

**BEYOND THE NATION AND THE DAERAH:
PAN-MALAYSIANISM AND AHMED IBN PARFAHN'S
MALAYAN GRANDEUR AND OUR INTELLECTUAL
REVOLUTION**

ZEUS A. SALAZAR
Department of History
College of Social Sciences and Philosophy
University of the Philippines

INTRODUCTION

The *daerah* as historical and socio-cultural domain (or field) of study) falls within the purview of local history and related historical concerns as they intimately relate to national history. Among these concerns are administrative—institutional history, “interfacial” history, regional history, ethnic history, ethnohistory and geohistory (or historical geography). Except perhaps for the last two, all these forms of local history are closely intertwined with or implicitly based upon the general outlines of national history, at least in the Philippines and probably in other Third World countries still in the process of historical self-definition and self-determination in the sciences.¹ Beyond the nation and these various infra-national levels of historical and anthropo-sociological inquiry, however, there exist broader “regional units” of investigation, such as, for instance, “Southeast Asia,” “the Pacific basin” (or “lake”) and even “the Malay World.”

Quite naturally, these supra-national units of study receive different treatments from essentially different practitioners of the art — i.e., the extra-regional and the “native” or intra-regional. To my knowledge, the latter have expended precious little effort in this field. This is largely due to two factors: 1) the various areas have been, in the main, creations of extra-regional investigators who consequently have developed primary and well-ensconced interests and traditions in the “specialty;” and 2) the native scholars and amateurs till now have been totally immersed in the study and elaboration of national history to pay any but desultory attention to supra-national research concerns. The little that has been done rests fundamentally upon nation-oriented criteria, even when universal themes are taken up. In the final analysis, this is, of course, equally true of the work being done by extra-regional investiga-

tors. The matter constitutes, in fact, an entire problem complex in terms of methodology and epistemology.² Nonetheless, the study of or just simple interest in supra-national units of study remains, at bottom, a nationalist preoccupation for local social scientists and interested amateurs. In this regard, Ahmed Ibn Parfahn and his improbable book entitled *Malayan Grandeur and Our Intellectual Revolution* constitute an example of rather uncanny familiarity in terms of recent fascist ideology.³ Aside from finding confirmation in "historical facts" for his basically racist view, however, Ibn Parfahn also carries to their extreme limits at least two lines of Filipino historiographic thought which had first found expression among the nationalist intellectuals around Rizal in the nineteenth century – i.e., the pan-Malayan connection and the tripartite view of Philippine historical development. The book is at the same time a reaction to generally Eurocentric views (specifically, the white or "Aryan" - centered one) of universal history. All this becomes clear from an analysis of Ibn Parfahn's "philosophy of history" and its ideological sources. But first the author and his book must be presented.

The Book and its Author

The University of the Philippines Main Library, the most extensive in Southeast Asia, has only one copy of Ibn Parfahn's book, apparently corrected and offered to the library by the author himself. The 281-page work was published in two installments, the first one being printed through the help of a loyal friend in Cotabato City in 1957, the other in Davao City ten years later. Both cities are situated in the problem island of Mindanao, and at least, at the time Parfahn's opus appeared, were predominantly Muslim, with strong immigrant Christian and Chinese population.

Purporting to be a contribution to what the author calls an "Intellectual Revolution," characterized by a "fourth dimensional warfare" for "truth freedom," which he thinks will follow the present Economic Revolution resulting from the Revolution of 1898, the book is provided with an "Introductory Message" supposedly signed in 1961 by Carlos P. Garcia, then President of the Philippines. The "message" was probably fabricated by Ibn Parfahn himself. In any case, its style and thesis correspond exactly to those of Parfahn. Thus, President Garcia also believes that

The Filipino can best be understood not as a product of western influences but as he originally was: part and parcel of the mighty Malay race which is supposed to be the parent stock of the human species. The study of Malay peoples, of which the Filipinos are a part, shows that their ancestors . . . laid the basic foundation of what we now call civilization.

Furthermore, President Garcia is made to take pride in emphasizing that it was only from the 16th century on that "the East was placed at a disadvantage as it groped beneath the twin incubi of vassaldom and ignorance." He thus recommends "Malayology" as the "field of inquiry (which) will . . . lead to the redemption of our lost glory and grandeur" (p. 2). It is possible that it was for Parfahn's misuse of the President's name that his book, according to the author himself, had to be "defended in the Cotabato courts."

I have not succeeded in obtaining information on Parfahn other than what he himself offers in his book. Parfahn considers himself a "Malayologist," Malayology being for him the "science of the little brown Malay peoples so rich, so profound and so ancient, but had been neglected, foresworn and scorned," in the same manner that Sinology is the "study of the Chinese people and things Chinese," Egyptology "the study of the Egyptian people and things Egyptian," etc. It is not certain if Ahmed Ibn Parfahn is in fact his real name, nor is it sure that he is indeed a Muslim, although he considers the Jews as "an uncouth mass of ignorant people" who "stemmed from the Arabian desert," were expelled from Egypt "through perhaps a violation of the laws of the Pharaoh or the rape of Egyptian girls" (p. 86) and may be called "weaklings of humanity," "poor in mind but still poorer in bodies" and "well known trouble makers," known in Spain as "Maranos or pigs" (p. 105). Only one of the friends he mentions appears to have a Muslim name: Atty. Guinaid Guiani, the legal counsel who defended *Malayan Grandeur* in the Cotabato courts. However, Parfahn claims that his father had Muslim ancestors, "the small and dark Moors of Spain who ruled the Spaniards for 800 years," and had gotten his name from the Solimans of Manila; and that his grandmother was a Dravidian, "fair flower of pre-Aryan India." But then again, Parfahn adores Malay-Asya, the "brown goddess" for whom he labored all his life "that I may lay at her feet this humble historical garland perfumed in every leaf and petal with her past greatness and grandeur" (p. 6).

Parfahn probably worked as a teacher in the Cotabato High School, whose principal "made the initial steps in the printing of the first half of the book." In any case it was in Cotabato that his interest in Malay civilization was "ignited and reignited . . . when enthusiasm . . . glowed low and dying" by Atty. Arturo Fernando, an employee at the provincial library. He became so enamored of the Malays that he organized a Pan-Malayan Club in the Mindanao Institute of Technology, where he also probably taught. His relatively good English and demonstrably extensive if undigested readings would classify him as an educated man, at least in the Philippine context. In history, however, he is a thorough amateur. Furthermore, some off-tangent remarks on his part tend to cast some doubt on his absolute possession of normal mental powers.

He was, nonetheless, able to have the early results of his research efforts published in the *Philippines Free Press*, a very prestigious political and literary weekly before Martial Law, and in the *Evening News Saturday Magazine*. In "The Malays," he considered the Malays and the Incas as Malayan, together with the Malays of the East, like the Filipinos and Asoka the Great of India. He shared with his readers the "astonishing fact" that

. . . in Malay society whether in the Americas or in the Malay East (there) was . . . absence of beggary, which in Europe as in all Christian countries are flagrant. Among the Incas of Peru, historians found a superior legislation that punished the governors if a man got hungry. How badly our modern democratic institutions fare in comparison in this regard! The ancient Malays in Peru did not have the much vaunted freedom of speech and freedom of the press: but they had the freedom to live. Every man had land to till. And because wealth belonged to the state, men did not struggle to be wealthy . . . The struggle was man against famine and earthquakes and such natural catastrophes, not man against man.⁴

This was in 1952, when in "Sex Gangsterism," Parfahn also defended the thesis that all the ills of Philippine society came from Spain, repeating the same rhetorical question asked of his own countrymen by Dr. Jose P. Laurel, president of the Japanese-sponsored Philippine Republic and respected senior statesman:

Have our contact with other peoples and the propensity we seem to have developed for imitating indiscriminately the ways of others — have these undermined and replaced with vice and weakness the sterling qualities of our forefathers?⁵

For Parfahn, these sterling qualities were particularly evident among the Filipino women of yore, who were

. . . continent and pure . . . the married (having) but one husband while the men were brave and honorable.

In one town called Dumagas there were found 1500 children, none of whom could be called illegitimate.⁶

In the same year of 1952, Parfahn put forward the thesis later popularized by Professor Cesar Majul, the eminent Filipino Muslim scholar, about Moro piracy which, in Parfahn's view, really began with Rajah Lapulapu, the conqueror of Magellan. It was Lapulapu

. . . who heard from Enrique de Malacca how Magellan plundered the natives of the Marianas Islands for food. He was convinced that these were a lowly people from Europe. His defiance to Spain was the start of the Moro piracy which lasted for centuries.

The difference between the European piracies and the Moro piracies is that while the first was (*sic*) motivated by plunder in gold, the second was (*sic*) motivated by resistance to foreign aggression and colonialism.

While European pirates carried gold and silver in the holds for their ships, Moro pirates carried Spanish Christians — all colonizers. After the collapse of Cebu and the invasion of Manila by Legazpi, in 1565 the capital of the resistance movement was transferred to Jolo. From there the Moslem Rajas issued orders and decrees, signed peace and declared wars. Mohammad Jamalul Abirin, the present Sultan, descended (*sic*) from an unbroken lineage of five centuries antedating even the Bourbon dynasty of Europe.⁷

Some of the major themes of his *Malayan Grandeur* were thus already quite clear to Parfahn in 1952. He doubtless discussed them with his students in the Pan-Malayan Club which subsequently "was guillotined so cruelly in its infancy."⁸ Two years after the publication of the first installment of *Malayan Grandeur*, Parfahn proposed that the Philippines be renamed Tanah Manile, its supposed ancient designation, or even Rizalinas, after Rizal. The country, after all, was not only "one of the oldest haunts of man" but likewise "the center of a great sea-faring activity between Africa on the Indian Ocean . . . and Peru on the west coast of America . . . and along the tropical belt 30 degrees latitude each from the Meridian." Furthermore, the "Manila seafarers" had made "long voyages across the expanse of the Pacific,

peopling the different islands and imparting their lingua franca, 15% of which is even now spoken by the Pimas Indians of California.”⁹

All these themes Parfahn would integrate with many others to elaborate his historical view of the Malays and their role in the civilization of mankind. The view assumes the primacy of the “brunet race” (composed of the Malays and related peoples), over the white Nordics, the yellow Mongolians (including the Chinese) and the Negroes; it thus constitutes the probably early elements of an Asian pendant to the Aryan myth.

The Malays in History

Whatever his inadequacies in terms of scholarship, Parfahn’s understanding of the Malays and their history constitutes a philosophy of history of the so-called speculative kind. It is, however, deeply rooted in his preoccupation with the course of his own country’s history, so that the Filipinos and Malays appear in his mind (and, of course, in *Malayan Grandeur*) to be practically identical — at least with regard to the pattern of their common history. At the same time because of the importance of the Malays as a civilizing force among the races, their history is nothing less than universal.

The universality of Malayan history is, in fact, a function of Parfahn’s understanding of “malayness.” For him the ethnico-racial category of Malays is rather vast, if not all-encompassing. Aside from the ethnic Malays and the Filipinos, it includes an entire array of peoples across the equatorial belt, from Ireland through the Mediterranean basin, the Middle East and India to Southeast Asia and beyond the Pacific to Central America and Peru.

What unifies the peoples of this immense territory is their constituting what Parfahn considers “the brunet race” or simply “Malay.” This idea appears to derive from his own particular interpretation of an assertion by H.G. Wells in the *Outline of History*, which he quotes thus:

. . . At some period in human history, there seems to have been a special type of Neolithic culture widely distributed in the world which had

a group of features so common and so unlikely to have been developed independently in different regions of the earth as to compel us to believe that it was in effect one culture. It reached through all the regions inhabited by the brunette Mediterranean race and beyond through India, farther India, up the Pacific coast of China and it spread at last across the Pacific and to Mexico and Peru. It was a coastal culture and reaching deeply inland. This peculiar development of the Neolithic culture which Smith called Heliolithic culture included many or all the following practices: circumcision, couvade, mummifying, megalithic monuments, sun and serpent symbols and the swastika for good luck Smith traces these associated practices in a sort of constellation all over the great Mediterranean-Indian Ocean-Pacific area. Where one occurs, most of the others occur. They link Brittany (France) with Borneo and Peru. But this constellation does not crop up in the primitive homes of the Nordic or Mongolian people, nor does it extend south and much beyond equatorial Africa For thousands of years from 15,000 to 1,000 B.C. such a heliolithic-neolithic culture and its brown possessors may have been oosing around the world drifting by canoes over wide stretches of seas. It was then the highest culture in the world; it sustained then the largest and most highly developed communities¹⁰

Parfahn reproduces in *Malayan Grandeur* H.G. Wells' map showing the spread of these "Brunet Peoples with Heliolithic Culture." However, he entitles it "The Malays (A Brunette People with Heliolithic Culture) and their Relations." For Wells, these "relations" apparently included the Welsh, the Iberians, the Mediterranean peoples, the Egyptians, the Semites, the Sumerians, the Dravidians, the Indonesians, the Polynesians, the Melanesians and, probably, the Peruvians. Parfahn's comment on the map identifies all the brunet peoples as Malays and gives the gist of his thesis:

Long before the descent of the Nordics and Mongols from their northern abodes, the Malay peoples occupied China, India, the Canaan area, the Balkans, the Spanish Peninsula and England. They built Egypt's first pyramids, India's first cities (p. 4)

Upon this basic pattern he then weaves the tapestry of his Malayan history, which of course carries as its central design the more familiar problem complex of the Malay-Polynesian (Austronesian) migrations.

The linkage with the Austronesians seems to have occurred to Parfahn from his reading of J.G. Forlong, a major-general enamored of the Malays, who in his *Studies in the Science of Comparative Religions in Asia* had asserted, as quoted by Parfahn, that the Malays were

... by far the most important race not only in the Indian Seas but from Africa to Polynesia. From unknown times they have been enterprising seafarers and colonizers in most eastern parts and coasts. They have thronged East Africa above a thousand years and have even a colony at the Cape of Good Hope. They traded everywhere throughout Madagascar Their ancient history and general character partake of the Pelasgians and Leleges They carried on a lucrative coastline trade from the delta of the Indus into all the ports of the Persian or Eruthian seas . . . ; and it was their mariners who enabled the great army of the Greeks to embark on the Indus and to sail therefrom They evidently long traded with and settled in New Zealand, Australia, and farther Polynesia where their language is recognized as Malay-Polynesian. Ptolemy noticed them in 30 to 40 A.D. as Te Malas which as they traded in tin give them among ignorant sailors in later times the sobriquet of Ten Malas

Parfahn identifies Forlong's Pelasgians and Leleges as "little brown Asians who first inhabited Rome, Greece and all the Balkan area before the coming of the savage Alpines and Nordics" (p. 176 and n. 1). Furthermore, it was also clear to him that it was "this great Indonesian race of little brown Malays" which

... since Neolithic times roved Europe, Africa and Asia, began the civilization of Egypt as under the Pyramid Pharaohs 4,000 B.C., the great Sumerian culture of the Tigris-Euphrates confluence 6,000 B.C., the advance civilizations of the Indus and the Yangtze of pre-Aryan India and pre-Mongol China respectively, and finally the Americas where a distinctly Malay culture had been flourishing for over twelve thousand years before the coming of the white men (p. 175)

Parfahn also felt himself supported on the anthropological side by the Italian anthropologist Sergi, whom he cites from Elliot Smith's *Human History* concerning the "Mediterranean race" thus:

People of this type agree in the main with the original population found around the whole littoral of the Mediterranean, and preserved today in great purity in islands such as Corsica and Sardinia, and also in the southern Italy and in fact the greater part of the Mediterranean coasts. This race occupied not only the shores of the Mediterranean both North and South and the Levant, but also northern and eastern Africa and western Europe including the British Isles. This race extended right up the Nile Valley through Arabia, India, Indo-China to the Malay archipelago of the East The Mediterranean race is fair skinned but definitely swarthier than the Nordics and the Alpines. Their skin color is olive-brown. Eyes - dark with black irises. Stature, the average of mankind. They show a surprising uniformity of stature in whatever country they may be living (p. 230)

Parfahn's thesis on the Mediterranean or Malay race is more asserted than argued, repetitively and disjointedly, through the nine chapters of *Malay Grandeur*, but its main lines are clear enough. In the first chapter, the author attempts to show that the Malays "preceded the White Man on the road to culture." Adam and Eve belonged, of course, to the brown race, since it was in Java that mankind began with the *Pithecanthropus erectus*. Then came the Neolithic Period, when the brown peoples continued to predominate, their stone tools being dug out by archaeologists "in pre-Mongolian China, in the pre-Caucasian India, Europe and the Middle East" and their megalithic monuments "still to be found in greatest profusion in Brittany (Western France), England, Morocco, Algiers, Spain, the Balkans, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Palestine, India, China, Indonesia and across the Pacific to Hawaii." Soon thereafter, "these little brown Asians" began to build cities, while

. . . the Mongols of the North were homeless nomads and white Europeans (pottery being unknown to them) were cooking their meat in animal-skins by the "hot-stones-immersed-in-water method" as their container could not withstand fire. Their caves and "kurgans" . . . can still be seen in the regions of the northern Danube to remind us of their very late awakening when the little brown Asians had well passed their Neolithic periods and were already in their Bronze Age.

Among the civilizations considered by Parfahn to have been founded by the Malays, only Mohenjo-Daro is treated in detail in Chapter One. It is here that "Malay India" shows "cultural evidences that neither the yellow Mongols of China nor the white men of Europe possess." In any case, the Malays were already there before the Caucasians irrupted into India in 1500 B.C., in the same manner that China was already in Malayan possession since neolithic times before the yellow Mongols came down from the steppes. Elsewhere, as a matter of fact, Parfahn agrees with a certain Hertz who "classified the white race as belonging to the Yellow with the Mongols" (*sic*), the Europeans being in the final analysis of the same color with the Chinese." (p. 237)

Whatever the case, it was not the Chinese but the native Houche, according to Edward Williams in *China Yesterday and Today*, who ruled China during its "most important formative period which gave the world Lao Tzu, Confucius, Mencius, etc. . .

(and during which its) social, political and economic institutions . . . had been fixed." Then the "terrible Chin Dynasty" of the "first yellow emperor" Huang Ti caused the Miao, the Mon Khmers, Shans, Karens (all little brown people) to flee to southern Asia (p. 34). As a matter of fact, Parfahn maintains that

. . . The Tagalogs (most prominent Filipino tribe) appear to have lived before in China, somewhere in Kwang-tung and Fukien provinces. The Hakkas people (not Chinese), speaking a language with Tagalog affinities, still live and multiply themselves there. They are known by their Malay features and customs. The women do not bind the feet as Chinese women. The Hakkas children play kites like Tagalog children, spin tops and fish in ponds using tuba as fish poison known and used in the Philippines. The Hakkas adults chew their betel nut with lime and "buyc" leaves just like the Filipinos and the millions of Indonesians, Cambodians and Malaysians in all Southeast Asia . . . (p. 224)

Elsewhere, Parfahn goes beyond this and asserts that the Malayan peoples, and the Tagalogs in particular, ruled China for 900 years during its "most important formative period" which gave the country its social, political and economic institutions and the world Lao Tzu, Confucius, Mencius, etc. (p. 4).

Practically the same procedure of identification is used by Parfahn to show the Malayan origin of the other civilizations of the world, from the Druidic and the Etruscan through the Minoan, the Egyptian and the Sumerian to the Mayan, the Aztec and the Inca of the Americas, across the Malayo-Polynesian realm. Since the creators of these cultures were neither Mongols nor Caucasians (i.e., for Parfahn, Nordics and Alpines), they could only have been Malays or Mediterraneans. This was evident because all these civilizations sprang from the basic Malayan neolithic culture across the earth. For it is known that

. . . The Neolithic Indonesians (descendants of Java man) had been roaming Europe, along the shores of Norway and England (from Scotland to Wales), Spain, Egypt and Morocco, the Mesopotamian Plains, India, Russia and China . . .

Beyond these continents, they crossed the ocean to the twin Americas 12,000 B.C., according to Dr. Frank N. Roberts . . . Across the Pacific, these Indonesians of the Neolithic Age carried their culture from island to island to the shores of the twin continents of America, thus encompassing the whole area of the globe and peopling every colonized land with Indonesian populations. (p. 2:8)

The early civilizations were thus simply natural offshoots of these basic Neolithic migrations of the Indonesians or Malays.

Then from out of their cold northern abodes came the Aryans and the Mongols to wreak havoc upon the unsuspecting Malayan civilizations. Practically only the original homeland of the Malays (i.e., Southeast Asia and the Pacific) and the Americas were spared the consequences of this generalized barbarian onslaught — in any case, until the 16th century, when the Americas, the Pacific and Southeast Asia (and, in particular, the Philippines) were likewise engulfed by the European whites. It was only then that the real period of decline set in for the Malays. For between the earliest invasions of Malay lands by the barbarian Aryans and Mongols and the sixteenth century European conquests, there were movements of Malayan resurgence during the “duel of the races” that the barbarian incursion engendered, particularly in Europe and the Middle East.

This “duel of the races” is taken up in chapters II to IV. Chapter II speculates that the Malays were subdued in various places only because they were generally peaceful and the “virile and warlike barbarians” could master Malayan arms better and more easily than they could master Malayan arts and sciences. Thus it was that

... the Khattis of ancient Armenia (were) supplanted by the Hittites; the Mesopotamians or the Malay-Sumerian peoples by the Amorites; the Malay-Dravidians of India by the Caucasoid Hindus and the Malayan Pharaohs by the Hyksos or the so-called Shepherd Kings. We recall that the ancient Malays according to archaeological finds did not fortify their cities as the palaces of Knossos (Crete) and Mohenjo-daro (India) reveal. We recall too that Gautama Buddha as late as 500 B.C. had been preaching *ahimsa* or non-violence; that the Malay communities enjoyed a long period of peace; that in Britain the non-Caucasian Druids (a corporation of the Malay philosophers) were counseling peace as the Roman arrows, fire and faggot decimated them to the last Druid. And when the little brown queen Boadicia replied in kind decimating the 70,000 Romans at St. Alban's battle, the fate of the little brown people of the ancient British isles was sealed (p. 49)

But even when they were enslaved, the Malays still continued to contribute to civilization — in particular, by civilizing their conquerors. Thus, in the Italian peninsula,

... From the 7th to the 4th century B.C. it was the custom of the Romans to send their children to Etruscan schools where they learned the rudiments of Geometry, Surveying and Architecture. Etruscan art seemed to have transformed Rome from an assemblage of barthen or wooden huts into a city of wood, brick and stones. Etruscan architects bequeathed to Rome a Tuscan style that still survives in the colonnades of St. Peter's church. (p. 52)

There was, likewise the struggle between the slaves (the ancient Malay masters) and the Aryan conquerors, which culminated in the revolt of the Malayan Spartacus. In the end, Rome itself was once again ruled by a Malay, Constantine the Great, whose mother was, despite her aristocratic lineage, "an ugly woman, small and dark like most Malay orientals" (p. 67).

There were other redeemers of Malayan honor. There was, for instance, Alexander the Great, who is discussed in chapter II as the "liberator of the brown race," for the Thraco-Illyrian peoples or Macedonians were a "non-Aryan nation," a segment of "the generally migrating Malay populations which marched the other direction southwestward through north Africa entering Europe at the neck of Gibraltar." Born of a "dark Epirote princess" and perhaps fathered by "the Egyptian refugee Pharaoh," Nectanebus, Alexander liberated his fellow Malays in Egypt and the entire Middle East from Aryan rule (in Palestine, from the Semitic Aryans or Jews). He also warred on Aryan India and, although he did not succeed in this enterprise, he was able to establish *Pax Malaya* "not only in Asia but also in Europe and Africa." This did not last long, of course. From a "long-seasoned apprenticeship" (with the Malayan Etruscans), Aryan Rome then "rose to power and enslaved the Macedons."

But there remained numerous Macedons in Palestine and Jerusalem. In due time, a brown man's religion would be born in that land -- Christianity. For Jesus or Isa was not a Jew but the leader of "the little brown Greeks" or Macedons. In fact, the Jews were the most vocal in condemning him "as a man of a different race." Indeed, "borne to fruition by Constantine," Christianity "was the triumph of the brown Greeks, the Macedons once powerful in all Europe" and Constantine later championed the new faith "not from political expediencies but from an innate love of the race to which he also belonged" (p. 96).

Chapter IV attempts to show that, like the Buddha, Jesus was a Malay and that he preached "neither for the Jews nor for the Romans." Jesus had a Malayan birth (i. e., he was born not in a stable but in a hut built by Joseph two hundred yards away from the village, as it is the custom among Malays) and he preached to the untouchable *Arhaarez*, who were "for racial reasons scorned by the better looking Sadducees and Pharisees." In this regard, Parfahn underlines the fact that "the Hebrews contributed nothing to culture" and were "very inferior to the little young Philistines whom they met in Palestine." From their customs and manners, it was likewise clear that the early people of Palestine, slender and small but not dwarfish, were non-Semitic

Despite all the redemptive achievements of the Malays — Alexander's brilliant successes in arms, Christ's triumph of the spirit and mind, and Constantine's Christian commonwealth — the white men could not be prevented from bringing about the dark ages. This is the subject matter of Chapter V, which also deals extensively with the moral and other defects of the Aryans, in order to show how they were able to debauch, contaminate and debase civilized Malayan Europe. But, even as Europe succumbed to barbarism, the Malay East

... was shining in untainted glory, (not the Indian Orient nor the Chinese Orient), but the Golden Chersonese, with glittering Malacca as the capital of the Indonesian world of which Tanah Manile (Philippines) was a part
 (p. 138)

This glorious Malayan achievement is treated in great detail in Chapter IV as a counterpoint to the decadence of Aryan Europe.

As Europe sank into its medieval decay as a result of Aryan incapacity, a vast Malayan world of civilized life became the beacon of mankind. This was the Islamic world which had as its important center the "Golden Chersonese." Islam itself was a religion revealed to the Malay Prophet Mohammed, in whose time "the Malay type was the most powerful in the Middle East . . . (where it was indigenous) for thousands of years before the Semitic race descended from the north as a barbarian people without a culture of their own." The other pole of this new Malayan ecumene was thus the Middle East, whence Malayan influence in

arts, science and technology began slowly to rekindle civilization in Europe. And to this enterprise, "the little Moros of the East made no less substantial contributions." For Sir Richard Winstedt himself had written in his *Cultural History of the Malays* that

. . . The existence in Malay of the fullest version of the Arabic account of Islam that Europe got to know brings home to us vividly that Malay was one of the languages of culture of the Moslems. The *Kitab Saribu Masah Alah* or *Book of a Thousand Questions* of which one copy has been printed in Mecca and another at Singapore by Malay editors as early as 963 A. D. and translated into Latin in Toledo after 1085. From Latin subsequent copies had been made in Persian, Portuguese, Dutch, French and other languages of Europe

Within the Golden Chersonese itself, the Philippines retained its ancient role as "center link in the Britany-Borneo-Peru Neolithic Chain." For Tanah Manile before Magellan was "a bright star in the constellation of Malaysia." In fact, Filipinos were great ship-builders, sailing not only in the Indian Ocean but "eastward in the Pacific guided by the Southern Cross and the flight of migrating birds." Sinbad the Sailor himself, according to Austin Craig in his *Oriental History*, "could have been a Malayan seaman who had voyaged around the Philippines and Borneo." In any case, the Moslem activity between East and West was not only cultural but "mainly racial in nature." It constituted a "reactivation of the little brown Neolithics who thousand years prior had crossed and recrossed the four oceans and made a habitation of the four continents of the world."

The reactivation lasted only till the sixteenth century. Decline would then set in as a result of contact with "the rotten blue-eyed zurqas -- the Prophet Mohammed called the Jews (whites) "blue-eyed zurqas" or blue-eyed devils -- who brought on the Dark Ages on Malay-occupied Europe." These "undesirables of the white stock" would take "to the sails armed to the teeth to plunder and to steal." Chapter VII catalogues the devastation, evil and death that "the white wolves" in their drive for empire brought upon the Malays of the Americas and Asia. The cause of the "defeat and ultimate decline" was basically their peaceful disposition. In the Orient, for example, the Malays had no prisons nor standing armies, their armed guards acting merely as police. In contact with their enemies, the Malays acted nobly, maintaining "their good

faith more, and being innured (*sic*) to peace they murdered less." It was thus a pity that the rajahs of Tanah Manile honored their blood compacts and treaties with the Spaniards. Otherwise, they could have at that time "staged a reconquest of Europe that once belonged to their sires." As fate would have it, however, they were enslaved, "like the masterful little brown Etruscans of Europe." As for the extent of the catastrophe,

... Multiply ... (the Aryan acts of Barbarism) a million times from Babylon to Cebu (3000 B.C. to 1521 A. D.), and we shall have the decline and decay in which we find the Malays anywhere in the world today ... The effect of the disasters is tripled when we consider (that) the rubbish, decay and prostitution in which Europeans waded for centuries in the Middle Ages had been transported into Malay lands.

Calamitous times have thus befallen the Malay lands since then. Whence the salvation? How the rebirth?

Parfahn first reviews in Chapter VIII the "souvenirs of Malayan control of Europe and Asia." Most significant here for his contemplated revival of Malaysian grandeur is Parfahn's statement about the Malayan Turks who distinguished themselves by wresting the "Byzantine leadership" from "the Nordic type" who had "risen in this way through marriages and rewards."

... The young Turks' Pan-Turanian and Pan-Turkish Movement today to purge their race of foreign blood runs parallel with the Pan-Malayan Movement in East Asia which aims at blood purification. NO RACE CAN BE STRONG WHILE ADULTERATED WITH HALF-BREEDS. Racial strength more important than national strength holds to absolute endogamy for racial salvation.

Much more than in nationality, salvation thus lies in Pan-Malaysianism and in the racial purification of the Malays in general and the Filipinos in particular. This is the gist of the last chapter.

Taking off from the 1965 campaign slogan of Marcos ("This Nation Can be Great Again"), Parfahn entitles his final chapter "The Malay Nation Can be Great Again," while at the same time circumscribing its theme through a quotation from Patrick Henry: "I know no way of judging the future but by the past." After

expatiating once again on the past of "the highest culture of the world" (the Malayan), Parfahn reveals that

. . . in our present intellectual Revolution, no other movement could be more heroically paramount than racial rehabilitation, a unification and Renaissance of the sundered Malay races after the Dark Ages of colonial rule to give flower to an age of superior philosophy, unmatched art, learning and intellectual grandeur.

And since Christianity is really Malayan, it should be the Malays who should do the converting of the Westerners, the education of the Americans (pp. 257). Racial rehabilitation also means, in Parfahn's view, "the re-education of the Malay youth . . . an intellectual overhaul to give bud to the mangled sixth sense — the sense of the race," so that the Malays could expugn (*sic*) the exuviae and maggoty crust of colonialism . . . leading to Malayan Renaissance of whilom (*sic*) world power, prosperity and grandeur" (p. 237). Parfahn also wants the moral purification of the Malays (and the Filipinos), particularly from the corruption and vice brought into their midst by the Western colonialists (pp. 265 et seq.). Finally, for him, the Philippines has ceased to be the Philippines since 1898. Since then, it has reverted to its old name of Tanah Manile (p. 264) and its language, therefore, should be Tagalog, particularly in the schools (p. 251).

Sources and Inspiration

Parfahn is obviously an autodidact, but his book is just as clearly a colonized mind's reaction to the colonial condition and against the more extreme forms of racist colonial ideology. His selection of sources is, therefore, a function of his counter-consciousness, which cannot be but equally racist and "ethno-centric" in the broadest (and wildest) sense of the term. Parfahn's counter-consciousness, however, is likewise, rooted in the intellectual (and emotional) history of his own country and, most probably, of the Third World.

Parfahn's documentation, quite naturally, is not only selective but rudimentary and "non-specialized." Aside from the great simplifications of H.G. Wells, Elliot Smith, Madison Grant and

the rest of them, he grasped at almost any source, from books and encyclopedias to stray comments, guesses and assumptions in out-of-the-way newspaper or magazine articles, to be able to contradict assertions which were common *to* and "in order" about the colonizing people in his (Parfahn's) colonial environment. In the end, he was able to dress up an historical vision which was satisfactory to his own psyche, if not to that of his own people or the "race" with which he and his people had come to identify themselves in contradistinction to their colonizers. After all, for him, history — as it presents itself in the colonial context — is not a normal constituent element informing the community's (or the society's) consciousness of itself. History is, in fact, the sole element that jars all sense of community. In the colonial environment, it becomes the main obstacle to any integral consciousness. History has, therefore, to be formulated, re-formulated or interrogated by a counter-consciousness which, in the end, has to come to terms with the reality of the past as story relevant and significant to one's own community.

In this task of historical formulation/re-formulation, Parfahn follows in the wake of two intellectual currents originating from the Propaganda Movement and, specifically, from Jose Rizal. The first of these directions is the Filipino's identification with the Malays and their cultural and ethnic homeland, usually designated as "Malaysia." This Malayan "fixation" became part of the Filipino psyche with the ideological acceptance by Rizal and his fellow Propagandists that their incipient nation was part of Malayan history and culture. It became closely linked, in fact, with the Filipino's developing awareness of nationality. Filipino national identity was thus subsumed in that of the much vaster Malay world.

The germ of Pan-Malaysianism was already evident in Rizal's organization of *Indios Bravos* in Paris in 1889. The group's inner core was to work for the redemption of the Malays, first in the Philippines, subsequently in Indonesia and Malaya. In his view of the Revolution, Apolinario Mabini understood the Filipino's revolutionary endeavor in the context of the liberation of all Malays. In fact, it had exemplary value not only to the entire Malay race, but to other peoples under the colonial yoke.

In the American period and thereafter, this Filipino Malayan identify became a textbook truism, particularly in conjunction with Rizal, who was dubbed "The Pride of the Malay Race" or "The Great Malayan." In the 1930's, Wenceslao Q. Vinzon launched the Pan-Malayan movement to unify all the fraternal peoples of "Malaysia" from Madagascar to Hawaii, the Eastern Islands and New Zealand. After the Second World War,

... an early member of Vinzon's Pan-Malayan Young Philippines, Diosdado Macapagal, became president of the Republic and launched the idea of Maphilindo, only to be rebuffed in the end by the realities of post-colonial international politics. The Pan-Malayan sentiment remained in the Filipino, however. Although it had at first struck the elite of the propaganda, the Filipino identification with the Malays gradually became part of what may be called the subconscious national ideology. Filipino "national identity" had as a major component from the very outset the nation's awareness of its Malayan cultural and racial roots.

Up to around the time of Macapagal, the expression of the Filipino Malayan identity had been in the main the handiwork of the elite. Although one can assume that the Filipino's awareness of his connection with the "Malay World" has somehow penetrated the masses at least through the Rizal cults, there is little evidence of this from actual research. Parfahn's autodidact reinterpretation of Philippine and world history from the Malayan point of view, however, appears to indicate that the Filipino identification with Malays has indeed struck deep roots in the folk psyche. In another sense, Jocano's not too profoundly thought-out reaction to the Filipino's classification as Malay also shows how deeply entrenched this view is in the Filipino fold consciousness.¹¹

In any case, Parfahn's effort has furnished the Malay peoples a history of sorts on the universal scale. In that sense, it goes beyond the simple traditional Filipino identification with things Malay. Because it offers the Malays (and the Filipinos) a view of the common "Malayan past," it likewise necessarily traces for them a common future however mythological both might be. At worst, the "Malayan past" becomes thus a historical problem complex after having served as a reference point for Filipino identity. At best, it has defined (or caricatured) the extreme limits of Pan-Malayan vision.

Parfahn's basic historical framework in *Malayan Grandeur*, likewise, falls within what has been called the "tripartite view" developed by the Propagandists in reaction to the Spanish

“bipartite” interpretation of Philippine history. And it constitutes Parfahn’s second intellectual source. Briefly, this viewpoint came about this way:

The Filipinos at Spanish advent had an indigenous sense of history which, basically cyclical, was concerned with history as story relevant (*may kasaysayan*) to a particular group. The Spaniards brought in a two-part historical consciousness and the broader archipelagic frame of reference. Relevant to the colonial enterprise was the declared “mission” of Spain in the Philippines, which was to christianize and civilize the “natives” of the islands which got the name of the Spanish king, Felipe Segundo. *Kasaysayan* came thus to be conceived as “the history of Spain in the Philippines,” with the entire previous period considered as a prelude to the Spanish task of bringing light to the “Filipinas.” As objects of the civilizing mission, the Filipinos would have to be not only pagans but savages. This the hispanized intellectuals (*ilustrados*) of the late nineteenth century could not accept. For del Pilar, the Filipinos were actually being hampered from progressing by the monastic orders, although it had indeed become the duty of the Spanish motherland to lead daughter Filipinas on the road to enlightenment. For Lopez Jaena, whatever progress Filipinas had attained was due to the spite of the monks. Finally, for Rizal, Filipinas in fact experienced decline under Spanish rule. For all, the second period of Filipino history was thus intolerable and, because it was a product of tyranny, would have to be superseded by a third one of freedom and creative endeavor.

This tripartite historical view worked out by the Propaganda, particularly in Rizal’s version of it, became part of the ideology of the Katipunan, and, consequently, of the Revolution¹²

In the same manner that the Propagandists and most Filipino historians of the present attach national history to the colonial phenomenon, Parfahn conceives Malayan history only in relation to and almost as a mirror image of an extreme Europocentric universal history — the Aryan historical epic mythology. Since the “Aryans” or “whites” become his central negative preoccupation, Malayan history divided itself naturally into “pre-Aryan grandeur,” “decadence under Aryan dominance,” and “post-Aryan resurgence” — the same basic pattern of “greatness/decline/rebirth” within which Rizal understood Philippine history. In Parfahn’s *Malayan Grandeur*, the “Aryans” become thus the defining leitmotiv of a “Malayan history” which should otherwise concern itself only with the “Malays” and their sense of community. In Rizal’s view, it was the “Spanish advent” which determined the historical flow. In both cases, the real subjects of the historical process — the “Malays” and the “Filipinos” — become really secondary to much broader themes: struggle between peoples, colonialism and the like.

CONCLUSION

Whether or not it is artificial, the continuum infra-national/national/supra-national is a useful conceptual tool. One could substitute "group," "societal" or "cultural" for "national," and the nature of the continuum would not significantly change. One could still make use of it to situate one's work as an historian or a social scientist. Situating one's endeavor at any one point in the continuum, however, does not necessarily show immediately for whom it is intended, for what group, society, culture or nation it is relevant and significant. In the case of Parfahn's *Malayan Grandeur*, one can at least suspect that it is intended, if not for the Malays (but which Malays in his broad understanding of the term?), at least for the Filipinos. However, the ubiquitous presence of the "Aryans" or "whites" in his work makes one wonder whether it is not in reality intended for them, in order both to negate their supposed or actual affirmation of historico-cultural supremacy and to assert its exact opposite. What makes this probable is that Parfahn has really only succeeded in presenting a caricature of the thesis of "Aryan" supremacy (and, subsidiarily, Europocentric development) in universal history.

In reality, Parfahn's effort belongs to a historiographic category in the Philippines, if not in the Third World. We have already mentioned that the "tradition" started with the Propagandists' reaction to the Spanish view of their national history. In our time, the entire school of "Filipino point-of-view" historiography (in contrast to historiography by foreigners – specifically, Americans – or foreign-oriented historiography on and about the Philippines) falls under this category. But all that this school has really succeeded in doing is to say the opposite (or just near the opposite) of what "foreign historiography" asserts about our national history. And the exercise is obviously addressed to the supposed foreign-oriented historiographic interlocutors, and in the English language. Implicitly, therefore, the historiographic discourse excludes any Filipino audience aside from the English-speaking elite. This is also the case with Parfahn. Together with other "native point-of-view" historians, he is just engaging in an ideological, if not historiographic, dialogue with the non-native "specialist" in his country's (or region's) history.

All that is, of course, a little better than just following what the "foreign specialists" say about one's native area. But it does not constitute a local scientific discourse in the way that there is, for instance, a French scientific discourse on French national history (and, in fact, on all other forms and areas of history). In the Philippines, at least, (and probably in most of the Third World), there is no such specific native scientific discourse — as yet. At any one point of the continuum mentioned above, therefore, it is not really clear for whom the historian's task is being performed, whether he be native or foreigner.

Most of the time, this endeavor is, in fact, being engaged in by international specialists whose discourse, if it has acquired some degree of commonality (if not cultural consistency), can only be what they themselves really are — i.e., international. With all due respect, they cannot, of course, think or explain for the natives themselves, nor determine what for them is relevant and significant throughout the entire gamut of the continuum. What they would know best would be, it would seem, what appears relevant and significant to their respective cultures, nationalities and scientific traditions. This is, at least, one reason why works like *Malayan Grandeur* and histories "with a native point-of-view" are being written. All are, however, just reactive and do not deal with the real subject matter of history, which is to show the relevant and significant past to a particular group of people. For there can be no real history but that which refers and is significant to a group of people (tribe, ethnic community, nation, society, civilization, etc.) for which it is intended.

More than psychology and the other social sciences, the practice and vision of history are without doubt culture-bound — at least, till now. The task is to transcend this situation. For the Philippines and other Malay nations, unfortunately, this can only happen after passing through the same ethnocentrism that the West and its national groupings have undergone, and, are, as a matter of fact, still undergoing. For what the Malay nations and other Third World countries are now doing is nothing more than just a reflection of the Western scientific enterprise, if, indeed, it is not, simply tributary to this — as in most other things else as well.

NOTES

¹ Cf. Z.A. Salazar, "Paunang Salita," in Jaime B. Veneracion, *Kasaysayan ng Bulakan*, Kolonya (Alemania): Bahay-Saliksikan ng Kasaysayan, 1986. pp. xii-xx. Also: Z.A. Salazar, "Ang Kasaysayang Pampook," *Mga Panayam sa Kalinagan* (Malolos: Hiyas ng Bulakan), 10 pp; and Jaime B. Veneracion, "Ang Kasaysayang Pampook," *Mga Panayam sa Karangalan nina Propesor Alfredo Lagmay at Propesora Encarnacion Alzona*, Lunsod Quezon: BAKAS, 1987, in press.

² If history is basically a report, it is a report to a particular group of people. A Filipino expert on France, for instance, would be reporting on what is relevant and significant to the Philippines about French history. As historian of the Philippines, a Filipino would be writing for and explaining principally to his own people — at least, ideally. His should be essentially a "Pantayo perspective." For a brief explanation of *panatayong pananaw*, cf. Z.A. Salazar, "Paunang Salita" to N.S. Ocampo, *Katurubo, Muslim, Kristyano: Palawan, 1621-1901*, Kolonya: Bahay-Saliksikan ng Kasaysayan, 1985.

³ Ahmed ibn Parfahn, *Malayan Grandeur (a narrative of history by a hundred seers) and Our Intellectual Evolution*. Cotabato City: High School Press, 1957; Davao City: San Pedro Press, 1967, 281 pp.

⁴ *The Evening News Saturday Magazine* (Manila), October 4, 1952, pp. 6-7, 23.

⁵ *The Daily Mirror* (Manila), III: 128 (September 27, 1954), p. 4 (in "Truth Forum").

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ "Piracy: Then and Now," *The Daily Mirror* (Manila), II: 96 (August 21, 1952), p. 5.

⁸ *Malayan Grandeur*, p. 10.

⁹ "The Name of the Philippines. Should Filipinos be called Manila-Men?" *The Philippines Free Press* (Manila), December 12, 1959. pp. 34-5, 166. I have not been able to obtain three other newspaper articles by Parfahn, but their titles indicate the same trend of thought pursued in the ones discussed here. Furthermore, all are likewise quoted in *Malayan Grandeur*, which puts into one whole "philosophy of (Malayan) history" his views and prejudices earlier expressed about his fellow Filipinos, the Malays and the peoples (white) of the West. As cited in *Malayan Grandeur*, the articles are: "Beggars Began in Europe," *Manila Sunday Times* (June 7, 1953); "The Golden Age of Philippine Pottery," *Philippines Herald* (May 15, 1954); and "Allah and Our Christian Civilization," *Sunday Times Magazine* (November 9, 1962). In any case, one gathers from the time span of Parfahn's publications before the second part of his *Malayan Grandeur* that he was occupied with his "researches" in Malayology during a period beginning in 1952 and up to 1964.

¹⁰ The quotation is directly taken from *Malayan Grandeur*. It has not been checked with Well's *Outline of History*.

¹¹ Z.A. Salazar, "'Malay,' 'Malayan' and 'Malay Civilization' as Cultural and Anthropological Concepts in the Philippines." Paper read at the Persidangan Antarabangsa Mengenai Tamadun Melayu, 11-13 November 1986, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp. 33.

¹² Z.A. Salazar, "A Legacy of the Propaganda: The Tripartite View of the Philippine History," in Z.A. Salazar (ed.), *The Ethnic Dimension. Papers on Philippine Culture, History and Psychology*, Cologne: Caritas, 1983, p. 124.