial, and of studies of Philippine historiography that recognize that history books are not just texts, but material objects and commodities with histories of their own.

The study of the history of history books has, like the history of the book in the Philippines, just started. But like the work of Gregory Pfitzer and Leslie Howsam, and most of the research that has already been done by book historians, this new field of inquiry is oriented primarily to books published in and about the West.\(^90\) The history of the Filipino history book is unique because despite the fact that printing began in las Islas Filipinas in 1593 using methods developed by the Chinese, the first history books about the Philippine Islands were printed in Europe and North America, and the first history textbook about the Philippines with a Filipino as its sole author was published by Americans in the United States. Aside from adding to the
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\(^88\) Howsam, *Past into Print*, 7.
\(^89\) Jurilla, *Tagalog Bestsellers*.
\(^90\) Howsam, *Past into Print*; and Pfitzer, *Popular History*. 
growing number of studies on Asian, especially Chinese and Indian, book history, this study provides a distinctly Filipino perspective on the production of history books within the context of multiple colonial and cultural influences.  

The study of textbooks, especially history textbooks, is not new, but much of what has been written around the world is largely concerned with contemporary controversies or the comparison of texts and intended meanings, not the circumstances surrounding their production or the extent to which the books were actually used. Meanwhile, scholarly studies on textbooks that employ the methods of book history are rarely about works on history, and the few that have examined specific history textbooks seldom acknowledge the existence of competing works, and overlook the importance of situating the subjects of their inquiries within the larger field of historical production and the length of time the books were in the hands of students. This study establishes the significance of two history textbooks in relation to similar and/or contemporary works, and examines the political, economic, and other circumstances that influenced their publication, adoption, and longevity.

Various studies of Philippine historiography and history textbooks have been published, but these have been concerned primarily with questions of authorship and nationalism, as well as evaluations of approaches or interpretations. Much has been made of Spanish and American colonizers writing the history of the colonized, of the need to rewrite Philippine history from the Filipino point of view, about recovering the history of the inarticulate, of writing histories from below. This study recognizes the importance of the historian, but emphasizes that publishers,

\footnote{See, for example, Print Areas: Book History in India, ed. Abhijit Gupta and Swapna Chakravorty (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004); Patricia May Jurilla, “Florante at Laura and the History of the Filipino Book,” Book History 8 (2005) 131-197; and Lucille Chia, Knowledge and Text Production in an Age of Print: China, 900-1400 (Leiden: Brill, 2011).}

\footnote{See for example, James Loewen, Lies My Teacher Told Me (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995); Gary Nash, Charlotte Crabtree and Ross Dunn, History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past (New York: Knopf, 1997); and What Shall We Tell the Children? International Perspectives on School History Textbooks, ed. Stuart Foster and Keith Crawford (Greenwich, CT: Information Age, 2006).


\footnote{For studies of Philippine historiography, see p. 2, n. 5, above. For studies of Philippine history textbooks, see Chapter Three of this dissertation, p. 78, n. 6.}
booksellers, and readers, as well as other agents in the fields of power and historical production, have been and continue to be indispensable to the consecration of Filipino history books.

This dissertation raises new questions and proposes a complementary approach to the study of Philippine historiography that, it is hoped, will contribute to a greater appreciation not only of texts and their authors, but also of the struggles and oppositions that accompanied the production of Filipino history books.
Philippine historiography by Filipinos has its beginnings with the publication of Jose Rizal’s edition of Antonio de Morga’s *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* in Paris in 1890.¹

In the quotation above, Teodoro Agoncillo reminds readers that one of the earliest Filipino history books was written in a foreign language, and printed in Europe. The original work by Morga, a Spanish colonial official, was printed in Mexico in 1609, but it was only after Rizal published his own edition almost three centuries hence that the history book, written in Spanish, began to attract scholarly attention, especially among Filipinos. Rizal’s annotated edition of Morga’s *Sucesos*, which is hereafter referred to as “Rizal’s *Sucesos*” for the sake of convenience, was not literally the first Filipino history book, but by tracing the emergence of Philippine historiography by Filipinos to this work, Agoncillo—who is not known to be an admirer of Rizal—pays tribute to his “deep sense of history” and his insistence that “Philippine history should be seen through Filipino eyes.”² Two of Rizal’s contemporaries, namely Pedro Paterno and Isabelo de los Reyes, had already written their own books on the Philippine past by the time Rizal published his, but their works have been neglected by scholars, not so much because of what they wrote, which many, including Agoncillo, consider unreliable, but more likely because of who they were not.³

Rizal is considered the national hero of the Philippines, and has been recognized by various biographers as “the first Filipino,” “the great Malayan,” and “the pride of the Malay race.” He was neither the first Filipino to criticize Spanish rule and the Catholic Church nor the
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only one to push for reforms during his lifetime, but he was the acknowledged leader of the opposition and, despite the fact that his major works were written in Spanish, which few Filipinos then (or now) could read, it is clear that his ideas inspired those who fought in the Philippine Revolution of 1896, and that his status as the premier symbol of Filipino nationalism is well deserved.4

Not surprisingly, historians have claimed him as one of their own, and recognized his Sucesos as the first history of las Islas Filipinas written “from the viewpoint of the ruled and not of the rulers,” and “from the point of view of the colonized not the colonizer.”5 But it is important to remember that Rizal was not, in fact, the book’s author, but its annotator. It is for this reason perhaps that Agoncillo asserts that “Rizal was no historian, as some over-enthusiastic idolaters claim obstreperously he was,” and claims instead that Rizal’s contribution to Philippine historiography lay in “his formulation of the axiom that one’s history is best seen through one’s eyes—not through foreign eyes.”6 Notwithstanding Agoncillo’s objection, it cannot be denied that scholars began to call Rizal a historian soon after his Sucesos was published, and that a century later, he was honored with an entry in Great Historians of the Modern Age (1991).

The best indicators of the high regard for Rizal’s Sucesos are that two offset reprints of the Spanish original, along with English and Tagalog translations, have been published and reprinted, and more than a century after its first edition was printed in Paris, Filipino and non-Filipino scholars are still scrutinizing Rizal’s annotations.7 In contrast, Wenceslao Retana’s Sucesos (1909), which many historians agree is the most authoritative edition of Morga’s work, has neither been honored with a reprint nor translated from Spanish into English or any Philippine language, and no critical studies of this edition have been published.8 There are many
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8 Among those who state—directly or indirectly—that Retana’s Sucesos (1909) is better than Rizal’s are Cummins, “Editor’s Introduction,” 29; Marcelino Foronda, Some Notes on Philippine Historiography (Manila:...
conceivable reasons for the greater interest displayed by Filipino academics in Rizal’s *Sucesos* (1890) over the various editions and translations of Morga’s *Sucesos* (1609)—including the fact that its annotator was the first to criticize Spanish colonization from below, literally, by adding footnotes to an existing work—but it is likely that the book has drawn more critical scrutiny because of the identity and symbolic capital of its annotator, not its content. The emphasis on Rizal’s role as author, however, obscures the fact that he was also personally responsible for its publication and distribution.

This chapter examines the history of Rizal’s *Sucesos*, and to a lesser extent other history books, to illustrate the significance of authorship, publication, and distribution in establishing a scholar’s reputation as a historian, and to identify patterns of communication that promote the survival of historical works. Like many books, Rizal’s *Sucesos* was written without any guarantee it would be published, but the manuscript’s publication ensured that anyone who had access to the printed book could reproduce, translate, quote, and echo Rizal’s views on pre-hispanic Philippine history, as well as recognize its annotator as a historian. The same is true of other history books discussed in this dissertation whose authors—some of whom, like Rizal, did not receive any formal training in history—began to be publicly acknowledged as historians only after the manuscripts they wrote were transformed into books.

The initial decision to publish a book is important because although Filipino scholars today are often consecrated as historians by fellow scholars on the basis of their academic degrees and positions without having a book published, it is also true that individuals with no history degree or teaching experience have also been recognized as historians by the public, if not by academics, solely because of their published works. Authorship and publication, however, are not enough. As this chapter shows, evidence related to the manufacture, distribution, reception, and survival of Filipino history books, along with the political, economic, and religious struggles that accompanied their production and reproduction, must all be considered in reconstructing the field in which they were consecrated.

The evidence used to reconstruct the history of Rizal’s *Sucesos* is taken from different copies and editions of the book preserved in Europe, the United States, and the Philippines; as well as contemporary accounts of its production and circulation found in correspondence, reviews, and other documents; and bibliographies and surveys of Philippine historiography that
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reveal not only which history books were consecrated or ignored during particular periods, but also the identities of the individuals and institutions involved in the struggles that took place within the field, as well as at the frontier that separates it from the field of power.

The first section discusses the history of Rizal’s *Sucesos*, from authorship to publication to distribution to reception, in relation to his other writings and the unusual circumstances surrounding their production. The second section reviews the ways in which scholars have written about or replicated his annotations in light of his privileged status among Filipino heroes and within the context of the study of Philippine history by Filipinos, the infrastructure that supported the publication of this secondary literature, and the controversies and celebrations that ensured the survival of Rizal’s *Sucesos* through the production of facsimiles, as well as translations.

**Rizal’s Sucesos**

Rizal’s edition of Morga’s *Sucesos* was not the first to attempt to reintroduce the rare, seventeenth-century work to a wider audience, but more scholars have studied Rizal’s annotations than those in an earlier English translation or any other subsequent edition. Some have translated and/or discussed Rizal’s notes in book chapters and journal articles, but few have consulted his correspondence for clues regarding the 1890 edition’s publication and dissemination, and even fewer have examined the remaining copies preserved in libraries and archives around the world. Only one study indicates the number of annotations in the book, but the figure provided is erroneous. This section seeks to present a more accurate assessment of the influence of Rizal’s *Sucesos* by reviewing evidence found in his published correspondence, as well as previously unexamined traces of the book’s history that provide a better understanding of the field in which it was produced. In addition, a simple quantitative analysis is undertaken to demonstrate that scholars have overstated certain aspects of the significance of Rizal’s annotations by neglecting to situate the notes they choose to highlight within the context of all his annotations.
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9 The most important of these studies are discussed in the second section of this chapter. See Table 2.2 on p. 71 of this chapter.

The importance of publication to Rizal’s *Sucesos* and other works printed in the late nineteenth century is better appreciated in light of the scarcity of academic, government, or commercial support during that time. The most significant struggles for Rizal and his contemporaries who were writing about the history of las Islas Filipinas were not the same as those that are likely to occur between purist and profiteer, or establishment and newcomer, in Pierre Bourdieu’s field of cultural production. Instead, they involved political and practical constraints that restricted book production and distribution, which the authors often had to undertake themselves. The field of historical production was in its infancy, and was subject not only to pressure from the field of power, but also the realities of geography and language that separated not only the colonizers from the colonized, but also Filipinos from their fellow Filipinos.

Morga’s *Sucesos* (1609) and Rizal’s annotated edition were printed almost three centuries apart, but both their authors were coincidentally the same age when the events that are arguably the most significant of their lives in las Islas Filipinas took place. Antonio de Morga was 35 years old when he arrived in Manila to assume the post of the archipelago’s second highest-ranking government official in 1595.\(^1\) It is believed that Morga began working on his manuscript that same year, shared it with others as he wrote, and finalized its text in 1607, but it was not until 1609 that the book was printed in Mexico, and for more than two centuries was the only history of the Spanish colony not written by a Spanish missionary.\(^2\) Like most works about Spain’s only colony in Asia before the twentieth century, Morga’s book was written in Spanish and, not unexpectedly, reflected its author’s biases related to Spanish superiority over the early Filipinos. But Rizal opted to annotate it nonetheless because although he found much to criticize in Morga’s text, he still considered the Spanish official a more reliable witness than the missionaries whose accounts of historical events were often distorted by their religious views.\(^3\)

Morga’s book is essentially a history of the Spanish in las Islas Filipinas, consisting of seven chapters devoted to political events that occurred between 1521 and 1606, and a final chapter that contains a relatively objective description—for a Spanish author writing during that...
period—of the islands and their inhabitants in the sixteenth century. The first four chapters are very short, accounting for less than a tenth of the entire work, while the fifth to seventh chapters take up two-thirds of the book, focus primarily on the years Morga spent in las Islas Filipinas, and devote more attention to the activities of the colonizers, not the colonized. The last chapter, less than a third of the work, discusses the colony’s geography, its peoples, and their customs before and after the Spanish arrived.

The available scholarship on Morga’s Sucesos invariably alludes to its rarity, but the significance of Rizal’s contribution to reviving interest in the book is seldom mentioned. Other editions of Morga’s work were published in Europe and North America in the twentieth century (Table 2.1), signifying the book’s importance even to non-Filipino scholars, but it is noteworthy that the earliest of these publications cite Rizal’s annotations more frequently than those in Henry Stanley’s 1868 English translation for the Hakluyt Society, suggesting that the former were more effective in arousing scholarly interest in Morga’s book than the latter. Rizal’s Sucesos (1890) has also drawn and continues to draw more attention from scholars than any other editions and translations of Morga’s work, not because it is the best, but more likely because of the identity of its editor.

Jose Rizal, born on 19 June 1861, is the de facto national hero of the Philippines. No law has been passed declaring Rizal (or any Filipino, for that matter) a “national hero,” but he is the only Filipino whose death anniversary has been an official, national holiday since 1898, and whose life, works, and writings have been legally required to form part of the curriculum in all schools and universities since 1956. The best-known Rizal biography is entitled The First Filipino, not so much because its subject was literally the first Filipino, but because Rizal made it possible for the inhabitants of las Islas Filipinas, who were divided by, among others, geography

---

14 Aside from the introductions to its different editions, Morga’s Sucesos has been discussed in other published studies such as a pamphlet by Epifanio de los Santos (“Cinco Notas al Capítulo Octavo de los ‘Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas’ del Dr. Antonio De Morga” [Madrid: Establecimiento Tipográfico de Fortanet, 1909]); and an article by Lothar Knauth (“Morga: Génesis de un Símbolo,” Historia Mexicana 14 (1964) 272-291)).

15 The only one among the succeeding editions and translations of Morga’s Sucesos that may be said to devote more space to Stanley than Rizal is the second English translation published by the Hakluyt Society in 1971, which may be attributed to the editor’s desire to justify the need for a new translation.

16 See Table 2.2 on p. 71 of this chapter.

Table 2.1
New editions and translations of
Antonio de Morga's Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas (1609)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Reprint/Translation</th>
<th>Editor/s and/or Translator/s</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Henry Stanley</td>
<td>The Philippine Islands</td>
<td>London: Hakluyt Society</td>
<td>1st English translation with annotations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Philippine Islands</td>
<td>New York: B. Franklin</td>
<td>Offset reprint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Jose Rizal</td>
<td>Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas</td>
<td>Paris: Garnier</td>
<td>1st Spanish edition with annotations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas</td>
<td>Quezon City: R. Martinez</td>
<td>Offset reprint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas</td>
<td>Manila: Comision Nacional del Centenario de Jose Rizal</td>
<td>Offset reprint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Encarnacion Alzona</td>
<td>Historical Events of the Philippine Islands</td>
<td>Manila: Jose Rizal National Centennial Commission</td>
<td>3rd English translation, including most of Rizal's annotations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Mga Pangyayari sa Sangkapuluang Filipinas</td>
<td>Maynila: Pambansang Komisyon ng mga Bayani</td>
<td>Tagalog translation, including most of Rizal's annotations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td>History of the Philippine Islands, 2 vols. in 1</td>
<td>New York: Kraus Reprint Co.</td>
<td>Offset reprint of 1907 reprint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Wencesiao Retana</td>
<td>Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas</td>
<td>Madrid: V. Suarez</td>
<td>2nd Spanish edition with annotations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and language, to imagine themselves as more than just, for example, Tagalogs, Visayans, or Bicolanos. As Leon Ma. Guerrero, the biographer, puts it, Rizal “taught his countrymen that they could be something else, Filipinos who were members of a Filipino Nation.” \(^{18}\) All his books were written in Spanish, but he also contributed articles to scholarly publications and nationalist newspapers, and corresponded with family and friends in English, German, Italian, French, and Tagalog. \(^{19}\)

Aside from his work as a novelist and essayist, Rizal was also a licensed physician who specialized in ophthalmology, and dabbled in painting, sculpture, and fencing—all of which he had accomplished before the age of thirty. He was the recognized leader of what has come to be known as the Propaganda Movement, which advocated for reforms in las Islas Filipinas late in the nineteenth century. \(^{20}\) In 1896, he was on his way to Cuba after several years of banishment when the Revolution led by Andres Bonifacio broke out. Despite the improbability of his direct involvement, Rizal was arrested, brought back to Manila to stand trial, and convicted of being “the principal organiser and the living soul of the insurrection.” \(^{21}\) On 30 December 1896, he was executed by firing squad. He was 35 years old.

Rizal came from a privileged family and was educated at Jesuit and Dominican schools in Manila before proceeding to Europe for further studies. He is remembered today for the novel *Noli Me Tangere* (1887) and its sequel *El Filibusterismo* (1891), which were published before and after his *Sucesos*, respectively. Both books were condemned by the Catholic Church, and eventually banned by the Spanish government in las Islas Filipinas, which officially declared mere possession of either novel a punishable offense in the 1892 decree that ordered Rizal’s exile, alleging that his ultimate purpose was “nothing else but to uproot from loyal Filipino breasts the treasure of our Holy Catholic Faith, the unbreakable keystone of national unity in this land.” \(^{22}\) The field of power, in short, was controlled by Spanish religious and government leaders who could easily silence dissent expressed by Filipinos in the field of cultural production by refusing to grant licenses to printers in las Islas Filipinas or intercepting copies of books printed elsewhere.

---

19 See Trübner’s *Record*: “Specimens of Tagal Folklore” (1889) 45-46, and “Two Eastern Fables” (1889) 71-74; *La Solidaridad*: “Filipinas Dentro de Cien Años,” 4 parts (September 1889-February 1890), and “Sobre la Indolencia de los Filipinos,” 5 parts (July-September 1890); and *Epistolario Rizalino*, ed. Teodoro Kalaw, 6 vols. (Manila: Biblioteca Nacional, 1930-1938).
22 Ibid., 335.
Rizal’s novels, two of the very first written by a Filipino, tell the story of Crisostomo Ibarra, the son of a wealthy landlord, whose experience of injustice at the hands of Spanish friars and government officials eventually leads him to plan a revolution that fails. The *Noli* and *Fili*, as they are now popularly known, were composed in Spanish, and Rizal himself arranged for their printing in Berlin and Ghent, respectively. Little evidence has been found regarding the publication and distribution of both novels, but it is known that 2,000 copies of the *Noli* were printed, and it has been estimated that 1,000 copies made it to las Islas Filipinas. Although the *Noli* and *Fili* have been credited with igniting the Philippine Revolution of 1896, no such claims have been made in relation to Rizal’s *Sucesos*. Like his novels, the book’s circulation was prohibited, but as Guerrero points out, it was “never attacked as bitterly as the *Noli* and the *Fili*, it was largely ignored.”

The title page of Rizal’s *Sucesos* (Figure 2.1) indicates that it is a new edition of Antonio de Morga’s *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, which was published in Mexico in 1609; that it was annotated by Jose Rizal and features a prologue by Fernando Blumentritt; and that it was printed in Paris by Libreria de Garnier Hermanos in 1890. The book is completely in Spanish, except for occasional words and phrases in other languages, and features not only Blumentritt’s 15-page essay, and the 390 pages devoted to Morga’s original text and Rizal’s annotations, but also a two-page dedication entitled “Á los Filipinos” [To the Filipinos], in which Rizal emphasizes “la necesidad de dar primero a conocer el pasado, a fin de poder juzgar mejor el presente y medir el camino recorrido durante tres siglos” [the necessity of first making known to you the past in order that you may be able to judge better the present and to measure the road traversed during three centuries]. In his prologue, Blumentritt lauds Rizal for providing a non-European view of Philippine history with his annotations, but he is also the first to criticize his friend for expecting “from the men of the sixteenth century the broad horizon of ideas that agitate the nineteenth century.”

---

23 Ibid., 147.
24 Ibid., 212.
All this information may be gathered from the surviving copies of the 1890 edition, the offset reprints that began to be published in 1958, the English and Tagalog translations that appeared soon after, and almost all the books and articles that reproduce, translate, or discuss Rizal’s annotations. What these details do not reveal, however, is that the book did not achieve the desired result.

*    *    *

“The tragedy of Rizal’s [Sucesos],” according to Leon Ma. Guerrero, “was that, for his purposes, it was a waste of time.” This assessment has been disputed, but Guerrero was in fact commenting on the annotator’s failure to achieve his objective, not the value of the work itself. The “purposes” to which he was referring were expressed in Rizal’s dedication:

Si el libro logra despertar en vosotros la conciencia de nuestro pasado, borrado de la memoria, y rectificar lo que se ha falseado y calumniado, entonces no habré trabajado en balde, y con esta base, por pequeña que fuese, podremos todos dedicarnos á estudiar el futuro.

[If the book succeeds in awakening in you a consciousness of our past, now erased from memory, and in correcting what has been distorted and falsified, then I shall not have worked in vain, and on this basis, small though it may be, we can all set out to study the future.]

In “The Nostalgic Historian,” a chapter from The First Filipino, Guerrero explains that Rizal’s Sucesos failed to arouse the historical consciousness of the Filipino people and rectify previous errors because it was “too scholarly for partisans, too partisan for scholars.” He points to the fact that it scarcely figures in Rizal’s correspondence as proof that its author did not feel as protective

---

27 Ibid., 211.
28 Rizal, Sucesos (1890) vi.
29 Guerrero, The First Filipino, 212.
of his *Sucesos* as he did of the *Noli*, but it could very well be that there was not much to protect because, as Guerrero himself puts it, the book was “largely ignored.”

Of the scholars and biographers who have consecrated Rizal’s annotated edition of Morga’s *Sucesos*, Guerrero is the one who has provided the most detailed description of its development from the time the project was conceived to its dismal reception (compared to the *Noli* and *Fili*) in the late nineteenth century. He traces its genesis to 1887, when Rizal urged Fernando Blumentritt to write a complete history of las Islas Filipinas because he is “the best man for the job,” confessing that “I do not know enough” and that he would be “suspected of having been inspired by partisanship.” Rizal began corresponding with Blumentritt the year before because of the Austrian scholar’s interest in Philippine ethnography, but as time passed, the salutations in their letters progressed from the formal “sir” to the more intimate “friend” and, finally, “brother,” even though they had met only once in 10 years.

In 1888, after trying for more than a year to convince his friend to undertake the project he proposed, Rizal informed Blumentritt that he planned to issue a new edition of Morga’s *Sucesos* especially for the Filipino people. Guerrero goes on to provide an overview of the book’s journey to publication, discusses the edition’s circulation and reception briefly, translates Rizal’s message “to the Filipinos,” and praises Blumentritt’s “magnificent preface.” Like most scholars who have written about the book throughout the twentieth century, he is clearly more interested in summarizing and analyzing Rizal’s annotations than describing the book’s material form or contextualizing the notes in relation to the total number found in the book. The rest of this section reviews the available evidence related to the publication, circulation, and reception of Rizal’s *Sucesos*, and emphasizes the need for quantitative, not just qualitative, analysis of his annotations.

Rizal was aware of Stanley’s English translation, but as Blumentritt suggests in his prologue, the “indifference and apathy” with which Stanley’s volume was greeted in Spain may have convinced Rizal of the need for a new edition of Morga’s work in Spanish. According to the letters that Rizal sent to his friends as he traveled back and forth between London and Paris,
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30 Ibid., 211-212.
31 See Table 2.2 on p. 71 of this chapter.
33 Nery, 239.
he copied Morga’s *Sucesos* by hand at the British Museum in London from August to September 1888, and by January 1889 had finished reading all the books he could find on the history of las Islas Filipinas while annotating Morga’s text at the same time.\(^{36}\) It took almost a year before the manuscript was printed due to a delay that arose when, according to Rizal, London-based lawyer Antonio Regidor, a Filipino, could not make up his mind to fulfill his promise to finance its publication, and so Rizal decided to publish it himself in May 1889.\(^{37}\)

Within two months, he selected a printer in Paris, and was proofreading and adding new annotations until November, when he told a Filipino friend that he had finished correcting the proofs and that the book would be out in a few weeks.\(^{38}\) Rizal began sending copies to friends in Europe and las Islas Filipinas toward the end of December, as indicated in his letters and confirmed in autographed copies preserved in London and Manila, evidence which has not been previously noted by scholars.\(^{39}\) Hence, although the year “1890” appears on the book’s title page, the year of publication recorded in most scholarly works and cited in this dissertation, Rizal’s *Sucesos* had clearly been printed and had begun to circulate in late 1889.

After Rizal decided to publish the book himself, he did not seem to have encountered any difficulties in raising money to finance its printing because there is no evidence indicating that he asked anyone for assistance, as he did for the *Noli and Fili*.\(^{40}\) Rizal reveals in July 1889 that friends from his hometown sent him an unspecified amount of money to spend as he saw fit, and that he was allocating some of it for an expense that he does not disclose.\(^{41}\) Perhaps he planned to use the funds for his new edition of *Sucesos*, but there is no way of verifying this hypothesis.

The absence of financial documents also explains why there are no estimates regarding the cost of printing, and not even a hint of how many copies may have been printed. In 1959, a Filipino

---

\(^{36}\) Unless specified otherwise, all letters cited in this chapter are found in *Epistolario Rizalino*, ed. Teodoro Kalaw, 6 vols. (Manila: Biblioteca Nacional, 1930-1938), which is henceforth *ER* [volume number]:[page number]. Jose Rizal to Fernando Blumentritt, 18 August 1888, 26 August 1888, 17 September 1888, 20 May 1889, in *ER* 5.1:287-294, 305-308; 5.2:438-441; Rizal to Mariano Ponce, 30 April 1889, in *ER* 2:170-171; Rizal to Marcelo del Pilar, [January 1889], 20 May 1889, in *ER* 2:96-97, 176-177.

\(^{37}\) Some have speculated that racial antagonism was the reason the half-Spanish Regidor did not live up to Rizal’s expectations, but considering that the two were back on good terms within a few months, it seems much more likely that Rizal merely misunderstood Regidor’s intentions. Nery, 52, 66-67, n. 3; Rizal to del Pilar, 12 July 1889, in *ER* 2:208-210.

\(^{38}\) Rizal to Blumentritt, 23 July 1889, in *ER* 5.2:476-479; Rizal to Ponce, 11 November 1889, in *ER* 2:237-238.

\(^{39}\) Rizal to Baldomero Roxas, 28 December 1889, in *Rizal’s Correspondence with Fellow Reformists (RCFR)*; Manila: National Heroes Commission, 1963) 413-414; Rizal to Ponce, 31 December 1889, in *ER* 2:264-265. One of the three copies at the British Library (T38760) is signed and dated “Paris 25.X.1889,” while the Lopez Museum copy (8141) is dedicated to “A mi querido amigo y paisano el Dr. J. F. Pardo de Tavera - Paris 30 Xbre 1889.” Both inscriptions are found on each copy’s half-title page. “X” and “Xbre” stand for December, not October.

\(^{40}\) Guerrero, *The First Filipino*, 272-276.

\(^{41}\) Rizal to del Pilar, 12 July 1889, in *ER* 2:208-210.
scholar visited the Paris offices of Garnier Freres (or Libreria de Garnier Hermanos, as its imprint appears on the book’s title page) and learned that the popular French publisher had no copy of the book and no record of its publication, which is not surprising because Garnier was not Rizal’s publisher; he merely paid them to print the book.\(^{42}\)

Guerrero and other scholars have relied on Rizal’s correspondence to document specific instances in which copies were sent or received, but no one has summarized this information or ventured an estimate of the book’s print run. The apparent lack of difficulty regarding financing suggests that Rizal ordered fewer copies of *Sucesos* than the *Noli* (of which 2,000 were printed in 1887), but the available evidence indicates that more than 434 were actually printed.\(^{43}\) Various letters show that 170 copies were shipped to Manila via Hong Kong, and at least 48 copies were sent by or received from Rizal, with a few purchased from a bookseller, between December 1889 and December 1891.\(^{44}\) What no scholar has cited thus far is an inscription written on the half-title page of a copy preserved at the Ateneo de Madrid’s library in Spain, which indicates that 216 copies of the book were confiscated in las Islas Filipinas in 1890:

*Apprehension of 216 copies that the Assistant of Sales of the Iloilo Customs House recorded on the 11th of June 1896 as sent to Yndio J. Yndio (Unreadable) of Commerce
Teodoro Sander*

Who the writer was or whether the inscription may be considered an official record of the event is unclear, but it provides a starting point for further research regarding references to the alleged

---


\(^{43}\) Guerrero, *The First Filipino*, 141-147.

\(^{44}\) Jose Basa to Rizal, 4 August 1890, 3 December 1890, in *ER* 3:88-89, and *RCFR*, 711-712.

\(^{45}\) Transcribed and translated with invaluable assistance from Francis Navarro.
confiscation and/or destruction of copies of Rizal’s *Sucesos*, which scholars have thus far asserted without citing any sources to support their claims.\(^{46}\)

When he began copying Morga’s *Sucesos* in 1888, Rizal declared that “I do this only for my country, because this work will not bring me either honor or money.”\(^{47}\) He was clearly wrong about the first (except he would not be alive to enjoy it), and not entirely honest about his hopes for the second. As a letter he sent a few days later reveals, he was not completely discounting the possibility of profiting from the book. “Mr. Regidor and I have agreed,” Rizal wrote in German, “that after he has recovered the cost of printing, we are going to divide the profits – one-half for him and the other half for me.”\(^{48}\) But no profits were ever divided because, as mentioned earlier, Rizal resolved to have the book printed himself.

While prices are mentioned in some of Rizal’s correspondence, amounts are given in different currencies (mainly in relation to where Rizal or his correspondent was residing at a particular time) and it is not always possible to determine how many books were sold at what price or, assuming it was possible to convert currencies easily, the prevailing exchange rates in London, Paris, Hong Kong, and Manila. In May 1890, Rizal informed Blumentritt that “My Morga is very much sought and read,” and that the first copies received in Manila were selling for 25 francs, or double the original price of 12.50.\(^{49}\) These assertions, however, were likely colored by the understandable tendency of authors to generalize from anecdotal evidence regarding actual sales because Rizal, after a few weeks, was begging a friend to find out if any money had been collected, suggesting that the early sales did not develop into a trend.\(^{50}\) It cannot therefore be concluded with certainty, as Floro Quibuyen does, that Rizal’s comment that the book was selling well contradicts Guerrero’s assessment that Rizal’s *Sucesos* was “largely ignored.”\(^{51}\) More than a year later, another friend reported that the committee tasked with selling


\(^{49}\) It must be noted that the peso—not franc—was the most commonly used unit of currency in Manila in the late nineteenth century. Rizal to Blumentritt, 26 May 1890, in *ER* 5.2:559-564, with English translation from *RBC* 2:355.

\(^{50}\) Rizal to Antonio Luna, 3 July 1890, in *ER* 3:74-75.

\(^{51}\) Quibuyen, *A Nation Aborted*, 190.
170 copies in Manila had still not remitted any amount or even provided an accounting.\(^{52}\) It is unknown whether Rizal eventually received the funds due him, but he was obviously keenly aware of the financial aspects of book distribution.

The largest amount Rizal is known to have received for the sale of his edition of Morga’s *Sucesos* was 200 pesos in 1891 for an unspecified number of copies sold in Manila by Manuel Rodriguez Arias, the Spanish owner of Agencia Editorial, a bookshop.\(^{53}\) Why Arias consented to distribute copies of Rizal’s books is difficult to determine, but he was clearly mindful of the risk he was undertaking because aside from instructing Rizal on the steps necessary to avoid the inspection and confiscation of any shipments of books, he requested that “nobody absolutely should know of our friendly relations…”\(^{54}\) Rizal makes more than a few references to Arias in his letters, but his most notable comment about the bookseller reveals more about Rizal’s own biases toward books and las Islas Filipinas than the attitude of his people toward reading in general.

It is not true what a Spaniard writes about the lack of books in the Philippines. In proof of this there are rich booksellers, like Agencia Editorial whose owner became so rich in three years that his bookstore looks like that of Bailly Bailliere. But the majority of the books for sale are religious and narcotizing in character. Many people have small libraries, big ones being rare, because books are very costly. The works of Cantú, Laurent, Dumas, Sué [sic], Victor Hugo, Escriche, Schiller, and others are read. In my town of only 5 to 6,000 inhabitants there are some six small private libraries.\(^{55}\) Rizal may or may not have been correct in saying that the majority of the books Arias sold were “religious and narcotizing,” but his assumption that Agencia Editorial’s owner became rich by selling books is erroneous because Arias was born to a wealthy family.\(^{56}\) His claim regarding the prevalence of libraries is actually negated by his later statement that indicates fewer than a tenth of one percent of his town’s population had their own libraries.

Finally, whereas it is possible to love reading books without access to a library, his assertion in the same letter that “The Indio in general is very fond of reading and studying” is

\(^{52}\) It seems that the composition of the committee had changed, and that a former member was responsible for the delay. Graciano Lopez Jaena to Rizal, 26 August 1891, in *ER* 3:216-226.

\(^{53}\) Rizal to Basa, 6 August 1891, in *ER* 3:205-206.


\(^{55}\) Rizal to Blumentritt, 8 November 1888, in *ER* 5.1:327-336, with English translation from *RBC* 1:209-211.

probably a hasty generalization based on his own experience, as well as those of his educated and mostly affluent friends, whose families could afford to send them not only to the best schools in las Islas Filipinas, but also in Europe. Thus, even if the average “Indio,” a widely-used term for Filipinos during the Spanish period, found a way to borrow one of the books cited by Rizal, it is unlikely that he or she could have read it because very few Filipinos then or since, certainly not “in general,” have ever been able to read, write, or speak Spanish or other European languages.\(^57\) While books in local languages had already begun to be published in significant numbers, among themmetrical romances, Rizal was clearly not alluding to such books.\(^58\)

The reality that Spanish was practically incomprehensible to most Filipinos has been neglected by scholars who claim that Rizal’s novels influenced the Revolution of 1896. Benedict Anderson, whose books have introduced a wider audience to Rizal’s work, is one of the few who acknowledges that “In the 1890s barely 3 per cent of the population knew ‘Castilian,’” but he does not indicate exactly how Rizal and other Spanish-literate Filipinos “managed to turn movements of resistance to colonial rule from hopeless peasant uprisings into a revolution.”\(^59\) Retana was probably correct when he suggested that the Spanish friars contributed greatly to propagating Rizal’s ideas among those who could not read the Noli by denouncing its author and the novel from the pulpit and in widely circulated pamphlets, but the same cannot be said of Rizal’s Sucesos.\(^60\)

The earliest known criticism of Rizal’s historical work is found within its pages, but evidence that it was actually read is remarkably limited. In the prologue that Blumentritt wrote upon Rizal’s request, he praises his friend’s work effusively, but disagrees with Rizal’s propensity to “censure the events of past ages in the light of contemporary ideas” and his “giving vent in some cases to [his] feelings about Catholicism,” insisting that the abuses committed by individual priests, not the religion itself, was to blame for many of the lamentable happenings that Rizal discussed.\(^61\) Blumentritt gave his friend permission to edit the prologue as he saw fit, but Rizal made only a few minor corrections and left the negative comments intact.\(^62\) In contrast, Isabelo de los Reyes’s explanation in Historia de Ilocos (1890), regarding divergent

\[\text{\(^57\) Andrew Gonzalez, Language and Nationalism (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1980) 26.}\]
\[\text{\(^58\) Patricia May Jurilla, Tagalog Bestsellers of the Twentieth Century (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2008) 84.}\]
\[\text{\(^60\) Wenceslao Retana, Vida y Escritos del Dr. Jose Rizal (Madrid: V. Suarez, 1907) 161.}\]
\[\text{\(^61\) Blumentritt, “Prologo,” in Rizal, Sucesos (1890) xii, with English translation from Guerrero, The First Filipino, 215-216.}\]
\[\text{\(^62\) Rizal to Blumentritt, 19 November 1889, in ER 5.2:510-511.}\]
interpretations of the Philippine past in their respective books, that Rizal’s “very laudable patriotism… blinds him at times,” drew an unnecessarily hostile and sarcastic response from Rizal, who wrote an article-length rebuttal to his fellow Filipino patriot that was likely read by more people than the 21-line footnote it addressed.\textsuperscript{63}

De los Reyes’s criticism, which was not all that different from the reservations expressed by Blumentritt in his prologue, appeared in a two-volume work of more than four hundred pages and probably would have remained unnoticed if Rizal had not consecrated it by responding in the pages of \textit{La Solidaridad}, the nationalist Filipino newspaper, which was printed in Spain and prohibited in las Islas Filipinas, but nevertheless made its way into Filipino hands from 1889 to 1895.\textsuperscript{64} Toward the end of his lengthy reply to de Los Reyes, Rizal added that he did not wish others to observe that “not only are there few of us, but we also are at odds with each other.”\textsuperscript{65} This, however, is essentially what happened, which led Juan Luna to chide Rizal for attacking his fellow Filipino, noting that “the Spaniards in Manila are having a holiday at our expense.”\textsuperscript{66} It was probably not the first time that Filipinos disagreed regarding a matter that even their friends considered trivial, but it could very well be the first recorded instance of a Filipino historian reacting negatively to a fellow historian’s criticism. It would not be the last.

Notwithstanding the scant criticism of Rizal’s annotations, and his own claim that the book was in demand, the available evidence indicates that the historical work was not read as much as his novels.\textsuperscript{67} Aside from the reactions already mentioned, only Paciano, his own brother, and Mariano Ponce, one of his regular correspondents in Barcelona, are on record as having even opened the book within the first two years of its publication. Paciano informed Rizal that he had read the annotations “hurriedly,” but nevertheless shared Blumentritt’s opinion regarding their importance.\textsuperscript{68} It is indicative of Rizal’s reputation or the high regard that his friends had for him that Ponce, after admitting that he had only read Blumentritt’s prologue, goes on to pronounce that “your book will change the wrong ideas now prevailing about our country. It is a strong

\begin{footnotes}
\item[{64}]Schumacher, \textit{The Propaganda Movement}, 143.
\item[{65}]Rizal, “A Reply,” 723.
\item[{66}]Juan Luna to Rizal, 8 November 1890, in \textit{ER} 3:122-123, with English translation from Guerrero, \textit{The First Filipino}, 212.
\item[{67}]Rizal to Antonio Luna, 3 July 1890, in \textit{ER} 3:74-75.
\item[{68}]Paciano Rizal to Jose Rizal, 27 May 1890, in \textit{ER} 3:33-38. The English translation is from \textit{Letters Between Rizal and Family Members} (Manila: National Heroes Commission, 1964) 295.
\end{footnotes}
blow against the enemy.”

Ponce’s prediction, however, was more applicable to Rizal’s novels, which were attacked and defended, both in Madrid and Manila.

Like the *Noli* and *Fili*, Rizal’s *Sucesos* was written in Spanish, printed in Europe, and must have circulated in las Islas Filipinas in very limited numbers due to censorship, religious condemnation, and its author’s own shortcomings in terms of marketing his books. But unlike Rizal’s novels, his *Sucesos* has not been credited with sparking the Revolution and is much less familiar to Filipinos. Most scholars tend to overlook the fact that the overwhelming majority of Filipinos during the late nineteenth century could not possibly have understood any of these three books even if they had miraculously been able to acquire copies. In addition, they extol the literary and political significance of Rizal’s works as if the reality of the Revolution renders questions regarding their circulation moot and academic. Guerrero is one of the few authors who recognizes that Rizal’s influence is not easily explained. But while he enumerates the factors that prevented wider circulation of the *Noli*, instead of discussing how these obstacles were surmounted, he merely concludes that “Indeed, one of the most extraordinary things about the *Noli* is that withal it changed the history of a nation.”

Caroline Hau, a literary scholar, does not accept Guerrero’s “sleight-of-hand,” which she interprets as a circular syllogism that claims “Rizal is… influential because he is Rizal.” Instead, Hau argues that the importance of the *Noli* stems not so much from its impact on the few who understood it, but its effect “on those who could not and did not read it.” Guerrero may be said to have alluded to this phenomenon when he observed that “the *Noli*’s fame was really made by the rage which it aroused among the rulers of the Philippines,” but Hau elaborates further by asserting that the controversy surrounding the book, while effectively limiting the distribution of Rizal’s novel, actually encouraged the dissemination of Rizal’s ideas in the form of rumors.

Hau does not go into the mechanics of how exactly the rumors spread or even specify what Filipinos were saying about the *Noli*, perhaps because it is practically impossible to do so, but she does quote a newspaper report that repeats the rumors about Rizal and summarizes what its author perceived the Filipinos were thinking:
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69 Ponce to Rizal, 31 December 1889, in *ER* 2:264-265; with English translation from *RCFR*, 415.
71 Guerrero, *The First Filipino*, 147.
73 Ibid., 51.
74 Ibid., 55.
Rizal has inspired hatred among his countrymen toward the Catholic religion, and his closest followers have abandoned all practice of religion, faithfully complying with that which he teaches in his novel *Noli me tangere*, [namely,] profound antipathy to the clergy... not to mention how he portrays the Spanish as a race.\textsuperscript{75}

Whether or not the rumors were true or the author’s perceptions were correct is beside the point. As Hau notes, “by repeating these rumors, the newspaper may have done more to lend credence to them just by the mere fact that they were printed at all.”\textsuperscript{76} Not only were the rumors lent credence, but their publication in a newspaper ensured that even those who had not previously been aware of the rumors could then start spreading the so-called news themselves.

\* \* \*

The evidence related to the publication, dissemination, and reception of Rizal’s *Sucesos* is incomplete, and it is unlikely that additional documents will ever be found. Rizal’s reasons for seeking to publish an annotated edition of Morga’s *Sucesos* is clear enough from his letters, but certain questions, such as where the funds to print the book originated or how many copies were produced, will probably never be answered satisfactorily. Questions related to basic facts about the book itself and Rizal’s annotations, meanwhile, may still be addressed because even though copies of the 1890 edition are neither abundant nor easily perused, they do exist and may be accessed with a little effort. Scholars, however, have yet to examine the available evidence in a systematic manner.

Those who have studied Rizal’s annotated edition of Morga’s *Sucesos* at length were neither bibliographers nor book historians, and it is thus understandable that none of them has discussed the book’s material form at length in any of their publications. Close examination of 18 copies preserved at libraries and archives in France (1), the United Kingdom (3), the United States (3), Spain (5), and the Philippines (6) indicates that the book measured 20 to 22 cm in height and 12 to 14 cm in width, approximately the size of today’s trade paperbacks.\textsuperscript{77} The

\textsuperscript{75} Account from *La Epoca*, 17 December 1891, quoted in Retana, *Vida y Escritos*, 141-142, and translated from Spanish into English in Hau, *Necessary Fictions*, 56.

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., 57.

\textsuperscript{77} The copies examined for this study are preserved in: France, Bibliothèque nationale (1 copy); the UK: British Library (3); the US: Library of Congress (1), Newberry Library (1), and New York Public Library (1); Spain: Bibliotecas AECID (1), Biblioteca del Ateneo de Madrid (1), and Biblioteca Nacional (3); and the Philippines: Ateneo de Manila’s Rizal Library (2), Lopez Museum (2), and National Library (2).
variable sizes, along with the assortment of colored cloth bindings, different texts on the spines, and assorted endpapers, suggest that the initial owners or buyers or perhaps even later collectors or libraries had the book rebound by a professional according to their preferences, in many cases removing the paper wrapper that originally enclosed the book. 78 It consisted of 390 pages of Morga’s text and Rizal’s 620 annotations, plus 22 pages of front matter. 79 The numerical signatures that appear at the bottom-right corner of every sixteenth page, which are used to ensure different gatherings are collated in the proper order, confirm that the book was printed in octavo format. Knowledge of these details is not always crucial to discussions of an author’s intentions, but it must be noted that most scholars who have written about Rizal’s Sucesos acknowledge only the existence of his more substantive annotations and ignore the rest, leading some to draw false or exaggerated conclusions.

Guerrero was the first to divide Rizal’s notes into categories—that is, “the simply anti-clerical, and the historical and sociological”—and indicates that the latter are dedicated to three main propositions:

that the people of the Philippines had a culture of their own before the coming of the Spaniards, that the Filipinos were decimated, demoralised, exploited and ruined by Spanish colonisation, and that the present state of the Philippines was not in all ways and necessarily superior to their past. 80

Ambeth Ocampo and Floro Quibuyen, whose works are discussed in the next section, formulate their own classifications, but it cannot be said that these are radically different from those proposed by Guerrero. 81 Not one of the three discloses that the categories they devised do not actually apply to all the annotations.

More than two-thirds of Rizal’s 620 annotations, in fact, provide sources, translations, corrections, and additional information that are clarificatory in nature, and are not necessarily
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78 Of the copies examined, only those at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France and the New York Public Library still have their wrappers.
79 There are approximately two annotations for every page of Morga’s text in the 1890 edition, but since almost a third of the book does not contain annotations, some of the remaining pages have as many as six notes. The longest footnote—107 lines that span four pages—is essentially a long quote from the diary of one of Magellan’s companions in 1521, while the shortest consists of just one character, an exclamation point. Rizal, Sucesos (1890) 3-6, 234. The average length of an annotation is approximately 6 lines, but almost half of them are one- or two-liners. The notes are not numbered consecutively throughout the book, but begin with “1” on each annotated page. If all these notes were put together, they would be equivalent to approximately 64 pages of the entire book. They were, of course, printed in a smaller font than Morga’s text, but even if they were the same size, they would still account for fewer than half of the total number of pages in Rizal’s edition.
80 Guerrero, The First Filipino, 216.
81 Ocampo, “Rizal’s Morga,” 193; Quibuyen, A Nation Aborted, 142.
ant clerical, anti-Spanish, or pro-Filipino. Of the 26 notes in the first chapter, for instance, at most three may be considered as expressing an opinion, of which only one—in which Rizal asserts that the Spanish phrase “encomendar una provincia” [entrust a province] had become synonymous with allowing the plunder of a province—may be viewed as being critical of Spanish rule. Meanwhile, the eighth and final chapter, the one most heavily annotated by Rizal, has 277 notes, fewer than half of which may be broadly construed as advancing a nationalist point of view. It is thus an exaggeration to claim, as Quibuyen does, that Rizal’s annotations “constitute a sustained interrogation of colonial power” or “construct a national view of history.”

This tendency to attribute achievements to Rizal that are unsupported by evidence is not unusual. Setsuho Ikehata, for instance, implies that Rizal’s book was superior to the works of Pedro Paterno and Isabelo de los Reyes because it was “a systematic study oriented toward composing a Filipino national history by Filipinos.” But it must be noted that although the histories by Paterno and de los Reyes could very well be less authoritative than Rizal’s Sucesos, it may be argued that each of their books, which are clearly not augmented editions of another author’s work, display the unity and coherence that a “sustained interrogation” or “systematic study” presumably requires, and which Rizal’s annotations can be said to possess only in a figurative sense.

Was the book’s production, therefore, as Guerrero claims, “a waste of time”? The Jesuit historian John Schumacher observes that there is no evidence that it was widely circulated, “even among the Spanish-literate minority reached by his novels,” but suggests that Rizal’s key ideas or a simplified form thereof influenced ordinary Filipinos in a very limited manner, specifically as “a summary of Rizal’s historiography” that appeared in a manifesto attributed to Andres Bonifacio, founder and leader of the Katipunan. “Ang Dapat Mabatid ng mga Tagalog” [What the Tagalogs need to understand] was written in the Tagalog language, and printed in the first and only issue of the revolutionary newspaper Kalayaan, whose distribution has been credited with an increase in the Katipunan’s membership from 300 to 30,000 during the five months

---

82 Rizal, Sucesos (1890) 12, n. 1.
83 Quibuyen, A Nation Aborted, 159.
85 Schumacher, The Making of a Nation, 114, 117.
immediately preceding the outbreak of the 1896 Revolution.\textsuperscript{86} Other historians agree that Rizal’s writings must have influenced Bonifacio’s thinking, but there is no way of ascertaining whether his manifesto was based on Rizal’s \textit{Sucesos} or the articles he wrote for \textit{La Solidaridad}, whose copies were more easily smuggled into the country—and read—than books.\textsuperscript{87}

Rizal’s \textit{Sucesos}, in short, was like most Filipino history books in the years immediately after it was first published: there is very little evidence that anyone read it, and any discussion regarding its effect on a broader audience is difficult to prove empirically, especially because the mediating factor (in this case, Bonifacio’s manifesto) does not explicitly indicate the source from which it drew inspiration. But unlike most books, Rizal’s \textit{Sucesos} did reach a wider audience eventually. As the next section shows, its consecration throughout the twentieth century was due primarily not to the book’s unique contribution to Philippine historiography, but to the symbolic capital attached to Rizal’s name, which more often than not increased as controversies regarding his life and novels arose throughout the twentieth century.

\section*{Survival}

Rizal’s annotations have been reproduced, translated, criticized, and cited by scholars in various ways. The most notable publications, either because they were the earliest or the most comprehensive, are the reprints and translations of Morga’s \textit{Sucesos} that feature some or all of Rizal’s notes, as well as book chapters, scholarly articles, or published conference papers that reveal not only how Rizal’s \textit{Sucesos} was understood at particular times, but also how the field of historical production in the Philippines evolved during the twentieth century. This section examines the extraordinary level of consecration accorded Rizal’s annotated edition (compared to other history books by his contemporaries) in relation to the different ways in which Rizal’s privileged status among Filipino heroes has been affirmed and contested through various government initiatives, religious objections, educational reforms, and cultural representations, as well as the development of the scholarly and commercial infrastructure that ensured the book’s survival even though it was never as controversial as the \textit{Noli} or \textit{Fili} during its author’s lifetime.


\textsuperscript{87} Two of Rizal’s better-known articles published in \textit{La Solidaridad} that echoed the views expressed in his annotations are “Filipinas Dentro de Cien Años” and “Sobre la Indolencia de los Filipinos.” Reynaldo Ileto, \textit{Pasyon and Revolution} (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1979/2003) 83.
Rizal is the only Filipino whose life and work have been the subject of intense scrutiny, as well as controversies, during practically every decade of the twentieth century. It may, therefore, be somewhat surprising that his status as the Philippine national hero was not seriously challenged until 1969, when Renato Constantino described him as “an American-sponsored hero.”

During the American colonial period, a province was named after Rizal, the day of his execution was declared a national holiday, his likeness was imprinted on the most widely circulated stamps and currency, and a monument was built in his honor. No other Filipinos were exalted in a similar manner during the early years of the twentieth century. Thus, it is not unreasonable to assume that the Filipinos who proclaimed Rizal a saint in 1903, watched the earliest films on his life and death produced in 1912, and reminisced about their encounters with Rizal in newspaper and magazine articles in the decades that followed, were influenced by American efforts to promote Rizal as a Filipino hero.

The truth, however, is that Filipinos already considered Rizal their hero even before the Filipino-American War began in 1899. One of the most concrete manifestations of his importance to Filipinos prior to American rule is the official decree issued in 1898 by the Filipino-led, revolutionary government that declared December 30, the date of Rizal’s execution two years earlier, a national day of mourning.

---

89 The minutes of the proceedings regarding the merger of the district of Morong and the portion of the province of Manila that lay outside the city of Manila met with objections, but apparently the suggestion made by Trinidad Pardo de Tavera, a Filipino, to name the new province after Rizal was eventually approved with the enactment of Act No. 137 on 11 June 1901, Report of the Philippine Commission, Part 9 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1901) 196-202; Leandro Fernandez, “Jose Rizal: Filipino Patriot” (M.A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1913) 59; Neil Shafer, A Guide Book of Philippine Paper Money (Racine, WI: Whitman, 1964) 24-25.
A second English translation of Morga’s *Sucesos* was published in two volumes in 1904 as part of the 55-volume *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1803* (1903-1909), edited by Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, both Americans, and published by the Arthur H. Clark Company in Cleveland. Of the new edition’s 431 footnotes, more than half are taken from Rizal’s annotations, most of which are fully rendered into English. “Blair & Robertson” or “B&R,” as the collection is now commonly known, was essentially a library of English translations of books, manuscripts, and documents. The great majority of the sources were written by non-Filipino, Catholic males in European languages, primarily Spanish, between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, which emphasizes not only the indispensability of Western sources to the writing of Philippine history, but also the significance of Rizal’s contribution as a Filipino.

The following year, Rizal’s preface to his *Sucesos* was reprinted in Manila along with what is probably its first ever English translation in *Revista Historica de Filipinas*, the official publication of the Asociacion Historica de Filipinas, which was founded in 1905. Felipe Calderon, the review’s editor and the association’s founder, was a Filipino lawyer and the primary author of the Malolos Constitution promulgated by the Philippine revolutionary government in 1899. In “Rizal en la Historia de Filipinas” [The place of Rizal in Philippine history], he pays tribute to Rizal in Spanish and in English for “reconstructing and popularizing the real history of the Filipino people” through his edition of Morga’s *Sucesos*, calling it a “precious gift which he presented to his country and to all the civilized world.”

Wenceslao Retana, one of the best-known Spanish opponents of Filipino nationalists during the 1890s, counters Calderon’s assessment in *Vida y Escritos del Dr. Jose Rizal* (1907), where he expresses admiration for Rizal’s *Sucesos*, but criticizes its annotator because he “proves too much.” Two years later, Retana produced his own edition of Morga’s *Sucesos*, which like his Rizal biography was published in Madrid. More than two-thirds of the book consisted of his own commentary on Morga’s text and some of Rizal’s annotations, additional

---


documents, and an extensive index with capsule definitions and biographies. His thoroughness is likely the reason Filipino and non-Filipino historians have called Retana’s *Sucesos* “the magnificent, definitive edition,” “a more comprehensive and more scholarly work than Rizal’s,” and “the more useful edition today for historians.”

His edition, however, has never been translated from Spanish into another language, and no new or offset editions have ever been published. In contrast, Rizal’s preface and 72 of his 620 annotations were translated into English by Austin Craig, an American who travelled to the Philippine Islands to work as a school teacher, and published by the Manila-based Philippine Education Company as a chapter in *Rizal’s Life and Minor Writings* (1927); and Rizal’s entire edition was eventually reprinted by two different publishers, and translated into English and Tagalog.

* * *

Several important developments occurred between Craig’s arrival in 1904 and the publication of the first offset reprint of Rizal’s *Sucesos* in 1958 that led to the increased production of Filipino history books in the latter half of the twentieth century. The publication and distribution of history books, for instance, were significantly affected by changes in the field of power. Whereas manuscripts had to be approved by ecclesiastical and government authorities before books could be printed or ordered during the Spanish period, very few restrictions were imposed on the publication and importation of books during the early years of American rule.

Since the biggest markets for Philippine history books were the United States (where the question of Philippine independence was debated for several decades) and to a lesser extent, at least initially, the Philippine Islands (where English became the language of government, business, and the public schools), more books were written in English (primarily by Americans), and those in Spanish, Tagalog, and other languages became rare as the decades passed. In short, geography and language—two factors that Bourdieu does not fully account for in his theory of the field of cultural production—must be considered in any attempt to discern the reason that the B&R translations, not the original Spanish works, became the scholarly reference on Philippine history for most of the twentieth century.

---

98 Craig, “Annotations to Morga’s 1609 Philippine History,” in *Rizal’s Life and Minor Writings*, 311-331.
Although some form of racial tension seems to have existed between those who regarded themselves as legitimate historians and those they considered “pseudo-Filipinistas,” and a Spanish scholar has suggested that an American historian systematically discredited the writings of his Spanish and Filipino counterparts, the available evidence is insufficient to conclude that these oppositions had a significant impact on the consecration of specific Philippine history books.  

It is much more likely, as Resil Mojares illustrates in *Brains of the Nation* (2006), that “Private initiatives like [Calderon’s] Asociacion Historica de Filipinas were swamped by the U.S. colonial state’s program of reorganizing government, establishing an English-based national educational system, and renovating the national culture.” Mojares goes on to say that the American divide “stranded” the Spanish-language works of Filipino—and, though Mojares does not mention them, Spanish—authors in the past, and indicates that “Increased professionalization, changing orientations in the disciplines and the hegemonic claims of American education propagated new approaches and methods.”

The establishment of the University of the Philippines in 1908, the first state university in the archipelago, as well as its all-American history department in 1910, did contribute to the professionalization of history as a discipline and the institutionalization of Philippine history writing in English, but it would be erroneous to assume that the process took place as smoothly as Mojares implies or that conflicts were solely between Filipino nationalists and their American colonizers. Austin Craig, for instance, joined UP’s history department in 1912, and was its chair from 1914 until he was dismissed in 1922. Various reasons have been offered for his departure, including his lack of formal training in history and his public criticism of fellow Americans, among them the Governor General and UP’s president; but Craig’s dismissal was clearly a result of personal and political differences with the university’s leadership, and not with his Filipino colleagues in the history department. It was the first controversy involving a UP historian to be reported on the front pages of Manila newspapers.

---


101 Ibid., 489.

102 Ibid., 497.

103 Ibid., 497.

All these developments encouraged the writing and publication of Filipino history books, but it is important to remember that such works were published sporadically, and that their distribution did not necessarily go unopposed. In 1935, both Spanish and English remained official languages when the American government turned over control of the Philippine Islands to Filipino leaders elected by their fellow Filipinos. But it is worth noting that a controversy surrounding the discovery earlier that year of a document written in Spanish was publicly discussed primarily in English. The controversy itself was a reminder of the enduring power of the Catholic Church in the Philippine Islands, despite the replacement of Spanish missionaries with American ones, as well as the continuing significance of Jose Rizal to Filipino nationalists.

The document is now commonly known as Rizal’s retraction of his “words, writings, publications and conduct” that were contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church, much of which is evident in the Noli and Fili.\(^\text{105}\) It was allegedly written and signed by Rizal on the night before his execution, but had never been photographed since its existence was first reported in 1896. Its significance is difficult to appreciate today, but at that time ascertaining whether Rizal died a Catholic or not was apparently a matter of national importance. The document’s discovery, announced in big bold letters under the masthead of the Philippines Herald, was not immediately controversial.\(^\text{106}\) Leandro Fernandez, who took over from Craig as chair of UP’s history department in 1922, was quoted as saying that if the document, which he had yet to examine, were authentic, it would not in any way detract from Rizal’s legacy.\(^\text{107}\) Before year’s end, however, a book written by a UP philosophy professor declared the document a forgery, and the publication of a review deemed offensive by Catholics resulted in the first recorded instance of censorship in the history of the Philippine Collegian, UP’s student newspaper.\(^\text{108}\)

Teodoro Agoncillo, the review’s author and Fernandez’s former student, not only expressed admiration for the book’s “cold and convincing logic,” but also cited “numerous forgeries committed by the church during the Middle Ages,” and sarcastically observed that, “when the Church’s interests are at stake its so-called ministers do everything within their power to attain its end. Satan must be served, not God, for the sake of faith! That’s Catholicism.


\(^{108}\) Ricardo Pascual, Dr. Jose Rizal Beyond the Grave (Manila: Manlapit Press, 1935); Teodoro Agoncillo, “Mr. Pascual’s ‘Dr. Jose Rizal Beyond the Grave’ or A Vindication of the Martyr of Bagumbayan (A Psychological and Historical Appraisal),” Philippine Collegian, 19 December 1935, 9+. 
Parenthetically, Catholicism is not Catholic.” The Collegian’s editor-in-chief was suspended after the university president received a complaint from a priest, who emphasized the need to avoid publicizing controversial matters that might offend “a very large portion not only of the students of the University, but also of the Catholic community of the Philippines.” It is indicative of the influence of the Catholic Church at that time that UP’s Protestant president echoed the priest’s concern. Agoncillo, who had recently graduated with a master’s degree in history, was not penalized. This would not be the last time that Catholics challenged an assertion that Rizal’s retraction was forged or objected to something that Agoncillo wrote.

The publication of another book about Rizal in 1949 triggered yet another controversy. Biografia de Rizal, written in Spanish by former UP president Rafael Palma, took the top prize in a government-sponsored, biography-writing contest in 1939, but it was not until after an English translation of the winning manuscript was published ten years later and created a stir among Filipinos that the Spanish edition was rushed into print. It is possible that the book’s publication was delayed by several factors—such as its author’s death in 1939, the Japanese occupation from 1942 to 1945 during the Second World War, the administrative problems that followed the recognition of Philippine independence on 4 July 1946, and the need to have it translated into English (unlike one of the contest’s runners-up, which was in print by 1940)—but it could also very well be that its author’s position that Rizal’s retraction was a “pious fraud” reached the ears of influential Catholics, who then worked to prevent its dissemination.

When The Pride of the Malay Race, a title supplied by the translator, was finally issued by Prentice-Hall in New York, the Philippine government ordered 10,000 copies for the use of Filipino high school students. Objections were raised almost immediately, and the distribution of copies was delayed indefinitely. Numerous Filipinos—among them Catholics, Protestants, Freemasons, and students—raised arguments and counter-arguments related to, among others, freedom of expression, the separation of Church and State, and the rights of parents. One of the more scholarly exchanges appeared in the Philippine Collegian, where Nicolas Zafra, chair
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109 Agoncillo, “Mr. Pascual’s ‘Dr. Jose Rizal Beyond the Grave,’” 9.
110 “Editor-in-chief is Suspended as Managing Editor Gets Reprimand,” Philippine Collegian, 6 January 1936, 1+.
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113 Palma, The Pride of the Malay Race, 343; Carlos Quirino, The Great Malayan (Manila: Philippine Education Co., 1940).
}

Several months later, a special committee formed by Elpidio Quirino, the President of the Philippines, to investigate the merits of a petition protesting the use of the book in public schools recommended its distribution.\footnote{“Rizal Biography Release Urged,” \textit{Manila Times}, 7 January 1950.
} Before Quirino could act on this suggestion, however, Catholic bishops denounced Palma’s book in a pastoral letter read across the nation as “a piece of anti-Catholic propaganda,” and objected to “the printing of 10,000 copies at the expense of the taxpayers,” 82 percent of whom, the prelates claimed, were Catholics.\footnote{See “Joint Statement of the Catholic Hierarchy of the Philippines on the Book ‘The Pride of the Malay Race,’” 6 January 1950, http://www.cbponline.net/documents/1950s/1950-malay_race.html.
} No other book had ever been the subject of the collective ire of the Philippine bishops, most of whom by then were Filipino, but it was a sign of the changing times that Quirino eventually accepted the committee’s recommendation to allow the book’s distribution.\footnote{“Editor’s Note,” \textit{Philippine Clipper}, March 1950, 1.
}

In 1956, almost sixty years after Rizal’s execution, the growing tension between Filipino nationalists and the Catholic Church precipitated two controversies about books. The first involved the publication of Agoncillo’s still-unpublished Bonifacio biography, which is discussed in Chapter Four of this dissertation, while the second and more divisive dispute revolved around a bill that required Rizal’s novels to be read by students in “all public and private schools, colleges and universities in the Philippines… in the original editions or in their unexpurgated English or National Language versions.”\footnote{J.B. Laurel, Jr., “The Trials of the Rizal Bill,” \textit{Historical Bulletin} 5 (1961) 130-131.
} The proposal unleashed a war of words, and the public debates created so much awareness that bookstores ran out of copies of the \textit{Noli} and \textit{Fili}.\footnote{“Best Sellers” [editorial], \textit{Philippines Free Press}, 12 May 1956, 1.
} As one journalist observed,

A month ago, one could not have imagined a Filipino politician speaking in any but the most respectful terms of the prelates of the Church; he would have considered it political suicide to express himself critically of them. Now all caution seems to have been thrown to the wind. Anything goes.\footnote{Teodoro Locsin, “The Church Under Attack,” \textit{Philippines Free Press}, 5 May 1956, http://philippinesfreepress.wordpress.com/2006/05/05/the-church-under-attack-may-5-1956/.
}
“Anything” included the mockery and ridicule of the bishops, who were also called “enemies of freedom.” Worse, Catholic senators led the attack.123

Another pastoral letter, unsigned but later authenticated by the Archbishop of Manila, affirmed the importance of Rizal and recognized that his novels contained “beautiful passages” that were “doubtlessly written as an expression of Rizal’s ardent and generous love for our dear Philippines,” but asserted at the same time that they also included heretical portions written when Rizal was estranged from his faith and could not therefore be read by Catholics in their entirety.124 Filipino Catholics mobilized to register their support for or against the bill, but a revised version with an amendment allowing the exemption of students from reading the novels (but not from taking the course) for reasons of religious belief was eventually signed into law on 12 June 1956.125

It is unknown whether Republic Act No. 1425, also known as the Rizal Law, was deliberately enacted on the fifty-eighth anniversary of the Philippine Declaration of Independence in 1898, which had yet to be formally commemorated at that time, or if it was intended to honor Rizal a week before what would have been his ninety-fifth birthday, but official nationalism was clearly on the rise, as seen in the elaborate preparations that preceded the centennial of Rizal’s birth in 1961. As early as 1954, the Jose Rizal National Centennial Commission (JRNCC) had been established by an executive order, and among its many responsibilities were the publication and translation of practically all of Rizal’s known works, including his correspondence, which were to be sold at cost.126 This, however, did not prevent profit-oriented local and international publishers from preparing their own editions of various translations of Rizal’s novels, especially after the enactment of the Rizal Law, as well as biographies and other Rizal-related works intended for students and casual readers.127 Among these publishers was R. Martinez and Sons, which issued an offset reprint of Rizal’s Sucesos in
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123 Of the 24 senators, all except one were Catholic. Only three senators opposed the bill; two were the brothers of archbishops, and the third was a good friend of another. Carmencita Acosta, The Life of Rufino Cardinal Santos (Quezon City: Kayumanggi Press, 1973) 71-72, 76.
124 Ibid., 72-76; “Statement of the Philippine Hierarchy on the Novels of Dr. Jose Rizal,” 21 April 1956, http://www.cbcponline.net/documents/1950s/1956-novels_of_rizal.html. The original basis for this statement, which shows that not all Catholic priests agreed that Rizal’s novels were sacrilegious, is discussed in John Schumacher, “The Rizal Bill of 1956: Horacio de la Costa and the Bishops,” Philippine Studies 59 (2011) 529-553.
125 College students continue to take this course, but no one has ever sought an exemption. Ambeth Ocampo, “The Fight Over the Rizal Law,” Philippine Daily Inquirer, 4 May 2007.
126 Executive Order No. 52, 10 August 1954.
1958, a limited edition of 500 copies.\textsuperscript{128} It is unlikely that any other copies were printed because the JRNCC soon began releasing Rizal’s collected works, including a facsimile of Rizal’s \textit{Sucesos} (1961), with translations in English (1962) and Tagalog (1964).\textsuperscript{129}

The Martinez and JRNCC reprints were published in smaller formats than the original edition, with new introductions for both. The translations, meanwhile, aside from being awkward or adding interpretations not found in the original text, did not correspond with Rizal’s Spanish annotations.\textsuperscript{130} Although the English translation essentially reproduced the format of the original edition, with footnotes on each page starting with “1,” the Tagalog translation gathered all of Rizal’s annotations, numbered consecutively per chapter, at the end of the book. But the most important difference between Rizal’s edition and the JRNCC translations is that not all footnotes were included in the latter and others were added. While Rizal’s \textit{Sucesos} has 620 annotations, the English translation has 610, and it is not always clear which among the latter were introduced by the translator. Meanwhile, the Tagalog edition only features 560, which probably reflects the fact that there was no need to reproduce the notes that translated Tagalog words and phrases into Spanish.

* * *

Greater scholarly interest in recognizing Rizal as a historian accompanied the production of new editions and translations of his \textit{Sucesos} in the latter half of the twentieth century. Except for a 1935 journal article on “Rizal as a Historian,” which proclaimed him “the father of Philippine history,” Rizal was rarely acknowledged as a historian before the 1950s.\textsuperscript{131} But as the 1961 centennial of his birth approached, more scholars began extolling the excellence of Rizal’s historical production, which included, depending on the author, not only his \textit{Sucesos} annotations and his essays in \textit{La Solidaridad} on “Filipinas Dentro de Cien Años” [The Philippines a century hence] and “Sobre la Indolencia de los Filipinos” [The indolence of the Filipinos], but also his

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{128} “Nota Preliminar,” in Antonio de Morga, \textit{Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas}, ed. Jose Rizal (Quezon City: R. Martinez, 1958).
\item \textsuperscript{129} Antonio de Morga, \textit{Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas}, ed. Jose Rizal (Manila: Comision Nacional del Centenario de Jose Rizal, 1961); \textit{Historical Events of the Philippine Islands}, tr. Encarnacion Alzona (Manila: Jose Rizal National Centennial Commission, 1962); and \textit{Mga Pangyayari sa Sangkapuluang Pilipinas} (Maynila: Pambansang Komisyon ng mga Bayani, 1964).
\item \textsuperscript{130} Ocampo, “Rizal’s Morga,” 212-214, nn. 12 and 28; Quibuyen, \textit{A Nation Aborted}, 398-399, n. 5.
\item \textsuperscript{131} Eulogio Rodriguez, “Rizal as a Historian,” \textit{Philippine Social Science Review} 7 (1935) 267. An earlier reference is from 1905, when he was dubbed “the great historian” in a footnote. Jose Rizal, “Á los Filipinos,” \textit{Revista Historica de Filipinas} (1905) 19, n. 1.
\end{itemize}
Most of their works tend to be hagiographic in tone, do no more than summarize or cite Rizal’s annotations in English, and rarely devote more than a few paragraphs to his annotated edition of Morga’s *Sucesos*. Only four scholarly studies may be said to have been devoted primarily to Rizal’s *Sucesos*. Two appeared in books dedicated to Rizal, and the remaining two were initially delivered as conference papers in the years immediately preceding the centennials of his birth and death. While all four publications provide some information related to the content, writing, printing, and distribution of the 1890 edition, and to a lesser extent the 1609 original, the bulk of the texts are composed of discussions or summaries of Rizal’s annotations.

Encarnacion Alzona, whose 1960 conference paper appeared in the proceedings of the first International Conference of Historians of Asia in 1962, devotes most of her attention to the salient points in Morga’s narrative that Rizal selected for comment “in his desire to help the student of Philippine history to form a truer picture of the country and her people.” Alzona, who translated Rizal’s *Sucesos* into English, does not present these points in any discernible order, but her enumeration of Rizal’s assertions—including his contention that Spanish colonization led to the decimation of the early Filipinos’ shipbuilding, mining, and weaving industries, as well as the decline in their ability to read and write in their own tongues—clearly illustrates Rizal’s main theses that, contrary to Spanish claims, the earliest inhabitants of las Islas Filipinas did have their own culture and history, and that Filipinos in the nineteenth century were not necessarily better off after more than three centuries of Spanish rule.

Leon Ma. Guerrero’s “The Nostalgic Historian” was a chapter in *The First Filipino*, the winner of the biography-writing contest conducted by the JRNCC in 1961, and published in 1963. Although almost half of the three-part chapter was not directly related to Rizal’s work on Morga’s book and Guerrero does not devote as much space to Rizal’s annotations as other scholars, it is worth mentioning because of its critical stance, making it the only study since Retana produced his annotated edition in 1909 to treat Rizal’s book with less than complete

---


deference.\textsuperscript{134} While Guerrero did consider it “a waste of time” and “too scholarly for partisans, too partisan for scholars,” he nevertheless defends Rizal’s \textit{Sucesos} by claiming that no one else had previously argued with Spanish historians on behalf of the Filipino people, and that despite its annotator’s limited access to primary sources, “his inspired conjectures have been upheld by modern scholarship.”\textsuperscript{135}

In a 1995 conference paper that appeared as an article in the journal \textit{Philippine Studies} in 1998, Ambeth Ocampo acknowledges that most of Rizal’s assertions about the early Filipinos have been proven correct, but he also enumerates three examples of flaws central to the arguments made, and cites documentary and archaeological evidence to support his contention that Rizal’s “zeal to recreate the greatness of the lost pre-Hispanic Philippine civilization” led to some conclusions not supported by the text.\textsuperscript{136} He demonstrates that Rizal erred when he used a few inconclusive remarks made by Morga as evidence that Spanish rule led to the extinction of indigenous industries in cannon-making and ship-building, as well as the destruction of the written literature of the early Filipinos by Spanish missionaries.\textsuperscript{137}

The most recent study of Rizal’s \textit{Sucesos} is found in a chapter in Floro Quibuyen’s \textit{A Nation Aborted: Rizal, American Hegemony and Philippine Nationalism}, which was based on his 1996 Ph.D. dissertation and published in 1999.\textsuperscript{138} Unlike Guerrero and Ocampo, Quibuyen seems less inclined to criticize Rizal, but he is in fact the only scholar thus far who examines Rizal’s annotations using critical theory, specifically Antonio Gramsci’s concept of hegemony (which he equates with the development of “a national-popular will”). He observes rather astutely, for example, that Rizal is practicing “what could well be the late nineteenth-century version of deconstruction” when he points out that Morga’s use of words such as “pacify” and “entrust” had come to mean “to make war” and “to plunder,” respectively, to the colonized.\textsuperscript{139}

The brief summaries above are not intended to introduce a detailed discussion of Rizal’s annotations or of the texts by Alzona, Guerrero, Ocampo, and Quibuyen, but to indicate how studies of Rizal’s \textit{Sucesos}, as well as the publication of such works, evolved from 1960 to 1999. The progression that may be observed, for instance, from the first partial translations of Rizal’s

\textsuperscript{134} Guerrero, \textit{The First Filipino}, 197-221.  
\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 220.  
\textsuperscript{136} Ocampo, “Rizal’s Morga,” 199.  
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 197-202.  
\textsuperscript{138} Floro Quibuyen, “Imagining the Nation: Rizal, Philippine Nationalism and American Hegemony” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii at Manoa, 1996); idem, “The Morga,” in \textit{A Nation Aborted}, 135-162.  
\textsuperscript{139} Ibid., 3, 151.
Sucesos to the critical analysis of his annotations also reflects changes that occurred in the field of historical production in the Philippines during the twentieth century—from the authors’ nationalities to their educational backgrounds to the publications in which their writings appeared (Table 2.2). Emma Helen Blair, James Alexander Robertson, and Austin Craig were Americans, Wenceslao Retana was Spanish, and Felipe Calderon was Filipino. None of them had a degree in history. Encarnacion Alzona was the first Filipina to join UP’s history department in 1917, the first among her colleagues to earn a Ph.D., and was the only woman teaching history in UP for more than two decades. Between the time Alzona graduated with her doctorate from Columbia University in 1923 and 1960, when she delivered her paper, more Filipinos finished Ph.D. degrees on Philippine history in the United States and elsewhere, and in the succeeding decades a doctorate became a much more common, even expected, credential among male and female Filipino historians. But there were, of course, exceptions.

Leon Ma. Guerrero, who was the Philippine ambassador to the United Kingdom when he wrote The First Filipino, had no degree in history and had never taught a course on the subject. He was not the first Filipino to gain popular recognition as a historian after winning a nationwide, government-sponsored, biography-writing competition (Rafael Palma and Teodoro Agoncillo were there before him), but he was the first non-academic to do so. Ambeth Ocampo had no degree—in any discipline—when he began to garner acclaim among Filipinos for his newspaper columns on history in the 1980s, but he eventually went back to school and was pursuing doctoral studies at University of London’s School of Oriental and African Studies by the 1990s. Ocampo later abandoned his dissertation, but this has not prevented his ascendancy as the most popular living Filipino historian today. Although Floro Quibuyen’s doctorate from the University of Hawaii was in political science, and his earlier degrees were in anthropology and philosophy, he has been recognized as a historian, like Guerrero and Ocampo, not so much because of his academic training, but because of the nature of his published work.
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141 Fernandez, “The Originary Filipino,” 468, 472.
Many more similarities and differences among historians, not just these authors, may be enumerated to illustrate the development of Philippine historiography, and others have in fact made such comparisons, but the most essential parallel that can be drawn is one that has been largely overlooked. Like Rizal’s Sucesos, all these works—from Blair and Robertson’s translations to Quibuyen’s commentaries—were published. Reviews of Philippine historiography invariably discuss authors and their writings, but the contributions of their publishers are rarely mentioned, suggesting that the decision to publish lies with authors, and that editors, printers, and binders are unnecessary.\textsuperscript{143} The evidence related to the publication of secondary literature on Rizal’s Sucesos disproves this notion.

When the Philippine Education Company (PECO), for instance, released Craig’s book in 1927, very few history books were published locally. By then, the company established by an American in 1904 to produce a magazine for public school teachers had grown into the largest distributor of books and school supplies in the Philippine Islands, and had even published 80

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Significant publications related to Jose Rizal's Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas (1890)}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Year of & Author, Editor or Translator & Nationality & Title & Publisher/Publication \\
Publication & & & & \\
\hline
1904 & Emma Helen Blair, James Alexander Robertson & American & Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas & Cleveland, OH: A.H. Clark \\
\hline
1905 & Felipe Calderon & Filipino & “Rizal en la Historia de Filipinas” [article] & Revista Historica de Filipinas (Asociacion Historica de Filipinas) \\
\hline
1909 & Wenceslao Retana & Spanish & Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas & Madrid: V. Suarez \\
\hline
1927 & Austin Craig & American & “Annotations to Morga’s 1609 Philippine History” [chapter] & Manila: Philippine Education Company \\
\hline
1962 & Encarnacion Alzona & Filipino & Historical Events of the Philippine Islands & Manila: Jose Rizal National Centennial Commission \\
\hline
\hline
\hline
\hline
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{143} Glenn May brings up the lack of support for the publication of history books about the Philippines in a 1982 article, but since he was specifically discussing the state of Philippine-American Studies, it is understandable that the little evidence he provides is about American publishers. Glenn Anthony May, “The State of Philippine-American Studies,” \textit{Bulletin of the American Historical Collection} 10 (Oct-Dec 1982) 11-31.
titles under its own imprint since 1907. Among these books were earlier works by Craig, as well as Filipino authors like Conrado Benitez and Camilo Osias, who had yet to write the public school textbooks for which they are now better remembered.

Local publishers began to multiply after the Second World War, but it was not until the 1950s that the confluence of conflicts between Church and State, and rival historical associations, along with the desire to promote Filipino nationalism, resulted in the publication of scholarly monographs, reprints, compilations, and translations that are still consulted by scholars more than 50 years later, but which very few commercial establishments have ever undertaken. In 1953, the first issue of *Philippine Studies* was published by the Society of Jesus, with an American Jesuit as its founding editor. In 1954, President Ramon Magsaysay issued Executive Order No. 52, creating the Jose Rizal National Centennial Commission (JRNCC), which was directed not only to plan the celebrations related to the centennial of Rizal’s birth in 1961, but also the publication of “all the works of Jose Rizal.”

In 1955, several Filipino historians who were dissatisfied with the leadership of the existing historical society founded the Philippine Historical Association (PHA), which went on to publish a scholarly journal and other books, and successfully lobby for the commemoration of Philippine independence on June 12, instead of July 4, from 1962 onward. And in 1956, the controversies surrounding the publication of Teodoro Agoncillo’s *The Revolt of the Masses* by UP’s College of Liberal Arts, as well as the enactment of the Rizal Law, inspired Filipino publishers to produce even more Filipino history books, among them the first offset reprint of Rizal’s *Sucesos*.

In 1962, the JRNCC issued Alzona’s English translation of Rizal’s *Sucesos*, and the PHA released the conference proceedings in which Alzona’s 1960 paper on the book appears. In the succeeding years, the first academic presses were established: the University of the Philippines Press in 1965, and the Ateneo de Manila University Press in 1972. The latter was the product of the merger of three separate publishing units, one of which was the journal *Philippine Studies*. There was not much demand, it seems, for copies of Rizal’s *Sucesos* because none of the Spanish, English, or Tagalog editions was reprinted until the 1990s, when the approaching
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144 “The Building of a Magazine and Business in the Philippines,” *Philippine Education Magazine*, June 1928, 16, 54. For more about PECO, see Chapter Three of this dissertation, pp. 104-106.
centennials of its author’s death in 1996, and the Philippine Revolution in 1998, resulted in what Ocampo calls a flood of Philippine history books similar to the one that occurred in the late 1950s and early 1960s.\footnote{Ambeth Ocampo, “After the Parades Comes a Flood of Books,” \textit{Philippine Daily Inquirer}, 13 June 1999, 10.} \textit{Philippine Studies} devoted issues to both centennials—including one in which Ocampo’s article and an earlier version of the first chapter of Quibuyen’s \textit{A Nation Aborted} appeared.\footnote{Quibuyen’s article was an excerpt from the second chapter of Quibuyen’s dissertation. Floro Quibuyen, “Towards a Radical Rizal,” \textit{Philippine Studies} 46 (1998) 151–183.} The UP Press reprinted Agoncillo’s \textit{Revolt} in 1996, while the Ateneo Press published Quibuyen’s book in 1999. In 2008, the National Historical Institute, one of the JRNCC’s many incarnations, issued a fourth reprint of the English translation of Rizal’s \textit{Sucesos}, this time with Ocampo’s article as its foreword.

One very important difference, however, must be noted between the circumstances surrounding the publication of Rizal’s \textit{Sucesos} and these secondary works or any other Filipino history book discussed in this dissertation: Rizal had practically no one to help him. In 1889, there were no commercial publishers, university presses, historical associations, government agencies, or history departments that supported the writing or publication of books by Filipinos, whether in Europe or in las Islas Filipinas, but Rizal and his contemporaries in Madrid and Manila persevered in their efforts to communicate what they imagined the Filipino past must have been. They were not academics who needed to have their research published to gain tenure or enhance their reputations as scholars. Neither were they entrepreneurs who expected to make money on their writings or even government officials mandated by law to produce historical materials for distribution to the public. They were nationalists struggling to make their voices heard in a field dominated by their colonizers, relying on evidence gathered by those same colonizers.

\section*{Conclusion}

Jose Rizal’s \textit{Sucesos} (1890) was, according to Leon Ma. Guerrero, “a waste of time” because its annotator’s intentions of awakening the historical consciousness of the Filipino people and correcting previous errors were not achieved. While it may be argued that these objectives were eventually accomplished, the evidence related to the book’s limited circulation and reception in the late nineteenth century, especially when compared with the significantly greater impact
created by Rizal’s own *Noli* and *Fili*, shows that it was indeed “largely ignored” at the time of publication. But Guerrero also recognizes that the work was, ultimately, an achievement worth celebrating because more than 70 years after its publication, no Filipino had yet written “a history of the Filipinos for the Filipinos, or, for that matter an impartial and complete history of the Philippines.” \(^{150}\) This assertion, however, was not entirely true.

Although the significance of Rizal’s *Sucesos* is confirmed by various editions, translations, and scholarly studies that have been published throughout the twentieth century, this does not mean that history books by Pedro Paterno, Isabelo de los Reyes, and other Filipinos—such as Leandro Fernandez’s *A Brief History of the Philippines* (1919)—that appeared from the late nineteenth century to Guerrero’s time were not written for Filipinos or were partial and incomplete. The quality of the books that Guerrero overlooks may be disputed, and it could be argued that some were unworthy of the paper they were printed on, but their existence cannot be denied. They were, in fact, written and published.

Guerrero, however, is not alone in discounting the value of the work of lesser-known or forgotten historians. In a study of American historiography, Peter Novick observes that “historians have repudiated the ‘great man theory of history,’ [but] there appears to be a residual great man theory of historiography.” \(^{151}\) He was specifically referring to the practice of devoting histories of historical thought to a few outstanding individuals, leading to generalizations based on examples that are not necessarily representative of the profession. \(^{152}\) But even Novick’s solution, that is, to survey the writings of hundreds of historians, is insufficient to address the impression that history books, as Leslie Howsam notes, “appear to emerge without the agency of anyone but the author.” \(^{153}\)

As this chapter has shown, the academic and commercial infrastructure that made the publication, dissemination, and criticism of Filipino history books possible has been overlooked in studies of Philippine historiography. Between the publication of Morga’s *Sucesos* in Mexico in 1609 and Rizal’s *Sucesos* in Paris in 1890, very few Filipino history books, most of which were written in Spanish, were printed in las Islas Filipinas or elsewhere. During the early twentieth century, such books, this time in English, became more common, but most were printed in the United States and exported to the Philippine Islands. It was not until the 1950s that

\(^{150}\) Guerrero, *The First Filipino*, 220.


\(^{152}\) Ibid., 7-8.

\(^{153}\) Howsam, *Past into Print*, 2.
history books by Filipinos began to be routinely published, sold, and reviewed by their fellow Filipinos. From then on, the development of the field of historical production in the Philippines benefited immensely from the support of history departments, government-created historical commissions, professional historical associations, university presses, and eventually, profit-oriented publishers and booksellers, as well as sympathetic coverage in widely-read newspapers and an increasing number of scholarly journals.

In addition, an individual who writes a manuscript on history with no prior degree or teaching experience on the subject, is rarely consecrated as a historian unless and until the work is published as a book. Authors like Rizal benefited from financing the printing of their own works, but as the twentieth century progressed, self-publishing became less likely to result in recognition for the author as a historian. Instead, government agencies and university presses emerged as the publishers more likely to ensure that scholars like Agoncillo and Guerrero were hailed as historians once their books were disseminated. Mere publication of a manuscript, however, cannot guarantee its consecration.

Many history books about the Philippines have been published, but not all have been considered important enough to include in reviews of Philippine historiography or bibliographies on Philippine history. Even fewer have been banned by the government, opposed by the Catholic Church, or criticized lengthily in scholarly journals. This reality, however, points to another aspect that needs to be acknowledged: the value of opposition. Notwithstanding Rizal’s reply to de los Reyes, the early Filipino historians were apparently not in the habit of publicly arguing with their critics.

Between the publication of Rizal’s annotations in 1890 and the celebration of his centennial in 1961, a few exchanges related to questions of historical fact and interpretation saw print in newspapers and magazines, but the most significant were undoubtedly those concerning the distribution of the English translation of Rafael Palma’s Rizal biography in 1949 and the publication of Teodoro Agoncillo’s Bonifacio biography in 1956, both of which not only provoked controversy, but also resulted in even more recognition for the authors and their works. These debates, despite the involvement of historians arguing about genuine historiographical concerns, were not truly disputes in what Bourdieu calls the field of cultural production, but confrontations between Church and State in the broader field of power.

Philippine historical production has become a much more autonomous field since then, but it is also true that its impact on national affairs has decreased considerably. Whereas the
battles over the biographies by Palma and Agoncillo, like those over Rizal’s novels, were fought on the front pages of the most popular Philippine newspapers during the 1950s, more recent debates have been relegated to scholarly journals with limited circulations, and the rare few that are discussed in mass media do not arouse passions similar to those in decades past. The field’s greater autonomy has not, it seems, made it easier to achieve Rizal’s stated objective of awakening Filipinos’ consciousness of the past.

Although the work of most Filipino historians today, unlike Rizal’s Sucesos during the late nineteenth century, are often not self-published, not printed in a foreign land, and not subject to censorship, the majority of these monographs, like Rizal’s annotated edition, continue to be written in a foreign language, circulate in limited numbers, and are, as Guerrero might say, “largely ignored.” This impression, however, applies mainly to scholarly studies, not to history textbooks, some of which have been used by millions of Filipinos who are required to read them in school.

The beginnings of Philippine historiography may be rightly traced to the books written by great men like Rizal, but the textbooks that have introduced several generations of Filipino students to their past should not be overlooked. As the next chapter illustrates, the patterns of communication that lead to the consecration of scholarly monographs are also relevant to the history books used by school children. Struggles related to the production of textbooks on Philippine history began to take place almost as soon as the first ones were procured for Philippine public schools, but the first such textbook written by a Filipino, which purposely omitted controversial views and was probably uncontroversial for this very reason, has been all but forgotten.
Dr. Leandro H. Fernandez (1889-1948), known during his time as an eminent historian, authored two books on the Philippines: his doctoral dissertation at Columbia University entitled, *The Philippine Republic* (New York, 1926), and *A Brief History of the Philippines* (Boston, 1919, with later revisions).¹

Teodoro Agoncillo, in the sentence cited above, names two books that like Rizal’s *Sucesos*, were written in a foreign language, and printed in a foreign land. He considers *The Philippine Republic* as his late mentor’s more significant contribution to Philippine historiography than *Brief History*, a book that Filipino students used for almost four decades, but which Agoncillo dismisses as “a mere textbook for children.”² This low regard for textbooks is echoed by Bonifacio Salamanca who, tasked with writing about Philippine historiography from 1946 to 1955 for one of the volumes of the *Philippine Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, expands the coverage of his survey of textbooks by 37 years to 1993 because he wants “to get this type of historical writing out of the way before tackling the more important, at least for the history of the discipline, monographic studies.”³ He makes no attempt to conceal his contempt (or envy, perhaps?) for the writers of such books when he notes that “this kind of historical writing or production, to use a not too generous term… yielded fabulous royalties to their authors.”⁴

Although Salamanca goes on to imply that University of the Philippines (UP) professors responsible for such textbooks were not motivated by financial rewards, possibly because he was a UP professor himself, it is clear that he is a purist distancing himself from profiteers in the field of cultural production. Not surprisingly, most historians who have produced reviews of
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² Ibid. Agoncillo neglects to mention two other books by Fernandez: *Philippine History Stories* (1925) and *The Story of Our Country* (1927), but since both are essentially simplified versions of *Brief History* for younger children, it is likely that Agoncillo would have expressed a similar opinion of the two books.
⁴ Ibid.
Philippine historiography since the 1960s do not even mention textbooks in their works. A few historians, along with scholars from other disciplines, have written specifically about Philippine history and social studies textbooks in journal articles and book chapters, but like those who have written about Jose Rizal’s *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (1890), their studies are more about texts than books.

This chapter challenges the existing scholarship on Philippine history textbooks and argues that assessments of a specific book’s importance should not be dependent solely upon the esteem with which historians regard its author or its contribution to the development of history as a discipline. It examines the histories of textbooks as material objects and commodities within the context of their production, and shows that some history books, because of their limited distribution, did not have as great an effect on students as certain historians have erroneously assumed they did; that decisions to publish the earliest such books were motivated by the desire to make a profit, and not necessarily to indoctrinate Filipinos in American culture; and that religious concerns, especially those expressed by Catholic bishops, played a far more significant role in the textbook selection process than has been previously acknowledged.

The prevailing conditions in which Philippine history textbooks were produced during the American colonial period are examined in this chapter according to the model proposed by Thomas Adams and Nicolas Barker, who indicate that the decision to publish a book is influenced by four motives—namely, to create, communicate, profit from, and/or preserve a text in a particular physical form—and that distribution is “more than simply getting a book or text from one person to another. It also includes the extent, in time and space, to which that process
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5 See Chapter One of this dissertation, p. 2, n. 5.

This chapter discusses the importance of these factors specifically in relation to the publication and distribution of Leandro Fernandez’s *A Brief History of the Philippines* (1919), whose significance in Philippine education and historiography remains largely unrecognized, and contrasts the extent of its adoption and usage with those of two books entitled *History of the Philippines*, one by David Barrows (1905) and the other by Conrado Benitez (1926).

Fernandez’s *Brief History* was written for seventh graders, while the works by Barrows and Benitez were produced for the use of high school students. All three were issued in multiple editions and were in print from early in the twentieth century to the late 1950s. Using annual reports, financial statements, personal and official correspondence, and newspaper and magazine articles, the histories of these books are reconstructed in this chapter within the context of struggles in the fields of power and historical production that occurred between and among Americans and Filipinos, Catholics and Protestants, government officials and bishops, and historians, publishers, and representatives of the Philippine Education Company (PECO), the most important bookseller during that time.

From 1898 to 1946, when the United States officially exercised control over the Philippine Islands, political power was primarily in the hands of American men, especially those appointed military and civilian governors. Filipinos declared their independence on 12 June 1898, several months before Spain ceded las Islas Filipinas to the United States, but since what is now known as the First Philippine Republic was never recognized by any nation, American authority over the archipelago effectively began on the day that Spanish rule ended. In 1935, the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands was inaugurated, which meant that Filipinos were finally given the opportunity to manage their own internal affairs, with the promise of complete independence by 1946. The plan was interrupted when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor and invaded the Philippine Islands on the same day in 1941, and established the Second Philippine Republic in 1943. The end of the Second World War, however, ensured that by 4 July 1946, the independence of the Third Philippine Republic was finally acknowledged by the United States.

The American period was different from Spanish rule in that, as decades passed, Filipinos were given increasing opportunities to assume leadership positions in government and other fields, the public school system became an effective training ground for future leaders, and the
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colonized were actively encouraged to learn the language of their colonizers. But as various scholars have pointed out, during the early years of the twentieth century, American politicians, businessmen, and teachers were the dominant figures in government, business, and schools. It is not surprising, therefore, that agents in the field of historical production at that time were also primarily American authors, publishers, and education officials. But it must be noted that while the advent of American rule undeniably resulted in the inclusion of racial and cultural biases in textbooks, the production and adoption of history books in Philippine public schools during the first half of the twentieth century was neither as straightforward nor as uncontested as it has been portrayed in previous studies.

Of the published literature on history textbooks used by Filipino public school students, only four mention books that were initially published before the Second World War. Two discuss one or both of the works by Barrows and Benitez extensively, one cites the latter in a footnote, and only one explicitly acknowledges the existence of Fernandez’s Brief History. None of these studies, however, including those on newer books, mentions the profit motive as a reason for the production of textbooks, all except one discuss Catholic leaders as having a meaningful role in the adoption process, and those that allude to the extent to which students used individual books do so in imprecise terms or, worse, erroneously.

Scholars have indicated, both explicitly and implicitly, that their studies on textbooks were based on the assumption that such works are important because many students use them, but it is rare that the extent to which specific books were used by Filipino students is quantified. One exception is an unpublished 1976 Ph.D. dissertation that goes unmentioned in the reviews of Philippine historiography or textbooks cited in this dissertation. Victoria Bantug, its author, uses statistical analysis to conclude that “a limited degree of propagandistic biases were present” in all the history books used by Filipinos in public and private primary, secondary, and tertiary schools from 1912 to 1972, and that “American concerns have been over-represented in Philippine history textbooks.” Although she is more interested in analyzing texts, the effort she exerts to
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10 See p. 78, n. 6, of this chapter for the journal articles and book chapters on Philippine history textbooks that were consulted. The studies that discuss earlier textbooks are: Ileto, “The Philippine Revolution,” 1-17; Raftery, “Textbook Wars,” 143-164; Yu-Jose, “The Japanese Occupation,” 66, n. 12; and Reyes, “The Language of History,” 33.
estimate the actual usage of the 35 books included in her study is much more rigorous than attempts made by other researchers who either assume that all textbooks are equally important or, at best, demonstrate the influence of specific books by citing anecdotal evidence. Her results, however, were based on a list of textbooks that were merely “perceived to have been used in Philippine schools” and rated by a panel of four resource persons according to “extent of use” or “the number of students who might have been exposed to a particular textbook.”

While it was probably not feasible for Bantug to obtain actual sales or rental figures, it is in fact possible to establish, as this chapter illustrates, that certain books were in the hands of a larger number of students than others. She could have accomplished this by verifying which textbooks were adopted for use in the public schools, ascertaining the number of years they were prescribed, and calculating how many students might have read them based on the education department’s annual reports, especially for the first half of the twentieth century. Considering that the majority of books examined in her study were used in Philippine private schools whose student populations have always been much smaller than those in public schools, it would not have been unreasonable for Bantug to focus her research on the few history books that most Filipino students used during the period covered by her study.

Although Bantug and other researchers do not always explicitly indicate their motivation for studying textbooks, it is apparent that the questions they seek to answer are at least indirectly influenced by Renato Constantino’s “The Mis-education of the Filipino” (1966). In one of the most-quoted passages from this essay—perhaps because it is the only one in which the word “mis-education” appears—Constantino asserts that

The first and perhaps the master stroke in the plan to use education as an instrument of colonial policy was the decision to use English as the medium of instruction. English became the wedge that separated the Filipinos from their past and later was to separate educated Filipinos from the masses of their countrymen. English introduced the Filipinos to a strange new world. With American textbooks, Filipinos started learning not only a new language but also a new way of life… alien to their traditions and yet a caricature of
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12 Ibid., 60, 214.
their model. This was the beginning of their education. At the same time, it was the beginning of their mis-education, for they learned no longer as Filipinos but as colonials.\footnote{Ibid., 37. Ellipsis in original.}

No studies of its reception have been published, but this essay, which originally appeared in a weekly magazine, has been and continues to be cited by students, activists, journalists, and professors. It has been reprinted as a pamphlet, as an article in a scholarly journal, as chapters in several anthologies, and as three separate readings in several editions of what is now known as Agoncillo’s \textit{History of the Filipino People} (1960).\footnote{Among the many publications in which Constantino’s essay have appeared are: the pamphlet by the Foundation for Nationalist Studies (Quezon City, 1982); the \textit{Journal of Contemporary Asia} 1 (1970) 20-36; \textit{The Philippines Reader}, ed. Daniel Schirmer and Stephen Shalom (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 1987) 45-49; and the 2nd to 5th editions of \textit{History of the Filipino People} (Quezon City: Malaya Books and R.P. Garcia, 1967-1977).} Until the present, whenever references are made to the mis-education of the Filipino, it is inevitably Constantino’s essay that is alluded to, even when it is not cited.

A few scholars have expressed reservations about the sweeping generalizations Constantino makes regarding American imperialism and its negative effects on Filipinos through the years, but their works have not received much attention.\footnote{Judy Ick, “La Escuela del Diablo, Iskul ng Tao: Revisiting Colonial Public Education,” in \textit{Bearers of Benevolence}, ed. Mary Racelis and Judy Ick (Pasig City: Anvil, 2001) 263; Ma. Teresa Pineda-Tinio, “The Triumph of Tagalog and the Dominance of the Discourse on English” (Ph.D. dissertation, National University of Singapore, 2009) 7-8.} This chapter’s criticism of his essay is limited to his imprecise reference to “American textbooks,” which implies that all textbooks used from 1898 to 1966—specifically “Philippine history textbooks,” as he suggests elsewhere in the same essay—were practically interchangeable in their American orientation.\footnote{Constantino, “The Mis-education of the Filipino,” 37.}

Without any references to specific authors or titles, readers are left to assume that Constantino’s criticism covered all textbooks adopted for use in Philippine schools, regardless of subject matter and the author’s nationality.

The absence of a specific timeframe also creates the impression that the introduction of American heroes and songs, as well as Santa Claus and snow, to Filipino students who were still struggling to learn the English language had never been questioned by anyone before Constantino’s essay was published. But nothing could be further from the truth. As shown below, the first American teachers objected almost immediately to the use of such textbooks, Philippine history textbooks written expressly for Filipino students were introduced as early as 1903, and textbooks were more likely to be adopted if these were adapted or written especially...
for students in the Philippine Islands. Constantino and other authors who have written about
Philippine textbooks are among those who, as Bourdieu notes, “go directly from what happens in
the world to what happens in the field,” thereby disregarding the internal dynamics of the field of
cultural production, which is not always influenced by external pressure.  

Books were printed in las Islas Filipinas starting in 1593, but it was not until the United
States assumed control over the Philippine Islands that Filipinos were able to write and publish
their own books, newspapers, magazines, and other printed materials with very few restrictions. Initially, these publications were written in Spanish and Philippine languages, but as more
Filipinos learned English, so too did the number of works written in English by Filipinos
increase. But this did not happen overnight. The decision to use English as the medium of
instruction, for instance, was definitely not the first in “the plan to use education as an instrument
of colonial policy.” The American military leadership did view education as a means to pacify
the Filipinos, as Constantino asserts, but the idea of imposing English on Filipinos was clearly
not the reason Major General Elwell Otis, who was then military governor, ordered mostly
Spanish textbooks in December 1899. This decision may or may not have been the first related
to education, but it was certainly implemented before English was designated the medium of
instruction.

After the new civilian leadership passed a law in 1901 establishing the department of
public instruction, English became “the basis of all public school instruction” and works in
English began to dominate the lists of books distributed to the public schools. Not everyone,
however, agreed with the use of such textbooks, especially the American teachers who had been
enticed to teach in the Philippine Islands and who began criticizing the appropriateness of the
books for Filipinos soon after they arrived. The American General Superintendent of Education
observed that “The teachers, almost without exception, found the books undesirable,” and agreed
that “Such words as ‘strawberry,’ ‘snow,’ ‘Jack Frost,’ and ‘fairy’ possess little significance for
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the children of the Philippines." From then on, publishers were requested to adapt their books for Filipino students.\footnote{25} Initially, this meant simply substituting words like “apple” with “banana,” but after Filipino coauthors began teaming up with the original American authors, more complex adaptations were carried out. This effort was not completely successful, as criticism expressed in an American-led report on Philippine education (popularly known as the Monroe Survey) published in 1925 certifies, but it is clear that textbooks did not go unchallenged and attempts were made at the highest levels to rectify the situation.\footnote{26}

Within two decades, a few of the students who used those early textbooks became the authors of Tagalog novels that were bought in record numbers, the printers who ran the presses that printed the books, and the historians who began teaching their own history in English at the University of the Philippines within a few years after it was founded in 1908.\footnote{27} Along with these developments, however, came the growth in demand for printed matter in English, especially after it became clear that knowledge of the language of the American colonizers, not Spanish or any Filipino language, was going to be the means for advancement.\footnote{28} Census data shows that the Filipino population increased by 150 percent from 7.6 million in 1903 to 19.2 million in 1948, two years after Philippine independence was recognized by the United States, and with it the number of students enrolled at public and private schools from elementary to college, which increased tenfold from fewer than 360,000 in 1903 to almost 3.4 million in 1948.\footnote{29}

This growing student population, as well as the cost of paying for their education, is likely the reason print and broadcast journalists have regularly filed stories on textbooks throughout the twentieth century and beyond.\footnote{30} More often than not, front-page articles or multi-


\footnote{26} Board of Educational Survey, \textit{A Survey of the Education System of the Philippine Islands} (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1925) 41.


\footnote{30} See, for example, the front pages of the \textit{Philippines Herald}, whose reporters covered the controversial implementation of the Textbook Law from 1-8 June 1932; and the \textit{Manila Chronicle}, which ran a series about
part series covered developments related to ongoing controversies or disputes involving biased interpretations, complaints regarding cost, the reasons behind recurring shortages, the prevalence of corruption in the adoption process, and lately, errors of fact and grammar. In some cases, individual history textbooks have been subjected to scrutiny, but since journalists seldom refer to disputes more than a few years old, it is not surprising that very few Filipinos are aware that American teachers were among the first to criticize American textbooks after the imposition of English as the medium of instruction in Philippine public schools in 1901, or that, as the next section shows, American Catholic bishops successfully blocked or caused the recall of some of the earliest Philippine history textbooks on religious grounds.

Textbook History

“Controversial views have purposely been omitted,” wrote Leandro Fernandez in his preface to the first edition of *A Brief History of the Philippines* (1919), “on the ground that such discussions, though they may be of advantage to maturer students, serve only to confuse young pupils.” This explanation is plausible, of course, but it must be noted that Fernandez, according to Agoncillo, was “a man who would rather suffer in silence to avoid any controversy than clarify historical points by joining issue with anybody.” It is not possible to determine what Fernandez considered “controversial” or why he thought such views might confuse the seventh graders for whom the book was written, but reviewing objections lodged against other Philippine history textbooks published in the early years of the American occupation is instructive. The opposition came not from Filipino nationalists, but from American bishops, whose influence on
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affairs in the Philippine Islands has been overlooked by historians. Contrary to the impression that may be gleaned from existing scholarship, the promotion of American colonialism and/or the repression of Filipino nationalism were not the only—or even primary—considerations in the evaluation of Philippine history textbooks early in the twentieth century; conformity with teachings of the Catholic Church was more likely to determine whether a textbook was adopted or not.

Three books written by American teachers, for instance, drew criticism from Catholic bishops (Figure 3.1). Copies of Adeline Knapp’s *The Story of the Philippines* (1902) were ordered from the US in 1903, but the book was withdrawn in 1904 at a loss of $10,000 after Bishop Frederick Rooker complained to Governor-General James Smith, a Catholic, that it was “written hastily, contained many inaccuracies, many misconceptions of Spanish rule in the islands, much Protestant propaganda, and was without merits of style or clarity.”

History was part of the public school curriculum as early as 1901, but because there were no prescribed courses of study at that time, the intended audience for the book by Knapp, who was among the very first teachers recruited to work in the Philippine Islands in 1902, is difficult to determine.

The same is true of the first edition of Prescott Jernegan’s *A Short History of the Philippines* (1904), which was initially published in Manila, but after Bishop Thomas Hendrick raised his objections to the Governor-General, who had specifically asked for the cleric’s opinion, a revised edition was issued by a New York publisher in 1905. Smith had, despite his presumably busy schedule, personally worked with Jernegan, a Protestant and former pastor, to revise the manuscript in accordance with Hendrick’s comments regarding its author’s poor English, ignorance of Church doctrine, and overall interpretation. This revision of Jernegan’s *Short History* was the one that sixth graders used when history began to be taught as a separate subject five times a week in 1906. The following year, when another grade level was added, history became a seventh-grade subject. Including an updated edition adopted in 1914,
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38 Raftery, 152-154. See also copies of letters exchanged between Thomas Hendrick, Jeremiah Harty, James Smith and Prescott Jernegan, 1 March to 15 July 1905, in BIA 1534-51/201/5/350.

39 Fabia, 3.
Jernegan’s book was the only prescribed Philippine history textbook in public schools for thirteen years. Neither Knapp’s work nor Jernegan’s, however, was publicly denounced. The same cannot be said for another book written for high school students.

Four editions of *History of the Philippines* (1905) by David Barrows were issued by three different publishers over a period of two decades. All the books were printed in the United States and copies were shipped to the Philippine Islands when necessary. Barrows was not a professional historian, but unlike other Americans who authored textbooks on Philippine history early in the twentieth century, he had a doctorate (in anthropology), and was the highest-ranking education official in the colonial government from 1903 to 1909. Ethical considerations related to his administrative position contributed to the book’s complicated publishing history, but objections posed by Catholics limited its use in Philippine public schools. To illustrate the importance of reconstructing the field in which a book was produced before any conclusions regarding its influence can be made, the rest of this section reviews the
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scholarly reception accorded the Barrows book as the centennial of the declaration of Philippine independence in 1898 approached.

In a 1997 lecture, Reynaldo Ileto, author of *Pasyon and Revolution* (1979), compares and contrasts various editions of two history textbooks—one by an American, the other by a Filipino—used by Filipino high school seniors.\(^{43}\) He demonstrates that accounts of the Philippine Revolution in the book by Barrows and another by Conrado Benitez (1926), also entitled *History of the Philippines*, were essentially “a repetition or replay of European history in an Oriental setting,” especially the discourses of progress and race that figured prominently in each book.\(^{44}\) Ileto’s criticism of the viewpoint that Barrows adopts is justified, of course, but a subject that he mentions only in passing, that the first edition of Barrows’ *History* was heavily criticized by the Catholic Church, was actually instrumental in ensuring that the book never became as influential as Ileto claims it did. The power struggle that ensued between the highest-ranking political and religious leaders in the Philippine Islands in 1906 was provoked not by the book’s Euro-centric approach, but by its unflattering portrayal of the dominant religious group in las Islas Filipinas before the Americans arrived. Its text, however, was not the only problem.

As Judith Raftery clearly shows in a 1998 journal article entitled “Textbook Wars,” the struggle over the Barrows book was also related to its author’s official position and his faith, and “a neglected area in the history of this period that concerned church and state relations.”\(^{45}\) Using archival documents and the correspondence of the main protagonists, Raftery recounts the numerous problems encountered by the newly-established, largely Protestant, American government in Manila, as well as the challenges faced by the Catholic Church in the Philippine Islands by 1906. She then reveals how Jeremiah James Harty, the Archbishop of Manila, waged a campaign in the American Catholic press to pressure the Catholic Governor-General, who had previously ensured the adoption of Jernegan’s work, into blocking the adoption of the history textbook written by Barrows, who was the Director of Education and a Protestant.\(^{46}\) The repercussions of the textbook wars, Raftery notes, even found their way to the White House and Theodore Roosevelt, who was then President of the United States and a Protestant.

\(^{43}\) Ileto, “The Philippine Revolution,” 1-17.
\(^{44}\) Ibid., 5; Conrado Benitez, *History of the Philippines* (Boston: Ginn, 1926, 1940, 1954).
\(^{45}\) Raftery, “Textbook Wars,” 143.
\(^{46}\) Raftery mistakenly identifies Barrows as the General Superintendent of Public Instruction. Barrows was General Superintendent of Education from 1903 to 1905, and Director of Education from then until he stepped down in 1909. *AR* - 1906, 4.
All these men were Americans deciding what Filipino students would be allowed to read, but there is no evidence that any conscious effort was made to mis-educate anyone. Instead, the problem at hand was essentially one that involved Protestant leaders seeking to placate Catholic bishops, who were concerned about what their Catholic brethren were being taught. Despite its title, Raftery’s article is not just about textbooks, but also the struggles between political and religious leaders in the field of power over public school education in the Philippine Islands. It must be noted, however, that neither Raftery nor Ileto accurately situates Barrows and his book within the field of historical production during the early twentieth century. Raftery, for example, leaves readers with the impression that Barrows’ *History* was never used in the public schools, stating in the final paragraph of her article that “The textbook struggles in the Philippines ended.” She was correct insofar as Catholic objections to the adoption of the Barrows book were concerned, but her sweeping generalization regarding the end of the textbook wars ignores the fact that the use of its 1924 edition was discontinued after historian Austin Craig, an American and a Protestant, like Barrows, criticized the book in 1925 not on religious grounds, but because of its “historical inaccuracies and prejudices regarding the Filipino people.”

Ileto, meanwhile, claims the exact opposite of what Raftery implies, and asserts that the Barrows book was adopted as a textbook from 1905 until it was replaced by Benitez’s work in 1926. He does not seem to be aware of the religious tensions that triggered Catholic censure of Barrows’ *History* or the circumstances surrounding the publication of Craig’s criticism. But unlike most academics who have conducted research on Philippine history textbooks, he explains how the books featured in his study were selected. Although he acknowledges that there were “competing textbooks from other sectors, such as the private schools,” he argues that “the

47 Raftery, 163.
48 Austin Craig, “Craig Scores Barrow’s [sic] Old History Book,” *Tribune*, 19 May 1925, 1+. Barrows’ publisher suggests that the publication of Craig’s article in a leading newspaper two days before a Textbook Board meeting was “evidently timed to do the most harm possible,” and speculates that Craig had a personal interest in the adoption of Benitez’s textbook. While it is certainly possible that Craig’s attack was purely motivated by a concern for the welfare of Filipino students, there is some basis for the publisher’s suspicion. Craig and Benitez, after all, were colleagues from 1913 to 1917 in what was then UP’s Department of History, Economics and Sociology, and Benitez was the lone dissenter on UP’s Board of Regents when it dismissed Craig in 1922 for allegedly discrediting the university. George Shoens to David Barrows, 1 July 1925, in David Prescott Barrows Papers, Box 32, Folder “World Book,” Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley. Henceforth, DPB Papers [Box], [Folder]. See Josepahine and Austin Craig, *Farthest Westing* (Philadelphia: Dorrance 1940) 98-99, 113-114, 168-169; Leslie Bauzon, “Benton’s Fleeting Performance,” in *University of the Philippines: The First 75 Years: 1908-1983*, ed. Oscar Alfonso (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1985) 144; and University of the Philippines, *Catalogue* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1913-1916). Henceforth, UP *Catalogue* - [year of publication].
official textbooks for public school use were much more influential than their rivals in shaping Filipino consciousness.” The fact that both the Barrows and Benitez books were printed in multiple editions, he adds, is indicative of their importance and influence. Ileto then justifies his analysis of Barrows’ work by stating that “when one considers that the text was read by Filipino public high school students… for at least two decades, its impact cannot be overstated.”

Ileto’s reasoning was sound, but he was, in fact, overstating the textbook’s impact. While Barrows’ work was first published in 1905, the only one of its multiple editions adopted for public school use was the 1924 revision, which was soon replaced by Benitez’s book in 1926. In short, Barrows’ History was an official textbook not for two decades, but two years. Ileto commits a similar error when he refers to Benitez’s History as the “earliest Filipino-authored textbook.” Since it was in the hands of high school students for at least three decades, the Benitez work was undoubtedly more influential than the Barrows book, but Ileto does not seem to realize or simply ignores the reality that Leandro Fernandez’s A Brief History of the Philippines (1919) was used by a much larger group of students for a longer period of time. This forgotten textbook for seventh graders, though undeniably pro-American, did not feature explicit discussions of progress or race like the books written by Barrows and Benitez. It was also the first textbook written by a Filipino adopted in Philippine public schools.

Fernandez’s Brief History

The need for a new textbook on Philippine history to replace Jernegan’s work was recognized in 1916, and by 1917, Fernandez’s Brief History had been selected, subject to revisions. Whether Fernandez was aware of the criticisms Catholic leaders had raised in the past about the books by Knapp, Jernegan, and Barrows cannot be ascertained, but it is quite likely that he had at least read Barrows’ History by the time he started writing his own textbook. Barrows alleges as much
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51 The Director of Education’s Annual Reports show that Barrows’ History was adopted in 1923, but since it was published in 1924, and there were funding problems, it is more likely that the book was used, at the earliest, toward the end of 1924. Benitez’s History, meanwhile, appears for the first time on the list of approved textbooks in 1926. Furthermore, Philippine history was never taught as a subject in public high schools until 1921 (except for a brief period in 1904), when teachers made do with whatever materials were available until the adoption of Barrows’ textbook. Annual Report - 1924, 1925, 1927; Fabia, 56.
in a 1922 letter to his own publisher, where he claims that Fernandez’s work and, rather improbably, others published a few years before his own were based on his book and “followed an almost identical plan.”54 There is some truth to Barrows’ statement because Fernandez’s textbook was also largely about the history of the non-Filipino in the Philippines.55

Like the first edition of Barrows’ History, Fernandez’s textbook devotes a considerable amount of attention to the Spaniards and other foreigners who visited or occupied las Islas Filipinas and the Philippine Islands—namely the Chinese, Portuguese, Dutch, British, and Americans—and occasionally even adopts foreign terms like “spring,” a season that most Filipinos have never experienced.56 Unlike Barrows, however, Fernandez did not feel compelled to devote entire chapters to the need for a study of Philippine history or to the progress of European history from the “Middle Ages” to the “Age of Discovery.” There is no evidence to suggest that Fernandez avoided writing about these topics because they were controversial or that he actually consulted Barrows’ work while he wrote his own, but comparing what he and Barrows say about the Catholic Church in their books is illuminating.

For instance, Archbishop Harty criticized Barrows in 1906 for characterizing Domingo Salazar, the first bishop of Manila, as “one of those authoritative, ambitious, and arrogant characters, so typical in the history of the Church,” but the absence of a similar description—or any description of the bishop, for that matter—in Fernandez’s work suggests that he considered such a characterization untrue or unnecessary, or even controversial and confusing. Fernandez, like Barrows, states that Salazar arrived in Manila in 1581, but only Fernandez explains that the quarrels between the Spanish religious and civil authorities in las Islas Filipinas arose because “the friars favored peaceful subjugation and humane treatment of the inhabitants.”57 In addition, whereas Barrows merely offers what Harty considered faint praise for the first Spanish preachers, Fernandez acknowledges without qualification that “The unselfish devotion of these early missionaries resulted in the rapid spread of Christianity among the Filipinos.”58 Fernandez was not beyond criticizing the advent of Christianity and Western civilization on Philippine shores, but he does so indirectly by quoting Jose Rizal: “They gradually lost their ancient traditions, their recollections; they forgot their writings, their songs, their poetry, their laws, that

54 David Barrows to Caspar Hodgson, 1 March 1922, in DPB Papers 3, “Aug 1921-Jun 1922.”
55 The same could also be said of the textbooks by Knapp and Jernegan. In fact, Fernandez’s chapters correspond more closely with those of Jernegan’s than Barrows’.  
56 The word “spring” appears in Fernandez, BHP (1919) 50, 94, 98.  
57 Barrows 1905, 147-148; Fernandez, BHP (1919) 130.  
58 Raftery, 157; BHP 1919, 77.
they might learn by heart other doctrines, other ethics, other tastes, different from those inspired in their race by their climate and their way of thinking.”

Not many, however, are aware of these differences because critical studies of Fernandez’s text have yet to be published. The few historians who have quoted from Brief History in recent years reduce it to what he writes about the American period, forgetting that history books about the Philippines were so scarce early in the twentieth century that the works of Fernandez and Barrows were cited as authorities on practically all aspects of Philippine history in scholarly monographs and journals, as well as magazine articles and trivia contests, and that theirs were the only textbooks included in the first edition of the American Historical Association’s Guide to Historical Literature (1931). Some of Fernandez’s contemporaries and a former student also deemed his textbook superior to similar works. In 1926, American anthropologist Frederick Starr wrote that Brief History was “a better work for Philippine schools than Dr. Barrow’s [sic] History.”

Two years later, Aniceto Fabia, an instructor at UP’s College of Education, conceded that Fernandez’s work was “superior” to the earlier textbook by Jernegan. In 1984, Agoncillo recalled using the books by Fernandez and Benitez as a student, and pronounced the former “better organized” than the latter.

But perhaps the most unusual evidence of Brief History’s influence is “‘History’—as Sometimes Written,” a satirical article published in the Philippine Magazine, which was not only the oldest monthly periodical in the Philippine Islands at that point, but had also become required reading for high school seniors in the public schools. Leon Ma. Guerrero, author of the one-page, two-column article (plus 14 lines on another page), and later The First Filipino (1963), uses slightly-altered sentences and even an entire paragraph from two chapters in Fernandez’s
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textbook to tell a story that dominated newspaper headlines only the year before. Unlike the real Teodoro Asedillo, who died in a shootout with law enforcers in 1935, the story’s similarly-named protagonist is given Andres Bonifacio’s date of birth in 1863, and is killed a day after Jose Rizal in 1896. Guerrero was obviously making a point by appropriating Fernandez’s words, but his point is not readily apparent. While Guerrero seems to be arguing that recent developments were merely repetitions of previous events related to the Philippine Revolution of 1896, the disparity between demands made by Filipino leaders at peace negotiations with the Spanish in Fernandez’s textbook and Guerrero’s article (Table 3.1), as well as the quotes around the word “history” in the article’s title, suggests that he was criticizing the propensity of journalists to make unwarranted comparisons.

| Table 3.1 |
| Comparison of demands made by Filipino leaders in exchange for peace |

**Fernandez’s Brief History (1919)**
1. The expulsion of the religious orders.  
2. Philippine representation in the Spanish Cortes.  
3. The equal treatment of Filipinos and Spaniards in the application of justice.  
4. The employment of Filipinos in the high posts of the government service.  
5. The liberty of the press, and the right to form associations.  
6. The payment by the Spanish government of the sum of three million pesos...

**Guerrero’s “History” (1936)**
1. A haircut for Encallado [who took over from Asedillo after his death].  
2. A trip to Malacañan [the President’s residence] for Encallado and a triumphal return to Mauban [Encallado’s hometown].  

Further research will have to be done to confirm the validity of this conclusion, but there is no doubt that Guerrero recognized the importance of his source because, between the title and his byline, he adds, “(With apologies to Leandro H. Fernandez, author of ‘A Brief History of the Philippines’).”

Fernandez’s book was clearly considered by scholars and journalists before the Second World War to be as good as, if not better than, those by Barrows and Benitez, so it is somewhat surprising that little has been written about Fernandez or his book since his death in 1948. In contrast, his colleagues, contemporaries, and students—such as Agoncillo, Eufronio Alip, Encarnacion Alzona, Austin Craig, Nicolas Zafra, and Gregorio Zaide—have been the subject of
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recently-published conference papers, magazine articles, and, in the case of Alzona and Agoncillo, edited volumes of their writings. While these historians’ contributions are certainly important, with some more influential than others, not one of their books has been in the hands of a greater percentage of Filipinos at one time as Fernandez’s textbook over almost four decades.

All three editions of *A Brief History of the Philippines* credit “Leandro H. Fernández” as its author, and “Ginn and Company” of Boston as its publisher. They are physically similar: hardbound, printed on book paper, and measure approximately 19 x 13.5 cm each, about the size of a regular DVD case today. The covers are almost identical, except that the 1919 edition’s cover is grey, while the 1932 and 1951 editions are red (Figure 3.2). The 1932 edition also bears the phrase “Revised edition” on its cover and spine, while the 1951 edition reads “Revised edition with 1950 supplement.”

![Figure 3.2 Covers of A Brief History of the Philippines](source: Personal collection of Vernon Totanes)
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69 The title and the word “Fernandez” appear on the front covers, as well as the spines, along with a seal featuring a woman on the covers, and “Ginn and Company” at the bottom of the spines. The copyright pages of the last two editions also reveal that Ginn copyrighted the first edition twice, once in 1919 (“Copyright”) and again in 1929 (“Philippines Copyright”), five years after the first Philippine intellectual property law was enacted in 1924. Fernandez claimed “Copyright” and “Philippines Copyright” in 1932, but the 1951 edition shows that after the author’s death in 1948, both copyrights reverted to Ginn, not to his heirs. Act No. 3134 (1924).
The first two editions of Fernandez’s book were used by Filipino public school students in the seventh grade from 1919 until 1940, the year when elementary schooling was reduced by law from seven years to six. Brief History was so ubiquitous that a 1940 capsule biography of Fernandez implies that he was known to all seventh graders throughout the Philippine Islands because they were supposedly conversing with the textbook’s author for an entire year. Upon the resumption of classes after the end of the Second World War, sixth graders began using the 1932 edition as part of a new curriculum that subsumed history under social studies. The available evidence indicates that the same edition remained in use as late as 1958, notwithstanding the publication of the 1951 edition and the selection of Agoncillo’s One World: Old and New (1955) as the new social studies textbook in 1953. Although lack of funds may have motivated the continued utilization of copies of an older edition, it is also likely that an executive order issued in 1951 regulating the entry of imported goods, including elementary school books, prevented the adoption of Brief History’s final edition.

It is not possible to determine how many students actually read Fernandez’s textbook or any of the early textbooks, for that matter, but it is more likely as Ileto argued in his 1997 lecture that a book in the hands of a greater number of students is more influential than one used by fewer students. In 1926, when Conrado Benitez’s History of the Philippines became the prescribed textbook for almost 8,000 seniors enrolled at public high schools, more than 41,000 seventh graders were using Fernandez’s work. By 1940, more students were making it to their senior year, but there were still five seventh graders for every high school senior required to read the latest edition of Benitez’s work. This ratio would change by 1958, when Brief History was estimated to be in the hands of almost 23,000 sixth graders, against the more than 41,000 seniors who were using the 1954 edition of Benitez’s History. But considering that two new Philippine history books for high school students had been adopted, purchased, and delivered by 1961, it is
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74 Annual Report - 1927, 127. In 1926, significantly fewer females than males were enrolled in public schools, 43 percent in the primary grades and 37 percent in high school. By 1950, more females were going to school, 47 percent in the primary grades and 44 percent in high school.
75 Annual Report - 1941, 25; Martin, “The Old Song,” 9, 14.
unlikely that those who used Benitez’s book ever came close to outnumbering those exposed to Brief History for nearly four decades. Fernandez’s work was the prescribed history textbook for hundreds of thousands of Filipino public school students, and it was very likely the first and last Philippine history book many of them ever read, but unlike the textbooks by Barrows or Benitez, neither its text nor its significance in Philippine historiography has been subjected to the scrutiny of scholars.

The rest of this section reconstructs the field of historical production in the Philippine Islands during the American period by examining the history of Brief History in relation to developments in the field of power, as well as the introduction of public school education by the Americans, the beginnings of the history department at the newly-established University of the Philippines, the evolution of the textbook adoption process, the influence of American publishers, and the contributions of the book distribution industry.

Unlike Jose Rizal, whose letters and other papers have been preserved and published, very little remains of Fernandez’s rare book collection and personal correspondence, which are said to have burned along with his house during the Second World War. The archives of Ginn and Company, according to a recent biography of its founder, must have been lost after its remnants were sold to one conglomerate after another during the latter half of the twentieth century. Fortunately, official documents, financial statements, and the personal papers of Ginn’s chair in the 1920s, along with those of some of Fernandez’s contemporaries and students, have been preserved in various institutions in the United States and the Philippines, and in one case, a personal collection. These primary sources, along with data from the different editions of Fernandez’s work and information from newspaper clippings and other published materials, have made possible this brief history of a forgotten textbook, which demonstrates that the motives of agents involved in the production and circulation of books were not as uncomplicated as they are made to seem in Constantino’s influential essay.

76 Teodoro Agoncillo and Gregorio Zaide, both former students of Leandro Fernandez, were the authors of Philippine History (1962) and Philippine History: Development of Our Nation (1961), respectively, which were intended for the use of high school sophomores in the newly-revised curriculum. “Data on Textbooks as of September 30, 1966,” 4.
Leandro Fernandez, Author

Leandro Fernandez, suggests Agoncillo, is “hardly read or remembered today—except by two or three of his former students” because he devoted more time to his administrative responsibilities than the study of history. But the reason that Agoncillo offers, that Clio “punished” Fernandez for neglecting her, is debatable. Neither David Barrows nor Conrado Benitez—who went on to become president of the University of California and the founding dean of UP’s College of Business Administration, respectively—was trained as a historian, and both are better known for their work as educators. But as the previous section shows, their textbooks have nevertheless been the subject of scholarly interest. Agoncillo, who credits Fernandez for convincing him to major in history, may have been wrong about the reason, but he is essentially correct that his former professor has been all but forgotten.

Fernandez, who began teaching at UP in 1914, was the first Filipino with a graduate degree in history to do so. He was also the history department’s first Filipino and longest-running chair, serving from 1922 to 1948. No scholar, however, has noted these distinctions, not even in the few published biographies of Fernandez or histories of UP’s history department. Neither has anyone acknowledged that his Brief History was the first textbook—on any subject—written by a Filipino approved for public school use at a time when most such books had American authors or were merely coauthored by Filipinos whose greatest contributions, it was suspected, were their names. More recently, one scholar has dismissed Fernandez as the
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79 Agoncillo, “Philippine Historiography,” 12.
80 See pp. 88-90 of this chapter.
82 UP Catalogue - 1915, 65.
83 Fernandez was appointed “acting head” in 1922, but since he was working on his Ph.D. in New York from 1923 to 1926, another colleague, Encarnación Alzona, is also identified as having the same designation during the same period on certain pages of the UP Catalogue, with Fernandez noted as being “on leave” on other pages. He is officially listed as “head” from 1927 until 1948.
85 A Century of Education in the Philippines: 1861-1961, ed. Dalmacio Martin (Manila: Philippine Historical Association, 1950) 193. Many scholars have recognized Camilo Osias as the author of The Philippine Readers, as well as the first Filipino to write a textbook used in the public schools. But what they do not realize, perhaps because very few copies of the original editions in the series can be inspected today, is that Osias was more properly the editor, rather than author, of the first three volumes, which featured a greater number of selections written by authors other than Osias. Among those who have claimed that The Philippine Readers were the first textbooks written by a Filipino to be used in the public schools are Osias himself in The Story of a Long Career of Varied Tasks (Quezon City: Manlapaz, 1971)146; Roland Coloma, “Disidentifying Nationalism: Camilo Osias and Filipino Education in
quintessential colonial Filipino historian who was “Educated and trained to think like his colonizer” and “displayed evident pro-American sympathies,” without considering that perhaps other reasons prevented him from advocating stronger positions.  

Fernandez, a graduate of the public school system established by the Americans, obtained his undergraduate and master’s degrees at the University of Chicago as one of the very first pensionados, the term for students sent to the United States who were selected through a competition and supported financially by the colonial government. He returned to Manila in 1914 with what was likely the very first master’s thesis written about Jose Rizal, and began teaching history as an instructor at the five-person Department of History, Economics and Sociology of the University of the Philippines, with the American Austin Craig as “chief,” and Conrado Benitez, his fellow pensionado, teaching all the economics classes.  

Economics and sociology were spun off in 1917, and by the time Brief History’s first edition was published in 1919, its title page lists Fernandez as “Assistant Professor of History.” With Craig’s departure in 1922, the history department became an all-Filipino one, with three men and two women on the faculty.  

The 1932 edition’s title page shows that, since the previous edition, Fernandez had been promoted to “Professor and Head of the Department of History,” which remained his official designation until his death in 1948. The 1951 edition adds the word “Late” to his designation, but does not indicate that he also served simultaneously as dean of the College of Liberal Arts from 1935 onward. Despite his administrative duties, he continued teaching students, among them Agoncillo and Gregorio Zaide.

Fernandez, however, was not solely a product of his American-sponsored education and career. Born in 1889—when the Spaniards were still very much in control in Manila, and Jose Rizal was struggling to have his annotated edition of Antonio de Morga’s Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas printed in Paris—Fernandez was seven years old in 1896, when the Philippine Revolution began and Rizal was executed. Evidence of Fernandez’s nationalism may be found in his Brief History, as well as in his lecture on “The Formation of Filipino Nationality” (1922),

the Early Twentieth Century,” in Revolution and Pedagogy, ed. E. Thomas Ewing (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005) 31; and Jurilla, Tagalog Bestsellers, 36. See also pp. 103-104 of this chapter.


88 UP Catalogue - 1923, 123. For more about Craig’s removal, see p. 89, n. 48, of this chapter.


which Agoncillo calls “The first work on the subject of Filipino nationalism,” and The Philippine Republic (1926), the doctoral dissertation he finished at Columbia University.91 Although Fernandez was averse to controversy, he nevertheless indicates in his textbook that Filipinos considered the American claim of sovereignty over the Philippine Islands as “unwelcome news,” states that they “refused to recognize the right of sovereignty of the United States over the Philippines,” and enumerates the reasons “Spain had no moral right to cede the Philippines to the United States.”92

Unlike Barrows, he also consistently referred to the Philippine-American conflict as a war, not an insurrection, and emphasized at length that an independent Philippine republic with a constitution was already in existence even before the ratification of the treaty in which Spain ceded las Islas Filipinas to the United States. In his lecture on Filipino nationalism, Fernandez expands on an incident mentioned in his Brief History that not only demonstrates that Tagalogs and non-Tagalogs waged war against the Americans, but also that “the feeling of nationality has gone deeper in the hearts of the people, much deeper than the enemies of Filipino nationhood are willing to concede.”93 In his preface to The Philippine Republic, a study of the events that occurred from 1892 to 1902, Fernandez defines the term “Philippine revolution” as “the armed revolution which began as a revolt against Spain and ended as an act of resistance to the United States.”94

These statements do not, of course, indicate that Fernandez was anti-American, but they do contradict the conclusion that he was pro-American merely because of where he obtained his education. It is important to remember that what is commonly known as the Sedition Law of 1901 was still in effect. This law prohibited anyone from advocating “orally or by writing or printing, or like methods, the independence of the Philippine Islands” until such time as the state of war was officially lifted. But as Fernandez himself noted starting with Brief History’s 1919 edition, “the war was officially declared to be ended [in 1902], but the law against treason and sedition was not repealed.” This law was revoked only in 1930.95

---

92 Fernandez, BHP (1919) 264-265.
95 Idem, BHP (1919) 291; Act No. 292 (1901); Act No. 3815 (1930).
His statements also clearly show that if anyone is to be held responsible for the fact that the Filipino-American War is largely forgotten—whereas the war for independence from Spain is remembered frequently, as Ileto has remarked elsewhere—Fernandez is not one of them. He is, however, much more fortunate than others involved in the production of history books. While Fernandez’s position has at least been noted by a few scholars (though not always accurately), the contributions of American publishers and their representatives, as well as local booksellers, to the promotion of the need for Philippine history textbooks written by Filipinos have been almost completely ignored or misrepresented.

**Ginn and Company, Publisher**

By the late nineteenth century, Ginn and Company was already one of the leading textbook publishers in the United States, and not surprisingly was also one of the very first publishers from whom the US Army requisitioned Spanish textbooks intended for use in the Philippine Islands. It was not the first time that Ginn or its competitors profited from the reconstruction that occurs after a war. When Edwin Ginn founded the firm in Boston in 1867, the markets in the southern states had just opened up after the end of the American Civil War. After the United States defeated Spain in 1898, publishers viewed the Philippine Islands as another potentially lucrative market for their books. While the Americans running Ginn and its competitors were probably patriotic and loyal to the United States, it is unlikely that their primary motivation in selling textbooks for the use of Filipino students was to turn them into little brown Americans. In fact, William Howard Taft, who was appointed the new colony’s civil governor in 1901, is said to have complimented Ginn for sending a representative even before a law governing the schools had been enacted. It is unknown whether his comment was sincere or sarcastic.

Although the first Philippine imprints appeared in 1593, the great majority of publications from then until late in the nineteenth century were religious in nature, most of which
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98 “History of Ginn and Company” (unpublished typescript, [1922-1923?]) 25-26, in George A. Plimpton papers, Box 29, Folder 6, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Library. Henceforth, GAP Papers [Box]/[Folder].
were printed on small presses owned by the Spanish missionaries. Consequently, there were actually no publishers in the Philippine Islands with the capacity to print textbooks on the scale needed early in the twentieth century. Purchase orders, therefore, were sent from Manila to US publishers’ offices, and books were then shipped back to Manila for distribution to the other islands. The whole process took several months from the time orders were initially placed.

The procedures for textbook selection evolved over the years, but it must have been very disorganized at the beginning, especially because Major General Elwell Otis, who was military governor of the Philippine Islands in 1899, was leading the effort to defeat Filipino soldiers who had begun waging a guerilla war at about the same time he started approving requisitions for textbooks for Filipino children. With the advent of civilian rule in 1901, superintendents were authorized to prescribe the books for their divisions. Later on, advisory committees, and eventually a Textbook Board created by law in 1921, went through the submissions and selected the books to be used over a five-year period.

Once a book was adopted, funds were supposed to be allocated, but there was never enough to acquire all the necessary copies immediately after adoption. This resulted in situations where old textbooks continued to be used for decades until they wore out or a sufficient number of new copies could be provided. Due to financial difficulties and changing priorities, especially after the onset of the Great Depression, whether a book was sold or rented in a given year depended on its condition, existing policies, and whether primary, intermediate, or high school students were using it.

Due to the keen competition between publishers, and the fact that Ginn had no Manila office but merely sent one of its partners to visit every five years, its Philippine business was initially not as profitable as they hoped. From 1907 to 1917, net sales averaged less than $18,000 annually, but after Ginn hired a permanent representative, income soared to more than $101,000 per year from 1918 to 1923, the last year for which such figures are available. The Philippine Islands thus increased in importance to Ginn because the company had never earned
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more than $30,000 from any of its foreign markets since 1907.\footnote{George Plimpton to Lewis Parkhurst, et al., 11 April 1924, in GAP Papers 30/2; Evelyn Hughan to George Plimpton, 16 January 1922, in Plimpton Family Papers, Box 5, Folder 7, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Library. Henceforth, PF Papers [Box]/[Folder].} In most cases, the primary market for textbooks was the colonial government, which explains why eventually the most successful publishers’ agents were former education officials.\footnote{Austin Craig, \emph{Farthest Westing}, 166-167.}

Hugo Miller was Ginn’s representative in the Philippine Islands from 1917 until the Japanese invasion in 1941. He began working in the new US colony as a teacher in 1906 and worked his way up the hierarchy in the public school system, while also writing textbooks, one of which—\emph{Economic Conditions in the Philippines} (1913) for high school seniors—was published by Ginn.\footnote{\textit{Annual Report - 1915}, 34; Hugo Miller, \textit{Economic Conditions in the Philippines} (Boston: Ginn, 1913; rev. ed., 1920). Supreme Court decision G.R. Nos. L-9456 and L-9481, 6 January 1958, \textit{The Lawphil Project}, http://www.lawphil.net/judjuris/juri1958/jan1958/gr_l-9456_1958.html.} Many of Ginn’s books sold in the United States were ordered for the use of Filipino students without revision, but the books that were written specifically for the Philippine market by Filipino authors, including \emph{Brief History}, were the ones that eventually resulted in phenomenal sales.

Several factors, starting with the selection of authors, were crucial in shaping the books, as well as ensuring their adoption. Miller’s familiarity with the textbook selection process as an author and former government employee, his acquaintance with potential authors, and previous working relationship with decision-makers in the Philippine Islands undoubtedly contributed to the adoption of more of Ginn’s books. But his prior relationship with the company as an author also served to bolster management’s confidence in his abilities as Ginn’s representative and facilitated decisions that would probably not have been made otherwise.\footnote{George Plimpton to Lewis Parkhurst, 24 September 1912, in GAP Papers 23/9; Hugo Miller to George Plimpton, 8 June 1916, in GAP Papers 27/22.} Among the most important of these decisions was the one that led to the engagement of Filipinos to write books for Ginn.

Through a letter from Miller, Ginn’s executives learned that Frank Crone, Director of Education from 1913 to 1916, would have wanted to send more business their way, if only because their occasional representative “stood way above” the others, but since Ginn did not have the needed books, they did not get the business. Then Miller added, “Which being the case I suppose it is up to Ginn and Company to make the books that are wanted.”\footnote{Hugo Miller to Thomas Lawler, 10 June 1916, in GAP Papers 27/22.} This observation does not seem to have required a great deal of insight, just as the hiring of Filipino authors like

\footnote{Hugo Miller to George Plimpton, 8 June 1916, in GAP Papers 27/22; Hugo Miller to George Plimpton, 10 June 1916, in GAP Papers 27/22.}
Fernandez appears to be rather obvious in hindsight, but apparently Miller had to point it out and follow through. His subsequent contributions were so important that when Miller expressed dissatisfaction with his compensation after seven years of outstanding sales, a partner urged Ginn’s chair to give Miller what he wanted, emphasizing that “If we lost him we might not find his equal in ten years.”

It is unknown just how *Brief History* came to be written, but a postscript in a note from Ginn’s chair that recommends “paying Fernandez” suggests that Miller was instrumental in engaging Fernandez to write the manuscript. It is also not possible to determine exactly how many copies were purchased by the Philippine government from 1919 onward, but the available evidence indicates that the initial order was for 15,000 copies, which was just a little more than the total number of seventh graders in 1918, when the Director of Education tried to negotiate a lower price via a telegram from Manila by asking for “cheaper cloth binding.” No publication records have been found that reveal if this request eventually resulted in a lower price or if it was the reason the book was not released as initially planned when classes opened in June 1919, but other sources show that *Brief History* began to be sold in September 1919 to Filipino students for P1.85, at a time when a laborer’s minimum daily wage in Manila was rarely greater than P2.00, and perhaps to a few American buyers for 75 cents.

The following year, Ginn began publishing the first three volumes of *The Philippine Readers* (Books V, VI and VII), edited by Camilo Osias. The readers were initially designated as supplementary materials, but when six volumes became prescribed textbooks in 1924, the colonial government purchased so many copies that the series accounted for 34 percent of Ginn’s entire foreign market, and 85 percent of its sales in the Philippine Islands. The Osias readers, as they came to be known, were used by even more students than Fernandez’s textbook because second graders, for instance, outnumbered seventh graders that year by a ratio of more than five
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116 For more information about this series, see p. 97, n. 85, of this chapter.
to one, and it is for this reason perhaps that *The Philippine Readers* are remembered by more scholars than any other textbook published during the same period. This logic, however, does not apply to comparisons of the actual usage of the history book by Fernandez, which was in the hands of Filipino students for almost four decades, with those by Barrows and Benitez, both of which were used by fewer high school seniors over shorter periods of time. Historians, it seems, have truly forgotten Fernandez and his textbook.

*Philippine Education Company, Bookseller*

The Philippine Education Company or PECO, as it was commonly known, had nothing to do with the adoption of textbooks for public schools in the Philippine Islands, which was negotiated directly between the government and the publishers. But it did play a role in creating awareness about and selling copies of textbooks through its bookstore and distribution network. The company was named after *Philippine Education*, which started out in 1904 as a monthly magazine purchased by the government and distributed to public school teachers throughout the Philippine Islands.118 PECO evolved from a one-man enterprise into the largest bookselling and stationery business in the country, in part through the acquisition of its Spanish and American competitors and other related businesses, such as McCullough Printing, Manila Publishing, and Rosenstock City Directory.119

Just like the publishers it dealt with, including Ginn, and despite its name, PECO was essentially an American-run company that catered to the needs of an American-run government until 1935, when the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands was inaugurated, with Manuel Quezon as its first President. But unlike US-based publishers who, at best, employed Filipino representatives, PECO was established in the Philippine Islands by Americans who started as teachers and evolved into managers. Before the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and Manila in 1941, fewer than 20 of its 600 employees were American, and the rest were Filipino.

---

118 The magazine was initially known as *Philippine Teacher*, whose first four issues were “Edited under the supervision of the General Superintendent of Education,” but it was renamed *Philippine Education* in 1906, *Philippine Education Magazine* in 1926 and *Philippine Magazine* in 1929. “The Building of a Magazine and Business in the Philippines,” *Philippine Education Magazine*, June 1928, 16; “Editorials,” *Philippine Magazine*, January 1938, 13.

As one of its managers felt compelled to assert in 1946, in answer to an accusation that prefigured the economic nationalism of the 1950s, “We have never pretended to be an American corporation… We are organized in the Philippines, we do business in the Philippines, we pay taxes in the Philippines… we make our money and we spend it here in the Philippines, except for what we have to send back to the United States to pay for the goods we import.” The same manager estimated that 90 percent of textbooks published specifically for use in the Philippine Islands were sold directly by publishers to the Philippine government, and that PECO marketed most of the remaining 10 percent to private schools and the general public.\textsuperscript{120}

There is no way of knowing how many copies PECO sold of any of the three editions of Fernandez’s textbook, but the appearance of its title in the pages of \textit{Philippine Magazine}, the successor to \textit{Philippine Education}, provides some information about the book’s distribution and influence during the 1930s. For instance, full-page advertisements bearing the name of Hugo Miller as Ginn’s representative in the Philippine Islands, reveal that copies of the newly-published, slightly-revised 1932 edition of \textit{Brief History} were selling at P2.40, and Benitez’s \textit{History} was almost twice as expensive at P4.50, at a time when 90 percent of Manila’s daily wage earners were earning less than P2.50 a day.\textsuperscript{121} The prominent and repeated references to the fact that the “basal texts” listed in the advertisements, including \textit{Brief History}, were “specially written for use in the Philippines” and “approved by the Board on Textbooks” suggests that there was, in fact, a market for Ginn’s books outside the public schools.\textsuperscript{122} In 1937, the magazine itself ran a promotion encouraging students to sell subscriptions to \textit{Philippine Magazine} in exchange for all the required textbooks issued by different publishers (not just Ginn) from the fifth grade to fourth year high school.\textsuperscript{123} Whether the promotion yielded any results cannot be determined, but the fact that it was even directed to students is quite remarkable.

\textit{Philippine Magazine} was not intended for students, but perhaps because of its regular features on Philippine folklore and legends, it officially became required reading for seniors in

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{120} Arthur Heidenreich to Sotero Laurel, 23 September 1946, in “Papers re Philippine Education,” Box 7, Walter W. Marquardt papers, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
\bibitem{121} The disparity in price of the textbooks was more likely due to differences in the sizes of their potential audiences, rather than an indication of quality or actual production costs. The first advertisement ran in the June 1932 issue of \textit{Philippine Magazine}, while a slightly different version appeared in the July and August issues. The wage data is from an unpaginated carbon copy of the 1932 \textit{Annual Report of the Bureau of Labor} found at the Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
\bibitem{122} Aside from those in the 1932 issues, other Ginn advertisements promoting “Books to Supplement Basal Texts” and “A Balanced Reading Program” appeared in issues of \textit{Philippine Magazine} from July to October 1933.
\bibitem{123} The promotion appeared in the magazine’s May and June 1937 issues.
\end{thebibliography}
public high schools beginning in 1934. This undoubtedly profitable arrangement ended, however, when the monthly’s use in public schools was suspended in 1941 because of allegedly blasphemous statements made by A.V.H Hartendorp, the magazine’s American editor since 1925, in an article in its latest issue. Hartendorp, who bought the publication from PECO in 1933, had been engaged in a word war for several months with American Jesuit priests over the monthly’s depiction of the religious order in its pages.

The Jesuit strategy of depicting criticism of their order as criticism of the Catholic Church paid off, according to the editor, when Michael O’Doherty, the American Archbishop of Manila, demanded that Jorge Bocobo, the Secretary of Public Instruction, put an end to the magazine’s “anti-Catholic attacks.” By then, the Philippine Commonwealth was already in place, and Filipinos like Bocobo were running the government, but Catholic leaders were still primarily American. Bocobo was a Protestant, not a Catholic, and so justified the immediate suspension of the magazine by asserting that several abstruse statements were offensive to all Christians (even though the statements were probably incomprehensible to most high school students), and violated the administrative code that prohibited any attempts to influence pupils for or against any church or religious sect.

Philippine Magazine launched a subscription drive, but lost some advertisers, and Hartendorp, who was also a presidential adviser, eventually brought the matter to the attention of President Quezon, who proceeded to overrule Bocobo’s order. It was a sign of the changing times. Whereas Americans were the only ones arguing about what was appropriate for Filipino students at the turn of the century, this time a Filipino had the final word. Sadly, however, Quezon’s intervention was all for naught. In December 1941, as Hartendorp wrote an editorial for what would turn out to be the magazine’s last issue, Japanese bombers flew over Manila, introducing Filipinos to the reign of yet another foreign power.

124 “For the Record,” Philippine Magazine, February 1941, 77-78.
125 An advertisement in the magazine’s February 1941 issue indicates that each issue since September 1940 contained at least one editorial or article related to Hartendorp’s feud with the Jesuits. For more on his career at PECO and purchase of the magazine, see “Editorials,” Philippine Magazine, October 1933, 194; February 1941, 55-57.
126 See also “Editorials” and “Four O’clock in the Editor’s Office,” Philippine Magazine, February 1941, 55-57, 78-82.
Conclusion

Most of the Philippine history textbooks used by Filipino students early in the twentieth century were written by Americans, published in the United States, and selected by American education officials. They were undoubtedly pro-American and were probably responsible for convincing many Filipinos of the benevolence of American colonial rule. But as this chapter illustrates, closer examination of the histories of these textbooks shows that some of them were used by more students over longer periods of time, that publishers were probably more concerned about profits than indoctrination, and that Americans objected to the adoption of the books almost immediately.

It may not be possible to obtain actual sales or rental figures for the different editions of David Barrows’ History of the Philippines or Leandro Fernandez’s A Brief History of the Philippines, but it is possible to establish that the former was used only for two years, not two decades, and that the latter was a prescribed text for almost 40 years. Both textbooks were published in multiple editions, but “published” is not necessarily the same as “required,” and “multiple editions” are not always indicative of influence. While conflicts that divided Filipinos and Americans early in the twentieth century no doubt shaped the writing and adoption of textbooks in various ways, it is necessary, as Bourdieu asserts, to distinguish between struggles that occurred in the field of power and those in the field of cultural production. Since the field in which Barrows and Fernandez produced their books was still quite fallow, it is not surprising that adoption decisions were influenced not by unknown selectors, as they have been for most of the twentieth century, but by the most powerful political and religious figures of their time.

The controversies discussed in this chapter reveal tensions between adversaries that have not been mentioned in studies of Philippine historiography. For example, 35 years after an American archbishop objected to the adoption of a history book by an American author, another American archbishop successfully blocked the continued use in Philippine public schools of a magazine edited by an American—not because it promoted Philippine folklore and legends, but because of allegedly disparaging remarks made in its pages about the Catholic Church. While these struggles signal that Americans wielded the power to decide which materials could be read by Filipino students, they also demonstrate that the selection of such materials did not go unopposed and that any mis-education that may have occurred did not necessarily involve the imposition of American culture on Filipino students. Instead, the Catholic Church’s leadership,
notwithstanding a shift from Spanish to American bishops, continued to play a much larger role in the choice of books and magazines used in Philippine public schools before the Second World War than has been previously acknowledged by historians and other scholars.\(^{128}\)

No such interference from the Catholic Church or anyone, for that matter, seems to have hindered the use of Fernandez’s textbook, perhaps because he knew enough to avoid expressing controversial views or maybe Ginn’s editors or Hugo Miller advised him against doing so. It is thus quite ironic that the uncontroversial Brief History was nevertheless banned after being used by students for almost two decades, and those responsible for its production and circulation were silenced in various, sometimes tragic, ways. The bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941 was followed almost immediately by the Japanese invasion of the Philippine Islands, causing untold suffering and death among Filipinos and Americans. The seemingly benign business of textbook publishing and distribution was not spared. Within a few months, classes resumed under Japanese rule and many textbooks adopted during the American period were used once again, but pages depicting the United States in a favorable light were eliminated. Among the few titles specifically prohibited in their entirety was Fernandez’s Brief History.\(^{129}\)

What Fernandez did during the war is uncertain, but it is clear that his house burned sometime before 1945 and that hypertension caused his death in 1948.\(^{130}\) What is not so clear is the identity of the authors of chapters appended to the 1951 edition. A footnote on the first page of the new material indicates that the additional chapters were “prepared in the Manila Office of Ginn and Company.”\(^{131}\) Who made up the Manila Office at that time is not so easily determined because Hugo Miller joined the US Navy after the war broke out, and was subsequently captured and executed by Japanese soldiers in 1944.\(^{132}\) With the end of the Second World War in 1945
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came the revival of PECO, but not before the returning US Army commandeered its printing facilities for a short time.\textsuperscript{133}

Official US recognition of the Republic of the Philippines the following year eventually led to the rise of economic nationalism, which included the imposition of import and foreign exchange controls, as well as the prohibition of imported textbooks for elementary and intermediate grades, which likely prevented the adoption of Brief History’s 1951 edition as a required textbook in Philippine public schools.\textsuperscript{134} Ginn and PECO never regained their previous stature in their respective markets, and although Hartendorp survived more than three years in a Japanese internment camp, he was unable to revive Philippine Magazine.

Although many changes occurred between the time Jose Rizal published his annotated edition of Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas in Paris in 1890 and the publication of the final edition of Fernandez’s Brief History in 1951, the disputes that took place within the field of historical production were not remotely as disruptive as those that the Spanish, Americans, and Japanese wrought within the broader field of power. In some ways, the smaller field in which the books by Rizal and Fernandez were produced had changed very little. Like Rizal’s Sucesos, Fernandez’s textbook was written in a foreign language and printed in a foreign land. Both Rizal and Fernandez obtained graduate degrees outside the land of their birth, and were among only a handful of Filipinos who were publicly acknowledged as historians during their time.

The differences, however, between the two books, their authors, and the reason each was published reveal significant changes in the field of historical production. While Rizal’s Sucesos was written in Spanish, Fernandez’s Brief History was in English, which reflected not only the shift from Spanish to American colonial rule, but also the new language of scholarship. While Rizal was essentially a self-taught historian, Fernandez had to submit a thesis (on Rizal, no less) to earn his master’s degree in history, which echoed the professionalization of the study of history then taking place in the West. Finally, Rizal’s decision to publish his annotated edition was essentially a personal one motivated by nationalism, while Fernandez’s publisher was clearly more interested in increasing its share of a new market for textbooks, which was indicative of the growing appreciation of the profitability of producing books for Filipinos.

The details of each book’s publication and circulation are also indicative of the contexts in which they wrote. Rizal’s work was an annotated edition of an older book, self-published with

\textsuperscript{133} Kerima Polotan, “PECO,” Sunday Times Magazine, 1 May 1960, 30.

a print run of fewer than 2,000 copies, smuggled into las Islas Filipinas, and though dedicated to all Filipinos, was likely read only by a few educated Filipinos who knew Spanish, and the Spanish officials who banned its distribution. Fernandez’s textbook, on the other hand, was entirely his own, published by a large American firm with a probable initial run of at least 15,000, legally shipped to and received by the Bureau of Public Schools in the Philippine Islands, and used by an entire generation of Filipino students.

*Brief History* was, of course, a prescribed textbook, and this is the main reason it was the most profitable Philippine history book during the first half of the twentieth century. Although its author was not the hero that Rizal was, Fernandez’s position as chair of UP’s history department from 1922 until his death in 1948, his graduate degrees in history, and the dearth of Philippine history books by Filipinos before the Second World War endowed his textbook with symbolic capital that resulted in its consecration by contemporary Filipino and American historians and journalists. Fernandez’s text does support claims that he “displayed evident pro-American sympathies,” but the book was also the only one in the hands of the greatest number of Filipinos to baldly state that “Filipinos refused to recognize the right of sovereignty of the United States over the Philippines.”

This work, however, was far from controversial. Except for the period during the Japanese occupation when it was banned, the textbook never caused any significant struggles or oppositions in the fields of power or historical production, which may be part of the reason it has been all but forgotten in studies of Philippine historiography. It was probably one of the books Agoncillo had in mind in 1960 when he wrote that his new textbook, the subject of the next chapter, was “a radical departure from any textbook on Philippine history.” But the circumstances in which Fernandez produced his book, including the fact that the study of history as a discipline in the Philippine Islands was in its infancy, must be taken into consideration before it is summarily dismissed. *A Brief History of the Philippines* was, in fact, a textbook. It was by no means a radical one, but its text must be appreciated in the context of its publishing and distribution history as a required textbook, which was anything but brief.

---

136 Teodoro Agoncillo and Oscar Alfonso, “Preface,” in *A Short History of the Filipino People* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1960) iii.
Chapter 4
History Book of the Filipino People

The fast-moving events that took place during the last twelve months, particularly the declaration of martial law, necessitated the updating of this book. Consequently, I have included in the present edition some sections on the martial law regime. One whole chapter has been deleted.¹

This passage is the entire three-sentence preface to the 4th (1973) edition of the college textbook that is now commonly known as Teodoro Agoncillo’s *History of the Filipino People (HFP).*² It is the shortest and most intriguing of the unique prefacing written by Agoncillo for each of the book’s first six editions before his death in 1985. It also seems to invite the reader to speculate. Which chapter was deleted? What was it about? Did the declaration of martial law in 1972 lead to the chapter’s deletion?

Agoncillo by then was one of the most influential Filipino historians of the twentieth century, and *HFP* was instrumental in making his name known across the nation. Unlike Leandro Fernandez’s *A Brief History of the Philippines* (1919), however, it was not a prescribed textbook for all sixth or seventh graders in Philippine public schools. Its mimeographed 1st (1960) edition was initially used only at the University of the Philippines (UP), but subsequent editions were gradually adopted in other colleges and universities, and its 8th (1990) edition, the most recent one, remains required reading for many students two decades after it was published. Hundreds of thousands of copies of *HFP*’s eight editions have been printed and bought, and countless others have been resold, borrowed, and photocopied. It has been cited more times by scholars in various disciplines, and has sold more copies over a period of one year, than most monographs on Philippine history published over the last five decades.

¹ Teodoro Agoncillo and Milagros Guerrero, *History of the Filipino People*, 4th ed. (Quezon City: R.P. Garcia, 1973) iii. Henceforth, this book’s different editions will be referred to as *HFP*, plus edition and year. Additional information will be supplied when necessary. See Table 4.1 for all other details.
² The word “edition” is used in this chapter not in the bibliographic sense, but according to the usage by Agoncillo and his publishers, as reflected in the copyright pages of the different editions.


*HFP* has become, in more ways than one, the history book of the Filipino people. But when historians mention *HFP* at all in reviews of Philippine historiography, it is often merely to quote Agoncillo’s preface to the 1st (1960) edition, where he notes that:

In some ways, the present textbook is a radical departure from any textbook on Philippine history. First, because it considers Philippine history before 1872, in the main, a lost history. Second, because the point of view taken is that of a Filipino.³ These assertions continue to be disputed—validating, if not necessarily supporting, the radical nature of the views expressed—but the book’s significance goes beyond the fact that more textbooks today devote greater attention to the period after 1872 than *HFP*’s predecessors, or that it has now become just one of many, where once there were hardly any, that look at Philippine history from the Filipino, not Spanish or American, point of view. The prefaces to its other editions, especially the intriguing preface to the 4th (1973) edition, as well as evidence of its publication, manufacture, distribution, reception, and survival can, in fact, be used to trace the development of the field of historical production in the Philippines during the latter half of the twentieth century.

The present chapter examines *HFP*’s complex publishing history—involving two credited coauthors, three uncredited contributors, and four different publishers—as a case study to further explore the evolution of the Filipino history book in an independent Philippines. The first section describes the changes that took place in the fields of power and historical production from the 1930s to the 1950s in relation to Agoncillo’s personal and professional history, and the controversy surrounding the publication of his *The Revolt of the Masses* (1956). The second section reconstructs *HFP*’s history and attempts to discern the reasons it has had so many coauthors and publishers. Unlike previous chapters of this dissertation, where evidence related to the publication and distribution of books by Rizal and Fernandez was limited to fleeting references found in the former’s correspondence or the scarce documents left behind by the latter’s publisher, this chapter relies on a relatively abundant collection of evidence, including royalty reports from Agoncillo’s publishers, and letters that he sent, received, and archived himself.⁴

---

³ *HFP*, 1st (1960) iii. Although authorship of the preface is attributed to Agoncillo and his coauthor, references to “the senior author” and “Mr. Oscar Alfonso” indicate that it was Agoncillo alone who wrote the preface.

⁴ Agoncillo was a compulsive letter-writer who kept carbon copies of the letters he sent and later compiled them in scrapbooks along with the letters he received. These letters are now part of the Teodoro Agoncillo Papers (TAA Papers) at the UP Library’s University Archives and Records Depository. The collection is still being processed, so some of the box numbers given in this chapter are necessarily provisional in nature.
Agoncillo’s *Revolt*

Four years separated the publication of Teodoro Agoncillo’s *The Revolt of the Masses* (1956), the scholarly monograph that established its author’s reputation as a historian, and the release of the first mimeographed copies of the college textbook that would later become known as the 1st (1960) edition of Agoncillo’s *History of the Filipino People*. The title pages of both works identify their publishers as the “University of the Philippines,” but the former was actually issued by UP’s College of Liberal Arts, and only the latter was properly a UP publication. The four-year gap between the two books and the difference in their publishers may seem like minor details, but they do in fact signal the end of one era in the publication of Filipino history books and the beginning of another.

This section reconstructs the history of Agoncillo’s *Revolt*, especially the political and religious pressure that delayed its release by eight years, within the context of its author’s professional and personal history using his own words and evidence of the book’s reception. The importance of *Revolt* in Philippine historiography is evident not only in the controversy that preceded its publication, but also in the number of scholarly studies that continue to analyze its significance and content many decades later.⁵ While the authors of these studies provide some background on Agoncillo and his polarizing book, they do not fully explore the book’s transformative effect on his career as a historian and the field of historical production.

“Like Byron,” wrote Agoncillo in a preface to *Revolt* that was never published, “I suddenly woke up one morning to find myself famous.”⁶ His newfound fame followed the suspension of the book’s publication by President Ramon Magsaysay, which in turn was a reaction to the scathing attack by an influential radio broadcaster, who also happened to be executive secretary of the Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines. Aside from front-page stories about *Revolt*’s suspension, editorials, editorial cartoons, and letters to the editor arguing for or against the book’s publication contributed to Agoncillo’s notoriety among Filipino...

---


⁶ Teodoro Agoncillo, “Preface to the Second Edition (of *The Revolt of the Masses*),” in Antonio Hila, *The Historicism of Teodoro Agoncillo* (Manila: UST, 2001) 140. For unknown reasons, the so-called second edition of *Revolt*, essentially a reprint to be issued by Solidaridad in the 1970s, was never published.
newspaper readers. It was not, however, the first time he was personally involved in a dispute that grabbed the attention of the nation.

While still a high school senior in 1930, Agoncillo witnessed an American teacher berate two of his classmates for being dirty, and claim in a long harangue that Filipinos did not take baths and looked like savages. Within a few days, Agoncillo and his classmates launched a school-wide strike to demand that “the offending teacher be shipped back to the United States,” which made headlines in the national newspapers, spread to other high schools, triggered further strikes, necessitated the involvement of the director of education, and was even reported in the New York Times. “We realized,” Agoncillo later recalled, “that nationalism had been awakened in us, a nationalism with racial overtones.” It is unlikely, though, that Agoncillo’s first known public expression of nationalism was solely a product of one insulting incident.

Born in the province of Batangas in 1912, Agoncillo grew up surrounded by relatives and friends who survived the wars against the Spanish and the Americans. His father, in particular, fought alongside one of the last Filipino generals to surrender to the Americans in 1902. His grand-uncle was one of the first Filipino diplomats who sought to gain international recognition for the first Philippine republic, and whose wife was one of the three women who sewed the very first Philippine flag. He was also a distant relative of Emilio Aguinaldo, the first President of the Philippines, who married an Agoncillo after his first wife died in 1921. He learned Spanish in kindergarten, and attended the public schools established by the Americans, where he became fluent in English, but affirmed his Filipino identity by reading Jose Rizal’s Noli Me Tangere (1887) and El Filibusterismo (1891) as early as the seventh grade. By the time he graduated from high school, Agoncillo had already begun writing poems, most of which were penned in

---

7 Teodoro Agoncillo, “Student Activism of the 1930’s,” Solidarity 10 (July-August 1976) 22.
9 Agoncillo, “Student Activism,” 23.
12 Ocampo, Talking History, 81. Agoncillo rarely mentioned these connections, but his critics tended to cite these relationships to bolster their claims regarding his biases for and against Aguinaldo, the United States, and whoever else they perceived Agoncillo to be praising or bashing.
13 Andres Cristobal Cruz, “Teodoro Agoncillo, at ang Kasaysayan[g] Maka-Pilipino,” Liwayway, 10 July 1972, 17+. It is unclear if he read the novels in Spanish, English or Tagalog.
It is hardly surprising, therefore, that he entered the University of the Philippines in 1930 with the intention of majoring in English, not history. He credits Leandro Fernandez, author of *A Brief History of the Philippines* (1919), and who was then UP’s registrar and chair of the history department, for convincing him that a student did not need a degree in English to be a good writer, and persuaded him to switch to history.

Agoncillo’s stint as a campus journalist at the *Philippine Collegian*, UP’s student newspaper, proves that Fernandez was correct, but it was not until after he began his master’s degree in history in 1934 that his writing began to draw feedback similar to the heated reactions his later articles and books received. Among those early, critical works were “Glaring Errors in a Doctoral Dissertation” (1935), a pamphlet he coauthored that questioned the content of a dissertation *and* its acceptance by the University of Santo Tomas, and “Ang *Banaag at Sikat ni Glimmer and Radiance* by] Lope K. Santos” (1936), which faulted the classic Tagalog novel’s author, who was considered an established pillar of Tagalog literature, for turning his protagonists “into mere sounding boards for Santos’ political slogans.”

But it was the publication of Agoncillo’s review of Ricardo Pascual’s *Dr. Jose Rizal Beyond the Grave* (1935)—in which he supported the author’s position that Rizal’s so-called retraction document was a fake, and made disparaging remarks about the Catholic Church—that resulted in the suspension of the *Collegian*’s editor-in-chief, the first recorded instance of censorship in the history of the campus paper. Agoncillo did not, however, consider it his duty to challenge authority whatever the cost.

Not long after he coauthored the first Tagalog history textbook and got married in 1941, the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and were effectively in control of the Philippine Islands within a few weeks. During the Second World War, Agoncillo’s wife refused to let him work for fear that he would be picked up by the Japanese and sent elsewhere, which was not uncommon during that period. Thus, he stayed home and, using his own private library, continued doing research, reading, and writing. He also collected periodicals and other printed materials, and

---

16 Nicanor Tiongson, “Teodoro A. Agoncillo: Portrait of the Historian as Literary Man” (paper read on the occasion of Teodoro Agoncillo’s retirement, University of the Philippines, Quezon City, 9 November 1977) 9-10.
17 Teodoro Agoncillo, “Mr. Pascual’s ‘Dr. Jose Rizal Beyond the Grave’ or A Vindication of the Martyr of Bagumbayan (A Psychological and Historical Appraisal),” *Philippine Collegian*, 19 December 1935, 9+. For more about this incident, see Chapter Two of this dissertation, pp. 63-64.
recorded his observations about the war, which eventually ended up in some of his books.¹⁹ After the war, a friend convinced him to join a government-sponsored, biography-writing contest because of all the data he had accumulated, and his wife again played an important role in his career when she taunted him after learning he had yet to write a single paragraph. He finished typing his manuscript in January 1948, and barely beat the deadline for submission.²⁰

Agoncillo’s entry was unanimously chosen the winner in July 1948, but it was not until Revolt was actually published in 1956 that he finally gained acclaim as a historian. In 1958, Agoncillo was hired as a full professor at the University of the Philippines, and took over as chair of its Department of History in 1963.²¹ By the time he retired in 1977, Agoncillo had received numerous awards, as well as an honorary doctorate, and had been promoted to University Professor, the highest academic rank at UP. A few months after his death in 1985, he was posthumously proclaimed a National Scientist. In the year 2000, he was declared one of the Philippines’ “Most Influential 20” in the twentieth century—the only academic in a group that included presidents, movie stars, and business leaders.²²

Unlike Fernandez, Agoncillo did not study in the US, earn a Ph.D. degree, or chair the history department for more than two decades. Between 1935, when Agoncillo finished his master’s degree in history, and 1958, when he joined UP’s history department, he was working at the Institute of National Language and teaching Tagalog language and literature at two universities. Although he produced historical works during that period, among them his manuscript of Revolt, he was more of a Tagalog specialist than a historian. In some ways, Agoncillo had fewer qualifications and less experience than many Filipino historians from Fernandez’s generation or his own, but he nevertheless emerged as the most influential among them. Why? There were many factors that contributed to Agoncillo’s stature, including his accessible writing style and his affiliation with UP, but none of these would have mattered if Revolt had not been published at all.

²¹ Canauay, “Teodoro Agoncillo,” 24; Ocampo, Talking History, 134; University of the Philippines, “Minutes of the 716th Meeting of the Board of Regents,” 20 December 1963, 12; Teodoro Agoncillo to Oscar Alfonso, 28 January and 7 July 1964, in Teodoro A. Agoncillo Papers, Box 511, “Correspondence, 1963-66,” University Archives & Records Depository, University of the Philippines Diliman Main Library. Henceforth, TAA Papers [Box], [Volume title].
Agoncillo’s *The Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan* (1956) has been called a seminal work, a classic, and a masterpiece, and at least one historian counts its publication as the beginning of a new era in Philippine historiography.

The book is considered important for several reasons. Its subject, for one, was Andres Bonifacio, founder and leader of the Katipunan, the separatist movement that launched the 1896 Revolution against the Spanish colonial government. Unlike Jose Rizal, about whom many books had by then already been written, very little was known about Bonifacio and the Katipunan in 1956, and Agoncillo’s *Revolt* was instrumental in raising awareness about a hero who had been practically forgotten.

In addition, the book argued that the masses, not the elite, were responsible for the Revolution. Previously, American and Filipino historians had not considered the socio-economic status of those who actively fought the Spaniards as necessary or relevant to understanding the Revolution. In fact, the rise of the notion of a “Great Divide” in Philippine history has been traced to *Revolt*, which “highlighted a new kind of historiography, one that anchored the writing of Philippine history in a theory of social divisions.” Finally, the book provoked not only disputes related to specific details, but also debates regarding the evaluation of historical sources and the appropriateness of Agoncillo’s interpretations. Few scholars, however, have recognized that the controversy surrounding the book’s publication was an important event in its subsequent consecration as one of the most influential books in Philippine historiography.

Unlike Rizal’s 1890 edition of *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, a few copies of which are known to have circulated before its distribution was officially prohibited by the Spanish, Agoncillo’s manuscript of *Revolt* was not published until eight years after it won the Bonifacio Biography Contest. The book was supposed to be printed at the government’s expense, but its...

---


24 *Katipunan*—or *KKK*—is short for Kataas-taasan Kagalang-galang na Katipunan ng mga Anak ng Bayan, which Agoncillo translates as “Highest and Most Respectable Society of the Sons of the People.” *Revolt*, 44.


publication was blocked not once, but twice, by two Presidents of the Philippines. In 1948, former President Aguinaldo, who was allegedly informed anonymously that he was portrayed unsympathetically in the prize-winning manuscript, complained to President Elpidio Quirino, who promptly suspended its publication.\(^{28}\) In 1956, after Agoncillo finally succeeded in obtaining the necessary permissions, and *Revolt* was finally going to be published by the government, President Magsaysay intervened and turned Agoncillo into an overnight celebrity, like Byron, and his unpublished manuscript into a *cause célèbre*.\(^{29}\)

Scholars have alluded to these struggles before, but what is rarely mentioned is that the circumstances surrounding the book’s controversial publication are indicative of the political and social tensions—or struggles in the field of power—that existed during that time.\(^{30}\) In 1950, newspaper coverage of the objections made by the Catholic bishops of the Philippines to the distribution of copies of the English translation of Rafael Palma’s Rizal biography, *The Pride of the Malay Race* (1949), to high school students paled in comparison to the threat posed to the government by the Huk movement, a peasant resistance organization during the Japanese occupation that transformed into a communist insurgent group after independence.\(^{31}\) By 1956, the Huks were not as potent a threat as they had been six years earlier, but the specter of communism remained, which the authors of an anti-*Revolt* pamphlet invoked soon after Agoncillo was granted permission to have the book printed himself.\(^{32}\)

Jose Hernandez, president of the Catholic Action, and Simeon del Rosario, formerly with the Committee on Un-Filipino Activities of the House of Representatives, admitted they had no evidence that Agoncillo was a member of the Communist Party, but claimed nevertheless that *Revolt* was “a purely Marxist interpretation of the Philippine Revolution of 1896,” which was intended to mislead the public into believing that the Huk rebellion was “merely a continuation

---


\(^{32}\) “Agoncillo Allowed to Print 20,000 Copies of Biography,” *Manila Chronicle*, 16 February 1956.
of the historical revolutionary struggle of Andres Bonifacio and the Katipunan." Withm a
month after the pamphlet’s release, debates erupted on the Senate floor over the Rizal Bill, which
required students to read Rizal’s novels in class, but this controversy is seldom mentioned in
connection with the disputes over the publication of Agoncillo’s Revolt.34

Although it was probably the last time that books written by Filipinos were the subject of
consecutive, front-page controversies in the same year, the lack of significance attached to this
confluence of events is understandable. Scholars who mention the battle over the Rizal Bill
usually do so in relation to Rizal’s importance to Filipinos, while those who discuss the
publication of Agoncillo’s book often focus on its role in the emergence of Bonifacio as a viable
alternative to Rizal as national hero. The two controversies, however, were directly related:
Agoncillo was responsible not only for writing Revolt, but also the earliest draft of the Rizal Bill,
which sought to promote the teaching of the lives and works of Filipino heroes, not just Rizal.35
It is unlikely that he planned it all himself, but the involvement of Senator Claro M. Recto in the
group that assigned Agoncillo to draft the bill, and Recto’s suggestion that Agoncillo spread the
word that he was going to sue for suppression of freedom of speech and of the press, lends
credence to the theory that aside from promoting Filipino nationalism, Recto also sought to “take
political revenge for Catholic support of [President] Magsaysay, and to put Magsaysay in an
embarrassing position before the bishops and the Catholic public.”36

The enactment of the Rizal Bill into law on 12 June 1956 was soon followed by the
publication of Revolt by UP’s College of Liberal Arts (CLA). There were no university presses
in the Philippines at that point, so Agoncillo’s chosen publisher endowed the book with symbolic
capital that none of the other interested parties could have matched. In addition, whereas disputes
related to the implementation of the Rizal Law were limited to practical matters and the law itself
was eventually taken for granted, scholarly debates regarding the arguments set forth in
Agoncillo’s book were only beginning. Ironically, one of the most vocal critics of Revolt was
then chair of the history department of the same university that published it.

33 Jose Hernandez and Simeon del Rosario, “‘The Revolt of the Masses’: The Story Behind Agoncillo’s Story of
34 For more about the Rizal Bill, see Chapter Two of this dissertation, pp. 65-66.
Schumacher, “‘A Hispanicized Clergy in an Americanized Country’ (1910-70),” in Chapters in Philippine Church
Nicolas Zafra was not a relative newcomer to the field of historical production like Agoncillo. He was, in fact, one of the very first Filipinos to join UP’s history department in the 1910s, along with Leandro Fernandez and Encarnacion Alzona. Zafra taught many students over the decades, including Agoncillo, became a faculty adviser for the Students’ Catholic Action during the 1930s, and took over as department chair in 1948. His mimeographed *Readings in Philippine History* (1947), an annotated compilation of materials from various sources, was UP’s history textbook for more than a decade. Zafra, in short, was an established historian. It was, however, through the intercession of Tomas Fonacier, CLA’s dean, that Agoncillo agreed to have his manuscript published by UP, despite having received offers from commercial publishers eager to cash in on *Revolt*’s recent notoriety.

Whether Zafra felt slighted by the dean’s intervention cannot be determined, but since he and another Catholic historian had personally tried early in 1956 to persuade Agoncillo to tone down the anti-clerical statements in his book, it is more likely that Zafra’s largely negative review of *Revolt* was influenced primarily by his religious views, and not internal politics. The lengthy review, which was published in the *Manila Times* over a period of five days and written in collaboration with four female faculty members, faulted Agoncillo for, among other alleged shortcomings, his reliance on literary license (for example, “Is the author writing history or fiction…?”) and being anti-Catholic (“The impression that the reader gets from a reading of the book is that the friars did nothing worthwhile or uplifting among the Filipinos”). Agoncillo responded the following week in the same newspaper with an equally lengthy rebuttal entitled “Four Girls and a Man.” He later explained in a letter why he felt it necessary to defend his work, even though he had not bothered to reply to other reviews.

Disagreement is healthy for the intellect, but that disagreement must not be marred by professional jealousy, nor by bad faith, nor by self-pity… What really got my goat was their dogmatic statement that I was “naive, credulous, unscholarly,” and such other phrases as “Agoncillo’s devious method”… which I did not expect of Zafra… Had Zafra


39 Nicolas Zafra, “‘The Revolt of the Masses’: Critique of a Book,” *Philippine Studies* 4 (1956) 493-514; originally published as “A Critique of The Revolt of the Masses,” 5 parts, *Manila Times*, 12-16 October 1956; Teodoro Agoncillo, “Four Girls and a Man,” 5 parts, *Manila Times*, 19-23 October 1956. Agoncillo later claimed that Zafra’s critique was intended as a statement from the entire UP Department of History, but that the “four girls” who received credit as his collaborators—namely, Guadalupe Fores Ganzon, Josefa Saniel, Donata Taylo, and Juliana Saltiva—were the only ones who affixed their signatures. Agoncillo, “Preface to the Second Edition,” 141.
et al. criticized me in a scholarly way… I would not even have answered them, believing that an honest difference of opinion is salutary to any discussion.\textsuperscript{40} In short, the manner in which Zafra delivered his critique, not its substance, supposedly provoked Agoncillo’s reply.

A few sentences in the 3-page letter, however, suggest that Agoncillo may have had other reasons for responding. In one, he says that Zafra’s purpose was “to drive buyers from acquiring copies” of the book. Then he adds that “If the critics were mere readers, I would not mind them and dismiss them as ignoramuses. But consider Zafra’s position in the State University.”\textsuperscript{41} Aside from revealing that Agoncillo was concerned about sales even then, it seems that he was also keenly aware that Zafra’s criticism was not so easily disregarded because of his stature within the field of historical production in the Philippines. But apparently, Zafra was not as influential as his former student thought because soon after Revolt’s publication, Dean Fonacier invited Agoncillo to teach at UP’s history department.\textsuperscript{42} In 1958, Agoncillo’s wife interceded for CLA’s dean, and her husband finally accepted the appointment. Agoncillo has said that he did not want the job because it did not pay half as much as what he earned as a division chief at a government office and as a part-time teacher at two private universities, but it probably did not hurt that he was coming in as a full professor, which was unprecedented at that time, and that Zafra had just retired.\textsuperscript{43}

History books are not just written, they are published. The importance of publication is clearly illustrated in the controversy surrounding Agoncillo’s Revolt. If the act of finishing a manuscript, or even winning a biography contest, were enough to ensure widespread recognition for an author, then Agoncillo should have been more widely known as a historian before 1956. But the opposition to his book’s publication, the symbolic capital of its publisher, and the scholarly criticism that greeted its release were instrumental in the consecration of Revolt and its author within the fields of power and historical production.

The book’s publication was also a turning point, when agents in the historical field began to exercise more autonomy from the power wielded by political and religious leaders. Although

\textsuperscript{40} Teodoro Agoncillo to Gabriel Fabella, 29 November 1956, TAA Papers 511, “Correspondence, 1938-62.” Agoncillo was paraphrasing. The exact sentences from Zafra’s review were: “He is, to put it mildly, quite naive, credulous and uncritical” and “Any one will readily see how irregular and devious is the author’s method of historical presentation and interpretation.” Zafra, “The Revolt of the Masses,” 506.

\textsuperscript{41} Agoncillo to Fabella, 29 November 1956, TAA Papers 511, “Correspondence, 1938-62.”

\textsuperscript{42} Inciong, “Agoncillo Breaks Silence,” 1+.

the government would continue to publish history books, most of the significant scholarly works published in the Philippines from then on would be issued by academic institutions (like Agoncillo’s *Malolos* [1960]), independent publishers (John Schumacher’s *The Propaganda Movement* [1973]), and eventually, university presses (Reynaldo Ileto’s *Pasyon and Revolution* [1979]). Evidence, however, of the field’s growing autonomy is clearer in the history of another book published four years after *Revolt*.

**Agoncillo’s History**

In 2004, a cultural studies scholar claimed that the significance of Agoncillo’s *Revolt* to Philippine history was “at least confirmed by its recent republication on the centennial anniversary of the 1898 end of the Revolution against Spain.” This assertion, however, merely places *Revolt* on the same level as dozens of books that were republished in 1998, many of which were not as well known or as highly regarded as Agoncillo’s scholarly monograph even after it went out of print in 1974. Also, if republication is enough to confirm the significance of a history book, then perhaps *History of the Filipino People*, which has been in print for almost 50 years should be considered even more important. But as the book’s relative invisibility in surveys of Philippine historiography indicates, historians do not consider such data as relevant in determining the importance of a book.

One indicator that *HFP* deserves more attention from historians than it has received thus far is that no other history book about the Philippines, whether textbook or otherwise, has had more editions published in the twentieth century. The claim could, of course, be made that new editions were deliberately produced to mislead students and their parents into thinking that older editions had been superseded, and thus, the latest edition must be acquired even though previously-owned copies could still be borrowed or bought at cheaper prices. While some evidence certainly supports this theory, this section shows that each of the book’s eight editions, though not always substantially different from the previous one, was published not to create demand for a new edition, but because of changes in political and economic conditions, and in Agoncillo’s relationships with his various coauthors and publishers.

---

44 Tadiar, *Fantasy-Production*, 160. It must be noted, however, that *Revolt* was reprinted in 1996, not 1998.
45 Teodoro Agoncillo to Fred Ruiz Castro, 6 October 1974, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1970-74.”
46 See Chapter One of this dissertation, p. 2, n. 5.
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*History of the Filipino People* is quite possibly the Filipino history book with the most complicated publishing history. It is not surprising then that scholars, journalists, and students have committed errors when citing *HFP* in their books, articles, or reports. Whether in their main text, footnotes, or bibliographies, writers frequently assign titles, authors, publishers, and/or years of publication to the wrong editions.\(^{47}\) One common mistake is the assumption that *HFP*’s title has been exactly the same since the first copies were sold. The 1st (1960) edition was, in fact, entitled *A Short History of the Filipino People*, but as Agoncillo’s preface to the 2nd (1967) edition points out, his friends and students did not consider the 629-page book “short,” and so “the offending word [was] dropped for good.”\(^{48}\) Although the covers of the 2nd (1967) to 8th (1990) editions all feature Andres Bonifacio in front of a revolutionary flag, with only slight deviations in color, it is only when the book’s various editions are viewed together (Figure 4.1) that certain changes become readily apparent.\(^{49}\)

The 2nd (1967) edition’s cover, for instance, bears the names “Agoncillo & Alfonso,” and the rest identify “Agoncillo & Guerrero” as coauthors, except for the 8th (1990) edition, in which “Teodoro A. Agoncillo” is credited as the lone author. The book’s prefaces, however, offer no explanations regarding the changes in authorship. Neither is any reference made to the reason four different publishers worked with Agoncillo and his coauthors as chapters were revised, merged, added, deleted, and restored over a period of three decades. In fact, only close examination of several copies of each edition reveals that the 3rd (1970) and 8th (1990) editions each had two different publishers.

Other differences that bibliographers or cataloguers might note are references to the “Fifth Edition,” “Sixth Edition,” etc., which appear only on the covers of the 5th (1977) to 8th (1990) editions, and the varying sizes of the eight editions’ hardbound and paperback volumes printed on book paper and newsprint. Measurements, in terms of page height and width, range from 21 x 14 cm (8th) to 23 x 15 cm (3rd), with the exception of the original mimeographed

---

\(^{47}\) Ed de Jesus, for instance, leaves out the word “Short” when he indicates that “*A History of the Filipino People*… [was] published in 1960.” Reynaldo Ileto goes further and suggests that *HFP* was published by the University of the Philippines in 1956 with Alfonso as coauthor, and revised only in 1977 with Guerrero as Alfonso’s replacement. Vicente Rafael matches the correct title and coauthor with the publisher of one of the later editions, but puts down 1960 as the year of publication. Ed de Jesus, *The Tobacco Monopoly in the Philippines* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1980) ix; Reynaldo Ileto, *Pasyon and Revolution* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1979) 3, n. 4; Vicente Rafael, *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000) 255, n. 10.

\(^{48}\) *HFP*, 2nd (1967) iii.

\(^{49}\) Such a comparison, however, is not easy to do because copies of *HFP*’s different editions are difficult to find even in the largest libraries in the Philippines, and purchasing any but the most recent edition is harder still.
Figure 4.1
Covers of History of the Filipino People
Source: Personal collection of Vernon Totanes.
The covers are arranged in this manner to facilitate comparison of the authorship of the 2nd, 3rd, and 8th editions.
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which is approximately 28 x 21.5 cm (or 11 x 8.5 inches). More importantly, significant
variations in the text and pagination do exist—especially from the 2nd (1967) edition to the 3rd
(1970), and from the 7th (1986) to the 8th (1990)—making it difficult to trace a citation’s source
if an incorrect reference to a particular edition is provided. It is necessary, therefore, to
distinguish each edition as clearly as possible from all the others. Table 4.1 summarizes the
information gleaned from the covers, title and copyright pages, and prefaces and tables of
contents of the various copies of each edition examined for this dissertation.

While the differences between editions noted above may be dismissed by scholars as
irrelevant to the study of Philippine historiography, the reasons behind the changes from one
edition to the next reveal much more about oppositions in the fields of power and historical
production between 1960 and 1990 than any of the critical analyses of history books that have
been published since then. For example, the deletion of a chapter entitled “The Continuing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Copyright</th>
<th>Year &amp; printing</th>
<th>Major changes</th>
<th>No. of pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>A short history of the Filipino people</td>
<td>Teodoro A. Agoncillo, Oscar M. Alfonso</td>
<td>University of the Philippines</td>
<td>1961 UP</td>
<td>1960 (1st)</td>
<td>Mimeoographed</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1961 (2nd) - 1966 (5th)</td>
<td>Offset printing</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>History of the Filipino people</td>
<td>TAA/OMA</td>
<td>Malaya Books</td>
<td>1967 TAA/OMA</td>
<td>1967 (1st) - 1969 (4th), 1971 (5th) - 1972 (8th)</td>
<td>New publisher; new cover; shortened title; two chapters merged; one new chapter, illustrations and index added</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1971 (2nd) - 1972 (3rd)</td>
<td></td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>HFP</td>
<td>TAA/MCG</td>
<td>RPGP</td>
<td>1973 TAA</td>
<td>1973 (1st) - 1976 (14th)</td>
<td>One chapter removed; index not corrected</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>HFP</td>
<td>TAA/MCG</td>
<td>RPGP</td>
<td>1977 TAA</td>
<td>1977 (1st) - 1983 (18th)</td>
<td>One chapter added; readings pruned; new index</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>HFP</td>
<td>TAA/MCG</td>
<td>RPGP</td>
<td>1977 TAA</td>
<td>1984 (1st)</td>
<td>Readings removed; new index</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>HFP</td>
<td>TAA/MCG</td>
<td>RPGP</td>
<td>1977 TAA</td>
<td>1986 (1st) - 1987 (2nd)</td>
<td>One chapter restored; index not corrected</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>HFP</td>
<td>TAA</td>
<td>RPGP Garotech</td>
<td>1990 &quot;The family of the late Teodoro A. Agoncillo&quot;</td>
<td>1990 (1st); other printings unknown</td>
<td>Co-author and nine chapters replaced; one chapter added; new index New publisher</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1993 (unknown); other printings unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crisis” in the 4th (1973) edition and the addition of “Under Martial Law” to the 5th (1977) edition may be attributed directly to the imposition of martial law by President Ferdinand Marcos in 1972.\(^{50}\) Likewise, the subsequent restoration of “The Continuing Crisis” in the 7th (1986) edition and the addition of a three-page chapter entitled “The Edsa Revolution” in the 8th (1990) edition were made possible by the revival of democracy in the Philippines in 1986.

The effect of politics on the text is most apparent in the 8th edition, in which all three chapters appear together with no explanation regarding the dramatic shifts in the characterizations of Marcos from a newly-elected president dealing with instability in “The Continuing Crisis,” to a benevolent leader during the martial law years in “Under Martial Law,” to a dictator overthrown by the Filipino people in “The Edsa Revolution.” Another way of appreciating the disparities in how Marcos is portrayed is by counting the number of times he is referred to as “President Marcos.” In the thirty pages of “The Continuing Crisis,” the term appears only eleven times, or about once every three pages.\(^{51}\) In “Under Martial Law,” “President Marcos” is used twenty-two times within twelve pages, almost twice on each page.\(^{52}\) And then there is “The Edsa Revolution,” where Marcos’s name is mentioned twenty-four times in three pages, or eight times per page, but the word “President” never precedes it. History is, in fact, written—or rewritten—by the victors.

The economic conditions surrounding the publication of HFP’s different editions are probably even less interesting to historians than the censorship that took place during the martial law years, but a closer look at financial difficulties to which Agoncillo alludes in two of his prefaces shows that political repression during the Marcos regime was not the only reason, as some have suggested, book publishers were reluctant to issue new works.\(^{53}\) In his preface for the 5th (1977) edition, Agoncillo explained that he had pruned the readings at the end of some chapters, consisting of the full text of or excerpts from historical documents, because of “the prohibitive cost of printing and the fact that my publishers cannot by law increase the price of this book.”\(^{54}\) But since he also made some revisions and added the chapter “Under Martial Law,” the 5th edition actually expanded by ten pages.

---

\(^{51}\) Marcos’s name is mentioned fifty-three times in the chapter, but is primarily referred to as “Marcos.”
\(^{52}\) He is referred to as “Marcos” only once in the entire chapter.
\(^{54}\) *HFP*, 5th (1977) iii.
Before this preface was published, the price of previous newsprint editions had increased only by 20 percent in seven years, from P16.50 in 1970 to P19.80 in 1977, but after restrictions were lifted in 1979, the book’s price rose almost 160 percent to P50.87 in June 1984. During that same period, the official peso-dollar exchange rate soared—directly affecting the cost of paper, which could not be produced locally—from P7.40 to P17.40 per US dollar, an increase of 135 percent in five years, which was partly due to the instability triggered by the assassination of opposition leader Benigno Aquino, Jr., on 21 August 1983. The minimum daily wage was raised from P19 in July 1983 to P35 in June 1984, but this was not much help, especially to those who had been laid off or whose employers had gone out of business.55

The effects of the economic crisis were reflected in Agoncillo’s preface to the 6th (1984) edition, where he pointed out that “the almost daily fantastic increases in the price of everything—paper, ink, food, school supplies, etc.,” necessitated the complete elimination of the readings at the end of each chapter.56 The reduction of 90 pages, however, could not prevent a further increase in the book’s price to P59.85 by November 1984. No further explanations regarding price increases were forthcoming, however, because Agoncillo, who had been battling life-threatening illnesses since the 1960s, passed away in January 1985.

Many more struggles that occurred in the field of power, including several discussed later in this section, affected the publication and distribution of HFP’s various editions, as well as Filipino history books in general. But none may be said to have had the same impact as the censorship that severely limited access to Jose Rizal’s Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas (1890) during the Spanish era, or Leandro Fernandez’s A Brief History of the Philippines (1919) during the Japanese occupation, or even the oppositions that delayed the release of Agoncillo’s Revolt during the 1950s. The declaration of martial law in 1972 did lead to a prohibition on the use of the 2nd (1967) and 3rd (1970) editions of HFP, but it was not long before the 4th (1973) edition was approved for general distribution.

In addition, it is worth noting that, according to Agoncillo’s preface to the 5th (1977) edition, “Even certain Catholic colleges and universities, which had hitherto banned my books from their classrooms and premises, have adopted [HFP] as textbook.”57 Perhaps, as Agoncillo


56 HFP, 5th (1977) iii.

57 Ibid.
observes in an oblique reference to the reforms introduced by the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s, “Catholicism in the Philippines has indeed become liberal and has opened its windows to the winds of change.”58 It is more likely, however, that the decreasing interest of agents in the field of power in Filipino history books made the increasing autonomy of the field of historical production in the Philippines possible.

Political and economic considerations clearly affected HFP’s content over three decades, but as pressures from the larger field were translated or refracted into the specific logic of publication and distribution in the smaller field, it is clear that the most significant changes in its content occurred not because of struggles between high-ranking government officials and religious leaders, as they did during the early 1900s and the 1950s, but because of Agoncillo’s differences with his coauthors and publishers.

Alfonso and Guerrero, Coauthors

While Agoncillo receives most of the credit for History of the Filipino People, perhaps because his is the only name on the cover of the edition that has been in print the longest, the truth is that he has never been the sole author of any of its different editions. Of the 1st (1960) edition’s 30 chapters, 10 were written by Oscar Alfonso, which were later reduced to nine for the 2nd (1967) edition, where Agoncillo’s chapter on “The Continuing Crisis” made its first appearance. From the 3rd (1970) edition to the 7th (1986) edition, chapters written by Milagros Guerrero took the place of Alfonso’s contributions, and remained essentially unchanged for almost two decades. In the 8th (1990) edition, published five years after Agoncillo’s death, Guerrero’s nine chapters were replaced with eight new ones written by three uncredited coauthors—namely Bernardita Churchill, Isagani Medina, and Samuel Tan—one of whom must have been responsible for the additional chapter on “The Edsa Revolution.”

In taped conversations that were published a decade after his death in 1985, Agoncillo narrated the story of how he came to write the 1st (1960) edition with a colleague, and indicated that he was disappointed with the chapters produced by his first coauthor, so he brought in a second.59 Letters he wrote in the 1960s and 1970s suggest, however, that the story was much

---

58 Ibid.
59 Ocampo, Talking History, 78. Alfonso was approached repeatedly by an intermediary to set up an interview regarding his collaboration with Agoncillo, but never responded.
more complex. In 1959, Agoncillo was instructed by UP’s president to write a textbook within three months for a new five-unit course on Philippine history that would be offered the following year. When Agoncillo protested that he could not meet the deadline, he was given an assistant—Oscar Alfonso, an assistant professor at the history department—whom he then promoted to what he called “junior co-author” because he wanted to “encourage young people.”

Agoncillo later disclosed in a letter to Alfonso that his primary consideration in selecting him as coauthor “was and is your writing ability.” Agoncillo even hinted that he was grooming Alfonso, who had by then begun studying for his Ph.D. degree at the University of Chicago, to take over for him as the expert on Philippine studies when he retired. Agoncillo’s close relationship with his junior coauthor, however, did not last.

In the preface to the 3rd (1970) edition, Agoncillo expressed satisfaction with the widespread adoption of his book with Alfonso, who goes unnamed, and noted that

Those who used to denounce the senior author for passionately advocating looking at Philippine history through Filipino eyes are today repeating and repeating what he has been saying all these years. And so what was then strange, unorthodox, and bold—as the writer’s works had been described by the Johnnies-come-lately—is now commonplace and, therefore, taken for granted.

But the closest that Agoncillo ever came to explaining why Alfonso was no longer his coauthor was when he referred to the 3rd edition as “a decided improvement over its predecessor.” Aside from noting that some passages were rewritten and that the narrative was brought up to December 1969, he also emphasized that “completely new chapters on the Spanish, American, and Commonwealth period have been written by Miss Milagros C. Guerrero,” but did not disclose why Alfonso’s chapters had to be replaced. It is unknown whether Agoncillo had a higher regard for Guerrero’s “writing ability” than Alfonso’s, but this was clearly not the reason the latter’s chapters were replaced.

---

60 Ibid., 135.
61 Agoncillo to Alfonso, 26 July 1962, TAA Papers 511, “Correspondence, 1938-62.”
62 Agoncillo was not about to retire, but felt it was necessary to plan ahead because “there’s nobody in the Department now who has any interest and devotion to Philippine studies.” Agoncillo to Alfonso, 29 October 1962, TAA Papers 511, “Correspondence, 1938-62.”
63 HFP, 3rd (1970) iii. This passage is exactly the same in the versions published by the 3rd edition’s two different publishers.
64 Ibid.
65 Ibid.
Toward the end of Agoncillo’s six-year term as chair of UP’s history department in 1969, Agoncillo’s attitude to Alfonso changed drastically when the latter declined to sign a petition requesting the former’s retention as chair. Even though Agoncillo was not interested in seeking reappointment, he considered the reason Alfonso offered—that he was deferring to his coauthor’s publicly announced preference for being “just plain professor of history”—as “flimsy” and “Fishy!” Suspecting that Alfonso wanted to become the next chair and had chosen to align himself with another faction in the department, Agoncillo instructed Guerrero, who was then doing research in Washington, D.C., to “PREPARE THE CHAPTERS ALFONSO WROTE FOR History of the Filipino People and in the revised (second) edition next year, I will drop him like a hot potato.”

At about the same time, recommendations for promotions were due, and Agoncillo, as outgoing chair, endorsed a one-step promotion for Alfonso, who deemed it less than he deserved, especially considering that some faculty members received two- or three-step promotions. Alfonso complained in a letter to Agoncillo about what he perceived to be a glaring injustice, demanded a reply, and ended with the following: “Lacking a satisfactory explanation and wanting redress from you otherwise, I shall be constrained to seek recourse to administrative remedies as a matter of fairness and justice.” In the letter’s margins, Agoncillo scrawled, “This is a threat! I am not frightened by any threat.” He did not reply to Alfonso. Instead, he fired off a letter the following day to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences urgently withdrawing Alfonso’s promotion.

In his letter, Agoncillo outlined his reasons for taking back his endorsement, and explained that the latest promotions were intended to narrow the gap between Alfonso and members of the department with doctorates. This gap, he admitted, was a result of the extraordinary promotion he had recommended for Alfonso from Assistant Professor I to Associate Professor I a few years earlier, which was unprecedented in the history department, as well as the rest of the university. Agoncillo’s reasons were consistent with his pronouncements

---

69 Ibid. Capitalized words and underlining in original. Agoncillo was referring to the forthcoming 3rd edition, which he regarded as a revision of the 2nd edition.
70 Underlining in original.
on the need to follow policies and procedures, but he was apparently deeply offended by Alfonso’s letter, which he referred to as an “ungraceful, impolite letter” that showed Alfonso was “not a man. Otherwise, he would have talked to me first before writing that impolite letter.”

Alfonso’s letter was not quite the same as Zafra’s critique of *The Revolt of the Masses*, but the manner in which the message was delivered certainly seems to have further provoked Agoncillo’s ire. Two decades later, Alfonso’s replacement was herself replaced because she infuriated another Agoncillo.

* * *

The new chapters by Milagros Guerrero, who was an instructor at UP’s history department in 1969 and had been Agoncillo’s student since her undergraduate and graduate days, ensured that her name appeared on *HFP*’s cover from the 3rd (1970) to the 7th (1986) editions. In between, she earned her Ph.D. degree from the University of Michigan in 1977, the same year Agoncillo retired, and went back to teaching in UP in 1979 after completing a fellowship in Australia. No document has been found that suggests Agoncillo wanted to replace Guerrero as his coauthor before his death in 1985, but unlike Alfonso’s relatively private dismissal, the chapters she wrote for *HFP* were removed after she had a very public falling out with Agoncillo’s heirs. In 1988, the *Philippine Daily Inquirer* published a three-part, front-page series on the need to rewrite Filipino history textbooks. Guerrero, whose status as one of the few well-known female Filipino historians at that time was due in part to her coauthorship of *HFP*, was quoted lengthily in the final installment of the series:

> Some 20 years ago, historian Teodoro Agoncillo said that the Philippines had no history before 1872, the mutiny at Cavite… At that time, this was logical because it was viewed that the Filipino nation was not born until they rebelled against the Spanish oppressors… But today, Agoncillo’s words may no longer hold true.

She was off by 10 years. It was actually 30 years earlier when Agoncillo first called for “A Reinterpretation of Our History Under Spain” in print, and 28 years had passed since his preface to *HFP*’s 1st (1960) edition indicated that he considered the period before

---

72 Teodoro Agoncillo to Romy [Romeo Cruz?], 5 March 1969, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1966-69.”
73 Teodoro Agoncillo to Roger Smith, 6 November 1970, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1970-74.”
1872 “in the main, a lost history,” but this was a minor detail compared to the reactions recorded in letters to the editor written by his son, Teodoro Agoncillo III, and his former student and colleague, Samuel Tan.

Agoncillo’s son accused Guerrero of having “missed his [father’s] point after all these years,” and suggested cryptically that the “scholars” mentioned in the front-page series, presumably including Guerrero, should “come up with a scholarly monograph on ‘History of Opportunism, Philippine Setting.’ I think they are the most qualified writers for the topic.” Meanwhile, Tan denied that Guerrero, contrary to a claim made in the series, was a contributor to *Tadhana [Destiny]*, the multi-volume history of the Philippines whose authorship was attributed to former President Marcos, and whose subtitle—*The History of the Filipino People*, with a “the” before it—suggests a desire to replace Agoncillo’s *HFP* as the Filipino history book. The identities of the scholars who participated in the project, which was abandoned after Marcos’s fall from power, were not widely known, but Tan admitted that he had been part of it for almost ten years, and would thus have known if Guerrero had been involved. He also added that before his death, Agoncillo had made it known that he planned to “drop Dr. Guerrero from the co-authorship of his book for reasons that are best kept unsaid.”

Guerrero addressed the two letters a few weeks later, not in a letter to the editor, but in a space where a regular column usually appeared. After acknowledging that Agoncillo’s “position in the firmament of Filipino historians is firm and secure; his contributions to Philippine historiography will always be appreciated and acknowledged,” she argued that it was her duty, “as a practising historian, to call attention to those changes that augur well for historical study and research.” She also noted that, “If Dr. Tan’s letter is of any value at all, it is because he titillates the readers to continue their speculation as to the real history of the writing of the Tadhana volumes.” She was “happy,” she added, that Tan had corrected the impression that she was involved in Marcos’s project. “I do not obtain any honor from being suspected of being a Tadhana writer.”

---

78 Ibid.
The references to opportunism, *Tadhana*, and speculation in the passages quoted above—as well as allusions to integrity, royalties, and jobbers elsewhere in their exchanges—suggest that academic, political, and financial considerations were behind the animosity between the parties involved. Ironically, the most tangible result of the front-page series on the need to rewrite textbooks occurred not because of a desire to correct historical distortions, but because of personal differences. At the end of her rebuttal, Guerrero revealed that, according to Agoncillo’s son, her name and contributions to *HFP* would be “dropped from the next reprinting of the book.”

True enough, when the 8th (1990) edition of *History of the Filipino People* was published two years later, Agoncillo’s name appeared as its sole author and Agoncillo’s son states in his preface that among the changes effected for the new edition was “the replacement of the chapters written by the junior co-author and the incorporation of other materials the senior author would have done.” The new chapters were, in fact, written by Tan, Isagani Medina, and Bernardita Churchill, but their authorship would go unacknowledged until the publication of the second volume of the *Philippine Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, which included an endnote that revealed the identities of Agoncillo’s uncredited coauthors. The note’s last sentence states that “The revision was initiated by the Agoncillo family on October 14, 1988.” It was the day after Guerrero suggested that Agoncillo’s position regarding Philippine history before 1872 no longer held true.

* * *

The chapters Alfonso and Guerrero wrote for *HFP* did not really need to be replaced. They were not perfect, but they could have been revised in the same way that Agoncillo

---

80 Ibid.
82 Bernardita Churchill, “History and Current Situation of the Discipline of History in the Philippines,” in *Philippine Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council, [1996]) 2:27, n. 30. Henceforth, *PESS* plus volume number. According to Agoncillo’s son, who wrote the 8th (1990) edition’s preface, “The difficult task of revision was assumed by the family with the invaluable help of scholar friends.” He acknowledged Tan, Medina and Churchill for their “many acts of kindness and assistance,” but did not specifically state that the three had written the chapters that replaced Guerrero’s. More recently, Agoncillo’s son disclosed that the three agreed to credit his father as the 8th edition’s lone author. Teodoro Agoncillo III, email to author, 3 July 2009.
continued to revise his own chapters from one edition to the next. *HFP*’s history of multiple coauthors is unique among Filipino history books. But it does reflect a phenomenon that is rarely acknowledged in print. Occasional references in disparate publications to Filipino historians as “an embattled and battling lot” and as members of an “often fractious historical community” suggest that scholars are not unaware that a problem exists, but the lack of discussion regarding its effect on Philippine historiography implies that the problem is not a significant one.\(^84\) This problem, like the differences that triggered the replacement of Alfonso and Guerrero’s chapters, is often not due primarily to theoretical or ideological differences, but to professional or personal idiosyncrasies.

In 1955, for example, a year before Agoncillo’s *Revolt* was published, the Philippine Historical Association (PHA) was established by former members of the Philippine National Historical Society (PNHS), which was founded in 1941. According to Bonifacio Salamanca, a former PHA president, the new group was formed because “it appeared that Dr. [Eufronio] Alip was bent on hanging on as the Society’s president for life.”\(^85\) Leslie Bauzon, a former PNHS president, does not dispute this assessment in a later publication, but he does note that Alip “served as the [PNHS] President until his demise in 1976.”\(^86\)

Almost 40 years later, after *HFP*’s 8th (1990) edition was published, each of the first two volumes of the *Philippine Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (1993-1998) featured a section on “History,” with one produced by the PHA in Volume I, and another by the PNHS in Volume II. They were not exactly the same, but their contents were similar, if not repetitive. No explanation is given regarding this duplication, but of all the disciplines represented in the Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC), the Encyclopedia’s publisher, history was the only one represented by two member associations, which apparently entitled both to “equal allotments… in the implementation of the PSSC Encyclopedia Project.”\(^87\) The exact reason behind the inability of the PHA and PNHS to work together is unknown, but an article by Salamanca in the Encyclopedia provides a few clues. He alludes, for instance, to “petty organizational and

---

\(^{86}\) Leslie Bauzon, “Philippine National Historical Society,” in *PESS* 2:94.  
personal differences” between members of the two groups, and indicates in a footnote that despite his “personal friendship” with Bauzon (as his colleague at UP’s history department) and the PHA’s support for a project spearheaded by his friend, “our efforts have not been reciprocated by the PNHS now headed by Dr. Bauzon.”

The Encyclopedia’s two accounts of the development of Philippine historiography, like those that led to the replacement of Alfonso and Guerrero as Agoncillo’s coauthors on HFP, were clearly the product of disagreements between agents in the field of historical production, not struggles in the field of power. Not all these agents, however, were historians. Publishers played an important role, too.

**UP and Malaya, Publishers**

Between 1958, when Agoncillo joined the University of the Philippines as a full professor, and 1988, when the decision to replace Guerrero as coauthor of HFP was made, more Filipino history books were published than during the time of Jose Rizal or Leandro Fernandez. Among the most important works produced during that period, according to several studies of Philippine historiography, were those from an earlier generation led by Agoncillo (Malolos [1960], The Fateful Years [1965]), Leon Ma. Guerrero (The First Filipino [1963]), and Renato Constantino (The Philippines: A Past Revisited [1975]), as well as emerging scholars like the uncredited collaborators of Ferdinand Marcos (Tadhana [1977-1982]), Reynaldo Ileto (Pasyon and Revolution [1979]), and Vicente Rafael (Contracting Colonialism [1988]). Several decades later, all their books continue to be cited by historians, and some have even been the subject of journal articles, theses, and dissertations.

Unlike the authors of these works, however, their publishers’ contributions to the consecration of these books is rarely acknowledged—or even mentioned in passing—in reviews of Philippine historiography. But as Thomas Adams and Nicolas Barker assert in their framework for the study of book history, the role of publishers must be recognized because it is

---

88 Salamanca, “Historical Associations and Societies,” in PESS 1:117, n. 36.
89 See Chapter One of this dissertation, p. 2, n. 5.
they who make the initial decision and investment to publish a book.\textsuperscript{91} The intensification of Filipino nationalism from the 1950s onward undoubtedly motivated authors to write their books, but it was the academic and commercial infrastructure that emerged at the same time to support the production of Filipino history books that made the printing and distribution of their historical works possible. The publication history of \textit{HFP}’s different editions demonstrates how Filipino publishers contributed to the consecration of history books during the latter half of the twentieth century. The histories of its four publishers—namely the University of the Philippines (1st), Malaya Books (2nd-3rd), R.P. Garcia Publishing (3rd-8th), and Garotech Publishing (8th)—also reflect developments in the book business. The first two did not publish as many editions as the third or as many copies as the fourth, but were probably much more influential in assuring the book’s legacy.

The University of the Philippines, through its president, who asked Agoncillo to write a textbook for a new five-unit course in Philippine history, may be said to have commissioned the 1st (1960) edition, vested it with the university’s considerable symbolic capital, and guaranteed its initial buyers. Malaya Books made it possible for other colleges and universities to acquire copies of a book that had previously been limited primarily to UP students by publishing the 2nd (1967) edition, coauthored by Alfonso, which was the first to feature the distinctive cover it retains to this day, and the first printing of the 3rd (1970) edition, which Guerrero coauthored. R.P. Garcia Publishing continued printing the 3rd edition and published the 4th (1973) to 8th (1990) editions through the 1970s and 1980s until it went out of business. Garotech Publishing took over the printing and distribution of the 8th edition from 1993 until 2009 when it, too, closed its doors a year before the book’s 50th anniversary. The rest of this section reconstructs the conditions in which \textit{HFP}’s various editions were published, and examines the reasons so many publishers had to be involved in their production.

* * *

The University of the Philippines did not formally establish its university press, the first in the Philippines, until 1965, but it did occasionally undertake the printing of a few books before then,

most notably Agoncillo’s *Revolt* (1956). When UP issued *HFP*’s 1st (1960) edition, the state university’s imprint was practically an endorsement that not only enhanced the reputations of the book’s coauthors, but also further distinguished the work from others on the same subject. It was not surprising, therefore, that Agoncillo soon began receiving inquiries about the possibility of using the textbook in other universities.

For the next school year, the original mimeographed edition was corrected and, as Agoncillo himself described it, “copied in the typewriter, photostated, and printed by offset process. It’s smaller, but bound.” He later told Alfonso, who was then in Chicago, that their book was “rather popular in the sense that copies of it have gone to the US and so many students there, Filipinos as well as Americans, have asked me where they could buy copies. It’s being used by the Peace Corps people in the US.” By 1965, almost 7,000 copies had been sold, and evidence from Agoncillo’s incoming and outgoing correspondence shows that some had been purchased by students and professors from other universities, including the Philippine Military Academy. A university dean from the south, for instance, complained that *HFP* was being sold for P16 even though the official announcement indicated the cloth-bound edition’s price was P12. He asked, “Why the discrepancy when copies are ordered in quantity for textbook use?” and added that their students were not rich.” A year later, a college professor informed Agoncillo that *HFP* was “fast eclipsing Zaide’s.”

Before the UP Press started operating in 1965 as a publisher and printer, different units of the university issued books with no assistance in terms of selection, editing, printing standards, and distribution. The books were then, as an article in the *UP Research Digest* memorably described it, “subsequently dumped in the University storerooms till they [got] mutilated by...
bookworms, rats and other pests, including prejudiced book reviewers." By 1967, these production and inventory problems were presumably already being addressed by the new Press when Agoncillo was assured that HFP’s 2nd edition, which had been updated “not only to incorporate recent historical and anthropological findings, but also to amplify some topics and to bring the narrative down to the middle of 1967,” would be ready for the opening of classes in June that year. Unfortunately, maybe because the Press was still new, delays were encountered and the promise was not kept. This angered Agoncillo, who decided to withdraw the manuscript after waiting for several months, and handed it over to the newly established Malaya Books, which quickly invited Agoncillo to join its board.

* * *

Malaya Books, which was named after the Tagalog word for “free,” was essentially a group of like-minded individuals who came together for the purpose of publishing books “to serve the cause of nationalism, with little profit if possible.” Agoncillo was a director and stockholder, and his home address appeared on the company’s letterhead as its office address until 1970. Other members of Malaya’s board were Renato Constantino, who was already known for his influential essays on Jose Rizal and the miseducation of the Filipino, as well as newspaper columns and books that attacked the status quo, and Joaquin Po, owner and manager of Popular Bookstore, which seems to have been named after its owner and not for the hard-to-find, controversial and progressive books it sold, and still sells.

Oscar Alfonso was also a stockholder, along with Mauro “Malang” Santos, who designed HFP’s first-ever, full-color cover based on a photo of a statue of Andres Bonifacio, the hero of The Revolt of the Masses, the essence of which was summarized in two chapters of HFP.

---

100 HFP, 2nd (1967) iii.
102 Teodoro Agoncillo to Renato Constantino, 1 September 1970, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1970-74.”
104 HFP, 8th (1990) 598.
Agoncillo liked the latter’s cover so much, for aesthetic as well as ideological reasons, that he told Malang, who is now one of the most highly regarded Filipino painters, “The cover is beuuuutiful! You got my psychology — [Bonifacio] facing defiantly the enemy of freedom…”\(^{105}\) *HFP*’s cover, which may very well be the most widely available (but not so well-known) example of Malang’s work, is one of the few featuring Bonifacio that has been in print for several decades.\(^{106}\)

Agoncillo’s letters show that his relationship with his new publisher, including its general manager Joaquin Po, was quite satisfactory until the publication of the 3rd (1970) edition coauthored by Guerrero. Soon, however, Agoncillo resolved to find another publisher because, as he put it, “In spite of the written contract, Mr. Po wanted to lower my royalty on the flimsy ground that I was earning more than the company.”\(^{107}\) Agoncillo, contrary to allegations that he was a Marxist, was very conscious of the importance of financial security, and was not beyond indulging in a few luxuries. For example, his sartorial elegance and chauffeur-driven luxury vehicle led a former student to dub him “the *barong Tagalog*-Mercedes Benz nationalist.”\(^{108}\) This, however, did not mean that Agoncillo was interested only in making money. As he explained, “you can write better if you’re financially stable… You cannot think well if you have children and you hear them crying because of hunger.”\(^{109}\) Financial independence also meant that he was not beholden to anyone or any institution, and was free to say what he thought needed to be said. It was not surprising, therefore, that he kept a watchful eye on his royalty statements, and insisted that publishers deliver them every year before Christmas.\(^{110}\)

Mercedes Benz notwithstanding, Agoncillo was still a nationalist, and wanted to make *HFP*’s latest edition affordable for students and “disseminate the nationalistic posture of the book throughout the country.”\(^{111}\) The 2nd (1967) edition paperback had retailed for P16.50, but since the peso-dollar exchange rate had gone up by almost 60 percent in the last three years,

\(^{105}\) Teodoro Agoncillo to Mauro Malang Santos, 10 July 1967, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1966-69.” Because more Filipinos have been exposed to *HFP* than *Revolt*, it is quite likely that the former, with Bonifacio on its cover, contributed more to increased awareness of Bonifacio as a possible replacement for José Rizal as national hero than *Revolt* ever did.

\(^{106}\) Books with Rizal on the cover, in contrast, are much more numerous.

\(^{107}\) Agoncillo to Constantino, 1 September 1970, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1970-74.”

\(^{108}\) Jose David Lapuz, “Teodoro Agoncillo as a Teacher” (paper presented at program in honor of Teodoro Agoncillo on the occasion of his retirement, Quezon City, 9 November 1977) TAA Papers 2005. Underlining in original.


\(^{110}\) See, for example, Teodoro Agoncillo to Jose Campos, 29 October 1962, TAA Papers 511, “Correspondence, 1938-1962”; and Teodoro Agoncillo to Joaquin Po, 24 September 1972, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1970-74.”

\(^{111}\) Teodoro Agoncillo to Benjamin Salonga, 29 September 1970, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1970-74.”
Agoncillo was amenable to pricing the 3rd (1970) edition at P19.50. Po, however, insisted on selling the book at P22.50, claiming that Malaya was earning less on HFP than its authors, and that bookstores had been receiving 30 percent discounts.\(^{112}\) When Agoncillo discovered that some bookstores had only been given 15 percent discounts, he accused Malaya’s general manager of being untruthful, and alleged that Po’s “interest lies purely and primarily in profit — his pretensions to having a social conscience notwithstanding.”\(^{113}\) He then literally crossed the street and gave the rights to HFP to a publisher that had already issued several of his books.\(^{114}\) As Agoncillo pointed out to Malaya’s board, his existing contract referred to “the second or 1967 edition, NOT TO THE PRESENT OR THIRD EDITION, which is very different from the second edition.”\(^{115}\)

**Martial Law and “The Continuing Crisis”**

All this was not, of course, happening in a vacuum. Among the events that occurred between the publication of HFP’s 1st (1960) and 2nd (1967) editions were the elimination in 1960 of the fixed peso-dollar exchange rate of P2 to US$1 (which had been in place since 1903), the commemoration of the centennial of Jose Rizal’s birth in 1961, the transfer of Philippine Independence Day celebrations from July 4 to June 12 beginning in 1962, and the inauguration of Ferdinand Marcos as President of the Philippines in 1965.

Two years into Marcos’s term, Agoncillo added a chapter entitled “The Continuing Crisis” to HFP’s 2nd edition. Although the new chapter began with the presidential election of 1961, most of it—as the title suggested—was devoted to a series of crises involving Marcos’s contentious path to the presidency, the rise of student activism, the deterioration of peace and order, and a “witch-hunt” that occurred toward the end of 1966. After Marcos declared martial law in 1972, ostensibly due to the worsening peace-and-order situation, a crackdown on mass
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\(^{112}\) Po was perhaps concerned about the high royalty rate Agoncillo and Alfonso were receiving. At that time, the average royalty rate was 10 percent, but in 1969, Agoncillo was earning 14 percent, with Alfonso collecting a further 6 percent. Andres Cristobal Cruz, “Book Publishing,” in *Philippine Mass Media in Perspective*, ed. Gloria Feliciano and Crispulo J. Icban (Quezon City: Capitol, 1967) 231-248; “Division of Royalty by Authors,” TAA Papers 537, “Letters, notes, invitations, etc., 1969.”

\(^{113}\) Agoncillo to Constantino, 1 September 1970, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1970-74.”

\(^{114}\) The earliest known works by Agoncillo published by R.P. Garcia Publishing were two volumes of *The Life of Jose Rizal* (1959) one each for the fifth and sixth grades, which do not seem to have been adopted as textbooks. These were followed by the two-volume *The Fateful Years: Japan’s Adventure in the Philippines, 1941-45* (Quezon City: R.P. Garcia, 1965).

\(^{115}\) Capitalized words in original.
media was ordered, including the imposition of limits on the publication of books.\footnote{Robert Youngblood, “Government-Media Relations in the Philippines,” 
\textit{Asian Survey} 21 (1981): 710-728.}

Considering that Marcos had by then closed democratic institutions and suspended constitutional privileges—and many of his critics had disappeared, gone into exile, been jailed, or even killed—it would not be unreasonable to suspect that the deletion of the chapter critical of the Marcos administration’s earlier years was related to the declaration of martial law. And it was.

Marcos, however, was not directly involved. As a letter from the executive director of the Mass Media Council (MMC) to the president of Malaya Books indicates, the former’s reviewers had found the latter’s submission, namely the 2nd (1967) edition coauthored by Alfonso, “rather subjective in [its] treatment of contemporary events and happenings, notably those that have something to do with the present administration and the military.”\footnote{Jose Crisol to Benjamin Salonga, 24 November 1972, TAA Papers 534, “Personal clippings, 1940-70.”} A subsequent letter from the MMC’s cochairs, who also happened to be the Secretaries of Public Information and National Defense, reveals that reviewers were more concerned about passages involving the military, intelligence agencies, Congress, and anticommunists, not Marcos himself. Conditional approval to reprint the book was granted, but the senior author was required to “delete or rewrite objectionable portions,” four samples of which were attached to the letter.\footnote{Francisco Tatad and Juan Ponce Enrile to Benjamin Salonga, 21 December 1972, TAA Papers 534, “Personal clippings, 1940-70.”}

Agoncillo could have complied very easily with the MMC’s conditions by deleting or rewriting the passages identified as objectionable. He had, in fact, previously shortened the chapter by approximately three pages—removing several paragraphs, sentences, and phrases—before the 2nd (1967) edition was published.\footnote{In the corrected proofs Agoncillo wrote, “Note my deletion[s] for obvious reasons.” Teodoro Agoncillo, proof of “The Continuing Crisis,” [1967?], TAA Papers 338.}

He could also have appealed to Marcos himself, who along with his wife Imelda had unsuccessfully tried to convince Agoncillo to write a postwar history for them in 1968, and then, later, to become editor-in-chief of the multi-volume \textit{Tadhana}, whose authorship was subsequently credited to Marcos alone.\footnote{Teodoro Agoncillo to Pablo R. Glorioso, 23 December 1976, TAA Papers 514, “Correspondence, 1975-79.”} As recently as 2002, Agoncillo and unnamed colleagues at UP’s Department of History were still being accused of having “formed the core of ghostwriters and consultants for Marcos’ epic project,” more than a decade after the actual collaborators had gone public. See Patricio Abinales, “Commentary,” in “Can We Write History? Between Postmodernism and Coarse Nationalism” (Yokohama, 2002) http://www.meijigakuin.ac.jp/~iism/frontier/Proceedings/Proceedings.htm; and Zeus Salazar, “Ang Historiograpiya ng Tadhana: Isang Malayang Paggunita-Panayam,” in \textit{Paksa, Paraan at Pananaw sa Kasaysayan}, ed. Ma. Bernadette Abrera and Dedina Lapar (Quezon City: UP Departamento ng Kasaysayan, 1989) 193-99.
possible that the latter could have persuaded the former to overrule the MMC.\textsuperscript{121} Agoncillo, however, did none of these things. After all, the edition in question was the one coauthored by Alfonso, and published by Malaya. He was not about to do them any favors.

* * *

Martial law affected the lives of Filipinos in very significant ways, but their political environment did not solely determine their interactions with one another. Agoncillo, for instance, had not forgotten his earlier conflicts with Alfonso and Malaya. He had previously told Guerrero that he did not wish “to continue to give money (in the form of royalty) to a slimy traitor and skunk,” namely Alfonso, and grudgingly accepted royalties remitted by Malaya, which continued selling copies of the most recent Agoncillo-Alfonso (A-A) edition until martial law was declared.\textsuperscript{122} Hence, it should not be surprising that Agoncillo considered the MMC’s order not as a curtailment of freedom of speech, but as “magandang balita” [good news] for him and Guerrero, who by then had begun her Ph.D. studies at the University of Michigan.\textsuperscript{123}

After the publication of the Agoncillo-Guerrero (A-G) edition in 1973, he informed his new coauthor that the military had banned the reprinting of A-A because of its antimilitary content. Agoncillo added that

\begin{quote}
Nilakad ako ni Po… nguni’t ayaw kong alisin ang tinututulan ng militar. Nais ko’y talagang ipagbawal ang A-A. Kaya’t hindi na lumalabas ito at solo na ng A-G, na totooong mabili ngayon… Kaya, maunawaan mo kung bakit malaki ang royalty mo noong nakaraang Hunyo.\textsuperscript{124} [Po asked me to cooperate… but I refused to remove the passages to which the military objected. I really want A-A banned… That’s why it’s not being sold anymore and A-G, which is truly selling so well now, has the market to itself… So you can understand the reason your royalty was huge last June.]
\end{quote}

His letter to Guerrero, however, was not as detailed as the one he sent a few months later to a reader who inquired about entries in the 4th (1973) edition’s index that did not lead to the pages

\textsuperscript{121} Teodoro Agoncillo to Inche Zainal Abidin, 22 July 1967, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1966-69.”
\textsuperscript{122} Agoncillo to Guerrero, 3 June 1969, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1966-69.”
\textsuperscript{123} Agoncillo to Guerrero, 13 November 1973, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1970-74.”
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid.
he sought. Instead of merely stating that a chapter had been deleted, and that the pagination had been altered without updating the index, Agoncillo volunteered much more:

When martial law was imposed, the Department of National Defense [DND], specifically Undersecretary Jose M. Crisol, wrote my publishers, Malaya Books, Inc., to delete certain passages in my chapter entitled “The Continuing Crisis”… Since Malaya Books violated our contract, I refused to delete the passages objected to by the DND. In other words, I allowed the book (pre-1973 edition) to be banned. The same book was also being published by an Ilonggo, Mr. R. P. Garcia, and it was this book (Agoncillo and Guerrero not the Agoncillo and Alfonso, which the Malaya Books, Inc. published) which I edited for publication; that is, I deleted not only the passages objected to by the DND but the whole chapter, for to delete the passages would destroy the unity and coherence of the whole chapter.125

Both accounts show that Agoncillo believed, as many did, that the MMC, although cochaired by the Secretary of Public Information, a civilian, was actually controlled by the military.126 But unlike his first letter, which is more concerned with relating events that occurred, the second provides Agoncillo’s justifications for his actions, and raises a few questions. In the second letter, he identifies an unspecified contract violation as the sole reason for refusing to revise the 2nd (1967) edition published by Malaya, and suggests that he preferred to remove the entire chapter from his new publisher’s version of the 3rd (1970) edition rather than detract from the chapter’s unity and coherence. He was right, of course, but he did leave out some details.

Agoncillo, for instance, having already disclosed more than was necessary, did not mention his feud with Alfonso at all. But this perhaps had more to do with the fact that he was writing to a complete stranger, not that he had changed his mind about Alfonso. Meanwhile, the reason he offered for deleting an entire chapter overlooks the reality that he was given the option to rewrite passages the censors found unacceptable. He had, after all, previously revised parts of certain chapters of the previous two editions, and did not seem to have had any difficulty deleting an “objectionable portion” from a chapter in the 4th (1970) edition. Neither of these actions destroyed the unity and coherence of the chapters involved, and he could have done the same for the chapter on “The Continuing Crisis.” But it is possible that he was determined to
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125 Teodoro Agoncillo to Sofronio Jucutan, 4 July 1974, TAA Papers 512, “Correspondence, 1970-74.” In both letters, Agoncillo misidentified chapter 28 as the one he removed for the A-G 4th edition, even though it was chapter 27 that the military identified as problematic in the most recent A-A edition.
delete the entire chapter not only so that the A-A edition would be banned, but also as a way of signalling his displeasure with the MMC’s order. Perhaps it was Agoncillo’s own form of rebellion, which allowed him to imply in his new preface that one chapter was removed because of the imposition of martial law.

There is no way, however, of ascertaining the veracity of these conjectures based on the available documents alone. But there is enough evidence to confirm that the chapter on “The Continuing Crisis” was not “ordered removed during the Martial Law years,” as his publisher asserts in the 7th (1986) edition. The official correspondence indicates that Agoncillo was given the option of deleting or rewriting the objectionable portions, but his letters show that he decided to excise the entire chapter voluntarily and that he wanted the A-A edition banned because of previous disagreements with Alfonso and Malaya. In short, he refused to make any changes to the 2nd edition (1967), and modified only the 3rd (1970), so that the 4th (1973), with Guerrero as coauthor and R.P. Garcia as publisher, could be released with the approval of the proper authorities.

Unlike Rizal’s Sucesos and Fernandez’s Brief History, HFP was neither confiscated nor banned outright. In contrast to Agoncillo’s previous encounters with censorship—when his editor was suspended in 1936 after publishing a review that offended a Catholic priest, and when publication of Revolt was delayed by eight years due to objections from a former President and Catholic conservatives—he actually had a choice this time, but decided not to fight. Agoncillo’s voluntary deletion of an entire chapter illustrates how the content and publication of history books can be shaped by political realities, as well as personal relationships, and that the authors involved do not necessarily view censorship negatively.

R.P. Garcia and Garotech, Publishers

HFP’s last two publishers had a less tumultuous relationship with Agoncillo and his heirs, but the struggles within the companies themselves may be seen as representative of the rise and fall of many family-owned publishing houses in the Philippines. From 1971 to 1990, beginning with the second printing of its 3rd (1970) edition, HFP was printed and distributed by R.P. Garcia Publishing (RPGP). Aside from regular royalty reports, there is very little evidence of communication between Agoncillo and Ricardo Garcia, his publisher; certainly none similar to the angry letters he sent to the management of UP Press or Malaya Books. Perhaps this was due
to the reality that Garcia’s office was right across the street from Agoncillo’s home, and that the publisher probably just knocked on his author’s door whenever a matter needed to be discussed.

RPGP was one of many publishers and booksellers that flourished after the US recognized Philippine independence in 1945. Garcia, who began taking on mimeographing jobs using a borrowed machine as a high school student in 1925, bought a printing press after the Second World War ended and went into textbook publishing. By 1960, RPGP had published 42 textbooks, employed 22 personnel, and posted total sales of more than P300,000, at a time when the peso-dollar exchange rate was P3:$1, and the minimum daily wage was less than P6.  

In 1958, the demand for textbooks written and published by Filipinos was so strong that Garcia decided to construct a bigger and more spacious printing plant, which just happened to be near the Agoncillo residence. It was not long before the neighbors began collaborating. In his acknowledgments for the two-volume The Fateful Years (1965), Agoncillo referred to Garcia as his “friend and publisher,” and “one of the most principled men I have ever met.” It is not surprising, therefore, that after questioning Joaquin Po’s integrity in relation to the distribution of the Malaya Books editions of HFP (2nd & 3rd), Agoncillo turned to Garcia. After Garcia’s death in 1982, his five sons continued running RPGP, taking turns leading the company until 1993, when HFP acquired its fourth publisher.

In a letter addressed to Antonio Garcia, who was then RPGP’s president, Agoncillo’s wife and son expressed dissatisfaction with the previous year’s sales, the “For Sale” sign outside the Garcia property, and unspecified “internal problems.” They withdrew all of Agoncillo’s books from RPGP in favor of an unidentified publisher, and requested that “all the flats (stripped negatives) of our books are released to us as a guarantee that no further printing of the books are made by your company.” The “internal problems” to which the Agoncillos referred were apparently related to disagreements among the heirs of Ricardo Garcia on how the company should be run.

The clearest evidence of familial discord may be found in an undated letter sent by Ricardo Garcia Jr., whose newly established Garotech was HFP’s latest publisher, to Agoncillo’s son, in which the author expressed his hope that “when your driver gets the FLATS he won’t be
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129 See p. 140, n. 114, of this chapter.
130 Agoncillo, The Fateful Years, xiv.
telling my brothers or our workers that I am the one that will be printing your books.”\textsuperscript{132} A few months after being informed of the Agoncillos’ decision to change publishers, Antonio Garcia wrote back to say that RPGP’s directors had “decided to stop operation for 1993 and dissolve our corporation due to financial difficulty.”\textsuperscript{133} This last claim is probably true, but like the reasons behind the replacement of HFP’s coauthors and the deletion of one chapter during the martial law era, the truth is very likely much more complicated.

Garcia Jr. oversaw the printing and distribution of HFP at Garotech as its price soared from P120 in 1993 to P300 in 2007, an increase of more than 230 percent in 14 years—one comparable to the 208 percent rise in price between 1970 and 1984. Garcia Jr. passed away in 2007, and his three children continued running the business, even though two of them were based in the United States, and the third, who remained in the Philippines, had no prior experience in publishing. In 2009, Ricardo Garcia’s grandchildren decided to leave the publishing business altogether. It is unclear whether Garotech’s demise means that HFP, the company’s most profitable book, is no longer as popular as it used to be, but a much larger company does not seem to have such reservations. This fifth publisher has committed to resume production of the 8th (1990) edition by 2012.\textsuperscript{134}

**Conclusion**

The book now commonly known as Teodoro Agoncillo’s *History of the Filipino People* (1960) is more than 50 years old. Its latest edition is 22 years old. Its eight editions, from four different publishers, bear Agoncillo’s name and those of two credited coauthors, with three more not explicitly recognized as such. It continues to be cited by scholars and nonscholars alike, and sold far more copies annually from the 1970s to the 2000s than the entire print runs of most Philippine history books published in the past five decades. This reality shows just how important HFP is, if not to Philippine historiography, then at the very least to the college students whose exposure to history books is often limited to the ones they are required to read in class. The book’s adoption beyond the University of the Philippines may be attributed not only to the content or readability of HFP compared with similar textbooks, but also to UP’s status as one

\textsuperscript{132} Ricardo Garcia, Jr. to Teodoro Agoncillo III, [30?] September 1992, private collection.
\textsuperscript{133} Antonio Garcia to Anacleta Agoncillo, 25 January 1993, private collection.
\textsuperscript{134} Teodoro Agoncillo III, email to author, 18 November 2011.
of the premiere universities in the Philippines and the timeliness of its publication in 1960. The influence of the Catholic Church on political affairs was waning; nationalism and pride in all things Filipino, including textbooks written and published by Filipinos, were on the rise; and colleges (with some run by the more liberal Catholic orders) replaced existing textbooks with *HFP*, despite or maybe because of objections to the alleged Marxist and anti-Catholic bent of its senior author.

Benedict Anderson alludes to the importance of the decline of religion and the rise of print-capitalism as prerequisites to the formation of imagined communities, but does not quite address the role of personal relationships in the development of nationalism. Filipinos, for example, are said to have united in the past against their Spanish colonizers in 1896 and a dictator in 1986, but this does not mean that everyone supported a common cause or that they set aside all other considerations. Agoncillo’s reply to a question regarding the rewriting of history and the preservation of truth may help explain his silence during the Marcos years. “The scholar’s duty,” he said, “is to preserve his life so he can tell the truth later. If this is not possible, then he should remain silent.” His nationalism is beyond doubt, but his devotion to family, the status of his relationships with friends and colleagues, and the desire for financial security also influenced his decisions. It is more than likely that choices made by others involved in the publication of Agoncillo’s best-known book were also informed by similar concerns.

*HFP*’s unusual number of coauthors hints at the importance of personal relationships among Filipino historians. There were, of course, unique circumstances surrounding the changes that took place, but Agoncillo’s falling out with Alfonso, as well as his son’s conflict with Guerrero later on, may be seen as examples of professional relationships that soured because of personal differences. While disagreements occur in just about every profession, there seems to be much more of it among Filipino historians, especially when one considers that the existence of two rival historical associations in the Philippines—sometimes more, depending on the decade—is not due primarily to ideological differences. It is also worth noting that all his coauthors, both credited and uncredited, were former students and colleagues at the University of the Philippines, who obtained graduate degrees at American universities. Although this reality shows the perceived dominance of the members of UP’s history department among Filipino historians based in the Philippines, as well as the continuing influence of American education on the telling

---

of Philippine history, as seen in the overwhelming number of history books written in English by Filipinos, it is clear that the rifts that resulted in the replacement of HFP’s coauthors were triggered principally by personal, not ideological, disagreements.

HFP’s complicated history also reflects the development of the publishing industry in the Philippines from 1960 onward. There were, in fact, no Philippine university presses as we know them today when HFP’s first mimeographed edition was published. By the time the first such press was established in 1965, a few idealistic publishers who sought to provide more than the usual fare had also emerged. There was, however, no way of avoiding the publishers’ need to make a profit, and all the problems that went with it, as Agoncillo’s frustration with his second publisher illustrates. The difficulties of sustaining a family-run business may also be viewed in the odyssey of a publishing company that flourished under the leadership of a first-generation entrepreneur, but which later floundered because of feuding second-generation managers, and whose subsequent incarnation was shut down by third-generation heirs less than two years after their father’s death.

Leandro Fernandez’s A Brief History of the Philippines (1919) is not, strictly speaking, comparable with HFP — the former, for one, was written for seventh graders, while the latter is a college textbook — but their similarities and differences are worth noting for what they reveal about the increasing autonomy of agents in the field of historical production from the influence of those in the field of power. Both textbooks were, of course, written in English by historians who were appointed chair of UP’s history department within a few years after their works began to be used, and revised editions with additional chapters from uncredited writers were issued after their authors’ deaths. But whereas Fernandez obtained his master’s and doctoral degrees in the United States and Brief History’s lone publisher was one of the largest American textbook publishers in the early twentieth century, Agoncillo earned his master’s degree in the Philippines (plus an honorary doctorate) and HFP’s four publishers were Filipino-owned and not entirely profitable.

Brief History was adopted in all public schools during the American colonial period at a time when the authors of history textbooks about the Philippine Islands were all American, but HFP was gradually selected as a required textbook by history instructors and professors at

Philippine colleges and universities over several decades in lieu of competing works by Filipinos who were not perceived to be as nationalistic as Agoncillo. Finally, although Brief History and HFP were both eventually banned by the Japanese and Filipinos, respectively, the renewed publication of HFP starting with its 4th (1973) edition not long after the imposition of martial law is a testament to the greater autonomy enjoyed by historians and publishers during the latter half of the twentieth century (compared to its early years when the adoption of history textbooks was determined by governors and archbishops), as well as Agoncillo’s skill at negotiating the frontier that separates the fields of power and historical production.

This examination of the untold history of History of the Filipino People clearly illustrates the value of investigating not only the content of history books or external pressures brought to bear on their authors, but also the relationships between historians, their peers, and their publishers. The concluding chapter explores the implications of such an approach on contemporary debates regarding the nature of history.
Conclusion
The Filipino History Book

The present study has attempted to reconstruct the history of the Filipino history book by examining evidence related to the production of three works that were initially published during different periods, and were intended for different audiences. The use of such evidence has not been previously employed in studies of Philippine historiography, most of which have treated historical works primarily as texts, and not as material objects or commodities with their own history. By contextualizing the significance of specific books and critically using Thomas Adams and Nicolas Barker’s book history framework and Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of the field of cultural production, this dissertation has shown that the study of Philippine historiography may be enriched through the analysis of prevailing conditions at different points in the evolution of the Filipino history book, the contributions of agents other than their authors, the struggles that accompanied their publication and distribution, and the evidence that may be gleaned from the books themselves. It has also demonstrated that the study of non-Western history books can help in fruitfully adapting and modifying established approaches to the study of historiography, and in raising new questions and directions of inquiry.

The development of the Filipino history book, as many scholars have observed, has been shaped by Spanish and American colonialism, and is closely tied to the emergence of Filipino nationalism. These influences have been traced in this study mainly through the histories of three books:

- Jose Rizal’s *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (1890), which was written in Spanish in the late nineteenth century, self-published in Europe, smuggled into las Islas Filipinas, and (like many scholarly monographs today) was “largely ignored”;
- Leandro Fernandez’s *A Brief History of the Philippines* (1919) in English, issued by an American company, exported to the Philippine Islands, and (like most history textbooks released anywhere during the first half of the twentieth century) is all but forgotten in studies of Philippine historiography; and
- Teodoro Agoncillo’s *History of the Filipino People* (1960), as it is now commonly known, also in English, but coauthored and published by fellow Filipinos in the Philippines, and along with his *Revolt*, heralded the growth of an autonomous
The historical field producing scholarly monographs and textbooks by Filipinos for Filipinos.

Two factors that studies of Philippine historiography have overlooked, but which are emphasized in this dissertation, are the influence of the Catholic Church and the significance of personal relationships on the production of Filipino history books. Not only did Spanish missionaries write most of the histories of las Islas Filipinas published during the Spanish colonial period, but the opposition mounted by American Catholic bishops to the adoption of textbooks such as David Barrows’ *History of the Philippines* (1905) during the American era, and the objections posed by Filipino Catholic bishops to the distribution of Rafael Palma’s *The Pride of the Malay Race* (1949) after Philippine independence was recognized, suggest that religious convictions, regardless of who was in power, played an important role in the publication and dissemination of history books until the 1950s.

In addition, while the dominance of the history department of the University of the Philippines and of US-educated Filipino historians in the latter half of the twentieth century may be deduced from the university affiliation and qualifications of Agoncillo’s coauthors on the various editions of his *History*, the reasons they were replaced are not necessarily indicative of theoretical or ideological disagreements that may be expected to arise between professionals. They are more representative of the less-than-scholarly disagreements that have divided the profession since disgruntled members of the Philippine National Historical Society formed the Philippine Historical Association in 1955 because one historian allegedly wanted to be the former’s president for life (and he was), or even as early as Rizal’s defense of his *Sucesos* in a disproportionate, article-length response published in a Filipino newspaper in 1890 to criticism expressed by Isabelo de los Reyes in a footnote—in a two-volume work—that even their contemporaries thought should have been ignored.¹

These factors are very specific to the field of historical production in the Philippines, and do not fully illustrate the value of employing a book history approach to the broader study of history as a discipline. But the relevance of this dissertation’s conclusions to current debates regarding the discipline, as well as their potential as catalysts for further research, becomes clearer if they are understood as answers to a question about the nature of history that historians and philosophers have discussed over the centuries. The following basic observations about the production of Filipino history books are offered strictly from the point of view of a book

---

¹ See Chapter Four of this dissertation, pp. 134-135; and Chapter Two, pp. 52-53.
historian, and not a professional historian, in an attempt to complicate the discourse surrounding the question “What is history?”

**History is published**

“History,” Agoncillo once wrote, “is what the historian says it is.” He was, in fact, drawing a distinction between facts and their interpretation, but he could also very well have been articulating an assumption that underlies numerous studies of historiography—that historians are the primary and even the only agents involved in the production of historical literature. But since such studies invariably revolve around printed works, Agoncillo probably did not mean his statement to be understood literally. Rizal, Fernandez, and Agoncillo, for example, undoubtedly said many things about history during their lifetimes, but it is what they wrote, and more importantly, what was published, that are remembered today.

No scholar, however, has yet recognized the importance of publishers to the production of Filipino history books. A few have acknowledged that Rizal published his own *Sucesos*, that Fernandez’s American education probably contributed to his selection as author of *Brief History* by an American publisher, and that UP ensured the writing and publication of the 1st (1960) edition of Agoncillo’s *History*, but none has drawn connections between the emergence of government, commercial, and academic publishers from the 1950s onward, and the rise in the number of Filipino history books produced since then. And while some scholars have recognized the role of publishers elsewhere, debates regarding history as a discipline are more often about historians and their ideas, and rarely acknowledge that without those who paid for the paper, for instance, on which the texts were printed, there would be nothing to discuss.

**History is required**

History is often discussed by historians in relation to scholarly monographs, but their studies seldom mention that required textbooks shaped the historical knowledge and consciousness of students far more than any book that has been cited as an outstanding example of Philippine

---

2 Teodoro Agoncillo to Milagros Guerrero, 11 October 1972, TAA Papers, Box 512, “Correspondence, 1970–74.” A later source indicates that Agoncillo may have also recalled what he said as, “History is what the historians say it is.” Ambeth Ocampo, ed., *Talking History: Conversations with Teodoro A. Agoncillo* (Manila: De La Salle University Press, 1995) 152.
historiography. Evidence of actual usage may be difficult to obtain, but even the smallest possible estimates of the number of Filipinos who were exposed to Fernandez’s *Brief History* and Agoncillo’s *History*—based on reasonable assumptions regarding enrollments during the period the former was a prescribed textbook, and reprinting data in the latter’s copyright pages—clearly show that both books must have been in the hands of more Filipinos than any of either author’s scholarly works.

Agoncillo’s *Revolt*, in particular, though certainly deserving of the acclaim and scrutiny it has been accorded since it was published, was probably not as effective as Agoncillo’s *History* in familiarizing Filipinos with Andres Bonifacio and the role of the masses in the Philippine Revolution of 1896. *Revolt* was out of print for more than 20 years, while *History* was in print for almost 50 years, and it is likely that more college students have seen the image of Bonifacio on the covers of the latter’s various editions than have even heard of the former. But studies of Philippine historiography are not unique in their neglect of textbooks. Even the recognized authorities on Western historiography barely mention the word “textbook,” and certainly do not contain discussions of the influence of any specific textbook on how history is understood by non-historians.3

**History is echoed**

History, according to discussions in most studies of Philippine historiography, is what the historian says in published works, mainly scholarly monographs and, to a lesser extent, required textbooks. But the influence of these publications, whether or not they were produced in multiple editions and/or printed in large numbers, is also contingent on whether their content, arguments, and interpretations are *echoed* in various ways, such as direct quotation, translation, or even condemnation in conversations, print, or other media. Although it is not unreasonable to conclude that Rizal’s *Sucesos*, for example, was the source of ideas expressed by historians despite the absence of explicit references to the book, it is also important to recognize the contributions of the agents who enable the transmission of those ideas despite bureaucratic, geographic, or linguistic constraints.

---

Those who facilitate the spread of historical knowledge include not only historians and publishers, but also politicians, bishops, journalists, booksellers, librarians, teachers, and even busybodies spreading the latest gossip. History, in short, is not only what the historian says it is, but also what other people say it is. This dissertation has explored some of the ways by which history has been echoed, but further research needs to be done regarding the nature of its transmission in the Philippines and elsewhere. The application of such an approach to the study of historiography and to contemporary debates about the nature of history will not be easy, but it could be used to prioritize the study of history books that have been echoed more than others and to ensure that history is echoed to an even larger audience.

These three descriptions of history are offered specifically as an alternative way of understanding the production of text-based representations of the past and the transmission of historical knowledge, but they may also be expanded to include newer forms of media that have, in some ways, already replaced printed matter as the primary source of information for many people. “Published,” for instance, could also refer to interpretations of the past that are recorded on video or preserved in museums. In fact, even before the advent of technology that has made it easier to access non-print materials, students were already “required” to watch films and go on field trips. And the history that has been “echoed” through the years has never been limited to what is contained in scholarly monographs and textbooks, but has also included anything that could be experienced with the five senses.

* * *

The great majority of the scholarly monographs and textbooks discussed and cited in this dissertation were written, respectively, for the equivalents of Bourdieu’s intellectual and mass audiences in the Philippines. But what about the bourgeois audience? Were all the history books issued since 1890 intended only for Filipino intellectuals and students? The rest of this conclusion briefly examines the history of another book that—like Rizal’s *Sucesos*, Fernandez’s *Brief History*, and Agoncillo’s *History*—was the first of its kind published in multiple editions over several decades, and is the most successful of a small number of Filipino history books that have been produced for casual readers, or what may be considered the equivalent of Bourdieu’s bourgeois audience in the Philippines. The book was never envisioned as a required textbook,
but there is some evidence that it has begun to be used in classrooms. More important, however, are the insights that may be gleaned regarding the observations that history is published and echoed from the book’s origins in journalism and the reception it has been accorded by the students and middle-class Filipinos who have read it voluntarily.

Ambeth Ocampo’s Rizal Without the Overcoat (1990), a compilation of newspaper essays, is “only” two decades old, but the publication of its 5th (2012) edition, its outstanding sales (for a non-textbook), and its readers’ enthusiastic reception, as shown below, indicate that it could remain in print—or its equivalent—for a few decades more. Karina Bolasco describes Ocampo’s book and similar works that Anvil Publishing, her company, began issuing in the 1990s, as “trade books,” which she says are “not literary titles nor textbooks required in schools; neither [are] they the scholarly or academic books university presses traditionally put out.” Instead, Anvil’s trade books were priced to “sell within the purchasing power of the target market” and featured “the kind of writing that will engage the widest audience possible and reinvent the genre.”

Ocampo began to gain recognition as a historian even before the publication of any of his books, but it is his Rizal, and not his previously-published columns, for which he received a National Book Award in 1991 (for the Essay category, not History) and to which a young academic has traced the beginnings of his desire to become a historian at the age of 11. Almost twenty years later, Ocampo observes in his preface to another compilation that historical essays “have a longer shelf life than the topical columns we feed on daily.” He is right, of course, but not entirely. True, what a popular pundit wrote about the crisis of the day in, say, 2001 would probably not be as interesting to readers after a few months as the latest crisis of the day. In contrast, essays that relate the present to the past can in fact be read again after a few years, or even decades, and still be relevant to readers. What Ocampo overlooks is that newspaper columns, whether historical or not, are unlikely to be read by anyone after they initially appeared in print. Unless, that is, the columns were published in a book.

---

5 Karina Bolasco, “When the Book Became Personal: 30 Years of Philippine Tradebook Publishing” (paper presented at the International Conference on Philippine Studies, Quezon City, 24 July 2008).
6 Ibid.
Several reasons account for the greater demand for Ocampo’s *Rizal* over others. These include Rizal’s primacy among Philippine heroes, which guarantees recognition, if not an audience, for the book; its author’s iconoclastic approach to history, which has often been credited with humanizing Rizal for Filipino readers; the jargon-free, easy-to-read language of its short, unthreatening essays, which some have also called “chapters”; and its publisher’s clout, which along with the material and symbolic capital of its parent company—National Book Store, the aptly-named, Filipino-owned chain that emerged as the successor to the Philippine Education Co.—ensures that the book is available on bookstore shelves when it is needed. But one feature that has not received much attention from scholars and journalists is its cover.

The enduring appeal of Ocampo’s *Rizal* begins with its title, which signals its author’s slightly irreverent take on Rizal sans his occidental overcoat, a piece of clothing inappropriate for the tropical islands of the Philippines. But it is probably the Superman cover, for lack of a better term, that has drawn the attention of potential readers more than its title, content, or publisher. The 3rd (2000) edition’s second cover (Figure 5.1), which shows Rizal with a Superman logo underneath his overcoat, has been retained for the 4th (2008) and 5th (2012) editions, with only minor changes in background color. This cover, the only one of the earliest covers that clearly shows Rizal with his overcoat, immediately communicates the idea that a different perspective on the national hero awaits the reader.

While a few might mistakenly conclude that the book is literally about Rizal’s secret life as a superhero, most potential readers will probably recognize that the cover is an ironic statement on what Filipinos have been taught about Rizal over the years, that Rizal was *not* endowed with superpowers. As just about every Filipino knows, he was not in fact faster than a speeding bullet. He may have been a genius, but he was also human. Those inclined to further reflection might also suspect that the cover designer was ridiculing the anachronistic notion that Filipinos only began to consider Rizal their hero after the Americans arrived.
Some historians have alluded to the popularity of Ocampo’s compilations among Filipino readers, but since their comments appeared in introductions they wrote for the books, their claims may be considered suspect. No such doubt, however, can be expressed regarding the most concrete evidence of the impact that Ocampo’s *Rizal* has had on its intended audience—the unsolicited opinions of actual readers. A preliminary study by this researcher on the use of blogs as evidence of reception shows that sentiments shared by bloggers about Ocampo’s *Rizal* between January 2006 and May 2009 are consistent with those contained in earlier reviews published in the 1990s.

But it is the bloggers’ spontaneous reactions to the Superman cover (“Jose Rizal the Superman, hehe, I couldn’t resist picking it up”), their unedited stories about how they and their family and friends initially read the book (“my dad has this collection of Ambeth Ocampo’s books... and my elder brother, of all people who i know would choose television and computer over books, reads them, and even enjoys reading them.”), their passionate, though not necessarily grammatical, expressions of affection for the book (“I love, love, love, love, love! I think every Filipino should read this book”), and even desires to become historians themselves (“it made history sound quite exciting and historians such passionate people. Hm, even made me want to be one, too”)—with one actually now a professor of history—that may be most helpful to historians and publishers searching for ways to stimulate interest in history as a discipline and a genre.

There is more to the history of Ocampo’s *Rizal*—including the fact that it has been largely ignored by historians—but its most notable contribution to Philippine historiography is that, unlike Rizal’s *Sucesos*, it has clearly succeeded in awakening in some Filipinos a

---


consciousness of their past. The reception accorded Ocampo’s *Rizal* is a sobering reminder that history’s potential to inspire is contingent upon the history book’s ability to engage. History can be published and required, but only when it is echoed with passion can it truly resonate.
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