

The Cry of Pugad Lawin or Balintawak

The Cry of Balintawak is a significant event in Philippine history. It was the start of the Filipino fight against Spanish rule. But there are different stories about when and where it happened. In this paper, I will explain the stories of three historians: Guillermo Masangkay, Pio Valenzuela, and Santiago Alvarez. I will also share my opinion on which version I believe is more accurate.

Account of Guillermo Masangkay basis :

Guillermo Masangkay was a close friend of Andres Bonifacio. He said the Cry happened on August 26, 1896, in Balintawak, at the house of Apolonio Samson. He said that Bonifacio and the other Katipunan leaders had a meeting there. After the meeting, they tore their cedulas (tax certificates) to show they were no longer following the Spanish government. Masangkay said it was a very emotional moment, with people crying as they tore the cedulas. However, his story has problems.

Flaws: He told this story in 1932 many years after the event so his memory might not be very accurate. Also, other people gave different dates and places, which makes his version less reliable.

Account of Pio Valenzuela basis:

Pio Valenzuela, who was also a leader in the Katipunan, said something different. He said the Cry happened on August 23, 1896, not in Balintawak but in Pugad Lawin. He

said the Katipuneros gathered at the house of Juan Ramos, the son of Melchora “Tandang Sora” Aquino. Bonifacio asked them if they were ready to start the revolution, and they all agreed. Then they tore their cedula and shouted, “Long live the Philippines!” Valenzuela’s story is detailed and easy to understand. In fact, in 1964, the National Historical Institute agreed with his version and said that Pugad Lawin was the true location of the Cry.

Flaws : Valenzuela gave four inconsistent versions of the location Balintawak, Kangkong, Pugad Lawin, Bahay Toro and His credibility is questioned due to contradictions in his memoirs

Account of Santiago Alvarez basis and flaws:

Santiago Alvarez was a Katipunero from Cavite. He gave another version. He said the Cry happened on August 24, 1896, in Bahay Toro. He described how Bonifacio and his men moved from Balintawak to Bahay Toro. There, they talked about their plans and decided to start the revolution. Alvarez’s version focused on the planning and the hard choices Katipuneros had to make.

Flaws: Alvarez was recounting events years after they occurred, which can affect the accuracy of his memory. Some of the specific details in his are not consistently supported by other eyewitnesses or official records.

Arguments :

These three stories are all interesting, but they are also confusing. The dates and places are not the same. This could be because the revolution was a time of chaos. It is also possible that each person remembered things differently, or that they wanted to

protect their group's image. Masangkay might have been biased because he was close to Bonifacio. Valenzuela changed his story in later years, so some people question if he was always telling the truth. Alvarez's version might show the side of the Katipuneros in Cavite, who had different experiences. Even with these differences, I believe the stories of Pio Valenzuela and Santiago Alvarez are stronger than Masangkay's. Valenzuela's version is clear, and he gave exact names, dates, and locations. He was also involved in studying history later on. Alvarez's version is also helpful because it explains how the Katipuneros planned their moves. Both accounts help us understand that the Cry of Balintawak was not just one big moment, it was a series of important actions and meetings.

In the end, the Cry of Balintawak is a strong symbol of the Filipino people's bravery and unity. Even if historians do not agree on the details, we know that it marked the beginning of our fight for freedom. Learning about the different stories helped me understand that history is complex and not always clear. It also made me respect the courage of the Katipuneros even more because they were willing to fight for our country no matter what.

Martial Law

Martial Law in the Philippines was declared by President Ferdinand E. Marcos on September 21, 1972, through Proclamation No. 1081. This became one of the most talked-about events in Philippine history. Marcos said he declared Martial Law to stop rebellion, communist groups, and increasing crime. But many Filipinos think the real reason was to stay in power and control the people. In this essay, I will explain why Martial Law was declared and why I am against it, using information from true sources.

Account Basis and Flaws :

Marcos gave many reasons for declaring Martial Law. He said the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) and its army, the New People's Army (NPA), were becoming a big threat. He also mentioned bombings, student protests, and violence as reasons the government had to act. In his diary on September 22, 1972, Marcos talked about an attack on Defense Secretary Juan Ponce Enrile and said it was one of the main reasons for declaring Martial Law. He said the country was in chaos and needed strong leadership. He also used Proclamation No. 1081 to explain his actions. The document said Martial Law was needed to stop the country from falling apart and to protect the people. Marcos said strict rules were necessary to bring back peace and safety.

But there were problems with these reasons. The Enrile ambush, for example, was later found to be fake. In 1986, after Marcos was removed from power, Enrile said the ambush was staged or planned. This means it was a lie to scare people and give a reason for Martial Law. Some reports also say that Marcos already had the Proclamation ready

before the ambush. This shows that Martial Law was planned, and the ambush was just used to make it look needed.

Another problem was ignoring the real stories of the people. Many sources from people who lived through Martial Law like letters, interviews, and news show that they were scared and hurt during that time. Thousands were jailed without reason. Many were tortured or killed for speaking up. TV and newspapers were shut down. People lost their freedom to speak. Important leaders like Senators Benigno Aquino Jr. and Jose Diokno were jailed early on. This shows that the government acted like a dictatorship, not a helpful leader.

Arguments:

I believe Martial Law was wrong and dangerous. A government must protect people's rights, not take them away. People should be free to speak, protest, and live without fear in a democracy. But Martial Law removed those freedoms. Marcos used it to control, not to help. Even if the country had problems, violence and abuse were not the right answers. We should learn from this part of our history. We must read all kinds of stories not just government papers, but also the voices of victims. The true story of Martial Law is found in what the victims went through. We should remember what happened to them.

In conclusion, Martial Law was a big event in our history. Marcos said it was to protect the country, but that reason is not complete and has problems. The truth is, it was more about power than peace. As students and future leaders, we must understand the

importance of freedom, justice, and truth. We must not allow any action that takes away our rights. We must make sure Martial Law never happens again.