

The Philippine Pangulo Regime

REMIGIO E. AGPALO

The development of my concept of pangulo regime was a protracted process, taking place in a period of twenty-five years. Its sharp and clear definition was made only two years ago in 1996 in my paper "The Pangulo Regime: From the Philippine Revolution (1896) to the Present and the Future,"¹ read and discussed during the centenary of the Philippine Revolution, where I distinguished the pangulo regime sharply from the parliamentary and presidential regimes. As a concept the pangulo regime is not known to Filipino politicians, mass-media practitioners, and academics, except only to a few in the University of the Philippines who know well my works on the subject, including the latest. The solid proof of its not being known to the general public is that in our country whenever we engage in a country-wide debate on what form of government is desirable for or applicable to the Philippines, such as in the constitutional conventions in 1934-1935, 1971-1972, and 1986, as well as in the recent discussions or debates during the full terms of former President Corazon C. Aquino and former President Fidel V. Ramos and the partial term of President Joseph Ejercito Estrada, the debate format on the forms of government has been confined to the bipartite format of parliamentary vs. presidential regime.

It is time therefore to liberate ourselves from this conceptual prison and to broaden our insights and knowledge of Philippine government and politics by the adoption of the tripartite format of debate – parliamentary vs. presidential vs. pangulo regime.

Since the pangulo regime concept is not well-known, it must be clearly and sharply defined, comparing and contrasting it to the English parliamentary and American types of regime. Let me, then, define it sharply and clearly as I had defined it in my latest work:

The Philippine pangulo regime is a democratic and libertarian form of governance like the English parliamentary and the American presidential regimes, but the pangulo regime is distinguishable from the Anglo-American types, for the pangulo regime operates on the principle of the supremacy of the executive and it puts premium on the value of *pagdamay* (sharing with and caring for fellow persons).²

In this definition, a pangulo regime has one implicit and four explicit defining characteristics. The implicit feature arises from the concept *regime*, for the pangulo regime is a regime. A political system of governance is not a regime unless it is institutionalized. In order that it can be regarded as institutionalized system, it must have a national constitution; an on-going government whose organs are complete – a lawmaking organ, an executive, an administrative agency, a judiciary, and national armed forces; national symbols, a national flag and a national anthem; and other paraphernalia of a nation, such as a national university. The last, however, is not absolutely required.

The four explicit defining characteristics of a pangulo regime are: (1) it is democratic; (2) it is libertarian; (3) it operates on the principle of the supremacy of the executive; and (4) it puts a premium on the value of *pagdamay*.

The three regimes – the parliamentary, the presidential, and the *pangulo* – are similar in some aspects, but in other aspects, they are vastly different from each other. All three regimes are democratic, for all of them believe in and practice the principle of popular sovereignty. In all these regimes the people control the government, for their fundamental laws provide that the people (*demos*) are the ultimate source of authority (*kratos*). All these regimes are also libertarian (from *libertas*, liberty or freedom), for all these regimes provide for a bill of rights in their constitution. Finally, all three regimes believe in the three great values which the French Revolution recognized – liberty, equality, and fraternity). All the three regimes recognize liberty as a value because as pointed out earlier, all three are libertarian. All these three regimes also recognize the value of equality, for as pointed out earlier also, all three regimes are democratic. Democracy implies that each individual in the political society is equal to each of the other individuals constituting the political society. This is enshrined in the doctrine of democracy – one man, one vote. And finally, all three regimes recognize the value of fraternity, for all of them are Christian, believing in God as the common Father and Creator, and, therefore, all the children of God are brothers (fraternity = brotherhood).

But, if all the three regimes are similar in these aspects, there are certain features in these regimes which are vastly different, so that each regime can be distinguished from the others. All three are similar in some aspects, as common members of one class (*per genus*), but each is different from the others (*per differentia*).

If the Philippine pangulo regime operates on the principle of the supremacy of the executive, the parliamentary regime operates on the supremacy of the parliament or the legislature.

Owing to the principle of the supremacy of the parliament in the English parliamentary system, the executive in that regime resigns if the parliament no longer has confidence in the executive.³ Under the same principle, there is no judicial review in England, for the judiciary cannot pronounce an act of the parliament as unconstitutional.⁴ In the American presidential system, on the other hand, neither the executive nor the parliament is supreme. Instead, in the American presidential regime the executive and the legislative branches are co-equal or coordinate. There obtains a separation of powers and checks and balances between these two great policymaking branches of the national government.⁵ The present politics of the United States involving the Monica Lewinsky affair of President William "Bill" Clinton and the politics of impeachment involving the President and the Congress illustrate the co-equality of the executive and the legislature, the separation of powers, and checks and balances in the United States.

With regard to the trinity of values recognized by the parliamentary regime of England, the presidential regime of the United States, and the Philippine pangulo regime, each regime in England, the United States, and the Philippines gives more importance or gives a premium on one of the three values of liberty, equality, and fraternity. The reason or explanation for this fact is the specific or particular history and political culture of England, the United States, and the Philippines.

In the English parliamentary regime, liberty as a value is given a premium. This is shown clearly in the importance of Magna Carta of 1225 and the Declaration of Rights that fructified in the Glorious Revolution of England in 1688.⁶

In the American presidential regime, it is also obvious that of the trinity of values Americans recognize, it is equality that

is first in importance. The American Declaration of Independence of 1776 is an eloquent proof. This great document states: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal." After this declaration, the American basic document stated further: "And that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights; and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."⁷

In the Philippine pangulo regime, which will be discussed extensively and with more empirical evidence in the next section, owing to the particular history and political culture of Filipinos, the fraternal value of *pagdamay* is given emphasis, as shown in Filipino folk sayings of various ethno-linguistic groups. Thus, the Tagalogs say: "*Ang sakit ng kalingkingan ay damdam ng buong katawan.*" ("The pain suffered by the little finger is suffered by the whole body.") The Ilocanos put this folk saying as follows: "*Uray la ti kikit ti magaradgadan isu amin ti bagi ti masakitan.*" ("Even if only the little finger is scratched, the entire body feels the pain.") On the other hand, the Cebuanos articulate the precept with practically the same meaning: "*Ang samad sa kumingking, pagabation sa tibuok lawas.*" ("The pain suffered by the little finger is felt by the entire body.")⁸

As part of the main body of my centennial lecture, I shall now substantiate the thesis that the Philippine Revolution produced a pangulo regime. In other words, the Philippine pangulo regime, embodied in the First Philippine Republic, established by General Emilio F. Aguinaldo in 1898-1901, was the flower of the Philippine Revolution.

The Philippine Revolution from a broad view followed a series of three stages.⁹ The first stage was the Propaganda Movement, from 1875 to 1895, led by Graciano Lopez Jaena,

Marcelo H. del Pilar, and Jose Rizal. Its main aim was reformist, to bring about social, economic, and political reforms in the Philippines and to effect the assimilation of the Philippines in the body politic of Spain. But towards the end of the movement, starting in 1892, the Propaganda Movement, at least as led by Rizal, was no longer reformist. It had become revolutionist, as clearly shown in the *Liga Filipina* of Rizal. If we include the *Liga Filipina* to the principal works of Rizal – essays, novels, and poetry – we shall find a pangulo regime model advocated by Rizal.

The second stage of the Philippine Revolution was the Katipunan Period led by Andres Bonifacio and Emilio Jacinto in 1896-1897, although the Katipunan was born in 1892 and died with the death of Jacinto in 1899. On August 23, 1896, a fully developed polity, the so-called Bonifacio republic, was born. It was only a week-old baby when it expired on August 30, 1896, when Bonifacio's and Jacinto's forces were defeated at Pinaglabanan, San Juan Del Monte, preparatory to the invasion of Manila.

The third stage was the Philippine Revolution proper, led by Emilio F. Aguinaldo and Apolinario Mabini in 1889-1901, although the Philippine Revolution may be dated to have begun in 1897 (when Aguinaldo was elected President of the Republic of the Philippines in the Tejeros Convention) and to have died with the death of Macario Sakay in 1907. The flower of the Philippine Revolution was the First Philippine Republic of 1898-1901 established by General Aguinaldo.

The First Philippine Republic was a genuine pangulo regime, for it was an institutionalized system of governance. It was not simply a pangulo-regime model which was the great contribution of Rizal – Rizal's model provided for a democratic

and libertarian form of government as seen in his great essays, novels, poetry and *Liga Filipina*. Rizal's model provided for the supremacy of the executive in the *Liga Filipina*; it put a premium on the value of *pagdamay* in the *Liga Filipina* – but it remained an idea or model like Plato's *kallipolis* which never existed on earth although it existed as a heavenly model for earthly imperfect political systems.

The same conclusion applies to Bonifacio's and Jacinto's so-called republic. Both Bonifacio and Jacinto contributed a pangulo-regime model in Philippine history, not a pangulo regime. It is true that all the characteristics of a pangulo regime were manifested in their so-called republic. Bonifacio believed in democracy as proven by his democratic actions in the Tejeros Convention in 1897. Jacinto provided in his *Pamahalaan sa Hukuman ng Silangan*: "Sovereignty resides in the people. This is the guiding principle upon which the Government of the East is established."¹⁰ Both leaders advocated and defended liberty and the rights of the people. Both also believed in the value of *pagdamay*. Bonifacio declared in his *Decalogue*: "*Bahaginan ng makakaya ang alin mang nagdaralita.*"¹¹ ("Insofar as it is within thy power, share thy means with the poor and unfortunate.")¹² Jacinto in the *Liwanag at Dilim* said: "*Kung ang pag-ibig ay wala ang mga Bayan ay mapapawi sa balat ng lupa... Sa pag-ibig nunukal ang kinakailangang pagdadamayan.*"¹³ ("If there is no love all the communities will vanish from the surface of the earth... From love springs the needed *pagdadamayan*."¹⁴

As regards the principle that should operate in the government, both Jacinto and Bonifacio believed in essentially the same idea. Jacinto said in the *Liwanag at Dilim*:

Ang alin mang katipunan at pagkakaisa ay nangangailangan ng isang pinakaulo, isang kapangyarihan una sa lahat na sukat

*makapagbibigay ng magandang ayos, makapagpapanatili ng tunay na pagkakaisa, at makapag-akay sa hanganang ninanais, katulad ng sasakyang itinutugpa ng isang bihasang piloto na kung ito'y mawala ay nanganganib na maligaw at abutin ng kakilakilabot na kamatayan sa laot ng dagat, na di na makaaasang makakadaong sa pampang ng maligayang payapa't kabuhayang binahanap.*¹⁵

(In any society or association, there is a need for one that serves as head, one authority which is superordinate to all who will provide good order, maintain true unity, and help in the attainment of goals as a boat needs a skillful pilot, the lack of whom will lead to the danger of getting lost and foundering at sea, thus losing all hopes of reaching its destination.)¹⁶

In the case of Bonifacio, his belief in the supremacy of the executive was articulated in the titles he held in the Katipunan – *Supremo* and *Pangulo ng Haring Bayang Katagalugan* (Chieftain and Head of the Sovereign People of the Tagalogs.)¹⁷

Bonifacio's and Jacinto's so-called republic¹⁸ was actually only a pangulo-regime model. It was only an idea. Bonifacio as *Pangulo ng Haring Bayan* had a comet-like existence. His Cry of Pugadlawin on August 23, 1896, the birth cry of his government, was vigorous, but the baby republic which he fathered expired on August 30, 1896 after the Katipunan forces were defeated at Pinaglabanan. Even if we prolong the life of his government until May 10, 1897, when he was killed, his system of governance could not be institutionalized, for it takes a long period to institutionalize a political system.

On the other hand, in comparison to Bonifacio's so-called republic, Aguinaldo's First Philippine Republic of 1898-1901

was a genuine institutionalized system of governance. It was a true and real pangulo regime.

First, it had a national constitution, the Malolos Constitution. Although formally it established a parliamentary form of government, as planned and vigorously defended by its principal author, Felipe Calderon, in practice and as amended in the transitory provisions, it actually was a government operating on the principle of the supremacy of the executive. As an institutionalized system of governance, it did not only have a national constitution; it also had a national legislature, the Malolos Congress. Moreover, it had a national administrative agency to run the affairs of the national government. In 1898-1889 it had a Council of Government, composed of Secretaries of Departments, headed during the critical days of the republic by Apolinario Mabini, also serving as Secretary of Foreign Affairs. The other departments of the National Government were the Department of War, under Baldomero Aguinaldo; Department of Interior, under Leandro Ibarra; Department of Finance, under Mariano Trias; Department of Justice, under Gregorio Araneta; and Department of Fomento (Industry, Commerce, Communications, Public Works, Public Instruction, and Agriculture), under Felipe Buencamino, Sr. The First Philippine Republic also had a national judiciary headed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Moreover, it had a national army, a national university, a national flag, and a national anthem.¹⁹

Second, the national government was operating under the principle of the supremacy of the executive,²⁰ as evidenced by the fact that its President, General Aguinaldo, was Commander-in-Chief of the Armed forces, National Administrative and

Executive Chief, and Chief Legislator. Practically all the laws of the First Philippine Republic, more than one hundred in all, which were compiled by Professor Sulpicio F. Guevarra, were decrees issued by General Aguinaldo.

Third, this regime had a democratic system of governance. In Article 3 of the fundamental law, popularly known as the Malolos constitution, there is a provision: "Sovereignty resides exclusively in the people."²¹ The President of the Republic, General Aguinaldo, was elected by the Malolos Congress, composed of representatives from the various provinces of the archipelago, several of whom were elected by representatives of provinces which were under the control of the revolutionists. The non-elected members were appointed by President Aguinaldo, who was elected by the Malolos Congress.

Fourth, the regime was libertarian, for the Malolos constitution provided for a Bill of rights.²² In Title IV and elsewhere of the fundamental law, there were such rights as freedom to express opinions or ideas, to form associations, to petition the government for the redress of grievances, to be free from arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, to be free from violation of entry of dwelling house, and to be guaranteed rights to privacy of correspondence, among others. Moreover, Article 5 provided for the separation of church and state.²³

Fifth and finally, the value which was given a premium by the First Philippine Republic was the value of *pagdamay*. Where do we find this value eloquently articulated? It is found in Aguinaldo's letter to the old members of the Katipunan dated July 15, 1898.²⁴ Aguinaldo could articulate this value eloquently not only because he is a Filipino who drank deeply from the springs of Filipino political culture but also because he was

familiar with Rizal's writings, and he became a member of Bonifacio's and Jacinto's Katipunan. Aguinaldo was administered the solemn rites of the Katipunan by Bonifacio himself before the outbreak of the Philippine Revolution proper. Aguinaldo became a member of the Katipunan in 1895. Familiar with Rizal's works and a Katipunero even before the outbreak of the Philippine Revolution proper in 1896, Aguinaldo was fully indoctrinated in the ideas of the pangulo-regime model of Rizal, Bonifacio, and Jacinto, especially its distinguishing characteristics of the supremacy of the executive and the emphasis on *pagdamay*.

How was the value of *pagdamay* articulated in Aguinaldo's letter of July 15, 1898?

This significant document stated that all Filipinos were brothers, for they were the sons of the same mother country. At first they were brothers under the Katipunan. However, the old Katipunan had been replaced by the Republic of the Philippines.

Aguinaldo's letter continued:

There is no Katipunan today, because the entire Philippines our most dear mother country is the true Katipunan in which all her sons are united and agreed in her desire and one wish, that is, to rescue the mother country which groans in slavery.²⁵

Adopting the metaphor of body implicitly for the entire archipelago, Aguinaldo's letter of July 15, 1898 concluded that all organs of the body politic, including all their cells, must cooperate with each other, giving *pagdamay* to all the rest. Aguinaldo said: "[I]t is the duty of all to contribute life and property to the arduous task of freeing the people."²⁶

And what is the role of Aguinaldo in this body politic? His role as he stated it echoed what Jacinto said in the *Liwanag at Dilim* – “*pinakaulo*” (one who serves as head). Aguinaldo’s letter stated:

I have no other duty. I have no other desire than to give the [assignment of] duty which is in accordance with his aptitude and demonstrated merit that he is fit to carry out.... [Y]ou know that for me to be able to do this, the complete harmony and unity of feeling which is the foundation of tranquility and moderation is necessary.²⁷

In the last paragraph of the letter, Aguinaldo continued to play the role of *pinakaulo* by enjoining the people to avoid “sacking, plundering, robbing and deceiving, [for those actions] destroy our credit and hurt us much before other nations and injure tranquility.”²⁸

In summary, owing to the fact that Aguinaldo’s first Philippine Republic was an institutionalized system of governance, which was democratic and libertarian in form, and it exhibited the distinguishing characteristics of the supremacy of the executive in the operation of the government and it put a premium on the value of *pagdamay*, it was truly a pangulo regime, as distinguished from the American presidential regime and the English parliamentary regime.

It was also a Filipino invention, acquiring a significant status in political science as what the American presidential regime and the English parliamentary regime have attained in political science.

Except for Quezon, Laurel, and Marcos after his declaration of martial law in 1972, all the other presidents attempted to establish a pangulo regime but failed owing to

certain reasons and various circumstances. However, owing to Philippine political culture and the fact that Rizal, Bonifacio and Jacinto advocated a pangulo-regime model and Aguinaldo did establish a pangulo regime, all these other presidents modeled their regimes using the pangulo-regime as their paradigm.

In conclusion, I posit that my concept of pangulo regime is significant. Its significance cannot be denied, for the sciences – natural, biological, and the social (the last includes political science and history) – advance by means of concept-construction and concept-exposition. Thomas Kuhn has demonstrated the truth of this preposition in his great work, *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*.²⁹

I had conceptualized the idea of a pangulo regime, describing its general nature or form and identifying its specific characteristic features so that the pangulo regime can be distinguished from the two other well-known democratic and libertarian regimes – the parliamentary and the presidential. I have also shown the empirical manifestation of a pangulo regime in the First Philippine Republic established by General Emilio F. Aguinaldo in 1898-1901. Thus, Thomas Gray's idea in his "Elegy" – "Full many a flower is born to blush unseen, And waste its sweetness on the desert air"³⁰ – while valid and true, cannot be said anymore of the flower of the Philippine revolution, the Philippine pangulo regime. Conceptualized and provided empirical evidence, the phenomenon of the Philippine pangulo regime which had bloomed unseen in Philippine political history and perhaps even in the history of the world, can now be seen, so that its "sweetness" can now be enjoyed.

The dismal bipartite debate in our country during the last sixty years or six decades from the Commonwealth era to the present year 1998, from the 1930s to the 1990s, from Quezon to Estrada – the presidential regime vs. the parliamentary regime format – can now be dumped in the garbage can of Philippine history and now replaced and broadened by the tripartite debate format – presidential regime vs. parliamentary regime vs. pangulo regime.

The significance of my concept, pangulo regime, is clinched by the fact that our country is now preparing for the revision of the 1987 Constitution for another round of Charter Change (CHA-CHA). It is also clinched by the fact that we are very close to the end of the second millennium and the beginning of the third millennium. In the passing away of the old millennium and the coming in of the new one thousand years, will the old and corrupt Babylon be destroyed forever and the beautiful new Jerusalem³¹ be established in our country? Let us broaden the scope of our debate in the next round of debate on the Philippine constitution. Through this debate, we may yet be able to establish the *kallipolis* of our dreams. ❖

Endnotes

¹ It was presented as a lecture and discussed in an open forum where about 300 participants attended at the Pandanggo Room of Manila Hotel on August 22, 1996. It is forthcoming as an article in a two-volume book edited by Elmer Ordoñez, tentatively in January 23, 1999.

² Agpalo, "The Philippine Revolution and Its Aftermath," p. 36.

³ Leon D. Epstein, "Parliamentary Government," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. by David L. Sills (The McMillan Co. and the Free Press, 1968), Vol. 11, p. 419.

⁴ Alex N. Dragnich and Jorgen Rasmussen, *Major European Governments* (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1978), p. 53.

⁵ Richard E. Neustadt, "Presidential Government," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. by David L. Sills (The McMillan Co. and

the Free Press, 1968), Vol. 12, p. 453. See also C. Herman Pritchett, *The American Constitutional System* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963), pp. 10-11 and pp. 35-36.

⁶ See Sir Ivor Jennings, *The Queen's Government* (London: Penguin Books, 1954), pp. 9-20; and Stuart E. Prall, *The Bloodless Revolution: England 1688* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, 1972).

⁷ Leslie Lipson, "European Responses in The American Revolution," *The American Revolution Abroad*, in *The American Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 428 (November 1971), p. 25. For the full text of the American Declaration of Independence of 1776, see Walter E. Volkmer, *American Government* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979); Second Edition, pp. 404-406.

⁸ Damiana L. Eugenio, ed., *Philippine Folk Literature* (Quezon City: Folklore Studies Program, CSSP, U.P. and U.P. Folklorists, Inc., 1982); p. 358.

⁹ Summary and generalization of Agpalo, "The Philippine Revolution and Its Aftermath," Chapter II and Chapter III.

¹⁰ The full text of the English translation of Jacinto's *Pamahalaan* is in Gregorio F. Zaide, *Philippine Constitutional History and Constitutions of Modern Nations* (Manila: the Modern Book Company, 1970). pp. 122-127. The quoted provision is Art. I, Sec. 2, on p. 122.

¹¹ Teodoro A. Agoncillo, Collector and Translator *The Writings and Trial of Andres Bonifacio* (Manila: 1963), p. 67.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 1.

¹³ Emilio Jacinto. *Buhay at Mga Isinulat ni Emilio Jacinto* (Maynila: 1935), pp. 33 and 34.

¹⁴ Translation by the author.

¹⁵ Jacinto, *Buhay...*, p. 36.

¹⁶ Translation by the author.

¹⁷ Milagros C. Guerrero, Emmanuel N. Encarnacion, and Ramon Villegas, "Andres Bonifacio and the 1896 Revolution," *Kultura*, 2 (1996). On p. 8 of this issue or number of the *Kultura*, there is a published facsimile of Emilio Jacinto's appointment as general (*pangulong hukbo*) of Northern Manila. This appointment document bore the title of Andres Bonifacio as *Pangulo ng Haring Bayan* (Head of the Sovereign People).

¹⁸ *Ibid.* Guerrero and her associates declared decisively: "Bonifacio was the first president of the Philippines." p. 4. However, as pointed out by this author, his "republic" or his "Philippines" was not a regime, for it was not an institutionalized system of governance.

¹⁹ Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *Malolos: The Crisis of the Republic* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1960), Chapters VII, VIII, IX, and X; Leandro H. Fernandez, *The Philippine Republic* (New York, Columbia University, 1926), Chapters II, III, and IV; Sulpicio Guevarra, *The Laws of the First Philippine*

Republic (Manila: National Historical Commission, 1972); and O.D. Corpuz, *The Roots of the Filipino Nation* (Quezon City: AKLAHI Foundation, Inc., 1989), Vol. II, Chapters 18, 19, and 20.

²⁰ Although as noted earlier in the text of the lecture, the constitution of the first Philippine Republic provided for a parliamentary system, it was also a fact that it also provided for transitory provisions, one of which was Article 99. This provision said: "Notwithstanding the general rule established in Paragraph 2 of Article 4, in the meantime that the country is fighting for its independence, the Government is empowered to resolve during the closure of the Congress all questions and difficulties not provided for in the laws which give rise to unforeseen events by the issuance of decrees, of which the Permanent Commission shall be duly appraised as well as the Assembly when it meets in accordance with the Constitution." Paragraph 2 of Article 4 provides: "The Government of the Republic is popular, representative, alternative, and responsible, and shall exercise three (3) distinct powers: namely, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial." Owing to this transitory provision of the fundamental law, the government, in effect, the President, was authorized to issue decrees with the force of law during the war of independence. This emergency power of the government or the President legitimized the executive to operate under the principle of the supremacy of the executive. That this principle was operative was manifest in the fact that practically all the laws of the First Philippine Republic as compiled by Professor Guevarra were decrees of President Aguinaldo. (Guevarra, op.cit.)

²¹ The full text of constitution of the First Philippine Republic – the Malolos Constitution – is in Guevarra, op. cit., pp. 104-119. Its Art. 3 is on p. 105.

²² Ibid., pp.105-109

²³ Ibid., p.105.

²⁴ The full text of this letter is found in John R. M. Taylor, Compiler and Military Historian. *The Philippine Insurrection Against the United States* (Pasay City: Eugenio Lopez Foundation, 1971), Vol. III, pp. 161-162.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 161.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 162.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

³⁰ Oscar Williams, ed. *Immortal Poems of the English Language* (New York: Washington Square Press, Inc., 1952), "Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard," by Thomas Gray, p.188.

³¹ *The Holy Bible*, New King James Version (Thomas Nelson:1982), Revelation 18:2 and 21:2-4.