

The Evolution of the Maranao Bangsa, 1903–1935

JUVANNI A. CABALLERO

ABSTRACT

This paper traces the evolution of the concept of *bangsa* or nation among the Maranaos in reaction to the American plan of granting independence to the Philippines through the speeches and letters of various Maranao leaders from 1903 to 1935. These documents reveal that the Maranao's conceptualization of the *bangsa* was primordially anchored on kinship confined within the local community sultanate called *Agama*. However, the American plan of lumping the Muslims with

the rest of the Christian Filipinos in the grant of independence became a powerful stimulus that prompted Maranaos to advance the concept of their *bangsa* beyond the confines of kinship. Some started talking about the Maranao tribe as the foundation of their nation; others thought they ought to join the other Islamized ethnolinguistic groups. A number believed religion was not an issue and were therefore willing to join their Christian Filipino brothers in an independent Philippines while not a few wished to become Americans.

KEYWORDS

nation, nationalism, Moro, Bangsamoro, Maranao, *Bangsa*, *Pengampong*

INTRODUCTION

When news spread that the American government would eventually grant the Philippines its independence, the natives manifested varied reactions. The Christian Filipinos were certainly excited but the Moros¹ of Mindanao and Sulu were divided. The issue polarized the Moro population into two: those who wanted to remain under American protection, and those who wanted Philippine independence with the rest of the Christian Filipinos.

By and large, the Moro leaders who were in favor of Philippine independence were accused of being “disloyal” to their own people and unsavory statements and personal

attacks were commonly hurled against them. One example was the comment against Lanao Representative Benito:²

If it is true that he is the Sultan of Maguindanao, let him stay in Cotabato because it is the town of the Sultan of Maguindanao. Benito is making his politics here in Lanao because the Filipinos are giving him money...³

On the other hand, statements opposing the inclusion or integration of the Moros with the Christian Filipinos were automatically interpreted as expressions of Moro nationalism.⁴ These “patriotic” statements would fill significant portions of the books of Salah Jubair and Abdulrasad Asani.

Because the term “Moro” is generally applied to the different Moro groups in Mindanao, the author focused on the Maranaos for two practical reasons: First, the author is more familiar with the Maranaos than with any other Moro groups; Second, the available documents are about the views of various Maranao leaders on the issue of independence.

The statements of the Maranao leaders were analyzed in the context of the evolving concepts of nation and nationalism to give new perspective instead of following other authors that simply branded those who resisted the Americans as “patriots” and those who cooperated with them and the Christian Filipinos “unpatriotic.” In this way, this paper hopes to contribute to Mindanao historiography in particular and Philippine history in general.

NATION AND NATIONALISM DEFINED

One needs a deeper comprehension of the concept of nation in order to better understand “love” and “betrayal” of country. Thus, it is imperative to define the term “nation,” which is complex because it can have different meanings, as Carlton Rodee writes, “no one definition will please everybody and many definitions may please only those who write them.”⁵ In this case, this paper, using the perennialist framework,⁶ offers a new definition of nation and nationalism:

1. The nation is a group of people who feel that they belong to one another.
2. Nationalism is an indicator of the feeling of belongingness. The basis of such a feeling is dynamic and evolving, i.e., “belongingness” depends on the stimulus that people feel or experience at different points in their life. For example, at some point, people base their sense of belongingness upon kinship; another, on ethnicity or in their conviction as rational beings.

To put the discussions in context, the aforementioned statements will be the premise in evaluating the traditional socio-political organization of the Maranaos. These will also serve as benchmark for assessing whether those who made the statements opposing or favoring the inclusion of the Moros with the Christian Filipinos in the granting of Philippine independence were patriots or otherwise.

THE TRADITIONAL MARANAO SENSE OF BELONGINGNESS

Cognizant of the Islamic resurgence in the 1960s and the emergence of various Moro liberation movements calling for the unity and nationhood of the 13 Islamized ethno-linguistic groups in the Philippines, the Maranao at present would perhaps consider oneself belonging to the “*Bangsamoro*.” But traditionally, the Maranao would consider himself/herself as “*taga-Taraka*,” “*taga-Ramain*,” “*taga-Balo-i*,” “*taga-Marinaut*,” “*taga-Bayang*,” and so on.

The present Maranao consciousness of identifying with the *Bangsamoro* is relatively a recent development. Historical accounts indicate a rather fragmented and numerous independent groups of Maranaos during the early days of American colonization as reflected in the 1903 Annual Report of the Philippine Commission:

The Maranaos were broken up into small tribes governed by petty chiefs, or dattos, as they were called, more or less jealous of and hostile toward each other.⁷

This nature of the Maranao was again mentioned in the Philippine Commission Report of 1904:

The population was found to be under the government of a multitude of petty dattos, the greatest of whom could scarcely muster 1000 men. Each of them had with his following built a fort, called cotta, of more or less strength, in and around

which he and his followers lived and within which they took refuge when attacked or threatened. All of them indulged for generations, perhaps centuries, in petty feuds and tribal wars each against the other, so that there was no man among them who had any extensive authority or moral force.⁸

Najeeb Saleeby made similar observation:

The Moros are greatly disunited. There is no community of thought or feeling among the Moro districts. Each is inhabited by a different clan and these have never been united... Though it is easy to defeat them in battle, it is a different proposition to occupy their land or colonize their country. The government cannot deal with a mob.⁹

Why did these reports describe the Maranaos as such? Was there no sense of belongingness that revolved around the tribe as a single entity? Where was the traditional Maranao sense of belongingness anchored? These are few of the questions that need elaboration. To answer them, the Maranao concepts of *Pengampong* and *Agama*¹⁰ must be reviewed.

According to Mamitua Saber, the *Pengampong* “refers singly or collectively to the four ‘principalities or states’ into which the Maranaos divide themselves, politically and territorially, within the Lanao region.”¹¹ Although much elucidation is still needed to justify the act of equating the *Pengampong* with the principality or state, Saber offered

no further explanation of his basis in calling the four *Pengampong* as “principalities or states.”¹²

While the preceding statement of Saber is suggestive that the Maranaos are divided into four (4) sovereign political entities (i.e., the four principalities or states), Saber, however, qualifies in another article that it was the *Agama* (local community) that corresponds to the ancient “Greek city-state.”¹³ The concept of the Greek city-state, which possessed territory, government, people, and sovereignty (which are the basic elements of statehood), demonstrated that the *Agama*, apart from being a territorial division within the *Pengampong*, also serves ultimately as the actual political division of Lanao, i.e., the entity that divides the Maranaos into sovereign political units. Hence, the reason why Saber used the terms “territorial and political divisions” in describing the *Pengampong* can now be deduced. It was apparently his way of suggesting that the concept could be viewed under two distinct perspectives: as a territorial or spatial entity and as a complex system made up of independent political entities. Saber, however, did not elaborate on the distinction between the territorial or spatial characteristics of the *Pengampong* and its political nature.

The extensive study of Manuel Tawagon on the *Pengampong* is an enormous help for the readers to see the difference between the territorial or spatial characteristics of the *Pengampong* and its political nature. Tawagon mentioned that “from the *Pengampong* down to the *Agama* are all sultanates, each is independent from one another.”¹⁴ This statement gives the idea that there exist sultanates

that represent the four *Pengampong* (i.e., sultanates that represent the different *suku* or districts, sultanates that represent the various *inged* or townships, and so on). But these sultanates are actually local community (*Agama*) sultanates.¹⁵ Hence, if a sultanate bears the name of a *Pengampong*, it does not necessarily mean that it has political control and jurisdiction over the entire territorial division of that particular *Pengampong*.

The case of Masiu is one example. The Sultanate of Masiu, which bears the name of a *Pengampong*, refers only to the sultanate in the local community (*Agama*) of Masiu in the southeastern portion of Lake Lanao. It does not include the entire regional division of the so-called Masiu *Pengampong*, which consists of several local communities or *Agamas* that are independent sultanates in their own right. This means that the *Pengampong* of Masiu refers to a territorial entity or regional grouping that somewhat resembles the regional divisions of Southeast Asia, Middle East, Latin America, etc. The said regional groupings are obviously territorial or spatial in nature but do not qualify as sovereign political entities. Instead, countries within these regions are the actual sovereign political units. It also means that the Sultanate of Masiu is not the *Pengampong* of Masiu. The former refers to a political entity while the latter refers to a regional or territorial grouping that consists of several political entities.

Tawagon explained this distinction as follows:

The name Masiu implies two things: First, it refers to the name of a *Pengampong*, which comprises most

of the region directly east and west of Lake Lanao. Second, Masiu refers also to the local community (*Agama*) found in the southeastern portion of the lake and lies on the eastern *suku* or district of the Masiu *Pengampong*. This local community is itself a sultanate that is independent from the rest of the other (*Agama*) sultanates of that region but does not exercise political control and jurisdiction over the entire region of the Masiu *Pengampong*.¹⁶

Clearly, the comment above speaks of Masiu as a region (i.e. as a *Pengampong*) and as a political unit (i.e., as an *Agama* sultanate). Hence, Tawagon helps elucidate the distinction between the *Pengampong* (with its *suku*, *inged*, *Agama*, etc.) as a territorial or spatial entity and the *Agama* (local community) as the actual political entity that comprises the *Pengampong*. He further clarified that among the Maranaos, communal solidarity within the *Agama* is given more emphasis because it is “bound by territorial interest and consanguineal bond.”¹⁷ He advanced the idea that “the *Agama* is really the focal point of authority system, the core of Maranao societal organization, and at the same time the decision and policy-making body.”¹⁸ The *Agama* also influenced the Maranao *Maratabat* (pride or self-esteem):

It is required and expected that the individual Maranao in a given community has to protect, defend, and safeguard his *maratabat*—for *maratabat* is linked with one’s *Agama*’s social rank, status, prestige, power, and influence in relation to other individuals or *Agama*.¹⁹

So what is the *Agama*? Why is it important to the traditional Maranaos? To answer these questions, the insider observations of experts on Maranao like Tawagon and Saber are worth-quoting. Tawagon writes, “The *Agama* refers to the local community with a well-defined territory... inhabited by closely related kin groups having a common ancestry... with a mosque as a manifestation of its physical independence from other *Agamas*.... It was headed by the Sultan who serves as the rallying point of unity within the *Agama*.”²⁰

Saber described the *Agama* of the Maranao society as a “society is composed of many small congeneric ‘we-groups’ called *Agama* corresponding to the ancient Greek city-state. Future students of Moro society may clearly visualize the ethnocentrism of the small group by coining from the native term the concept of ‘Agamaism.’”²¹ He adds:

The protective function of kinship is important to a Maranao. His strong attachment to his group of blood-relations makes him a potential enemy to other families and clans. If he happens to be a datu... he is by his role obligated to protect the interest of his group at all cost.²²

Clearly, the two authorities depict the cohesiveness, solidarity, and sense of belongingness in the *Agama*. By using the term “we-group,” Saber in particular, illustrates the fact that within Maranao society, the “sense of being a Maranao” is not attached to the entire tribe but to the “we-group”—the *Agama*. By mentioning kinship, *Agama-Maratabat*, and the sultan’s unifying attribute, the statements above also explained why the *Agama*

possesses such characteristics. Indeed, in the context of a primordialist²³ definition of a nation, the *Agama* meets the criteria.

THE MARANAO *BANGSA*

According to Tawagon, the word *bangsa* (variously spelled as *bang'sa* or *bangensa*) has three meanings among the Maranaos: 1) nation; 2) social rank; and 3) ancestry or genealogical connection with a certain family from a certain place.²⁴ Taking the first meaning as a clue, the traditional Maranaos, contrary to modernist's²⁵ belief, had already an idea of "nation." Considering further the third meaning, it can be assumed that their concept of nation is primordial, i.e., based on kinship. If nation then is defined as a group of people who feel they belong to one another, therefore, the *Agama* is the traditional Maranao *bangsa*.

But the feeling of belongingness, which is one of the most important bases of nationhood, is not fixed or static. Thus, the *bangsa*, as a synonym of nation, must also be an evolving concept. Depending on the historical circumstances that individuals encounter, their feeling of belongingness continuously changes from time to time. It is not exclusively confined within kinship according to Carlton Hayes:

For while man's most striking loyalty has been to the group, he has always been able to detect and in measure to respect a similar human nature in other men. The member of a primitive tribe usually combines with deep devotion to his own 'nation'

a curious interest in, and even admiration of, other tribes, other 'nations,' so that with his own 'nationalism' he joins, perhaps paradoxically, a regard for foreigners.... On occasions he finds it convenient and not at all impossible to favor confederation of his group with others and to expand his 'national' loyalty.²⁶

The preceding comment surely helps us understand better the different reactions of Maranao leaders to the issue of Philippine independence and the integration of Muslims with Christian Filipinos. The remarks of these people in reaction to the granting of Philippine independence were but exemplifications of the observation of Hayes. To know how they became exemplifications, a content analysis of various statements made by the Maranaos is imperative.

EVOLUTION OF THE MARANAO *BANGSA* IN THE STATEMENTS OF MARANAO LEADERS

It was already pointed out that the idea of "nation" is not fixed or static. It is a dynamic concept that evolves from time to time depending on the historical circumstances that it encounters. With this as a premise, the Maranao *bangsa*, as a synonym of nation, must also be an evolving concept.

Apparently, many might perceive the Maranaos today as part of the *Bangsamoro*—a conceptualization of a nation that is composed of the 13 Islamized ethnolinguistic groups of Mindanao, Sulu, and Palawan.²⁷ However, it must be

noted that the conceptualization of the *Bangsamoro* did not happen overnight as it was a product of the lengthy process of history. With this, it can be said that prior to the emergence of the *Bangsamoro* as a concept among the Maranaos, there was a transition period during which the Maranao has begun to gradually subordinate his individualism and started to expand his concept of *bangsa* beyond his own *Agama*. Through content analysis some speeches or messages delivered by various Maranao leaders show the transition in the conceptualization of the *bangsa* among the Maranaos.

In 1903, shortly before the cotta of the *Panondiongan sa Bacolod* was assaulted by the Americans, this great Maranao leader was remembered to have said:

... Panindugun niyo so ingud niyo...na omani isa na ogop sa kaphulindinga ko *maratabat* iyo, so bantogan ago kabunar iyo, na kalaan non so *Agama* niyo....” (Defend your place...your community, and everyone must help to defend your pride, honor and freedom....)²⁸

The preceding remark of the *Panondiongan sa Bacolod* was undoubtedly nationalistic or patriotic. However, it must be noted that such patriotism or nationalism was evinced exclusively for the *Agama* of Bacolod. It was not even intended to ask all Maranaos to resist the Americans for in the first place, the Bacolod people knew that there were Maranaos belonging to other *Agamas* who were cooperative and loyal to the Americans. It is all the more fallacious to assume that the speech was a call for a united resistance

of the 13 Islamized ethnolinguistic groups of Mindanao, Sulu, and Palawan (the Moros/*Bangsamoro*). The purpose of the *Panondiongan* was simply to motivate and appeal to the people in the local community (*Agama*) of Bacolod to fight. Indeed, the statement of the *Panondiongan* was representative of the kind of Maranao nationalism of that period. It was a nationalism exclusively confined within the concept of *Agama* as the Maranao *Bangsa*.

When Philippine independence became the hottest issue in the 1930s, some groups of Moros demonstrated their opposition to the movement. One example was the group of Hadji Bogabong (Kali sa Onayan of Lanao) who petitioned the Governor-General in 1934:

...We all Islams of Lanao want to request His Excellency, the Governor-General that this letter be read at the time of the meeting of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention who will frame the Post of the Philippine Government. This letter is a sincere one from the hearts of the Islams of Lanao... (Underline supplied)

...we want to request that all the land of the Islams unoccupied in the province of Lanao, forest or not forest, be given to us and that we should be given a time of twenty years to apply for them... (Underlines supplied)

... If the Islams (i.e., the Maranaos) before [*sic*] to do what we do not want, we must pray that Lanao should be melted so that we will forever and entirely eradicated.²⁹

It is important to note that the aforementioned appeal did not include the Maguindanao, Tausug, Sama'a, etc. Apparently, the letter was exclusively representing the Maranaos as a distinct group. All of its signatories were Maranaos so that one can sensibly say that the petition did not represent the *Bangsamoro* yet (conceptualized as composed of the 13 Islamized ethnolinguistic groups). Nevertheless, while this letter did not represent the *Bangsamoro*, a turning point in the conceptualization of the Maranao *bangsa* can be concluded from this document, this letter was signed by Maranao leaders who did not only come from Onayan, (the *Agama* of Hadji Bogabong) but also included datus and sultans coming from other *Agamas*.

What makes this document more significant is the fact that the signatories came from both the *Agamas* known to be friendly with and hostile to the Americans at the outset of the latter's occupation of Lanao. The communities of Dansalan, Madaya, Ragain, and Malabang ever since were friendly and cooperative with the Americans while Bayang, Taraka, Masiu, and Bacolod were once known as recalcitrant *Agamas* or communities. Since all of these communities were represented in the letter, it is, therefore, logical to assume that the Maranaos by this period had begun to forget their differences in the past and were more eager to unite as a tribe.

In 1935, Hadji Bogabong sent another letter. This time, it was addressed to the president of the United States of America. It was not only about the Maranaos but about the Moros of Mindanao and Sulu. An excerpt of his letter reads:

...we want to tell you that the Philippines ... are populated by two different people with different religion, practices, and traditions. The Christian Filipinos occupy the Islands of Luzon and the Visayas. The Moros predominated in the islands of Mindanao and Sulu...

...because we are yet weak to depend [*sic*] our rights as an independent nation... because we are a small nation, unlike other big independent nation. It is not proper and fitting that a small, weak and poor nation should an [*sic*] independent from a benevolent powerful nation...

The Moros (Islam) of Mindanao and Sulu can be compared to a small child lost in the thick forest who does not know where to go.... It is not legally right that parents should abandon their child when the child can't yet live out in this cold and cruel world... we are like a calf who once abandon its mother [*sic*] would be devoured by a merciless lion. Should the American people grant the Philippines an independent, [*sic*] the islands of Mindanao and Sulu should not be included....³⁰

In the letter, Hadji Bogabong acknowledged two groups of people—the Moros of Mindanao and Sulu, and the Christians in the Visayas and in Luzon—as two distinct nations. He used the term “nation” and regarded the first as a “small, weak and poor nation.” Unlike his previous letter, Hadji Bogabong, included the rest of the Moro groups in his request to remain under

American protection. This reflects that Hadji Bogabong had begun to transcend the Maranao's individualism and tribalism. By naming two distinct groups of inhabitants in the Philippines (namely Moros and Christians) and by identifying his tribe with the second group, this Maranao leader manifested his broadening concept of *bangsa* from the traditional *Agama*, to the tribe, and perhaps to what we now call the *Bangsamoro*.

Other groups, however, had a different perspective on the issue of independence as reflected in their petitions. For example, Datu Auraya Dianalan and his group writes:

We are not like carabaos that Americans pull to one side and Christian Filipino to another. We have proper convictions and we do not [*sic*] the dismemberment of our country and the separation of our territory from that of our Christian brothers.³¹

Datu Ibra, Lanao delegate to the House of Representatives, shared the same sentiments with Datu Dianalan in his 30-minute privilege speech. An excerpt of his speech reads:

After all, the inhabitants of Mindanao and Sulu and the inhabitants of Luzon and Visayas are brothers in fact. We are of the same race and there runs in our veins the same blood. We inhabit a group of islands, which Providence has given us. We must live not only as friendly neighbors but as brothers in fact. A nation is like a human body. To be healthy, all its parts must be healthy. A man cannot be said to

be healthy because his arms are strong provided his feet are weak... A beautiful Manila does not make a beautiful Philippines, and so we ask you to pay more serious attention to the problems of the south, which in progress is far behind the north.³²

An hasty generalization may mislead many people to brand Datu Dianalan and Datu Ibra as *makatipo*.³³ However, a deeper analysis of their statements reveal their broadening concept of the *bangsa* by considering the Moros in general and Maranaos in particular as members of the bigger *bangsa* Filipino. They were examples of Maranao leaders who ceased to conceive their *bangsa* as confined within the Maranao *Agama* (local community). They envisioned nationalism as one that transcended the tribe and even religion, a modern type of nationalism that is anchored on the modern concept of Filipino nationhood.³⁴

If Datu Dianalan and Datu Ibra conceptualized their *bangsa* as transcending the *Agama*, the tribe, and religion, other leaders went beyond race as they preferred to be under American rule. According to Hadji Abdullah of Marawi:

We, the undersigned datu in favor of late Amai Manabilang, who had been the foremost Americanista party for many years and until his death, respectfully send this communication to his excellency, the President of the United States of America, to request that the American people must not give us to any other race except the American people.³⁵

Datu Dimaampao Dangcal of Dansalan expressed the same sentiments:

We would like to be under the American rule forever. We do not want independence... We have found out that American[s] as a people are kind, honest, and just.³⁶

The letters of Maranao leaders, Datu Dimaampao, Hadji Abdullah, and Hadji Bogabong have points of comparison and contrast. They wanted to remain under American protection. However, Hadji Bogabong only wanted temporary American protection as implied by his comparison of the Moros to a calf or a child who is not yet prepared to live independently; that they would be given independence after being prepared for self-government.

Datu Dimaampao and Hadji Abdullah, on the contrary, revealed their desire for a permanent American protection. They expressed that the Moros should not be given to other people except to the Americans and that they wanted to be under American rule “forever.”³⁷ They manifested their expanding concept of *bangsa*—a *bangsa* that was conceived beyond the *Agama*, the tribe, religion, and even race. Just like the nationalism of Datus Ibra and Dianalan, Dimaampao’s and Hadji Abdullah’s nationalism was a product of their conviction.

If only historical circumstances favored such a conviction (e.g., if the Bacon Bill of 1926 was only approved) then Mindanao and Sulu would have been the 50th state of the United States of America instead

of Hawaii,³⁸ and the Moros of today would have been American nationals.

CONCLUSION

The Commonwealth era was certainly a period of change. In the case of the Maranaos, change was reflected in their feeling of belongingness. Prior to the coming of the Western colonizers, Maranao loyalty and belongingness was parochially confined within the *Agama*. But with the inauguration of the Philippine Commonwealth, it evolved and transcended the local community.

The statements of various Maranao datos and leaders reflected the evolution of the Maranao sense of belongingness. The statement of the *Panondiongan sa Bacolod* in 1903 was representative of the traditional kind of Maranao nationalism that was attached to kinship and confined within the *Agama*. The petition of Hadji Bogabong in 1934 manifested the idea that the Maranaos considered themselves distinct from the other Islamized tribes and that they could unite as a tribe in spite of their differences. His letter in 1935, however, reflected a turning point in Maranao sense of belongingness, that it transcended the tribe. Through religion as the common denominator, the concept of *bangsa* included other Islamized tribes of Mindanao and Sulu.

But there are Maranaos, too, whose conceptualization of their nation transcended even religion and race. Datu Dianalan and Datu Ibra regarded the Moros in general and Maranaos in particular as members of the bigger *bangsa*

Filipino. Hadji Abdullah and Datu Dimaampao looked into the Maranao *bangsa* under a permanent American protection. These feelings of belongingness were products of their convictions as rational beings so that we can logically say their nationalism was anchored on the modern concept of nationhood.

Rather than look at the Commonwealth era as a period of “betrayal,” an episode of “disloyalty,” and a moment where people could blame other people, it is perhaps more appropriate to view it in the context of the Maranao *bangsa* as an evolving concept.

NOTES

- ¹ In this paper, the term Moro is used to refer to the Islamized natives of Mindanao, Sulu, and Palawan. It should not be confused with the term *Bangsamoro*, which is a conceptualization of a nation composed of the 13 Islamized ethnolinguistic groups.
- ² While his name sounds Hispanic, Benito was a descendant of a Maranao and Maguindanao royal marriage. Though he was raised as a Maranao, he was, nevertheless, entitled to the Maguindanao sultanate.
- ³ Letter of Lawi Usongan to Governor-General L. Wood and Carmi Thompson, 6 September 1926. Box 28–31, Hayden Papers. Copy at MSRC, MSU Marawi City.
- ⁴ These include statements prepared by Americans like the June 9, 1921 petition from Sulu, which requested absolute separation of the said archipelago from the Philippine Islands and its permanent annexation to the United States. Though the document is an impressive one, it was questioned because aside

from the fact that it was prepared by the Americans whose names and signatures were the first to appear in the document, many of the Moros signed it with their thumb marks. It is, therefore, assumed that those who supported the petition were unable to write and presumably unable to read. Thus, there is basis to doubt as to whether or not the Moros were correctly informed with regards to the contents of the paper. See W. Cameron Forbes. *The Philippine Islands* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1928), 47.

- 5 Carlton Rodee, et al. *Introduction to Political Science*, 4th ed. (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1983), 20.
- 6 This school of thought advances that the phenomena of nations and nationalism are perennial, i.e., ever-present in the history of mankind. Perennialists believe that the political entities and the ideas or sentiments called by the modernists as nations and nationalism, respectively, of the modern world are simply larger and more effective versions of similar units and sentiments traceable in the much earlier periods of human history. See Anthony D. Smith. *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates About Ethnicity and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 2000), 11–12.
- 7 *Philippine Commission Report, 1903*, Part I. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), 7. Henceforth, the Philippine Commission Reports will be cited as PCR followed by the year of report in parenthesis.
- 8 *PCR (1904)*, Part I, 8.
- 9 Najeeb Saleeby quoted in Mamitua Saber. *Marginal Leadership Mindanao Journal* Vol. XVIII, Nos. 1–2 (July–October 1991), 115.
- 10 In Maranao, the term *Agama* has two meanings: religion and local community. In this paper, the second meaning is employed.
- 11 These four principalities, locally known as *Pat a Pengampong ko Ranao*, are composed of Bayabao, Masiu, Unayan, and Baloi. Except for Baloi, each of the other three *Pengampong* is territorially

divided into *suku* or district: with Bayabao being divided into Poona Bayabao, Lumba Bayabao, and Mala a Bayabao districts; Masiu into East and West Masiu; and West and East Unayan. Each of these districts is subdivided into different *inged* or townships, with each *inged* being subdivided into several hundred *Agama* or communities. Each of these *Agamas* is further subdivided into *bangon*, which is composed of 2 to 5 families, and each *bangon* is further divided into *isa-ka-igaan*, which literally means “one sleeping place.” See Mamitua Saber and Abdullah T. Madale, ed., “Pengampong: An Ancient Confederation,” *The Maranao* (Manila: R.P. Garcia Publishing House, 1975), 71–73.

- 12 Instead of using the terms “principalities or states,” Intuas Abdullah described the *Pengampong* as “‘nation-state’ comparable in authority to modern political organizations.” But just like Saber, Abdullah did not elaborate as to how the four *Pengampong* met the requirements of being “nation-states.” See Intuas M. Abdullah, “Dispute Settlement Among Meranaos: Case Studies of Conflict Resolutions in Marawi” (master’s thesis, University of the Philippines, November 1982), 46. Aware that each *Pengampong* hardly constitutes a single political entity, Melvin Mednick did not use the terms “principalities,” “states” and all the more “nation-states” in referring to the four *Pengampong*. He used instead the term “Encampments of the Lake.” See Melvin Mednick, “Encampments of the Lake: The Social Organization of a Moslem-Philippine (Moro) People” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, September 1965), 44.
- 13 Mamitua Saber, 14.
- 14 Manuel R. Tawagon, “The Pengampong: A Historical Study of the Multiple Sultanates of Lanao” (research funded by the Toyota Foundation in August 1987), 44.
- 15 In relation to this, Tawagon explains a Maranao idea which he calls the “Triple One” concept. This concept refers to the principle of one *Agama*, one Datu, one Mosque. *Agama* refers to the local community, which always stands for a sultanate while the datu refers to the leader of the community, which specifically refers

to the sultan. The Mosque does not only refer to the centralized place of worship where the faithful congregate five times a day but also symbolizes the sultan's centralized power and authority over the people he both rules and serves. In effect, the mosque serves as a manifestation of an *Agama's* physical independence as a sultanate. Hence, Tawagon helps elucidate the fact that the *Pengampong* is but a regional grouping while the *Agamas* serve as the sovereign political entities that comprise the said regional grouping. See *Ibid.*, 130–131.

- 16 Interview with Prof. Manuel R. Tawagon on August 14, 2004 in his residence at Tipanoy, Iligan City.
- 17 Tawagon, 108.
- 18 *Ibid.*, 101. In relation to this, Charles Warriner said that the *Agama* has a set of offices through which occupants of the said offices act in facilitation of decision, and other established procedures for decision-making and action-taking. See Charles K. Warriner, "Traditional Authority and the Modern State: The Case of the Maranao of the Philippines (There are no Bangsa in the Barrio)," *Philippine Sociological Review* (July–October 1964), 174.
- 19 *Ibid.*
- 20 *Ibid.*, 99–105.
- 21 Saber, 14–15.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 113.
- 23 Primordialism is another school of thought which argues that human associations based on kinship are the primordial i.e., early form of nations.
- 24 Tawagon, 93
- 25 Modernism is a school of thought which argues that nations and nationalism are purely modern phenomena.

- 26 Carlton Hayes, *Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1931), 2.
- 27 Federico V. Magdalena, "Ethnicity, Identity and Conflict: The Case of the Philippine Moros Social and Cultural Studies" *Institute of Southeast Asian Studies* (No. 1, April 1996): 35.
- 28 Sulutan Sarip cited in Ashary M. Alauya and Casmin B. Alauya, "Panondiongan sa Bacolod: Great Hero of the Battle of Bacolod Grande" (paper presented during the Conference on the Centenaries of Mindanao Battles/Military Encounters, Bacolod Grande, Calahui, Taraka, Cotabato and Surigao, 1903–2003, Mini-Theatre, Mindanao State University–Iligan Institute of Technology, Iligan City, April 9–10, 2003), 23.
- 29 Letter of Hadji Bogabong et al. to the Governor-General of the Philippine Islands dated July 13, 1934. Box 28–11, R.J. Hayden Papers. Copy at MSRC, MSU Marawi City.
- 30 Letter petition of the Datus, Hadjis, Imams and Kalis of Lanao to the President of the United States of America dated March 18, 1935. Copy at Peter Gowing Memorial Center, Dansalan College, Marawi City.
- 31 Auraya Dianalan, Ibra and Other Lanao Datus. "We have our convictions, Datu claims," *Tribune*, 22 August 1926. Box 28–34, Hayden Papers. Copy at MSRC, MSU, Marawi City.
- 32 "Datu Ibra Makes Plea for Mindanao in Maiden Speech," *Herald*, 4 August 1931. Box 28–34, Hayden Papers. Copy at MSRC, MSU, Marawi City.
- 33 This is the Maranao term for collaborator.
- 34 A conceptualization of "nation" composed of all the inhabitants of the Philippine islands regardless of religion, customs and tradition, dialects, etc.
- 35 Letter of Hadji Abdullah of Marawi to the President of the United States of America dated May 16, 1934. Copy at MSRC, MSU Marawi City.

- 36 Letter of Datu Dimaampao Dangcal of Dansalan to Governor-General Frank Murphy dated May 15 1934. Box 28-11, Hayden Papers. Copy at MSRC, MSU Marawi City.
- 37 Knowing the traditional socio-political organization of the Maranaos, Hadji Abdullah must have thought that only the Americans could provide the Moros an impartial and disinterested leadership. Thus, one possible interpretation of this statement is that Hadji Abdullah did not even want the Moros to govern themselves.
- 38 Magdalena, 17-18. The Bacon Bill of 1926 if only approved would have provided for the permanent annexation of Mindanao and Sulu to the United States of America. Had this proposal been realized, Mindanao and Sulu would have been the 50th state of the U.S. in 1926 rather than Hawaii, which entered the union only on August 21, 1959. See also Gowing for details of the bill. 250-251

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- Auraya Dianalan, Ibra, and other Lanao Datus. "We have our convictions, Datu claims," *Tribune*, 22 August 1926. Box 28-34, Hayden Papers. Copy at MSRC, MSU, Marawi City.
- "Datu Ibra Makes Plea for Mindanao in Maiden Speech," *Herald*, 4 August 1931. Box 28-34, Hayden Papers. Copy at MSRC, MSU, Marawi City.
- Letter of Datu Dimaampao Dangcal of Dansalan to Governor-General Frank Murphy, 15 May 1934. Box 28-11, Hayden Papers. Copy at MSRC, MSU, Marawi City.
- Letter of Hadji Abdullah of Marawi to the President of the United States of America, 16 May 1934. Copy at MSRC, MSU, Marawi City.

Letter of Hadji Bogabong et al. to the Governor-General of the Philippine Islands, 13 July 1934. Box 28–11, Hayden Papers. Copy at MSRC, MSU, Marawi City.

Letter of Lawi Usongan to Governor-General L. Wood and Carmi Thompson, 6 September 1926. Box 28–31, Hayden Papers. Copy at MSRC, MSU, Marawi City.

Letter petition of the Datus, Hadjis, Imams, and Kalis of Lanao to the President of the United States of America, 18 March 1935. Copy at the Peter Gowing Memorial Research Center, Dansalan College, Marawi City.

Philippine Commission Report, 1903, Part I. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Philippine Commission Report, 1904, Part I. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Books and Articles

Abdullah, Intuas M. “Dispute Settlement Among Meranaos: Case Studies of Conflict Resolutions in Marawi,” Master’s thesis, University of the Philippines, November 1982.

Alauya, Ashary M. and Casmin B. Alauya. “Panondiongan sa Bacolod: Great Hero of the Battle of Bacolod Grande.” Paper presented at the Conference on the Centenaries of Mindanao Battles/Military Encounters, Bacolod Grande, Calahui, Taraka, Cotabato and Surigao, 1903–2003, Mini-Theatre, Mindanao State University–Iligan Institute of Technology, Iligan City, 9–10 April 2003.

Forbes, W. Cameron. *The Philippine Islands*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1928.

Gowing, Peter G. *Mandate in Moroland: The American Government of Muslim Filipinos, 1899–1920*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1983.

- Hayes, Carlton. *Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1931.
- Magdalena, Federico V. "Ethnicity, Identity and Conflict: The Case of the Philippine Moros Social and Cultural Studies." *Institute of Southeast Asian Studies*, No. 1 April 1996.
- Mednick, Melvin. "Encampments of the Lake: The Social Organization of a Moslem-Philippine (Moro) People." PhD diss., University of Chicago, September 1965.
- Rodee, Carlton et al. *Introduction to Political Science*. 4th ed. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1983.
- Saber, Mamitua. "Marginal Leadership," *Mindanao Journal*, XVIII, Nos. 1-2 (July–October 1991).
- Saber, Mamitua and Abdullah T. Madale, ed. "Pengampong: An Ancient Confederation." In *The Maranao*. Manila: R.P. Garcia Publishing House, 1975.
- Smith, Anthony D. *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates About Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 2000.
- Tawagon, Manuel R. "The Pengampong: A Historical Study of the Multiple Sultanates of Lanao." Research funded by the Toyota Foundation, August 1987.
- Warriner, Charles K. "Traditional Authority and the Modern State: The Case of the Maranao of the Philippines (There are no Bangsa in the Barrio)," *Philippine Sociological Review* (July–October 1964).