

Priests, Mayors and Indigenous Offices: Indigenous Agency and Adaptive Resistance In the Mariana Islands (1681 -1758)

David Atienza
University of Guam

Abstract

This paper challenges the historiographical conception of a break, of a historical discontinuity in the Mariana Islands, and an annihilation of its native inhabitants by the Spaniards at the end of the Seventeenth-Century. The indigenous agency and adaptive resistance was continuously performed asymmetrically but actively in the *reducciones*, producing organs of power, prestige, and control through military titles and offices that were active until 1791. This adaptive resistance would face two structures of power, the Jesuit priests and the *alcaldes* or mayors. The history of the relations between them is the history of the villages of Guam and its peoples.

Ian Christopher Campbell (1989), in a general and popular book entitled *A History of the Pacific Islands*, when writing about the Mariana Islands, reduced three hundred years of contact, forced collaboration, adaptive and cybernetic resistance, and indigenous agency under the Spanish colonial forces in the this Archipelago to no more than ten lines of his narrative in a work of more than 200 pages. According to Campbell, the indigenous Marianos after 1700 were transformed into a kind of “peonized peasantry” and were forced to work “under the centuries-long somnolence of Spanish colonial rule.” (Campbell, 1989, p. 130). This is an image about the Mariana Islands historiography that was internationally spread and shared by scholars that highly influenced Micronesian studies like William Alkire. He wrote, per instance, in the past tense about the indigenous population of the Marianas in his classic study *An introduction to the peoples and cultures of Micronesia*, asserting that because of the Spanish War of Extermination “there are no ‘pure’ Chamorro” left in the Mariana Islands (Alkire, 1977, p. 20). As a conclusion, the Chamorros became Hispanicized people (Farrell, 2011, p. 189) living in a “oasis” of “*Pax Hispanica*” (Rogers, 1995, pp. 74–107) in where little or nothing important happened. As it has been discussed before (i.e. Underwood, 1976; Diaz, 1994; Hattori, 2009; Viernes, 2010; Atienza, 2013a), this misconception about the survival of indigenous Marianos that maintained elements of their Austronesian culture, is rooted in ideological and colonial international political struggles, but is a misrepresentation of the historical reality of the Mariana Islands. On the contrary, indigenous Marianos survived by playing an active role in the historical development of their islands and on the history of the Pacific as well as the interaction and resistance against the colonial rule and dynamics.

The “Spanish-Chamorro Wars”¹ and the consequent *reducciones* – reductions – to villages did not eliminate and exterminate the indigenous life from the Mariana Islands (see Atienza, 2013b). The indigenous chieftdom and leadership was re-semanticized and incorporated into Hispanic military categories to maintain the traditional clan structures and the native political system under the new settlement structure forced by the Spanish policy of *reducciones*.

¹ See Hezel (2013) for a discussion about the historiographical concept of “Spanish-Chamorro Wars”.

In the *partidos* – villages – one could easily find chiefs and principals from different clans and levels forced to live together in only one village after the reduction. To make sense of this new situation, in order to create a coherent socio-political organization, one acceptable to the indigenous and for use by the colonial power, the plan was to turn to forms of traditional war alliances that were executed normally with concrete goals and for a limited time. Now the goals were to organize the communal work or *apluy* (Madrid, in press, pp. 17–18),² to maintain the moral order and religious obligations in the villages,³ and probably to serve as examples of Christian life.

These same structures, which worked well in the socio-political sphere, were introduced also in the religious domain, giving honor seats in the Church to the officials and the early creation of Marian indigenous congregations, since 1690. In this year, the Jesuits created the first congregation in the Marianas under the advocacy of *Dulcísimo Nombre de María*, including in it only those indigenous who were faithful to the Spaniards during the revolt of 1868.⁴ In the Marianas, as in Paraguay, “the ritual became the transactional context [...] where the possibility existed to mix traditional and new elements and to define a dynamic equilibrium” (Wilde, 2003, p. 215).

As Makihara and Schieffelin have pointed out, “though shaped by asymmetrical power relations”, colonial encounters were “dynamic and complex” (Makihara & Schieffelin, 2007, p. 14). These complexities in the Marianas have drawn a continuum picture that has reached contemporary times, and where the indigenous agency and adaptive resistance have been always present. Manichean structures cannot represent reality in an accurate way and are mainly ideological: they might be licit in a political fight, but are definitely not historical. Reality is much more rich and challenging. In 1818 the Russian captain Vasíli Mijáilovich Golovnin (1776-1831), commander of the *Kamchatka*, mentioned his surprise at the following instance:

All local officials are appointed and promoted by the Governor from among the native inhabitants. I learned about this from the Governor himself in a rather peculiar manner: when he first invited me and my staff to dinner he quietly asked me, before sitting down, whether I would object to eating at the same table with his staff, consisting of natives appointed to their posts by himself, while we were all Europeans appointed to our ranks by our Sovereign. (Wiswell, 1974, p. 81)

As we can see, the governor José de Medinilla y Pineda, during his first administration (1812-1822), followed suit in this practice to appoint officials from among the *naturales* – natives, which proves the existence of indigenous Marianos. Moreover, Medinilla took meals with them at the same table, a manifestation of an important degree of consideration and respect he had for the indigenous. It is also true that other governors and officials took advantage and exploited the indigenous Marianos for their own personal profit, for example Juan Antonio Pimentel (1709-1720) or Luis Antonio Sánchez de Tagle (1720-1725) and their subordinates. While some of these were criminally prosecuted and punished, others underwent no such reprimand.

² Military terminology associated with communal work and leadership is still in use among some Guaraní people like the Mby'a from Misiones. Other indigenous organizations in Bolivia are still organized using military names such as the Consejo de Capitanes Guaraníes de Chuquisaca or Capitanes Chiriguano from Chaco (Combés, 2005).

³ The indigenous principal and Captain Manuel Tayitup from Sinahaña denounced before the superior of the mission, the immoral behaviors of some *naturales* from his village because he “[did] not want to be an accomplice to their sins” (ARSI Phil 14, fol. 80.)

⁴ ARSI Phil 14 fol. 82

Trying to track back the transformation of the indigenous Marianos traditional clan structure and chiefdom into these new categories of power, we have a point of departure with Diego Luis de San Vitores and what may be called an incipient “martial and missional genesis”. I consider that this embryonic “martial-missional” indigenous structure was defined and established in 1681 with Saravia’s military organization of the villages and the subsequent appointment of officials. We find this structure again in the native collaboration with the Spaniards during the revolt of Yura of 1684; we find it emerging again during the attack of English Captain Rogers in 22 March 1710. In 1724, we can find it in the criminal investigation of the Governor Luis Antonio Sánchez de Tagle and his *Alcaldes* or *Mayordomos* – Mayors –; and we find a clear structure of these offices in the 1758 census, a few years after the expulsion of the Jesuits from the island.

The martial spirit of Saint Ignatius de Loyola existed in all the Jesuits, especially during the first century after the establishment of the order. Many Jesuits perceived themselves as a spiritual army with no weapons other than the cross and their prayers, yet with powerful allies: the trinity –*Dominus Deus Excercitui*– and the Virgin Mary – *Castrorum Aces Ordinata*–.⁵ This martial conception of the mission, supported by the idea of engaging in battle against the devil who is the archenemy of God and man, always presented itself in the life and actions of Diego Luis de San Vitores.

In the villages, during the teaching of the Doctrine, Diego Luis de San Vitores would organize the children who were following him into a “squadron of *Mariano* infantry, weak in the eyes of man, but formidable to demons”, (García, 2004, p. 202) giving the title of Captain as well as the arms and banner, which was the cross, to the cleverest (García, 2004, p. 202). In the same way he organized the first Mariano Army – *escuadrón mariano* – composed by nine Filipinos and one Spaniard from Vizcaya. This squad was commanded by Don Juan de la Cruz Panday, a Filipino blacksmith who came to Guam with San Vitores in 1668 alongside his wife, his sister-in-law, and his sixteen-month old child.⁶ The Jesuit accorded them titles such as *Capitán* – Captain –, *General de Artilleria* – General of Artillery –, *General de la Caballeria* – General of Cavalry – or *Condestable* (Lévesque, 1995, p. 573) and sent them on their first mission to pacify the island of Tinian (García, 2004, pp. 218–224). However, not one of them was a professional soldier, no horses existed in the island, and the artillery was nearly absent. In all likelihood, San Vitores utilized the same organizational strategies with other indigenous men willing to join ranks with that Christian spiritual army. Only when San Vitores was killed did the violence spread and the spiritual army became more telluric.

During the Jesuitical chronical, indigenous support was basically motivated by sincere adscription to the truths of the faith, but, most likely, the alignment of some indigenous with European interests was more related to interethnic dynamics and the political fragmentation of the indigenous clans. Already in 1521, Pigafetta (2002, p. 233) showed his surprise at the lack of

⁵ See the Cryptic letter of Fr. San Vitores to Father Medina dated in Rota on the 26 of December of 1669. (Lévesque, 1995, p. 573) Cathedral of Guam. In this letter we can find the spiritual-martial vision of San Vitores’ mission that many historians have wrongly interpreted in its textual and real sense. When San Vitores wrote in Latin the expressions: *Dominus Deus Excercitui* and *Domina Castrorum Acties ordinata*, Lévesque translates it as “Lord God [is our] army. Oh Lord of the fortified places, regulate [our] actions” (Lévesque, 1995, p. 575), but this Latin formulas makes references to God (God Lord of Host) and the Virgin Mary (ready for the battle) with images taken from the Bible and the book of Revelations, addressing a spiritual battle against the Devil and not a physical war against the indigenous people of the Mariana Islands.

⁶ ANH 09-02676-04 f3

indigenous solidarity when, after the killing of seven Chamorro natives, several other Chamorros continued friendly trading with the Spaniards. Meanwhile, on the shoreline, the family of the Chamorro victims cursed and cried for the deaths of their loved ones. Juan Pobre de Zamora mentioned the lack of central power and structure and of a paramount chief. Even in the religious sphere a lack of centralization existed. (Martinez Perez, 1997, p. 446) Garcia noted that while the Jesuits were burning idols, “other Marianos, who were looking on, laughed also, for not all of them venerate the skulls of their ancestors and cared less when the fathers told them that their souls were burning in hell.” (García, 2004, p. 188)

This general fragmentation, or lack of central power, allowed for individuals or chiefs and clan heads to engage in freelance alliances. We have several cases of indigenous chiefs establishing coalitions with the colonial forces. The first is Quipuha, principal of Agatna (Murillo Velarde, 1749, p. 10) who gave part of his land to build the first permanent mission. He was baptized as Juan “in honor of Saint John the Baptist, patron Saint of that island [Guam].” Juan Quipuha received the honor reserved solely for people of noble birth “to be buried in the church, since he had given the ground on which the first church was built.” (García, 2004, p. 188) Don⁷ Juan Quipuha died six months after the arrival of Diego Luis de San Vitores, without experiencing the revolts and fights that followed the death of this proto-martyr. Nevertheless, his clan remained loyal to the missionaries.

Antonio Jaramillo, in a letter to the King of Spain dated on December 20, 1680, explains the appointment of another Chamorro *principal*, Don Antonio Ayihi, as captain of “one part of the mountains” and “was invested with a baton”⁸ as a sign of his office. Ayihi “granted other indians with the grade of squad corporals for him”, and together they “patrolled the land capturing enemies”.⁹ Other Marianos imitated this action and finally the Governor of the Filipinas, D. Juan de Vargas, granted one of the highest military degrees to Don Antonio Ayihi, the title of *Maestre de Campo de los indios*¹⁰, a recognition that the King of Spain himself later confirmed in 1686 as “Maestre de Campo y Teniente de Governador y Capitan General de los suyos”¹¹ - *Maestre de Campo* and Lieutenant Governor and Captain General of their own. The title was conferred together with three silver insignias, one for him and two for another who merited likewise, and with the possibility of passing down the title to his heirs (de Morales & Le Gobien, 2013, p. 218). Many governors, such as Saravia or Esplana, honored him, and he resided at the garrison with the rest of the troops (García, 2004, p. 481). Don Antonio Ayihi’s furnishment of provisions to the garrison during the revolt of Agualin is an exemplary incident demonstrating the fundamentality of Ayihi for the survival of the colony. Ayihi himself entered into combat shoulder to shoulder with the colonial forces and collaborated in the epic conquest and conflagration of Picpuc and Talofofu at the end of 1678 (García, 2004, p. 481). Don Antonio

⁷ The title of ‘don’ was reserved exclusively for noble people. Therefore, to use this term is to recognize the nobility of the indigenous. According to the Spanish Laws of Indies (Book VI, Title VII), principal and noble indigenous were exempt from paying taxes or military service.

⁸ This was already a traditional symbol of power that the Chamorros integrated perfectly. According to Freycinet, “[...] *tinias*, sticks or staffs painted and then encircled at the top with plant filaments and long strips of palm-leaf – something like that phallus of the pagans in ancient times. These staffs were carried about during the native festivals as symbols of debauchery in the *ulitaos*” (Freycinet, 2003, p. 33)

⁹ Letter of Antonio Jaramillo to the King, Manila, December 20, 1680.

¹⁰ This grade existed between the offices of Captain General and Master Sergeant. This officer was responsible of a whole *Tercio* in the battlefield. More or less, 3,000 infantry soldiers comprised this military unit, the *Tercio*.

¹¹ ARSI Phil 14 f80 Informe anual Jesuita 1689-1690 por Pr. Bustillo también en Levesque Vol 9 pp. 396-409.

Ayihi's death on April 15, 1701 was a moment of bereavement for the Spaniards. All made a procession of homage, the captains of the garrison carrying the body aloft, the remainder of the village following, and Don José Quiroga y Losada at the front. The people carried out the burial with great solemnity (Murillo Velarde, 1749, pp. 351–355).

Don Alonso Soon participated in the battle of Picpuc and Talofoto alongside Ayihi. The Spaniards proclaimed Alonso as *Principal y Sargento Mayor de Indios de los Partidos de Agat y Umatac*¹² - Principal and Master Sergeant of the Indians of the Districts of Agat and Umatac. García (2004, p. 481) mentions that the 'criminals' so greatly hated and feared Don Alonso Soon that “when they heard someone say, “Soon says it”, they obeyed and kept quiet.” Even José Quiroga came to send Alonso Soon to lead eight troops in an exploratory journey to the Carolina Islands in 1689 (Hezel & Driver, 1988, p. 147).

Nine years after the death of San Vitores, to regulate the emergent Marianas militia and political organization of the *partidos* and *reducciones* that were initiated by the *Sargento Mayor* Joseph Quiroga, and also to incorporate the clan structure of the native Marianos in the colonial system, the Captain General D. Antonio de Saravia convened the chiefs and *principales* of Guam in Agatna in 1681. A pompous military performance, composed of salutes, parading about, a solemn religious ceremony of processions, chants and speeches expounding upon the loyalty due to God and the King of Spain, Saravia installed an oath of fidelity for the principal heads of the clans of the Chamorros.

Nosotros los gobernadores y principales oficiales de las ciudades, aldeas y otros lugares de la isla de San Juan, llamada Guahan, capital de las islas Marianas, estando todos reunidos en la iglesia de la Compañía de Jesús, llamada del Santísimo Nombre de María, prometemos libre y voluntariamente en presencia de la Santísima Trinidad, Padre, Hijo y Espíritu Santo, y de la bienaventurada Virgen María, juramos sobre estos cuatro santos evangelios, con toda la solemnidad que podemos, permanecer súbditos fieles (folio 295) a nuestro Rey y legítimo Señor Carlos II, Monarca de las Españas y de las Indias, y obedecer sus órdenes de la misma manera que los demás vasallos y súbditos le obedecen; sometiéndonos a las leyes justas y católicas a las que su Majestad considere que debemos someternos. En fe de los cual hemos firmado los aquí presentes y sellado con nuestro sello. (Hecho en la iglesia del Santísimo nombre de María, el día 8 de septiembre, día de la Natividad de la Santa Virgen, del año 1681)

We, governors and leading officials of the cities, villages and other places of this island of San Juan, called Guahan, capital of the Mariana Islands, we are all gathered in the Company of Jesus' Church, named after the Blessed Name of Mary, we promise in total freedom and voluntarily in the presence of the Most Holy Trinity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and the Blessed Holy Virgin Mary, we swear over these four Holy Gospels with all the solemnity possible, to remain faithful subjects to our King and legitimate Lord Carlos II, Monarch of Spain and the Indies and obey His commands in the same way that the rest of the vassals and subjects obey Him; submitting ourselves to the just and Catholic laws to which our monarch considers we should submit. In faith with those we have signed, those present here and sealed with our seal. (September 8, Nativity of the Virgin Mary of 1681)

¹²ARSI Phil 14 fol77 Informe anual de los Jesuitas 1689-1690 Pr. Bustillo.

After the oath, the chiefs would be granted the offices of *Maestres de Campo*, Captains, Second Lieutenant, and Bailiffs – *Maestres de Campo, Capitanes, Alféreces y Alguaciles* (de Morales & Le Gobien, 2013, p. 251) and receive different signs confirming and displaying their power and responsibility. Don Antonio Ayihi was confirmed as the first *Maestre de Campo General* and was made head of the whole indigenous nation.¹³ In this way, the indigenous structure of power was probably re-semanticized in colonial terms, making possible the integration of these structures into a new colonial system of “government and justice”.¹⁴ If this is correct, the traditional structure would not disappear, but would be merged and intertwined with Western categories in a complicated religious and military work of social engineering in which the indigenous agency and adaptive resistance would have had a crucial role.

One of the *principales* that received the grade of Master Sergeant of the Marianas militia in 1681 was Don Ignacio Hineti who had grown up in Sinahana (Murillo Velarde, 1749, p. 251). Commanding an indigenous militia consisting of more than fifty Chamorros, Hineti protected the colony from obliteration by the revolt of Yura in July of 1684. The Master Sergeant, “shedding many tears” over the deaths that the Yura revolt produced, “offered his person and all his people to the service of both Majesties”, (Murillo Velarde, 1749, p. 251) the Governor and the King. Some students from the school of *Letran* joined the resistance, as did numerous others *indios amigos* – friendly Indians.

Hineti and his men engaged in combat with the Chamorro ‘rebels’ on several occasions during the time that the conflict lasted, from July to November of 1684. The conflict ended when, after four months of siege, Quiroga managed to return from Saipan and put an end to the revolt. Ignacio Hineti and his men, all members of the Marianas militia, were considered the real heroes of the resistance and survival of the colony.¹⁵

Aside from these individual allies, many *indios amigos* –Indian friends– as the Spaniards called them, acted on behalf of the Spaniards. In all likelihood, some natives acted in a ‘friendly’ way towards the Spaniards out of fear, but many others did it certainly because of shared goals with the colonial agenda and the expectation of some benefits to be received in a process of reciprocation. For instance, some Chamorros from Rota brought to the garrison in Agatna the dead body of Matapang, the killer of San Vitores. In the same way, some handed over the murderers of Fr. Antonio de San Basilio from Tarragui. It seems that this time of revolts and conflicts engendered the future political organization of Guam. It is probable that Chamorros did not primarily intend their first step to veer toward the militias, but the militias were an occurrence later supported by the colonial government and blended, in some way, with the cultural idiosyncrasy of the Chamorro people. In the same way, the Jesuits considered this form of government appropriate in their efforts to resolve socio-cultural issues and deal with the highly fragmented structure, inherent to the Mariana islanders. The militias were included in the organization of the *reducciones*, in the *pueblos de indios*.

On the date of 22 March 1710, for example, four English ships under the orders of the Captain Rogers arrived to Humatac and “entreated the Spaniards to provide them with food,

¹³ Morales/Le Gobien mentioned that (2013, p. 251) [Saravia] established governors in the main villages of the island, justice agents, and police agents, who were to maintain severe discipline. He gave these offices to the Chamorris that showed more love to the Spaniards, and as head of the whole nation, he put the famous Antonio Ayihi.'

¹⁴ Letter of Fr. Solorzano to don Vicente Gonzaga AGI Fil. Leg. 11, Ramo 8, Doc, 92.

¹⁵ See “Relación de los sucesos de las misiones Marianas desde 25 de Abril de 84 hasta primero de Mayo de 1685”.

refreshment [...] lest they raze the island to the ground along with their inhabitants” (Coello de la Rosa, 2013, p. 208). The governor at that time, Antonio Pimentel, convened a War Council which he did not attend and eventually negotiated with the pirates. In this context the *principales* Alonso Soón, *Maestre de Campo*, and Antonio Ayo, Master Sergeant of the indian militias “committed to gather 2000 men from the *partidos* of Hagat, Humatac, Malesso, and Inalahan to launch an assault against the English ships.” (Coello de la Rosa, 2013, p. 209) Pimentel finally rejected this proposal¹⁶, although this event still effectively tells of the existence and the function of the militia and its leaders.

On July 1724, the existing governor Luis Antonio Sánchez de Tagle, successor of the corrupted and condemned Pimentel,¹⁷ faced a triple prosecution by the *Real Audiencia* –Royal Court– of Manila. The first indictment was presented by the owner of the Patache *San Andres*, who was illicitly retained by this governor in the Marianas, causing material losses and the unfortunate encounter with the English privateer *Success* commanded by John Clipperton. Sánchez de Tagle was then accused for not having received confession or communion in the preceding four years being, thereby, a “bad example for the naturals and other peoples of the islands.” This accusation came from Fray Sebastian de Foronda, Bishop of Caledonia and apostolic administrator of Cebu and therefore diocesan responsible of Marianas souls. Lastly, and more interestingly for us, he and his collaborators, – *alcaldes or mayordomos* – were indicted by the vice-provincial of the Jesuits in the Marianas and vice-protector of the Natives, Fr. Felipe Maria de Muscati, for three grievances: first that he made the indigenous work in the lands of the king, the governor’s land, and the *alcaldes* land, more than was stipulated by the Laws of the Indies – *Leyes de Indias* –; second, that he did not appropriately compensate the work of the indigenous people; and finally that his collaborators sexually abused indigenous women and threatened their husbands and families in attempt to gain their silence. Fr. Felipe María de Muscati exposed this third grievance in the following way:

El tercer agravio es el de ponerse en cada partido con nombres de alcalde unos mayordomos del Gobernador que mas bien se pudieran llamar obrajeros. Estos que son siempre españoles o Filipinos y que por ordinario son de poca capacidad y de mucha malicia no solamente atarean a los indios con los trabajos arriba dichos sino que añaden ellos por su parte otros varios para su particular conveniencia y provecho quitándolos también algo de la corta paga que les esta señalada sin decir nada del modo bárbaro y tirano con que les tratan de palabra y obras. Lo mas lastimoso es que teniendo estos tales por el nombre del alcaldes el poder de remediar y castigar desordenes y escándalos que se cometiesen en el partido abusan de tal suerte de esta autoridad que haciéndose como dueños de todas las mujeres se valen de leves pretextos para castigar cruelmente a los maridos que celan a sus mujeres y de estos mismos a los que se resisten y así en lugar de ser como debieran el brazo derecho de los ministros para evitar los

¹⁶ In 1721, during the *proceso de Residencia* of Pimentel, defending himself from the accusations of allowing the pirates to land on Guam, Pimentel solicits the Captain don Fernando Velez de Arce to survey how many men were at the age of having the capability to use weapons. The count was of 25 men in Agatna, 233 in Merizo, 66 in Agat and 54 in Pago; a total of 619. Probably more than half of those counted were native Marianos.

¹⁷ See Coello de la Rosa (2013) for a complete study on the corruption and *residencia* process of Governor Pimentel.

escándalos y promover el servicio divino son ellos los que mas escandalizan y los que mas estorban y destruyen el bien espiritual de las almas.¹⁸

The third grievance is that of placing in each district some majordomos of the Governor with the titles of Mayors who would have better been called overseers instead; these who are always Spaniard or Filipino, and usually of little mental capacity and great maliciousness in tasking the Indians, not only with the above-mentioned task, but also with many other ones for their own individual convenience and benefit, by also taking a share of their already shorted pay assigned to them, besides the barbarous and tyrannical manner with they treat them in words and deeds. The most lamentable aspect is that such men are given the authority as Mayors to remedy and punish the disorders and scandals committed in their districts. They abuse such authority to such an extent that they covet all women, and use the slightest pretext to cruelly punish the husbands who jealously watch over their wives and these same women who resist them. And it is this, in place of being as they should as the right hand of the Minister in the prevention of scandals and in promotion of divine service, they are the ones who most scandalize, disturb, and destroy the spiritual welfare of the souls. (Lévesque, 2000, p. 514)

Finally, taking into account that the *mayordomos* or mayors are necessary for the good government of the villages of Indians, Fr. Felipe María de Muscati recommended that “[...] they would be not need to be stationed in the districts –*partido*– but to visit them from time to time,” and that they should be selected among the “most pious” (Lévesque, 2000, p. 515).

The *Juez Pesquisidor* or *Comisario* – prosecutor or traveling judge – sent to deal with the Governor and his subordinates was Don Manuel Diaz de Dosal, appointed also as *Sargento Mayor* to substitute for Joseph Sandoval, acting *Sargento Mayor* elected by the soldiers of the garrison after the death of Quiroga in 1723. After his arrival to Agatna, the governor first ignored him, then placed him in shackles and sent Diaz back to the Nuestra Señora de la Soledad y San Francisco, the vessel in Merizo in which he had arrived at the island. After four days, Diaz was allowed to land due to his ill state, and was finally able to interview sixteen witnesses:¹⁹

1. Julian Macaqui	Pago
2. Lucas Etotop	Pago
3. Estanislao Canno	Agat
4. Francisco Suyo	Apurguan
5. Tomas Meno	Aniguan
6. Feliz Hizo	Umatac
7. Timoteo Adgon	Umatac
8. Antonio Arreci	Mongmong
9. Nicolas Hermano	Agat
10 Dionisio Gadoa	Merizo
11. Basilio Vlequi	Nuevo (Merizo?)
12. Angel Idi	Merizo
13. Juan Ayuya	Rota

¹⁸ AGI Fil. Leg. 99, f33.

¹⁹ I took the last names as were spelled in the transcription prepared by the *Archivo General de Indias* for MARC, UOG, AGI Fil. Leg. 99 ff. 45v-134v.

Priests, Mayors and Indigenous Offices

14. Sebastian Ami	Rota
15. Nicolas Bello	Umatac
16. Dionisio Cadan	Inarajan

According to their declarations, three different political forces existed in the *partidos* or indigenous villages, which conflicted among them from time to time. First, we have the indigenous system of offices and/or military titles imposed by Saravia, This system survived at least until 1791, when the Governor José Arlegui y Leóz (1886–1894) implemented the Royal Decree of 1787, unifying indigenous offices’ nomenclature used in the Marianas with those used in the Filipinas. Consequently, all native officials would be called *gobernadorcillos*, and no more *Maestre de Campo*, *Capitanes*, *Sargentos* or *Alféreces*. Second, it was the religious Jesuitical forces: the priests and *fiscales*. The *fiscales* were an indigenous office created to help the priest to control the moral and religious life and necessities of the village. Finally, the third force was the colonial political representative of the Governor, the *mayordomo* or mayor, installed in the indigenous villages to monitor the *apluy* or communal indigenous work.

From these testimonies, we are able to see that not all of the *mayordomos*, or mayors, were in essence totally corrupt. Yet, all of them made the indigenous work more that the Law stipulated. The main goal of the work of the mayors and reason for their existence was to organize the *apluy*, or indigenous work, to maintain the inactive population of soldiers of Agatna, and, in theory, to control the moral and Christian life in the villages.

However, the witnesses from the villages of Umatac and Merizo: Feliz Hizo (or Isso) a *Sargento Mayor reformado* –retired Mayor Sargent–, Timoteo Adgon, Basilio Vlequi, Angel Idi and Nicolas Bello testified that their Mayor, the Sargent Mayor Joseph de Sandoval, extorted fathers and husbands in his village, threatening to remove them or offering to give them offices should they consent to give their daughters or wives to perform sexual benefits for him. The benefits as an indigenous official would significantly increase should they offer as compensation the integrity of their daughters and wives in exchange for official titles. Most likely, these officials received a double reward: prestige in the community and a lessened amount of, or no, *apluy* at all. In any case, we can confirm the existence of an indigenous political structure in the villages in 1725, although the relations with the Governor and his subordinates appear inefficient and abusive. In the end, the Royal Court dismissed the charges against Sargent Mayor Joseph de Sandoval, mayor of Merizo and Umatac, and those against Maestro de Campo Francisco de Robles, mayor of Agat. Only Maestro de Campo Andres Arceo, mayor of Pago, was condemned for cruelly whipping a young Mariano of thirteen years old, Francisco Ego, on the backside during the former government of Pimentel. The young man died from his wounds after three weeks time.

Even though as a result of this trial there was finally only one formal criminal conviction, the Provincial Father of the Jesuits in the Philippines, Fr. José Verdis, wrote to the King of Spain in 1725 in the name of the vice-provincial in the Marianas, Fr. Felipe Maria de Muscati, petitioning the King to force application in the Marianas of the laws of D. Fausto Cruzat and Góngora and Don Domingo Zabalburu²⁰ “not to appoint mayors in the indigenous villages since they are unnecessary due to the fact that the indigenous *Juezes de Sementera* –Judges of the

²⁰ According to these laws the *Gobernador de Indios* –governor of the natives– in the Philippines was supposed to be elected annually by the adult males of each villages (Sánchez Gómez, 2010, p. 40).

lands of labor— already perform the work which the mayors are appointed to fulfill.” (Lévesque, 2000, p. 581). It was the Law applied?

In the 1758 census (see annex 1), near the time the Jesuits were expelled, we may discover a link that still existed between a clear military structure and the indigenous government of the *pueblos de indios*. We find the military grades of *Maestre de Campo*, *Sargento Mayor*, *Capitán* and *Asistente* –assistant– assigned to indigenous people in each one of the 13 *partidos* of the Marianas (ten in Guam and three in Rota). Among these offices, we see one *Maestre de Campo* “*General*” in Anigua for Guam, don Joseph Antonio Muña, and another in Sesanrago for Rota, don Sebastian Emi. These two officials were probably responsible for the whole indigenous militia and political organization in their islands, as they held the title granted to don Antonio Ayihi in 1686 by the King of Spain as “*Maestre de Campo* and Lieutenant Governor and Captain General of their own,” and in all probability received one of the three silver insignias sent by the King through the Viceroy of New Spain in that same year (de Morales & Le Gobien, 2013, p. 218).

Nevertheless, sifting through this census we can observe two or three *Maestres de Campo* coexisting in each *partido*, along with two or three *Sargentos*, *Capitanes*, and *Asistentes*. Not one of these officials appears to be Spanish or Filipino according to their last names. This duplication of offices may indicate the existence of *cargos vivos* –active positions– and *cargos pasados o reformado* –retired positions–; however, this kind of information was usually explicated in the documents, and we do not see an explanation of the duplications of offices in the 1758 census.

Should we look to the census of 1727 for further inquiry, a few of the officially titled persons found in the list of second positions in the census of 1758 were already married in 1727. Considering a minimum of 14 to 16 years as a marriageable age, they should have being older than 55 years old by 1758. In Mongmong in 1758, four of the five first officials, Sargent Mayor Nicolas de Manglao, assistant Juan Anga, Sargento Mayor and Fiscal Francisco Tano, and Captain Juan Alugao were listed as “boys” –unmarried young men– in the census of 1727. Three of the four following officials listed as Capitán Lorenzo Taiticho, Capitán Blas Babao, and Capitán Pedro Gogui were included in the census of 1727 as married men. This might confirm the thesis that those registered at the end are retired positions. However, in Sinahana, for instance, four Sargentos Mayores, Miguel Achuga, Manuel Manahani, Lorenzo Atogot, and Ignacio Aguhoti, listed after the first main officials, were designated as “boys” or “unmarried men” in the census of 1727, as being under their 40s in 1758 and probably not yet retired.

We should notice that among some traditional indigenous cultures of Micronesia, it is common to have chiefs at different levels: territorial chiefs, lineage chiefs and “seniors or high-ranking individuals” (Petersen, 1999, p. 369) that society considers leaders or chiefs as well. The establishment of more than one office with the same category might therefore correspond to traditional ways of political organization and leadership. It is also important to note that in the whole list of officials in 1758 (see annex 1) there were no two people with the same last name in the same village, which might have reflected a political distribution of power and prestige between clans or families.²¹

²¹ It would be important to conduct further studies on the process of how indigenous surnames were adopted and pass down trough generations. This information will allow us to understand better the transformations that took place during the first years of the contact and how clan structures and kin concepts were integrated and/or collapse. However, I consider that by the middle Eighteen Century the Spanish system was already widely established, not only among *Mestizos*, but also among indigenous Marianos.

In conclusion, I propose here that indigenous agency and adaptive resistance could have been channeled mainly through the maintenance of clan structures in the *reducciones*, organized by military titles and offices. These offices were active in 1758 and probably survived the expulsion of the Jesuits until 1791. The history of the native political structure is the history of the clash and dialogue between three elements and several actors: the civil colonial power with the Governor and his mayors; the religious missionary activity with the priest and his *fiscales*; and finally, the native agency and adaptive resistance with the *maestres de campo*, *sargento mayor*, *capitanes*, and *ayudantes*.

It is probable that the letter of Fr. José Verdis was followed and that the Jesuits recovered part of the control and vision they had during the time of San Vitores in the formation, protection, and maintenance of the “pueblos de indios.” In the census of 1758, the indigenous *Maestres de Campo* of the most important indigenous villages of Guam: Anigua, Merizo, and Umatac, were former students of the Jesuit School for the Marianas’ Youth: don Joseph Antonio Muña, born in Anigua in March 27, 1706; Nicolas Taisiyo, born in Mongmong in February 20, 1708; and Casimiro Aguiguan, born in Merizo in March 10, 1714 (Lévesque, 2000, pp. 659–660) respectively. They were the higher indigenous authority of their villages and don Antonio Muña was the political heir of the privileges and duties conferred to don Antonio Ayihi back in 1686 by the King of Spain. It is obvious that this history does not match at all with the vision of the “dormant” indigenous (i.e. Campbell, 1989) or the idea of the “annihilation” of the native Marianos in the Seventeen-Century (i.e. Alkire, 1977). On the contrary, the history of the Marianas is soaked with an intense political life and a constant indigenous presence, agency, and adaptive resistance.

Annex 1

The following list is composed of the indigenous offices of the villages taken from the census of 1758:

ANIGUA	
Maestre de Campo General	Joseph Antonio Muña
Sargento Mayor	Francisco Taitano
Capitan	Manuel Joseph Inoo
Ayudante	Miguel Nataynam
Maestre de Campo	Ignacio Joseph Naota
Maestre de Campo	Francisco Tauacta
Capitan (Fiscal)	Juan Tailaf
Capitan	Ignacio Agñasina
Capitan	Martin Tainatongo
Capitan	Diego Taipilus
Ayudante	Francisco Masogni

MONGMONG	
Sargento Mayor	Nicolas de Manglao
Capitan	Ignacio Chocholage
Ayudante	Juan Anga
Sargento Mayor (Fiscal)	Francisco Tano
Capitan	Juan Alugao
Capitan	Lorenzo Taiticho
Capitan	Blas Babao
Capitan	Pedro Gogui
Ayudante	Miguel Charfaulus

SINAHANA	
Maestre de Campo	Francisco Taisongsong
Sargento Mayor	Joseph Neno
Capitan	Miguel Ogo
Ayudante	Miguel Finoña
Maestre de Campo	Francisco Sagualahe
Sargento Mayor	Miguel Achuga
Sargento Mayor	Manuel Manahani
Sargento Mayor	Lorenzo Atogot
Sargento Mayor	Ignacio Agihoti
Capitan	Lorenzo Quegachay
Fiscal	Raphael Taquiqui

ASAN	
Sargento Mayor	Anselmo Gofhigam
Capitan	Pedro Quetogua
Ayudante	Marcos Quegaga
Maestre de Campo	Ambrosio Taisagua
Capitan	Thorivio Maaño
Capitan	Joseph Quetano
Fiscal	Ignacio Cheboc

Priests, Mayors and Indigenous Offices

TIPUNGAN	
Capitan	Nicolas Apo
Maestre de Campo	Pedro Quetalaf
Capitan	Benancio Yuyo
Ayudante (Fiscal)	Manuel Lafña
Maestre de Campo	Domingo Agangi
Capitan	Ignacio Tanoña
Maestre de Campo	Diego Hean
Capitan	Lorenzo Quehorge
Capitan (Fiscal)	Pedro Ano
Ayudante	Lucas Nelemlem

PAGO	
Maestre de Campo	Phelipe Ena
Sargento Mayor	Joan Eo
Capitan	Francisco Guatafe
Ayudante	Pablo Taihaia
Maestre de Campo	Matheo Memis
Maestre de Campo	Pablo Atoti
Maestre de Campo	Mathias Gaion
Sargento Mayor	Luca Ytutup
Sargento Mayor	Joseph Taiguaha
Sargento Mayor	Marcos Mafnas
Sargento Mayor	Clemente Taytinfo
Capitan	Francisco Melo
Capitan	Gaspar Fagani
Fiscal	Bernave Añao

AGAT	
Maestre de Campo	Pedro Taisagui
Capitan	Joseph Taitiguan
Ayudante	Pedro Laguaña
Maestre de Campo	Thomas Abloglagua
Capitan	Miguel Aguan
Capitan	Diego Mafac
Capitan	Thomas Quedaga
Capitan	Alonso Agua
Capitan	Phelipe Apo
Capitan	Joseph Chigua
Capitan	Domingo Chanti
Ayudante (Fiscal)	Basilio Chataan
Ayudante (Fiscal)	Pablo Naputi

UMATA	
Maestre de Campo	Nicolas Taisiyo
Sargento Mayor	Leon Guasaan
Capitan	Juan Taisinon
Ayudante	Pedro Nasi
Maestre de Campo	Luis Guguan
Maestre de Campo	Fernando Fajaviu
Fiscal	Francisco Nahagong
Maestre de Campo	Juan Taicaie
Maestre de Campo	Felix Iso
Capitan (Fiscal)	Bautista Taitichong
Capitan	Leon Fahalang
Capitan	Francisco Abi
Capitan	Ignacio Taisagui
Ayudante	Francisco Gofsagua
Ayudante	Dima Nasaiao
Ayudante	Gemiano Catlahi

Priests, Mayors and Indigenous Offices

MERIZO	
Maestre de Campo	Casimiro Agiguan
Sargento Mayor	Estevan Taimanglo
Capitan	Santiago Mansapti
Ayudante	Francisco Etagui
Maestre de Campo	Pablo Guasa
Maestre de Campo	Theodoro Aconhog
Sargento Mayor	Pascual Maasi
Capitan	Pedro Dudu
Capitan	Esteban Taimanglo
Capitan	Juan Enon
Capitan	Diego Quechogui
Capitan	Gabriel Tayhilo
Fiscal	Juan Nahagong

INARAJAN	
Maestre de Campo	Joseph Tiyae
Sargento Mayor	Martin Chatlahe
Capitan	Andres Maftos
Ayudante	Dimas Piña
Maestre de Campo	Raymundo Quedagua
Maestre de Campo	Lino Charguani
Sargento Mayor (Fiscal)	Juan Agsenton
Sargento Mayor	Phelipe Fecharang
Sargento Mayor	Pedro Nego
Capitan	Silvestre Oca
Capitan	Joseph Quitongico
Capitan	Ninago
Capitan	Igancio Chargima
Fiscal	Thadeo Miyacho
Fiscal	Pascual Ayig

ROTA - SESANRAGO	
Maestre de Campo General	Sebastian Emi
Maestre de Campo	Santiago Quicanay
Capitan	Santiago Sanga
Ayudante	Ignacio Tayquinini
Maestre de Campo	Migual Matanani
Fiscal	Alonso Sangan

ROTA - MIRING	
Fiscal	Mariano Guatagi

ROTA - SOSAMHAIA	
Fiscal	Juan Vnaam

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank one more time the work of the editor of *Pacific Asia Inquiry*, Nicholas Goetzfridt, and recommendations of the anonymous reviewers. I appreciate the help always received by MARC and especially by Omaira Brunal-Perry. Finally, also I would like to thank Carlos Madrid for the long talks we have about these and other topics.

References

- Alkire, W. H. (1977). *An introduction to the peoples and cultures of Micronesia*. California: Cummings Publishing Company.
- Atienza, D. (2013a). A Mariana Island history story: The influence of the Spanish Black Legend in Mariana Islands historiography. *Pacific Asia Inquiry*, 4(1), 13–29.
- Atienza, D. (2013b). The Mariana Islands Militia and the establishment of the “Pueblos de Indios”. Indigenous agency in Guam from 1668 to 1758. *One Archipelago, Many Stories: Integrating Our Narratives* (Vol. 3, pp. 137–158). Presented at the 2nd History of the Marianas Conference, Guam: Guampedia Foundation. Retrieved February 14, 2014, from https://www.academia.edu/5305090/The_Mariana_Islands_Militia_and_the_establishment_of_the_Pueblos_de_Indios_Indigenous_agency_in_Guam_from_1668_to_1758
- Campbell, I. C. (1989). *A History of the Pacific Islands*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coello de la Rosa, A. (2013). Corruption, greed, and the public good in the Mariana Islands, 1700–1720. *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints*, 61(2), 193–222.
- Combés, I. (2005). Nominales pero atrevidos: Capitanes chiriguanos aliados en el Chaco boliviano (siglo XIX). *Indiana*, 22, 129–145.

- Diaz, V. M. (1994). Simply Chamorro: Telling Tales of Demise and Survival in Guam. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 6(1), 29–58.
- Farrell, D. A. (2011). *History of the Northern Mariana Islands to partition*. Public School System, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.
- Freycinet, L. C. D. de. (2003). *An Account of the Corvette l'Uraine's Sojourn at the Mariana Islands, 1819*. Saipan: CNMI Division of Historic Preservation.
- García, F. (2004). *The life and martyrdom of the Venerable Father Diego Luis De Sanvitores of the Society of Jesus, first apostle of the Mariana Islands and the happenings in these islands from the year of one thousand six hundred and sixty-eight, to that of one thousand six hundred and eighty-one*. Mangilao, Guam: Micronesian Area Research Center, University of Guam.
- Hattori, A. P. (2009). Colonialism, Capitalism and Nationalism in the US Navy's Expulsion of Guam's Spanish Catholic Priests, 1898-1900. *Journal of Pacific History*, 44(3), 281–302.
- Hezel, F. X. (2013). The Early Spanish Period in the Marianas, 1668-1669. *One Archipelago, Many Stories: Integrating Our Narratives* (Vol. 3, pp. 127–136). Presented at the 2nd History of the Marianas Conference, Guam: Guampedia Foundation. Retrieved from http://issuu.com/guampedia/docs/mhc_history_bookpft/1?e=1294219/5869441
- Hezel, F. X., & Driver, M. C. (1988). From conquest to colonisation: Spain in the Mariana Islands 1690–1740. *The Journal of Pacific History*, 23(2), 137–155.
- Lévesque, R. (1995). *History of Micronesia: Religious conquest, 1638-1670*. Quebec: Éditions Lévesque.
- Lévesque, R. (2000). *History of Micronesia: Carolinians drift to Guam, 1715-1728*. Quebec: Lévesque Publications.
- Madrid, C. (in press). Ritidian and Songsong across the Rota channel. Historic significance and culture of historic preservation. In M. Carson (Ed.), *British Archaeological Reports, International Series*. Oxford: Oxford Archaeopress.
- Makihara, M., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2007). Cultural processes and linguistic mediations. *Consequences of Contact. Language Ideologies and Sociocultural Transformations in Pacific Societies* (pp. 3–29). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martinez Perez, J. (Ed.). (1997). *Fray Juan Pobre de Zamora: historia de la pérdida y descubrimiento del galeón San Felipe*. Diputación Provincial de Avila - Institución Gran Duque de Alba.
- De Morales, L., & Le Gobien, C. (2013). *Historia de las islas Marianas*. (A. Coello de la Rosa, Ed.). Madrid: Ediciones Polifemo.
- Murillo Velarde, P. (1749). *Historia de la provincia de Philipinas de la Compañia de Jesús. Segunda parte. Desde el año de 1616 hasta el de 1716* (Vol. Libro IV). Manila: Imprenta de la Compañia de Jesús.
- Petersen, G. (1999). Sociopolitical rank and conical clanship in the Caroline Islands. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 108(4), 367–410.
- Pigafetta, A. (2002). *Primer viaje alrededor del mundo*. (L. Cabrero, Ed.). Madrid: Historia 16.
- Rogers, R. F. (1995). *Destiny's Landfall: A History of Guam*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Sánchez Gómez, L. Á. (2010). Las élites nativas y la construcción colonial de Filipinas. In B. A. Salvador (Ed.), *Poblar la inmensidad: sociedades, conflictividad y representación en los márgenes del Imperio Hispánico (siglos XV-XIX)* (pp. 37–70). Madrid: CSIC-Dpto. de Publicaciones.

- Underwood, J. H. (1976). The Native Origins of the Neo-Chamorros of the Mariana Islands. *Micronesica*, 12(2), 203–209.
- Viernes, J. (2010). Chamorro men in the making. *eJournal of the Australian Association for the Advancement of Pacific Studies*, (1.2 and 2.1). Retrieved from <http://intersections.anu.edu.au/pacificcurrents/viernes.htm#n1>
- Wilde, G. (2003). Poderes del ritual y rituales del poder: un análisis de las celebraciones en los pueblos jesuíticos de Guaraníes. *Revista Española de Antropología Americana*, 33, 203 – 229.
- Wiswell, E. (1974). *Chapters on Hawaii and the Marianas in V.M. Golovnin's Voyage Around the World*. Miscellaneous Work Papers. Honolulu, Hawaii: Pacific Islands Program, University of Hawaii. Retrieved August 31, 2012, from <http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/15410>