

# Pansacula and Manalang: The Katipunan in Zambales (1896-1898)

MARY CLAIRE M. MALASAGA

University of the Philippines Baguio

The Cordillera Review: Journal of Philippine Culture and Society 13 (1-2): 168-193  
<https://doi.org/10.64743/XKSJ4026>

## ABSTRACT

Scholars on the Philippine Revolution face two major challenges: navigating the divide between the nationalist and the imperialist narratives, and properly locating the stories of the “masses” excluded from the dominant discourses. As a response, this paper narrates the history of two *Katipunan* chapters in Zambales: the North, led by Roman Manalang, and the South, led by the Pansacula brothers. Their stories of resistance reveal that dichotomies of elites vs. non-elites, and Christianized vs. un-Christianized, which proliferate in the dominant historiography, are blurred or non-existent in local contexts, and that the linear timeline of the Revolution does not hold true in places where the fighting did not cease even after 1897. Trickle-down narratives of elites passing down Enlightenment ideas towards what Reynaldo Ileto called the “*pobres y ignorantes*” were also defied by the Revolution in Zambales, as the native practice of *pangangayaw* dominated the behavior of the two chapters.

**Keywords:** Katipunan, Philippine Revolution, Zambales, Pangasinan, local history

*“... according to their doctrine, it was already time for the rich to be poor and for the poor to become rich, endeavoring to make the people believe that the ignorant should direct the towns and the intelligent be subordinate to them...”*

Col. Wenceslao Viniegra to Emilio Jacinto  
regarding the Pansacula brothers, November 1898  
(translated by John R.M. Taylor)

*"...many of the Filipinos, especially those who are steadfast servants of the nation, no longer trust the Spanish officials then, hence, despite the knowledge of the Pact (of Biak-na-Bato) between the leaders of the revolution and the Spaniards, they continued organizing as a way to serve their country..."*

Col. Felipe Quintos on the *Katipunan*  
in Northern Zambales, 1926  
(translation supplied)

Unknown to many, the *Katipunan* extended its influence on other provinces in Luzon, including Zambales and Pangasinan. Interactions with local practices, and certain political and economic conditions, however, have transformed the doctrines and principles of the national organization and yielded stories that defy the national narratives of the Revolution.<sup>1</sup> Quoted above are two of such specific instances: with the Pansacula brothers of Southern Zambales advocating for a systematic change in 1898 under the First Republic, and Felipe Quintos of Pangasinan highlighting the disagreement of ordinary Filipinos regarding the Pact of Biak-na-Bato. Local histories of the Revolution, such as the cases of Zambales and Pangasinan, thereby reflect what Milagros Guerrero (2015) referred to as "contradictions in Philippine society," as these foreground the ironic themes of peace and war, and independence and insurgency.

This paper deals with the histories of the two *Katipunan* chapters in Southern and Northern Zambales (now Pangasinan) from 1896 to 1898. These are among the narratives of "contradictions" found in Philippine society during that period and a contribution to the growing discourse on decentering narratives of the Philippine Revolution. To do this, I review the historiography of (1) the dominant narratives of the Philippine Revolution, and (2) the decentering narratives on the period, produced in response to the limitations of the former.

### **Revisiting the Historiography of the Philippine Revolution**

In the historiography of the Philippine Revolution, Guerrero (2015, 3-4) divides the prevailing narratives into two: the imperialist and anti-imperialist league; the former composed of colonial narratives produced by American scholars immediately after the Treaty of Paris in 1898, and the latter produced by postwar nationalist historians. Included in the imperialist league are James A. Le Roy's *The Americans in the Philippines: A History of Conquest and First Years of the Occupation, with an Introductory Account of the Spanish Rule* (1914), Charles B. Elliot's *The Philippines to the End of the Commission Government: A Study in Tropical Democracy* (1917), Dean C. Worcester's *The Philippines, Past and Present* (1930), and

John R.M. Taylor's *The Philippine Insurrection Against the United States, A Compilation of Documents with Notes and Introduction* (1971). As all of the authors served the American colonial government, it is not surprising that their works assert the incapability of the Filipinos to govern themselves and the necessity of America's "benevolent assimilation" to guide them properly in using the freedom they have risked their lives to gain (Le Roy 1914, 280-306; Worcester 1930, 208-9). Prominent in these works as well is the narrative that the Revolution was a movement that was a legacy of the *ilustrado* movements, which provided the intellectual foundations of the revolt, and that the peasantry and the poor were ignorant and gullible to be persuaded to raise their arms against the Spaniards (Le Roy 1914, 280-306; Worcester 1930, 208-9).

As a response, nationalist historians of the postwar period produced counternarratives that would centralize the agency and role of the masses in the Revolution; among the most monumental were Teodoro Agoncillo's *The Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Andres Bonifacio* (1956) and Renato Constantino's *The Philippines: A Past Revisited* (1975). In trying to decenter the narrative away from the colonial center and towards the Filipino nation, Agoncillo (1956) and Constantino (1975) highlighted that the Revolution was a "people's war" waged for freedom and independence of an emerging nation. Both also conceded to the necessity of *ilustrado* leadership in the Revolution. Agoncillo (1956, 18-32), in tracing the radicalization of Andres Bonifacio, posits that the *ilustrados* emerged when the Suez Canal opened in the 19th century, creating a shorter route to Europe, which led to the fall of the Galleon Trade. This allowed the group to study abroad and to publish radical texts and Enlightenment ideas, to which Bonifacio was exposed. Constantino (1975, 166) likewise argued that the Revolution was waged for the masses' desire for freedom, as it owes its "explicit form" from the elites who forged its intellectual foundations. He even forwarded the claim that the poor followed the lead of the elites in a similar way that they followed the authority of the Spaniards earlier, for they were used to such subordination. Hence, despite trying to reclaim the agency of the Filipinos in the narrative, they nonetheless reinforced the same elite-centered narrative that the imperialists' histories forwarded. Agoncillo (1956, 10) and Constantino (1975, 266) also referred to the peasant movements prior to 1896 as "mystical, deliberate, and inchoate," ending in "extravagant failures" without providing adequate explanation as to why; such movements became more coherent only when the elites finally stepped in to make the Revolution as it is.

These two traditions comprise the "dominant narratives" of the Philippine Revolution, and these could be succinctly summarized as having three distinct characteristics: teleological, linear, and elite-centered. The narratives of imperialists and nationalists both portray the poor masses as passive and irrational participants in the Revolution,

incapable of articulating and realizing their goals without the guidance of the rich and educated elites.

As such, scholars of the Philippine Revolution face two major problems: (1) bridging what Guerrero (2015, 79-80) pointed out as the divide between highlighting the role of the masses versus upholding the elite-centered narrative, and (2) determining other participants in the Philippine Revolution aside from those already known, like Bonifacio and Aguinaldo, and to illustrate more clearly the complicated relationship of the participants from different classes and localities (Michael Cullinane 2014, xvi).

In response to such challenges, the *Pantayong Pananaw* ("from us, for us perspective") emerged as a new approach to writing Philippine history, embodied in the framework called *Bagong Kasaysayan* (new historiography). As one of the approaches under *Pilipinolohiya*, or the school of thought that aimed to "Filipinize" the social sciences, *Pantayong Pananaw* aims to present an independent historical discourse from the native perspective, using the native language and concepts (Salazar 1991, 46-72). Portia Reyes (1999, 32) pointed out how the prevailing narrative on the Philippine Revolution presents the non-elite as a people devoid of their own ideas and perspective on the revolution. Hence, Zeus Salazar (1999, 17) argued that there is a distinction between the *ilustrado's nacion* and the masses' *bayan*; with the former being a product of the European Enlightenment, aiming to replace the Spanish in the political structure, while the latter is a persistence of Austronesian traditions aimed towards the destruction of the old order and the establishment of a new one. Such dichotomy is reflected in the concepts that *Pantayong Pananaw* proponents use to articulate their ideas, such as *revolucion* vs. *himagsikan*, and *Filipino* vs. *Tagalog*. Although it is difficult to assess the historiography of *Pantayong Pananaw* as it has transformed depending on who is using the approach, the scholars mentored by Salazar typically use the framework of *bayan* in their narratives as an alternative to the colonial *nacion*, making it as teleological as the dominant narratives it sought to critique.

Aside from *Pantayong Pananaw*, different local histories on the Philippine Revolution have been published to respond to the limits of the dominant narrative, including Reynaldo Ilet's *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910* (1972) on Southern Tagalog, the book edited by Delfin Tolentino, Jr., *Resistance and Revolution in the Cordillera* (1994) in the Cordillera, and Cullinane's *Arenas of Conspiracy and Rebellion in the Late Nineteenth-Century Philippines: The Case of the April 1898 Uprising in Cebu* (2014) on Cebu.

As local histories, such literature moved the narratives further away from the nation towards peripheral localities, and as a result, counter the teleological, linear, and elite-centered narratives of the imperialist and nationalist histories. Ilet (1979, 14-22), for instance,

argues that as opposed to the trickling-down of radical ideas from the *ilustrados*, the masses had their own source of radicalism, which is the *pasyon*; wherein the life of Jesus Christ, as reflected in the religious text, exposed the *pobres y ignorantes* (poor and ignorant) to ideas of questioning the status quo, of oppression, and of sacrifice. Though Iletto's work is still limited as he only used written texts as sources in his work, prompting readers and scholars such as Guerrero (1981, 245) to question his representation of the "illiterate and inarticulate," his work was the first major attempt to understand the masses' *mentalité* beyond the elite-centered framework.

The works on the Cordillera, on the other hand, such as Fay L. Dumagat's, "The Role of the Itneg (Tinggian) in the 1896 Revolution," Luis Talastas on "The Battle of Lias: Resistance in Eastern Mountain Province," William Henry Scott's "The Bontoc Uprising of 1881," and Maria Nela Florendo's "Ideology and Inter-ethnic Images: Igorot Participation in the Revolution," highlight how the uprisings in the Cordillera highlands were often waged in response to direct forms of colonialism (i.e., taxes, *polo*) that were creeping into the region in the late 19th century. As such, they were often small-scale and short-lived; once the problem raised was resolved, the participants returned to their usual routines (Scott 1994, 40; Talastas 1994, 49). Participation in the *Katipunan* were also often limited to encounters and provision of food and services as guides, with a few exceptions (Dumagat 1994, 100-01). There were even instances noted when the natives refused to help the lowlander *Katipuneros* at all due to previous inter-ethnic conflicts (Florendo 1994, 84-85). The argument, therefore, that the Revolution was due to the poor following the leadership of the elites clearly does not apply to the Cordillera; the Revolution was not even a major event in the highlands, as much as it was to the lowlanders.

Cullinane (2014, xiii and 17) stands out by raising the questions about who were the participants of the Revolution and the Cebu conspiracy: were they middle class, peasants, or elites? Cullinane (2014, 88-89) broke the polarities produced by the dominant narratives and *Pantayong Pananaw* by forwarding the argument that the participants in the Revolution cannot be boxed into one category alone; they could be poor in terms of income, but they were not the poorest, and they may not be European-educated, but they were not illiterate or unlearned. In the case of Cebu, Cullinane (2014, 88) argued that there is little evidence that the elite joined the Revolution out of sympathy for the masses, as the dominant narrative argues; motivations are not defined by nationalistic aims, but by personal ambitions often hampered from fruition by the present regime. In Cebu, therefore, the Revolution was neither elite-centered nor teleological.

If the local narratives prove that the Revolution is only a minor event in the localities, if their participation is nuanced by personal

and inter-ethnic relationships, if written sources like the *pasyon* is inadequate to explain their motivations in rising against the Spaniards (whether within or outside the *Katipunan*) and if, like Cullinane (2014, 89) asked, the *Katipunan* was not an organization from below, where is the place then of the so-called *pobres y ignorantes* in the anti-colonial struggles of the late 19th century? How would we make sense of their participation? Were they really passive participants like the dominant narrative argued, and if they were not, how could they have been active and absent at the same time? This study aims to clarifying the questions raised by the current discourse by narrating the history of the *Katipunan* chapters in Zambales, a province outside what is now the metropolitan capital, and to demonstrate how the place of the people from below lies in the nuances between the polarities created by the linear, teleological, and elite-centered narratives between the elite vs. non-elite, *ilustrado* vs. *pobres y ignorantes*, local vs. national, etc. By liberating their voices from these polarizing vacuums, the active place of the inarticulate will finally resurface in the narrative of the Revolution.

To do so, this paper utilized archival documents, including documents from the *Portal Archivos Españoles*, the Philippine Revolutionary Records (PRR), and the Historical Data Papers (HDP) at the National Library of the Philippines. As this is a local history paper, the HDP is heavily used, corroborated with local sources produced by local amateur historians in the past who were able to interview the direct descendants and participants in the Revolution of 1896, such as Floro Docuyanán's *Brief History of Botolan, Zambales*, and Pedro Asis, Jr.'s *A Short History of Zambales*. Because the *Varias Provincias* for Zambales were not yet digitized by the National Archives of the Philippines and therefore, I have not been granted access, the missing information was filled in by secondary sources such as the unpublished theses of the late Prof. Alma Bameró. For documents in the PRR that are not yet digitized, John R.M. Taylor's translation was used. In tracing the genealogy of the Pansacula brothers (which led me to my oral sources), I used the birth records available in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Narratives about the revolts were taken from newspapers such as *La Política de España en Filipinas*, *El Renacimiento*, and the *Official Gazette*. Early revolts in Zambales prior to 1896 were reconstructed from the accounts of Father Casimiro Díaz in his *Conquistas de las Islas Filipinas* (1890) and Father Vicente Salazar's *Historia de la Provincia de el Santissimo Rosario de Philipinas* (1742). Other primary documents inaccessible in their original transcripts were taken from the translations of James Alexander Robertson and Emma Helen Blair in *The Philippine Islands*. In reconstructing the narrative of Roman Manalang and his *Katipunan* in Northern Zambales, the author relied heavily on the translated memoir of Felipe Quintos, as I cannot understand the Pangasinan language, and Quintos's memoir remains the sole comprehensive

account of the Revolution in Northern Zambales. Lastly, I interviewed the living descendants of Doroteo and Teodoro Pansacula, Gil Albay, and Armando Pansacula, in their homes at Iba and Botolan, Zambales, respectively. I tried to trace Manalang's bloodline, but his birth records are elusive in the archives.

This paper (1) tackles the revolution of the *Katipunan* in Northern and Southern Zambales, (2) narrates their interactions, if any, and (3) uses their narrative to further enrich the historiography of the Philippine Revolution in an attempt to secure for the "people from below" their rightful place in the narrative.

### **Zambales: Scope, Conditions, and Early Revolts Before the Revolution of 1896**

Before we tackle the history of the *Katipunan* and the Philippine Revolution in 1896, I will first discuss the local context of Zambales prior to the revolution in terms of its geopolitical scope, societal conditions, and the early revolts waged in the province. Bamero (1999), the late history professor at the University of the Philippines Diliman, produced a master's thesis entitled "Zambales Before the Revolution," which discussed the local history of the province prior to the 1896 Revolution. As mentioned earlier, the majority of the data in the succeeding discussion will come from her work.

*Scope.* Currently, Zambales has 13 municipalities, based on data from the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG).<sup>2</sup> The municipalities are Castillejos, San Marcelino, Subic, Botolan, Cabangan, Candelaria, Iba, Masinloc, Palauig, San Antonio, San Felipe, San Narciso, and Santa Cruz. But this geopolitical scope of Zambales began only after the establishment of the *Philippine Commission*, which enacted Act 1004 that divided the province into its current boundaries (Philippine Commission 1903). Before 1903, Zambales extended up to the town of Bolinao in the north (currently part of Pangasinan) and Subic in the south (Arechederra 1747). Hence, when the *Katipunan* reached the province, it was when it had a wider scope. Thus, the chapters were divided into two: one in the north and the other in the south.

Before Zambales became an independent *corregimiento*,<sup>3</sup> it was also previously under the control of the *encomienda* in Pangasinan. The decision to separate Zambales—then referred to as *Playa Honda* ("slingshot beach") because of its shape—could be found in the letter written by Governor General Juan de Arechederra in 1747. According to the letter, both the Fort *Playa Honda* and the territories from Bolinao to Olongapo would be separated from Pangasinan, and a separate *corregimiento* would be established with a *corregidor*<sup>4</sup> in charge of it (Arechederra 1747). Zambales will remain as a *corregimiento* until 1840, when it will officially become an *alcaldia*<sup>5</sup> governed by an *alcaldia mayor*

(Bamero 1999, 84). The fact that it took until the late 19th century for Zambales to be established as an *alcaldia* is a testament to the difficulty faced by the Spaniards in pacifying the province.

Zambales's geography later on shaped the pre-1896 revolts and the Revolution itself; its mountain range that extends until Bataan (Zuñiga 1893) will serve as a natural barrier for the *bandidos*, *mangangayaw*, and later on, *Katipuneros* against the Spaniards, who have very little knowledge of the terrain. In later discussions, following the footsteps of *Katipuneros* will reveal that they have trekked the mountain range, and will also explain why they chose to establish their headquarters in Alaminos and Botolan. Additionally, Zambales's coasts also face the West Philippine Sea, and its wild waters made its coasts unfriendly to small boats, making *pangangayaw* (headtaking) by sea waged by Moro raiders seldom (Zuñiga 1893). Subic was the sole coast suitable for the mooring of boats and ships, which is why the Spaniards decided to build their naval base there (Reed 1904, 25).

*Conditions*. Being an *encomienda*<sup>6</sup> in 1840 meant that there would be higher tributes and more intense implementation of *polo y servicios*, and these two were among the most recorded reasons for early revolts in Zambales. The *polo y servicios*, for instance, were recorded for abuses such as failure to provide proper compensation, and some laborers were reported to complain about being banned from going back to their homes after working all day (Bamero 1991, 94). When *vandala*<sup>7</sup> was implemented, it added to the grievances reported by the natives in Zambales during the 19th century because of the low prices paid for it by the Spanish government (Bamero 1991, 138).

Education also was not in a good state during the 19th century in Zambales; Don Fernandez de Zendreda, a wealthy *principalia*, was reported to have forced children to work for him instead of letting them go to school (Bamero 1991, 138). Healthcare also suffered terribly under the Spanish period, as Zambales was recorded to have lacked adequate medical personnel; there was only one doctor, one midwife, and one *vacunadorcillo*<sup>8</sup> in the province, and they were all based in Iba (Bamero 1999, 100). As such, death rates in the province were recorded to be high (Bamero 1999, 100). Under these conditions, revolts are most likely to be expected, and a number of them were recorded prior to 1896, and they will be discussed in the next part of the paper.

*Pangangayaw*. A remarkable practice in Zambales prior to 1896 and even up to the arrival of the Spaniards is *pangangayaw*; a practice that, I argue, has transformed and persisted until the Revolution. *Pangangayaw* is not exclusive to Zambales; it is a practice done in different communities in the Philippines and Southeast Asia. It came from the proto-Austronesian word, /*ŋayaw*/, meaning "to take heads" (Villan 2021, 31), and scholars distinguish it from conventional tribal warfare by emphasizing the role of rituals attached to it (Simon 2012,

165; George 1996, 70-71). *Pangangayaw* also takes on many forms—from taking actual heads to replacing them with other goods that resemble them, to taking anything available from the victims seen as the “other” (George 1996, 71-72). Central to the study of *pangangayaw*, however, are three things: it serves as the way communities navigate their relationship with the “other” (the outsiders from the community), it is commonly practiced between upland and lowland/coastal communities, and it is susceptible to changing political and historical conditions (Rosaldo 1980, 31; George 1996, 91).

Hence, in the Philippines, *pangangayaw* was defined by scholars in many ways—depending on the community that practices it and on the particular time period. In the Visayas region, William Henry Scott (1994, 154) discussed that *pangangayaw* refers to sea raiding during the pre-Spanish period, but in Ifugao, *mangayaw* meant to raid, ambush, and to take heads—a practice that persisted until the American contact (Scott 1994, 262). T’bolis, on the other hand, use the term *nayaw* to mean an ambush done during the night to pillage and kill (Villan 2021, 31). Interestingly, Vicente Villan (2021, 3) also recalls his mother and grandmother from Capiz using the term to mean “migration” or the movement to another place in the contemporary period. In Mindanao, the Lumad peoples use *pangayaw* to refer to various forms of killing, such as slave raiding, revenge raids, prestige killings, and even armed revolts (Tamos-Cabazares 2016, 8). As such, Villan (2021, 31-32) articulated that all forms of *pangangayaw* are centered around the reclaiming of one’s lost honor, defending one’s life, and seeking one’s comfort (*tinataglay nilang buhay, inaasam na ginhawwa, at inaadhikang dangal*<sup>9</sup>)—or to meet emotional or materialistic needs.

In Zambales, Francisco Canamaque (1880, 127), a Spanish missionary, recorded how *pangangayaw* is done to end the mourning period; the black cloth on the head of the mourner will not be removed until the deceased is avenged. Blair and Robertson (1903-09, 98) also noted the same observation among the Aytas of Zambales, and both the Sambals and Aytas were therefore feared by the neighboring provinces for their headhunting practices. As both Sambals and Aytas were noted to kill one another during *pangangayaw* (Canamaque 1880, 127), it reinforces the “othering” narrative in the practice, where victims were normally outsiders in the community. Geography also plays an important role, as Zambales is characterized by its mountainous regions inhabited by upland communities and the coastal areas where such hostility normally occurs. Additionally, this practice, as Rosaldo argued, will change as a response to the changing political conditions upon the arrival of the Spaniards, and will transform into direct (revolts) and indirect (banditry) forms of resistance to reclaim one’s lost honor, defend one’s life, or seek one’s comfort, as Villan argued. These forms of resistance will be discussed in the next part.

*Early Revolts Before 1896.* The people in Zambales participated in a number of revolts prior to 1896, but some of the notable ones are: the participation by the native Sambal and Aytas in the revolt of Andres Malong in Pangasinan in 1660 (Diaz 1890, 590-96), the killing of Father Domingo Perez, and the revolt of Tumulang that killed General Phelipe de Ugalde in 1656 (Diaz 1890, 747-48).

First, there was the revolt led by Andres Malong in Pangasinan in 1660, against the *polo y servicios* and the paying of tributes (Bamero 1991, 167). After liberating the town of Bagnotan<sup>10</sup> in Pangasinan, Malong declared himself the king of the *alcaldia* of Pangasinan, and he asked for the assistance of Zambales natives to help defend his new kingdom (Diaz 1890, 590-96). Among the participants from Zambales is Don Francisco Sumulay, who led forces from Bolinao, Don Antonio Surray from Santa Cruz, and Don Juan Derrey from Agno (Bamero 1991, 168-69). The rebellion was suppressed when General de Ugalde arrived with his forces, and the three leaders were sentenced to die in 1661 (Bamero 1991, 168).

Father Domingo Perez, on the other hand, is a priest in Iba, Zambales, who tried to intervene in the revenge killings between the natives Dilunen and Calignao to avoid the military intervention of the *corregidor* in *Playa Honda* (Salazar 1742, 294). However, after a relative of Calignao was killed in their secret attempts to avenge despite the priest's intervention, Father Perez was killed by Calignao with the assistance of an Ayta named Quibacat who used a poisoned arrow to shoot the priest while he was on his way home from Baubauen (Salazar 1742, 300-301). In the account, both Calignao and Quibacat shot an arrow at Father Perez, but only Quibacat was able to pierce through the priest's heart, while Calignao missed it by inches (Salazar 1742, 300-301). While his death is not a result of a direct uprising like Malong's, I argue that his killing still represents the resistance against foreign intervention.

Lastly, Tumulang was a native who launched a revolt that spread to the neighboring *alcaldias* of Pangasinan, Ilocos, and Tarlac in 1656, by which he was able to kill General de Ugalde (Diaz 1890, 747-48). Unlike the previous leaders who joined Malong, however, Tumulang surrendered in 1681 to the forces of Captain Alonso Martin Franco and Captain Simon de Torres and expressed his desire to pledge allegiance to the Spanish regime along with his followers (Diaz 1890, 747-48). As a result, he was baptized as "Alonso" and established the *pueblo* of *Nueva Toledo* for his followers (Diaz 1890, 747-48).

Apart from early revolts, the 19th century in Zambales also saw rampant banditry. Bamero (1991, 175) described the cases of banditry or *panunulisan* as a conflict between the *atagay a tawo* (literally means, "tall/high person") and the poorer natives in the provinces who raided and pillaged from them. Thereby, if not rising in revolt, which takes more time and effort to organize, pillaging and ransacking could be

done faster if one intends to liberate oneself from poverty by stealing from others. James C. Scott (1985) referred to these as “weapons of the weak,” or everyday forms of resistance done by peasants to express dissent. Among the banditry cases recorded are those done by Marcelino Mendoza, Domingo Menos, Alberto de la Cruz, and Juan Bacal, who were accused of stealing from households and cattle rustling in 1860 (Bamero 1991, 175).

From these narratives, we can conclude that, first, resistance in Zambales even before 1896 was not isolated; it was often waged with the help and participation of natives from other provinces. Second, these early revolts were not nationalistic in character; despite having a wider reach than their local provinces, most of them were waged because of the worsening societal conditions in Zambales during the 19th century. Third, not all uprisings led to death for their causes; Tumulang’s case demonstrates that sometimes, rebellions can lead to further subjugation by the Spanish. Fourth, the divide between the elite vs. the non-elite, the Christianized vs. the un-Christianized, often does not exist; the leaders of the revolts used the title, “Don,” indicating that they were Christianized elite, and they fought alongside un-Christianized non-elites like Malong. However, this does not mean that the natives in Zambales have lived together peacefully; the proliferation of banditry shows that the elite and non-elite were still in conflict, which again attests to the complicated relationship between the two classes. And lastly, the transformation of the native practice of *pangangayaw* could be observed in these early revolts; in aiming to liberate their followers from the hardships of *polo* and tributes or avenging a killed loved one, or even in pillaging others’ houses for food and cattle, it can be argued that early revolts and banditry in Zambales have been waged as a form of *pangangayaw*—or the pursuit of honor, life, and comfort against the antagonistic “other.”

The question remains, however, whether the same pattern will persist or shape the revolt of the *Katipunan* in the province. The history of the two chapters of *Katipunan* in Zambales will now be discussed.

### **The *Katipunan* in the South: The Pansacula Brothers<sup>11</sup>**

The *Katipunan* in Southern Zambales was founded and led by two brothers; Teodoro and Doroteo Pansacula. Doroteo was the older one; his birth records show that he was born in 1850, while Teodoro was born in 1866 (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints<sup>12</sup>). Doroteo’s records reflect that he was married to Felipa Soria from San Marcelino (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints), and my interviews confirmed this as a fact. The Soria-Pansacula clan can still be found in San Marcelino, with their mayor (by the time I visited), Elmer Soria, coming from the same family. Teodoro did not reflect any spouse in

his records (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints), and even my informants, Armando Pansacula and Gil Albay<sup>13</sup>, did not recall that he ever married and had children. But Doroteo's records show that he had four children, the youngest of whom was interviewed by the local historian Floro Docuyan in 1982.

Interviewing Armando and Gil did not give me a lot of information about their occupation, but they did insist that Teodoro was a known headhunter in the province during the Spanish period. We cannot ascertain whether the brothers were poor or wealthy, or whether they were illiterate, but what is certain is that they were not occupying a major governmental position (because the people who did are listed in the HDP), and that they did not produce any written works which will enable us to understand their ideas. The meager information on their background reflects the same issues raised by Cullinane (2014, xii); scholars have the habit of assuming that the previously unknown participants of the *Katipunan* are poor and illiterate, when most of the time, we do not really know. It does not mean, however, that the Pansacula brothers were not part of the marginalized population; their marginalization will show once we discuss their status post-independence.

The *Katipunan* chapter was established in 1896, but the exact date could not be found in the existing sources that I encountered. Docuyan (1982, 57) has also reiterated the same data from Bamero and the primary sources from Blair and Robertson that the natives from Zambales have long since expressed their sympathies towards early revolts in the nearby provinces. Gil Albay even told me that Teodoro has been known as one of the prominent headhunters of Spaniards during the Spanish Period. However, the *Katipunan* chapter in Zambales was only established by Teodoro when Doroteo was arrested by the Spanish authorities and was incarcerated in Iba (Docuyan 1982, 57).

Jorge Pansacula recounted that his father was taken by the Spaniards when his uncle Teodoro was in Manila for a *Katipunan* meeting (Docuyan 1982, 57). I tried to scour the existing *Katipunan* documents as compiled by Jim Richardson (2013) in his book, *Light of Liberty: Documents and Studies on the Katipunan, 1892-1897*, to verify Teodoro's attendance, but I did not read his name on any of the documents. What I know is Jorge's birthday, based on his birth records (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints), and I know that he was born in 1891. If he is old enough to remember his father being arrested and finding him wounded and half-dead with his mother near the riverbank, then Jorge must be at least a toddler. That would make the arrest happen around 1895-96; if we look at the records of *Katipunan*, an important meeting was held on Christmas Day of 1895, where the establishment of the Highest Council (*Kataas-taasang Konseho*) was discussed (Richardson 2013, 76-83). After such a meeting,

the succeeding meetings had been less important, and if we look at the timeline of the Revolution in Zambales later on, Teodoro will no longer have enough time to attend them. Hence, it is most possible that this is the meeting Teodoro has attended, and the arrest of Doroteo happened around the same time; the fact that it happened during Christmas Day may have added to the reason why Jorge had remembered that incident even years later. Thus, the Katipunan in the South may have been established around this time. As for the absence of his name in the attendance records, one will not miss noticing that only the names of the leaders of each *balangay* were recorded by Emilio Jacinto, and if the *Katipunan* chapter in Southern Zambales had only been established after Teodoro went home after the meeting, why would his name be on the records?

Upon arriving on the shores of Olongapo, the natives sympathetic to him have informed him immediately of his brother's arrest, and of the presence of the *guardia civil* in the port that was looking for him (Docuyanán 1982, 57). Hence, Teodoro went straight to *barrio* Santa Fe in San Marcelino to meet with Domingo Angcot and Don Ruperto Dayap to formally establish the *Katipunan* chapter in Zambales (Docuyanán 1982, 52). Domingo Angcot is an Ayta described differently in various sources; local historian Pedro Asis, Jr. (1981, 5), for instance, said that his Christian name is Francisco Baylon, but he escaped the *alcaldia* and went back to the mountains when the *polo* and the tributes became too much of a burden to bear. In the mountains, Baylon intermarried with an Ayta and adopted the name "Angkot." Armando Pansacula kept mentioning his name to me during our interview and constantly referred to him as the companion of Teodoro Pansacula, who is known by the alias "Labong."

While it is unclear whether his name is really Domingo Angkot or just an alias he adopted later on, what is clear from the data is that the *Katipunan* in Southern Zambales was founded by an Ayta, an elite like Don Ruperto Dayap, who was incarcerated for reading Jose Rizal's novels (Docuyanán 1982, 52), and a non-elite *mangangayaw* like Teodoro Pansacula, who sought to liberate his brother from jail.

After its founding, the *Katipunan* in the South began mobilizing its forces against the Spaniards, and their first battle happened in March 1896, five months earlier than Bonifacio's first battle, which began in August (Retana 1898, 157). This is again proof that the Revolution was far from linear; it had different starting points and was waged in response to struggles faced by different localities. In the case of Teodoro, the incarceration of his brother, coupled with the worsening conditions in the province, could be argued as reason enough to start the revolution ahead of the decisions on the leadership in Manila.

Their first battle happened in Rivera de San Fernando, now called Sitio Poonbato in Botolan (HDP 1953, 65). Aside from Jorge Pansacula's

account as recorded by Docuyanán, Wenceslao E. Retana also covered the event in his article, “*La Insurrección de Zambales*” in the newspaper, *La Política de España en Filipinas*, and the HDP also provided a full account of the event—a testament of how monumental the first battle was. However, because of the number of sources that covered the event, conflicts on the provided information are inevitable; the exact date of the battle, for instance, varies from one source to another. Docuyanán (1982, 57) mentioned that it happened on March 9, but according to Retana (1898, 157), it was on March 6, and the HDP did not provide the exact date. Yet all sources agree that in this battle, the church was attacked, and Father Julian Jimenez was killed by Angkot (Retana 1898, 157; Docuyanán 1982, 59; HDP 1953, 69). The *Katipuneros* were also reported to have succeeded in raiding the quarters of the *guardia civil* to obtain rifles and revolvers, killing a corporal named Panganiban in the process (Retana 1898, 157; Docuyanán 1982, 59; HDP 1953, 69).

The next recorded battle was in Bakilan,<sup>14</sup> now called San Juan, and the documents now speak of Doroteo fighting alongside his brother (Docuyanán 1982, 59). It was followed by two simultaneous battles; one in Iba led by Teodoro, in which they had successfully driven the Spanish forces away, and the other was a second battle at Rivera de San Fernando led by someone named Commander Malintis, which was not as successful, and had forced the *Katipunán* forces to retreat (HDP 1953, 229-30). Their last stand was in Castillejos and Subic, where the Spaniards retreated and eventually surrendered in June 1898 in the Zambales mountain ranges (Docuyanán 1982, 60). According to Bamero (1999, 105), it was Brigadier General Gregorio Gonzales who signed the documents of surrender, but Docuyanán (1982, 60) insisted that it was Teodoro who received the Spanish flag and arms from the Spaniards before Gen. Gonzales told Teodoro that it should be him who should receive them. Though it was not explicitly mentioned by Docuyanán and Bamero who Gen. Gonzales was, it could be argued that he was an official appointed by the Aguinaldo government, given his use of the title during the period wherein the Revolutionary Government had already been established. Nonetheless, both sources agree that Teodoro conceded to Gen. Gonzales’s demands and went back to Botolan to declare himself the governor of Zambales, and Doroteo as his Brigadier General (Guerrero 2015, 324).

Their leadership was cut short, however, when President Aguinaldo assigned his nephew, Colonel Wenceslao Viniestra, as the leader of the revolutionary forces in Zambales in 1898 (Viniestra 1898).<sup>15</sup> Col. Viniestra wrote a letter to his uncle in September 1898, which not only revealed his position in the province, but also contained his report indicating that the Spaniards had already been driven out of the province and that peace was reigning at last (Viniestra, 1898).<sup>16</sup> It was thereby, a surprise for me when I found out that in November 1898,

his next letter to the President contains the litigation details against the Pansacula brothers who were accused of different crimes like robbery, intimidation of the natives in Zambales, and treason to the Revolutionary Government for abandoning their posts and establishing their own revolutionary group after their titles as governor and brigadier general was stripped off from them (Viniestra 1898). In the same letter, Col. Viniestra urges the President to launch his forces to hunt down the two brothers who threaten the stability of the Government, but we got nothing else from him that will inform us of whether they succeeded in arresting the two brothers (Viniestra 1898).

In trying to figure out what happened to them, I came across three versions of the story; first, Docuyan (1982, 60) and Gil Albay said that the two brothers received a letter requesting their presence in Kawit, and that they were killed in the boat that they were riding on the way there. Second, according to Armando Pansacula, his “Tito Panyong” (Epifanio Pansacula) told him that the two brothers were killed in an encounter against the forces of President Aguinaldo. According to Armando, this is the reason why his Tito Panyong kept on telling him growing up that the Philippines was not yet truly free in June 1898, as their ancestors had been killed by his fellow Filipinos, their ancestors who, from Tito Panyong’s view, are the true heroes of the liberation of Zambales.

Lastly, Guerrero (2015, 343) speculated that they died of natural causes, and even their death records reflected that they both lived until 70 years old. This data, however, is unreliable since the NAP told me after I inquired about their birth and death certificates that the documents are not available, and thus there is no way for me to verify whether the data in *FamilySearch* is true. All of their descendants, to whom I was able to interview both in Botolan and Iba, also failed to provide any additional information regarding their death, or even point me to where their bodies could have been buried. Hence, equipped with this limited data from sources, I argue that Armando’s testimony stands to be the closest to the truth, as (1) it is quite improbable that the two brothers will respond to a letter summoning them to Kawit when it was clear, based on Viniestra’s letter, that the government intended to hunt them down, and (2) the new governor of Zambales, Vicente Camara, cousin of President Aguinaldo, had declared martial law in the province in response to Viniestra’s calls (Guerrero 2015, 343). Hence, it is most probable that the brothers died in their last armed encounter with the forces of the Government.

The *Katipunan* in the South, however, did not die with them; early American records report of someone named Moises Abueg leading the new chapter in 1900, centered now in Masinloc and Candelaria (Abueg 1900).<sup>17</sup> Bamero (1999, 105) mentioned that Abueg was a former lieutenant under the Pansacula brothers, and thereby, his decision

to take his place means that the *Katipunan* did not end in Southern Zambales until Abueg's surrender to the Americans in 1901 (Philippine Commission 1901, 247), despite the efforts of President Aguinaldo to abolish them.

### **The *Katipunan* in Northern Zambales: Roman Manalang**

As for the *Katipunan* in the North, the documents in the PRR, as well as the Philippine Commission Reports, tell us very little about them. It is, thereby, fortunate that Melchor E. Orpilla has translated Felipe Quintos's diary from Pangasinan to Filipino. Quintos was a colonel under Roman Manalang's command, the founder of *Katipunan* in Northern Zambales, and he wrote a memoir entitled *Sipi Awaray Gelew Diad Pilipinas (Revolucion Filipina)* that narrated the foundation and the battles faced by their *Katipunan* chapter.

According to Quintos (1926, 10-11), Manalang founded the chapter in the North on November 3, 1897, in a small house in Sadsaran, Alaminos. Manalang was said to have been born in Castillejos (my hometown in the South), but he moved to Alaminos when he married Silveria Resurrecion, who was a native there. Like the Pansacula brothers, we have very little information regarding his socio-economic background, except his occupation: *celador ng telegrafo*, or a caretaker of the telegraph (Quintos 1926, 10). The exact words that Quintos used to describe Manalang's job are "*omaapiger na peteng*," which Orpilla (2020, 10) translated as, "*tagaayos ng kawad ng telegrafo*." His job requires only manual labor, so there is a chance that Manalang is uneducated—or if he is, perhaps not as educated as Bonifacio, who was a clerk. But this is purely speculative, and like the Pansaculas, we cannot assume that Manalang is part of the *pobres y ignorantes* identified by Ileta, though like the Pansacula brothers, his marginalization will appear later on, too, after independence.

When the *Katipunan* was established, Quintos (1926, 19) mentioned that they had contact with the Supreme Council in Manila through their representatives, Julian Santos and Eulalio Garcia, who brought their *nobramientos* (appointment), *cartilla*, and some periodicals from Manila. It is also from Quinto's memoirs where we had a glimpse of the efforts of the Supreme Council in Manila to organize the revolution around the same time; Feliciano Jocson, was narrated by Quintos (1926, 16) to have been communicating with them about the matter. Jocson was a *Katipunero* from Nueva Ecija who joined the Revolution in Central Luzon in 1896 (*El Renacimiento* 1907) and was among the *Katipuneros* who refused to sign the Pact of Biak-na-Bato and continued fighting with his troops even after Aguinaldo and the rest surrendered in December 1897 (Alejandrino 1949, 31).

According to Santiago Alvarez (1992, 202), he attended a meeting called by Jocson on November 20, 1897, with the goal of gathering enough men to attack Intramuros, but the plan failed after the Spaniards raided their meeting place. Alvarez (1992, 202) said that since then, Jocson was struggling to recruit manpower for his troops, and that he moved from Matikaw to Sta. Cruz, Laguna to recruit more men. It could be that Alvarez came across the *Katipunan* in the North around this time, as Manalang had already founded the chapter by then. It is also unclear whether Jocson agreed to the date that Manalang chose to wage the Revolution in the North, which was on March 7, 1898 (Quintos 1926, 28). The date was followed through by the different towns in Northern Zambales; Alaminos, Agno, Anda, Also, Balincaguin, Bani, Potot (now Burgos), Bolinao, Lingayen, Salasa, Sual, and Zaragoza all raised their arms against the Spaniards on that monumental 7th day of March 1898.

If Teodoro founded the *Katipunan* in the South when his brother was arrested, Manalang founded the *Katipunan* in the North when the Spaniards made the mistake of mass-arresting the beloved *principals* in their town and brought them to the *cuartel* in Iba (Quintos 1926, 19). This again is a testament to the complexity of the relationship between elite and non-elite and the first common thread we see of the two *Katipunan* chapters; both were initially founded after the incarceration of important people in Iba.

The battle faced by the different towns in the North also reflect the same pattern as those in the South; Manalang and his followers attacked and ransacked the *cuartels* and *forts* to obtain arms and killed the priest in every town, except for the Anda curate referred to by Quintos (1926, 40) as Father Marcelo N., who begged for Manalang to spare his life in exchange for his services in the *Katipunan*. Ever since, Father Marcelo had been distracting the Spanish officials and *guardia civil*, if not negotiating the freedom of those who were imprisoned on their behalf (Quintos 1926, 38-40).

On March 11, 1898, the Spanish forces led by General Monet (Quintos did not mention his first name) were able to drive them to Also, where their second and bloodiest battle began on March 15 (Quintos 1926, 67-68). According to Quintos (1926, 67-68, 80), around 150 *Katipuneros* were killed during that battle, and they were forced to relocate to Labrador, where they experienced a short-lived peace “akin to a little Republic” under Manalang’s authority, until the battle resumed on June 27, 1898, with assistance from *Voluntarios Bulakeños*, and they had successfully driven Gen. Monet away from Alaminos. On July 16, 1898, Alaminos was liberated, and Manalang joined forces with General Manuel Tinio to liberate La Union after three days (Quintos 1926, 92-96).

However, like what happened to the Pansacula brothers, it was the Tinio Brigade who got the sole credit because they had the official

appointment from the Government in Cavite. Quintos (1926, 104-6) even narrated that the natives from Zambales were incarcerated by Gen. Manuel Tinio—himself included—after Quintos refused his offer to serve as a captain under the Tinio Brigade in exchange for signing a document that would signify the reasons behind the forthcoming death of his fellow inmates. Quintos (1926, 104-106) recalled that they were imprisoned for a month until a new commander was assigned who took mercy on them and liberated them, and ever since then, Quintos refused to be involved in the *Katipunan* or any further efforts to liberate his hometown.

Hence, Quintos's narrative ends here, and although he did not mention whether Manalang was imprisoned with him, the newspaper *Manila Times* reported that the leader was still alive when the Americans arrived in Northern Zambales (Coats 1968, 190-93). Roman Manalang repeatedly escaped the Americans until he was cornered and killed in battle in January 1903 (Hurley 1938, 143-44). The last *Katipunan* member was said to have been arrested in 1905 (Report of the Chief of the Philippine Constabulary 1906, 53), and this will be the last time the sources will speak of a *Katipunan* in Zambales.

### **The *Katipunan* in Zambales: Relations, Similarities, and Differences**

Based on the previous discussions, we can see that there is very little evidence that points to any relationship or encounters between the two chapters of *Katipunan*; they both have different networks, with Manalang having a closer connection with Jocson of Nueva Ecija and Tinio of Northern Luzon, while the Pansacula brothers were reported to have attended meetings in Manila. The only possible encounter between the two—which may have occurred in the blindsides of written documents—may have occurred in the *cuartel* in Iba, where both the beloved *principalias* in Pangasinan and Doroteo Pansacula were incarcerated. Given the lack of exact dates provided in memoirs, testimonies, and recorded interviews, it is hard to discern whether, at some point, both Manalang and the Pansacula brothers met in Iba in their attempts to liberate some of their loved ones, but it is possible. For instance, we know that the South was liberated first, forcing the Spanish forces to retreat further south in Subic, which may be the reason why Manalang's forces did not have to go as far as Iba and focused instead on the occupied territories of Alaminos and Western Pangasinan.

*Pangangayaw* could also be glimpsed in both chapters; while Teodoro has since been known as a headhunter, Quintos (1926, 60) also pointed out that most *Katipuneros* in their chapters are skilled in using the *talibong*, a kind of weapon that resembles a machete, most likely used for headhunting. The Pansacula brothers were also accused of pillaging, and Manalang was repeatedly accused of banditry by

American reports for “stealing food” for sustenance (Coats 1968, 192). *Pangangayaw*—the pursuit of one’s honor, life, and comfort by taking something from an antagonized “other,” was thereby clearly transformed during the Spanish period, from headhunting rituals to early revolts, banditry, flight, and participation in the Revolution. The Spanish colonial officials, as well as the wealthy who benefited during the period, were now seen as the new “other.”

Both chapters also redefined the polarizing identities in the dominant narrative; we have seen how one of the founders in the South (Don Ruperto Dayap) was a *principalia*, and Quintos (1926) also listed a lot of elite members in their chapter, which explains their sympathies with the arrested elites in Iba. The “othering” created by the persistence of *pangangayaw*, therefore, does not echo or replicate the same colonial divisions, nor does it assume that identities created by such practice are rigid or unchanging. Hence, the assumption that the *Katipunan* was a *solely* plebian organization does not stand true in Zambales, nor the usual assumption that the poorer natives have only learned the ideas of freedom from the *ilustrados*, for the fight and revolt of both chapters could be explained not only by nationalist ideas but also by the tradition of *pangangayaw*.

Lastly, it is also remarkable how both chapters showed a conflictual relationship with the First Republic; the Government, through Col. Viniestra in the South, hunted down the Pansacula brothers to their possible deaths, while the *Katipunan* in the North was unjustly incarcerated for a month by the Tinio Brigade. Both were also robbed of the proper credit for their liberation, claimed by the appointees of the Government, and it was not until studies like this were written that we come to know of their gallant efforts.

This is where we confirm that the Pansacula brothers and Roman Manalang, despite the limited information on their socioeconomic background, are still in a marginalized position; as people outside of President Emilio Aguinaldo’s network and government, they stand less powerful compared to Gen. Gonzales, Col. Viniestra, or Gen. Tinio. Within the local context, they may be powerful and influential figures, but when subjected to the national paradigm upon the establishment of the Revolutionary Republic, the Pansacula brothers and Manalang are reduced to traitors, murderers, and bandits. When we speak of the “marginalized” and the “masses” in the Revolution, thereby, we must look beyond rigid categories of class, gender, and ethnicity, and acknowledge that marginality is *multi-layered* and *nuanced* as we move away from power centers—whether *spatially* or *socially* (Aguilar 2018, 3). Hence, Cullinane’s trouble of looking for the “masses” in the Revolution is a problem because of the limited understanding of marginality; the “masses” could be the autodidact Bonifacio, who could read works of European authors, and could be the unnamed *pobres y ignorantes*—

but it does *not* mean that they were marginalized to the same degree. The nuance in their marginality is what sheds light on their ideas on nationalism, freedom, and independence—and thus, must be properly acknowledged in writing their narratives.

## Conclusion

The *Katipunan* in Zambales has challenged the dominant narratives in the historiography of the Philippine Revolution in three ways: first, it has challenged its universal, linear periodization. The start and the end of the revolution were different in Zambales; it did not follow the same timeline as the nationalist historiography, and the revolution in the province was not interrupted by the Pact of Biak-na-Bato.

Second, the Revolution in Zambales is not necessarily elite-centered; their fight did not reference much of the Enlightenment ideas brought about by the educated elites, but instead, reflects the indigenous practice of *pangangayaw* more in their brave pursuit of comfort, honor, and life. While we have a few sources to prove the extent of the influence of the *Katipunan* ideas on their chapters,<sup>18</sup> their connection with *Katipuneros* in Manila and Nueva Ecija is telling of the influence already, no matter how little. Their motivations, however, could be glimpsed from the doctrine of the Pansacula brothers as reported by Viniegra (1898), which I have quoted at the beginning of this paper—a systematic change to expand opportunities for the “poor and ignorant”<sup>19</sup> that both the Spanish colonial government and the Philippine Republic have persistently taken away from them. Like *pangangayaw*, their revolution is a materialistic pursuit, and the *Katipunan*, to them, is but the most effective means they saw to achieve such ends. By creating a new community in their *Katipunan* chapters, they have broken away from ethnic and class divisions—resembling the imagined *nacion* of the *ilustrados* and the *bayan* of the *Katipuneros*. This, thereby, is the nuance of their participation in the *national* revolution; their connection with the nationalist organization and exposure to nationalistic ideas were *not* the *sole* motivation behind their resistance. It was *not* a trickle-down revolution; the *Katipuneros* of Zambales were *mangangayaw* who incorporated the principles of *Katipunan* in their *pangangayaw*. The *mangangayaw* *Katipuneros* could not be defined by colonial divisions of class and ethnicity; they were identified by their desire to pursue honor, life, and comfort amidst the new colonial order.

## The Author

Mary Claire Malasaga is a Teaching Associate and an MA History (Ethnohistory and Local History) student of the Department of History and Philosophy at the University of the Philippines, Baguio. She

finished her undergraduate degree in Social Sciences (major in History) at the same university. She was raised in Olongapo City before moving to Castillejos, Zambales, and it was there that she first discovered her love for studying the past. Currently, she is teaching undergraduate history courses and is working on her MA thesis regarding colonial transformations on headhunting in the Cordillera during the American period.

## Notes

1. Revolution spelled with a capital “R” refers to the event, the Philippine Revolution that began in 1896.
2. The information came from the DILG website, in the LGU profile of Zambales.
3. Similar to *político-militar commandancias* in Northern Luzon, *corregimientos* are military governments governed by a *corregidor*. This implies that Zambales, before 1840, had not been completely conquered by the Spaniards.
4. *Corregimiento* is an administrative subdivision in Spanish Philippines controlled by Spanish forces, as opposed to *alcaldia*, which is governed by native elites recruited to serve on behalf of the colonial government. Normally, territories still considered as “unpacified” are *corregimientos*. The leader of a *corregimiento* is called a *corregidor*.
5. See previous note re: *corregimiento*.
6. Technically, *encomienda* refers to the administrative right to draft labor and collect taxes from a population of a defined geographical area, which comes with a responsibility to provide religious instruction. However, sources and historians typically use the same term to refer to the geographical area itself, in lieu of “barangay” to emphasize that the area is now more “pacified” in the sense that they are now paying tributes and rendering labor for the Crown. The person in charge of an *encomienda* endowed with the task and powers mentioned above is called an *encomendero*.
7. *Vandala* refers to the forced sale of goods to the Spanish government, usually at low prices.
8. *Vacunadorcillo* refers to medical personnel assigned to issue vaccines.
9. *Ginhawa*, *dangal*, and *buhay* are used here by Vicente Villan as part of the composition of an organic psychology (*organikong sikolohiya*). As *pangangayaw* is viewed as the expression of the *kaloobang-bayan*, Villan used concepts in *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* to build the core concepts of his *pangangayaw* and *kaloobang-bayan*.
10. This is the name of an old town in Pangasinan, and should not be mistaken with Bacnotan of La Union.

11. Most of the data I got about the life of Doroteo and Teodoro Pansacula came from my interviews with their descendants, Armando Pansacula and Gil Albay<sup>7</sup>, aided by primary documents such as the PRR, HDP, and the transcript of Docuyanán's interviews with Jorge Pansacula, the youngest son of Doroteo Pansacula. This part of the paper will summarize the findings I got from these sources.
12. The Church of Jesus Christ for the Latter Saints provided me access to copies of the birth records of both Teodoro and Doroteo Pansacula, and even Doroteo's son, Jorge Pansacula's. In the case of Doroteo, his marriage records were also found in the church's website called *FamilySearch*.
13. Armando Pansacula and Gil Albay are both great-grandsons of Doroteo Pansacula. I interviewed Armando Pansacula, or Tatay Manding, on December 1, 2022 in their home in Botolan, Zambales. He was 73 years old when I interviewed him. Gil Albay, on the other hand, was 74 years old when I interviewed him on November 24, 2022 in his home in Iba, Zambales. Tatay Manding and Gil are cousins.
14. The records speak of no dates for the battle in Bakilan.
15. This report was accessed in its translated version by John R.M. Taylor in his book, *The Philippine insurrection against the United States: a compilation of documents with notes and introduction*. The report was labeled "Exhibit 288."
16. This was accessed in the Philippine Revolutionary Records in the National Library of the Philippines, Box 601, document #7.
17. This was accessed in the Philippine Revolutionary Records in the National Library of the Philippines, Box 572, document #452, roll 33.
18. This is common to the history of mentalities that deal with historical figures who left little to no written works; historians who study their motivations and ideas are left to speculate based on sources written by others about them by "reading against the grain." This is the same method I used when writing this paper.
19. This is directly lifted from John R.M. Taylor's translation of Col. Viniegra's report. It should not be mistaken with Iletó's use of "*pobres y ignorantes*."

## References

- Aguilar, Filomeno V. 2018. *Peripheries: Histories of Anti-Marginality*. Ateneo de Naga University Press.
- Abinales, Patricio N., and Donna J. Amoroso. 2005. *State and Society in the Philippines*. Ateneo de Manila University Press.

- Abueg, Moises. 1900. "Moises Abueg Authorizes A. Esmela to Organize Katipunan in Zambales." March 1900. *Philippine Insurgency Records*, Box 572, document #452, roll 33. Accessed from the National Library of the Philippines.
- Agoncillo, Teodoro A. 1956. *The Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Andres Bonifacio*. University of the Philippines Press.
- Alejandrino, Jose. 1949. "Feliciano Jocson." In *The Price of Freedom (La Senda del Sacrificio)*, translated by Teodoro M. Kalaw. Manila.
- Albay, Gil. 2022. Personal interview, November 24, Iba, Zambales.
- Alvarez, Santiago. 1992. *The Katipunan and the Revolution: Memoirs of a General*, translated by Paula Carolina Malay. Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Asis, Pedro, Jr. 1981. "Zambales during the Revolution." In *A Short History of Zambales*. Philippines.
- Bamero, Alma. 1991. "Zambales before the Revolution." Master's thesis, University of the Philippines Diliman.
- Bamero, Alma. 1999. "Patterns of Resistance in Zambales: 1660–1898." In *Centennial Papers of the Katipunan and the Revolution*. Manila Studies Association.
- Blair, Emma Helen, and James Alexander Robertson. 1902–1909. *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1803: Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and Their Peoples, Their History and Records of the Catholic Missions*. 55 vols. The A. H. Clark Company.
- Canamaque, Francisco. 1880. "Monografía de Zambales." In *Las Islas Filipinas: De Todo Un Poco, Segunda edición*. Librería de Fernando Fe. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=chi.20507766>.
- Coats, George Yarrington. 1968. *The Philippine Constabulary: 1901–1917*. PhD diss., Ohio State University.
- Constantino, Renato. 1975. *The Philippines: A Past Revisited*. Tala Publishing.
- Cullinane, Michael. 2014. *Arenas of Conspiracy and Rebellion in the Late Nineteenth-Century Philippines: The Case of the April 1898 Uprising in Cebu*. Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- De Arechederra, Juan. 1747. "Sobre la Separacion de la Provincial de Zambales." Accessed from Portal Archivos Españoles.
- Diaz, Casimiro. 1890. *Conquistas de las Islas Filipinas*. Valladolid: Imprenta, Librería, Heliografía, y Taller de Grabados de Luis N. De Gaviria. Accessed in HathiTrust. [https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=yul.11366937\\_002\\_00&seq=7](https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=yul.11366937_002_00&seq=7).
- Docuyan, Floro. 1982. "Katipunan Uprising in Botolan." In *Brief History of Botolan, Zambales, Philippines: 1611–1946*.
- Dumagat, Fay. 1994. "The Role of the Itneg (Tinggian) in the 1896 Revolution." In *Resistance and Revolution in the Cordillera*. University of the Philippines College Baguio.

- El Renacimiento. 1907. "Por Un Héroe del Pueblo: El Monumento a a Jokson." May 3.
- Elliot, Charles B. 1917. *The Philippines to the End of the Commission Government: A Study in Tropical Democracy*. The Bobbs-Merrill Company. Accessed from Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/philippinestoend00elli/page/n11/mode/2up>.
- Florendo, Maria Nela. 1994. "Ideology and Inter-Ethnic Images: Igorot Participation in the Revolution." In *Resistance and Revolution in the Cordillera*. University of the Philippines College Baguio.
- George, Kenneth M. 1996. *Showing Signs of Violence: The Cultural Politics of a Twentieth Century Headhunting Ritual*. American Council of Learned Societies.
- Guerrero, Milagros C. 1981. "Understanding Philippine Revolutionary Mentality." *Philippine Studies* 29 (2): 240–56. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42632589>.
- Guerrero, Milagros C. 2015. *Luzon at War: Contradictions in Philippine Society, 1898–1902*. Anvil Publishing.
- Historical Data Papers. 1953. Accessed from the National Library of the Philippines.
- Hurley, Vic. 1938. *Jungle Patrol: The Story of the Philippine Constabulary (1901–1936)*. Cerberus Books.
- Ileto, Reynaldo C. 1979. *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840–1910*. Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Le Roy, James A. 1914. *The Americans in the Philippines: A History of Conquest and First Years of the Occupation, with an Introductory Account of the Spanish Rule*. Houghton Mifflin Company. Accessed from Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/americansinphili00lerouoft/page/n9/mode/2up>.
- Pansacula, Armando. 2022. Personal interview, December 1, Botolan, Zambales.
- Philippine Commission. 1903. "[Act No. 1004, November 21, 1903] An Act Annexing the Northern Part of the Province of Zambales to the Province of Pangasinan and Providing That the Southern Part Thereof Shall Continue as a Separate Province under the Name of Zambales." *Official Gazette*. <https://issuances-library.senate.gov.ph/legislative%2Bissuances/Act%20No.%201004>.
- Quintos, Felipe. 2020. *Tala ng Kasaysayan ng Pag-aalsa sa Pilipinas (Revolución Filipina)*, translated by Melchor Orpilla. National Commission for Culture and the Arts.
- Retana, Wenceslao. 1898. "La Insurrección de Zambales." *La Política de España en Filipinas* 8, no. 184 (April). Madrid.
- Reyes, Portia L. 1999. *Ang Himagsikang Pilipino sa mga Pahayagang Aleman*. Palimbagan ng Lahi.
- Richardson, Jim. 2013. *Light of Liberty: Documents and Studies on the Katipunan, 1892–1897*. Ateneo de Manila University Press.

- Reed, William Allan. 1904. "Geographical Features." In *Negritos of Zambales*. Bureau of Public Printing.
- Report of the Chief of the Philippine Constabulary, 1905. 1906. Government Printing Office. Accessed in the American Historical Collection, Ateneo de Manila University.
- Rosaldo, Renato. 1980. *Ilongot Headhunting, 1883–1974: A Study in Society and History*. Stanford University Press.
- Salazar, Vicente. 1742. *Historia de la Provincia de el Santissimo Rosario de Philipinas*. University of Santo Tomas Press. Accessed in Google Books. <https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=P19PAAAACAAJ&rdid=book-P19PAAAACAAJ&rdot=1>.
- Salazar, Zeus A. 1991. "Ang Pantayong Pananaw Bilang Diskursong Pangkabihasnan." In *Pilipinolohiya: Kasaysayan, Pilosopiya at Pananaliksik*, edited by Violeta Bautista and Rogelia Pe-Pua. Kalikasan Press.
- Salazar, Zeus A. 1999. *Ang Kartilya ni Emilio Jacinto at ang Diwang Pilipino sa Agos ng Kasaysayan*. Palimbagan ng Lahi.
- Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. Yale University Press.
- Scott, William Henry. 1994. *Barangay: Sixteenth-Century Philippine Culture and Society*. Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Scott, William Henry. 1994. "The Bontoc Uprising of 1881." In *Resistance and Revolution in the Cordillera*. University of the Philippines College Baguio.
- Simon, Scott. 2012. "Politics and Headhunting among the Formosan Sejiq: Ethnohistorical Perspectives." *Oceania* 82: 164–85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1834-4461.2012.tb00127.x>.
- Talastas, Luis. 1994. "The Battle of Lias: Resistance in Eastern Mountain Province." In *Resistance and Revolution in the Cordillera*. University of the Philippines College Baguio.
- Tamos-Cabazares, Sheila. 2016. "Ginhawa: Concepts of Emotions and Resolution in Pangayaw Killings among the Agusan Manobo." *The Cordillera Review: Journal of Philippine Culture and Society* 6 (2).
- Taylor, John R. M. 1971. "Exhibit 288." In *The Philippine Insurrection against the United States: A Compilation of Documents with Notes and Introduction*, vol. 5, with an introduction by Renato Constantino. Eugenio Lopez Foundation.
- The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. n.d. "Jorge Pansacula." *FamilySearch*. <https://ancestors.familysearch.org/en/LCVV-DBN/jorge-pansacula-1891-1956>.
- Tolentino, Delfin, Jr., ed. 1994. *Resistance and Revolution in the Cordillera*. University of the Philippines College Baguio.
- Villan, Vicente. 2021. "Buhay, Ginhawa, at Dangal: Kontekstong Pangkamalayan sa Pangangayaw at ang Pagsasakasaysayang Pilipino Hanggang sa Unang Hati ng Ika-19 na Siglo." In *Mula sa*

- Pangangayaw: Ang Panginigbang-Bayan at Paghahanap ng Ginhawa sa Kasaysayan at Kalinangang Pilipino*, edited by Vicente Villan and Kristoffer Esquejo. National Commission for Culture and the Arts. Viniegra, Wenceslao. 1898. "Wenceslao Viniegra Wishes to Join E.A. Having Restored Order in Zambales." *Philippine Insurgency Records*, Box 601, document 7. Accessed from the National Library of the Philippines.
- Worcester, Dean C. 1930. *The Philippines, Past and Present*. The Macmillan Company. Accessed from Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/philippinespastp0001unse/page/n9/mode/2up>.
- Zúñiga, Martínez. 1893. *Estadismo de las Islas Filipinas, o Mis Viajes por Este País*. Imprenta de la Viuda de M. Minuesa de los Ríos.