

HISTORICAL ACCURACY AND ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION IN THE CONDUCT OF CITY TOURS IN METRO MANILA

ROSARIO MIELMIA C. AQUINO, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to discover whether the conduct of city tours – particularly coach tours in Metro Manila is historically accurate. It employed both descriptive research employing participant observations and focus group discussions and mainly, a qualitative research design using thematic analysis and content analysis to substantiate the findings. The researcher employed person triangulation in the collection of data using different sets of groups as sources namely Educational Tour Guides, Asosasyon ng mga Dalubhasa, May-Hilig at Interes sa Kasaysayan (ADHIKA) ng Pilipinas, Inc.; and Professors of History and Anthropology of State Universities and Colleges of the Philippines. The main tool in gathering the data were focus group discussion guide questions and the audio recordings of oral narratives which were transcribed accurately to capture the information provided by the tour guides. In general, coach tours in Metro Manila contain some historical inaccuracies. Thirty three percent of the tour guides' narratives lacked historical basis while 88% of the narratives relayed only already well known or obvious historical facts and therefore there was inadequate information on Philippine history transmitted. The researcher recommended synergy between the Department of Tourism and agencies such as the National Historical Commission of the Philippines and the National Commission for Culture and the Arts as well as liaising with academe to improve the quality of historical tourism in the country; institutionalizing a code of ethics among tour guides that stresses the necessity of being honest, accurate and informative; and adoption of self-regulatory measures by the Philippine Tour Operators Association.

Introduction:

Tourism is the world's largest service sector industry, contributing 9.8% of the world's GDP. The sector now supports 284 million people in employment

– that is 1 in 11 jobs on the planet (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2016). The United Nations World Tourism Organization (2016) reports that there were 1.18 Billion tourists worldwide in 2015 with tourism receipts of US\$ 1.5 Trillion.

The Philippine government has identified tourism as an important contributor to the generation of foreign exchange earnings, investments, revenue, employment and to the growth of the country's output. If developed in a sustainable manner, it can indeed be a powerful economic growth engine for the country. (Department of Tourism, 2015). The Department of Tourism reports tourist arrivals in 2015 at 5.4 million with tourism revenue of as much as PHP 306.6 Billion. (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2016). Manila is the main gateway to the country with the Ninoy Aquino International Airport serving more than 30 airlines flying to and from cities around the world (Department of Tourism, n.d.)

Given its magnitude, tourism cannot be marginalized and its credibility as an industry should be safeguarded. Tour guiding is a significant aspect of a viable tourism industry and the information provided by tourist guides must be historically accurate so that the industry's integrity remains intact.

Theoretical Framework

The theory of the Narrative Paradigm espoused by Walter Fisher (1987) suggests that humans are storytellers and that we experience and understand the world as a series of narratives or stories was adopted for this study. He argues that we use stories to learn or reinforce values and to help us make decisions. The processes of deciding which story to believe is known as narrative rationality. Narrative Rationality is based on two components: Coherence and Fidelity. Coherence refers to how well a story hangs together, while fidelity refers to the truthfulness of the story when compared to other life experiences. A story has fidelity when logic is used to answer questions on the story but the logic is based on "good reasons," a more subjective type of logic. If a story has coherence and fidelity, then we judge it as being a good story, and a good story is far more powerful than rational thought when used to reach the same conclusion.

Statement of the Problem

The study aimed to discover whether the conduct of city coach tours in Metro Manila is historically accurate and if adequate information on sites, personalities, events and time period is relayed to tourists.

Methodology

The research is descriptive employing participant observation and focus group discussions. It has mainly, a qualitative research design using thematic analysis and inductive content analysis to substantiate the findings. The researcher employed person triangulation in the collection of data using different tapping on

the expertise of the Educational Tour Guides, Asosasyon ng mga Dalubhasa, May-Hilig at Interes sa Kasaysayan (ADHIKA) ng Pilipinas, Inc.; and Professors of History and Anthropology of State Universities and Colleges in the Philippines who compared the oral narratives against the accepted historical datum and classifying them into time period (T), event (E), site (S), personalities (P) and general information (G.I).

The three expert sources rated each segment of the oral narrative using the Authentic Assessment Toolbox for Historical Accuracy as follows:

- | | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| 1 (30%+) | = | Numerous historical inaccuracies (NHI) |
| 2 (1%- 29%) | = | Some historical inaccuracies (SI) |
| 3 (0%) | = | No inaccuracies (NI) |

On the other hand, the data were likewise analyzed as to the volume of information transmitted. The assessment had the following interpretation:

- | | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| 1 (33% below) | = | Only well-known or obvious facts transmitted (O) |
| 2 (34%-66%) | = | More than well-known facts transmitted (MWK) |
| 3 (67%-100%) | = | Abundant information transmitted (A) |

Findings:

The tour guides provided oral narratives for the following sites, persons and events of interest: Nielson Tower; American Cemetery, Manila Hotel, Tomoyuki Yamashita, Roxas Boulevard, Luneta Park, Intramuros, Manila Cathedral, San Agustin, Miguel Lopez de Legaspi, Casa Manila, Fort Santiago in General, Dungeon and the White Marble Cross, Rizal Shrine inclusive of the life and writings of Dr. Jose Rizal.

Critical Review:

I. On Nielson Tower, Makati, the tour guides gave a rather sketchy narrative of the site as being the first airport in the Philippines with the existing structure as having been the tower overlooking Paseo de Roxas and Ayala Avenue which were the two runways. What the tour guides fail to mention – which would have made the relayed information more meaty and more interesting -- is to why it was named such and why it was built in Makati.

According to Duldulao (1996), it was named after its builder and primary investor, an American stockbroker named L.R. Nielson. Don Enrique Zobel de Ayala (1877-1943), who was a special aide to President Manuel L. Quezon was privy to the proposal of the Nielson and immediately offered a portion of Hacienda de San Pedro de Makati as a possible site for the project. The airport was inaugurated in 1937 and opened in time for Manila's hosting of the Eucharistic Congress.

Filipinas Heritage Library (n.d-a) complements this information by revealing that Nielson Airport became the base of the American Far Eastern

School of Aviation. When the Far Eastern Air Force was established by Philippine authorities in response to Japanese militarization, the Nielson Airport became its headquarters. It also served as terminal of the country's first commercial air services – the Philippine Air Taxi Company (PATCO) and the Iloilo-Negros Air Express Company, and later, on March 15, 1941, Philippine Airline's first flight took off from the Nielson Airport for Baguio. The Filipinas Heritage Library (n.d-a) adds that the company was all set to offer its first international flight to Hong Kong when World War II broke out.

The three groups of assessors found fault in the information relayed on Nielson Tower not so much for its inaccuracy but for its inadequacy.

2. ***On the American Cemetery, Makati***, one noteworthy aspect of the narration was that the tourists were told that those buried in the site and those 37,000 names written on the walls were killed in battle in wars the Americans fought in the Pacific.

The Manila American Cemetery and Memorial (n.d-a) however states the 152-acre memorial, which is the largest of all the cemeteries administered and maintained by the American Battles Monuments Commission (ABMC) is the resting place of 17, 202 U.S. servicemen of World War II, and although most of these servicemen died in the military campaigns in New Guinea and the Philippines; since civilian technicians, entertainers, workers of the Red Cross were and still are also considered members of the armed forces, they are were also entitled to be buried here.

The three expert assessors felt that considering the size of the American cemetery and its significance to World War II and Philippine-American relations, a more expansive explanation of the site was required. There was consistency in their assessment on both the historical accuracy and volume of information as having some historical inaccuracies and transmitting only obvious or well-known facts.

The only reason why this site was assessed with some historical inaccuracies instead of numerous historical inaccuracies is because there was very little information relayed to assess. Ironically, information on this tourist "attraction" is one of the most accessible as it is available in all forms of media right at the administration office of the park. Data available is also abundant and exhaustive

3. ***On Manila Hotel, Manila***, the tour guides narrate that it is the oldest hotel in the Philippines, built in 1900 and where General Douglas McArthur and General Tomoyuki Yamashita once stayed.

The article Manila Hotel Through the Years (n.d-a) contradicts this statement inasmuch as it reveals that before the end of the nineteenth century,

there were two well-known hotels, the Hotel de Oriente and the Fonda de Lala. On July 4, 1912, on the 136th anniversary of American independence, Manila Hotel was inaugurated.

As to its historical significance, in an earlier writing, Conaughton (1995) relates that the Commonwealth government provided the MacArthurs with a stately residence – the penthouse of the 5-storey Manila Hotel and throughout his tenure as military advisor to the Commonwealth, Douglas, his wife Jean, and son Arthur lived in the penthouse. He did not just “stay” (as a guest) in Manila Hotel therefore, but he actually lived there.

More information is given by Conaughton, et al. (1995) when he writes that from 1942-1945, the Manila Hotel was under the Japanese – not necessarily housing Yamashita.

Except for ADHIKA, all assessors rated the narrative in relation to Manila Hotel as having numerous historical inaccuracies. Already, the commentary on Manila Hotel was too brief considering its age and historical significance, yet, the sketchy information was peppered with historical inaccuracies. All the assessors however judged that the volume of information transmitted by the tour guides as having the most minimal level of transmitted information with only obvious or well known facts relayed.

4. **On Tomoyuki Yamashita**, the Manila tour guides embark on a commentary of Yamashita disclosing that he was the Japanese General who was appointed to head the army in the Philippines but the superior American artillery during liberation forced him out of Manila to retreat to the Mountain Province in Northern Philippines. The tour guides also said that it was under Yamashita in 1945 that the Massacre of Manila happened and more than 100,000 civilians were killed. Yamashita was ultimately tried for war crimes and was hanged. As a finale, tourists were told that the verdict was written by no less than Douglas McArthur.

Inasmuch as Yamashita played a key role in the events of the Japanese occupation of the Philippines and its involvement in World War II, the tour guide could have lifted factual information from several notable and respected history authors who discuss Yamashita in their books.

In the book, *The Yamashita Precedent: War Crimes and Command Responsibility*, Richard Lael (1982) writes that General Tomoyuki Yamashita took command of the Japanese 14th Area Army to defend the Philippines from October 9, 1944 to September 9, 1945. However, Prevost (1992) qualifies this by explaining that in the beginning Yamashita was given command of only half of the troops in the Philippines. Up to December 1944, the army and the navy were

operating independently of each other and Yamashita had not been given control of either the naval forces and the army air force.

It was not until January 1944 that the Imperial Headquarters transferred the command of the naval personnel in Manila to the Army. However, this transfer of command was never clearly stated. In fact, the navy retained veto power over the chain of command. It was still the naval commander, Admiral Sanji Iwabuchi who had the authority to distinguish what was naval business and what were land operations (Prévost, 1992).

The account of Lael (1982) refers to Yamashita having realized the superiority of American fire power on the ground was impossible to match so he moved his headquarters to Baguio and ordered his 1,600 army troops to leave Manila.

Because as explained earlier Iwabuchi had the authority to distinguish what was naval business and what were land operations and had veto power over the chain of command, Yamashita's decision to leave Manila was opposed by the naval forces and the army air force. They did not want to give up the capital. The volatile situation in Manila was intensified by the presence of kamikaze troops who were now under Iwabuchi's command. It is said that the Japanese naval forces refused to give up the capital without engaging the American forces in heavy street-to-street, building-to-building, house-to-house fighting". (Parsons & Morales, 2007)

On March 3, 1945, all the Japanese forces in Manila had been killed but only after they committed atrocities of war with fatalities totaling 1,010 Americans, 16,665 Japanese [counted dead] and 100,000 inhabitants. (Reel, 1949).

The report of Fisher (2003) reveals that the trial of Yamashita lasted from October 29 to December 7, 1945. He says it began shortly after the war and prior to the international tribunals in Nuremberg and Tokyo. Yamashita was charged with command responsibility for the atrocities that the Japanese naval forces committed in Manila in 1945.

According to Prévost (1992), throughout the trial, the only proof of Yamashita's involvement in the atrocities was in the form of hearsay evidence. The military commission heard 286 witnesses during the trial but the prosecution was unable to connect Yamashita to even one of the 123 atrocities in the bill of. Although the military commission was supposed to be an independent body, its members were all subordinates of their Supreme Commander – MacArthur himself. Yamashita was hanged on December 7, 1945 at the Los Baños prison camp in Laguna.

Educational Tour Guides, ADHIKA and the Professors of History and Anthropology of State Universities and Colleges in the Philippines all judged the description of the events related to Yamashita as having some historical

inaccuracies. However, all assessors ranked the narrative as having relayed only obvious information or well known facts rather than transmitting to the tourists more in-depth information on the events of World War II and the role of Yamashita.

It was imperative for the tour guides at this juncture to relate to the tourists the dynamics between Yamashita and Iwabuchi for them to understand the controversy in the trial and execution of Yamashita inasmuch as he (Yamashita) was tried for command responsibility. To make a sweeping statement that the Massacre in Manila happened under Yamashita's command is open to debate and is not historically accurate.

There too is no direct evidence that Mc Arthur wrote the decision of Yamashita's conviction himself. What is implied in historical records is that Mc Arthur had influence over the war crimes tribunal.

One of the tour guides concludes his account of Yamashita by saying: *"This general is also very controversial because he had stolen so much treasure around Asia and buried them somewhere here in Luzon and up to now, people are still finding this treasure."*

Dr. Ricardo Josean authority on the Japanese occupation of the Philippines and professor of history in U.P. opines that although the Japanese forces looted Southeast Asia during the war, it is highly improbable that they hid the treasures in the Philippines. The most obvious reason for this is that both the Americans and the Japanese knew that the final battleground of the Pacific War will be the Philippines" (Economic Times, n.d.)

Qualifying phrases draw the line between fact and tale. In the absence of historical data and hard evidence in this tittle-tattle, the tour guide could have used phrases like "some people believe that" so as not to compromise accuracy. This is a common practice in tour guiding when no concrete evidence links the "attraction" to fact.

5. *On Luneta Park, Manila*, the tour guides narrate that Luneta Park also referred to as Rizal Park and historically Bagumbayan and introduces the monument of Dr. Jose Rizal as national hero of the Philippines. They then continue to describe the scenes that are depicted in the walls in the Rizal Shrine at the Luneta.

Being in one of the few remaining opens spaces and located right at the heart of the city of Manila where making a stop is convenient, the tour guides could have embarked on a richer narrative using the writings Medina (1994) that describes the present Rizal Park as part of a settlement outside the walls of Intramuros. A more illustrative description of what Luneta was could be lifted from Torres' (2005) account describing Luneta as originally as a promenade close to the Manila Bay but towards the end of the nineteenth century, it became

notorious for public executions of purported subversives, agitators and revolutionaries -- the two most significant of which were those of the GOMBURZA and Jose Rizal.

Physically, there is nothing extraordinary about Luneta. Its significance and value therefore emanate not from what people see now but from the fact that it bore witness to several historical events. When the story teller, which in the case of a tour is the tour guide, waters down his stories to mere identifying statues and markers, then his tourists miss out on significant knowledge.

6. *On Intramuros, Manila.* Upon entering the gates of Intramuros, the tour guides start their spiel by describing Intramuros as 60 hectares walled city in Manila and inside the walls, is Fort Santiago. Tourists were also told that Intramuros was built in the 1570's but prior to that, it was a settlement of Muslims led by Rajah Sulayman. He says it was very easy for the Spaniards to capture Intramuros because the people then were innocent or ignorant. He also points to the two main churches here, Manila Cathedral and San Agustin. He also mentions two schools that the Spanish put up Colegio San Juan de Letran and Ateneo de Manila.

The tour guides claim that the subjects of Rajah Sulayman were easily subjugated because they were ignorant is totally unfounded. How the narrator reached this conclusion without any historical data to substantiate his theory and pass it on as gospel truth is unfortunate. Intramuros is packed with historical significance and a thorough explanation of this site based on written references would have been forthcoming based on an extensive array of references available. There is no mention for example why it was called Intramuros nor that it was built from labor conscripted from Indio and Chinese communities.

Although the tour guides correctly mention that Intramuros rose from the remains of Maynilad, the write-up of Abinales and Amoroso (2005) explains that the city Maynilad, a Muslim settlement was ruled conjointly (not solely) by Rajah Sulayman and Rajah Aceh (Matanda) at the time of the arrival of the Spaniards in the sixteenth century. To substantiate this, Torres (2005) draws a textual picture of Maynilad as a Bornean trading post with a palisade of earth and coconut logs guarded by locally-crafted cannons called lantakas. It was the main entry point of the archipelago where goods were accumulated and exported. This would have been a more graphic and interesting way to present Intramuros.

And although the tour guides mentioned about two schools being built in Intramuros, they he failed to discuss what the city was all about. In the book *Beyond Intramuros: The Beginnings of Extramuros de Manila to the 19th Century*, Medina (1994) says: "*In the confines of Intramuros grew the political, cultural, educational, religious, and commercial center of Spain's empire in the*

Asia. Within its walls, the largest Iberian community lived throughout the Spanish era” (p.51).

The criticism in the narrative in Intramuros is not so much of what was said but of what was not said. To describe Intramuros in a few sentences, given the accessibility and availability of voluminous information, is truly a disservice. There were no narratives for example on the walls, and except for the mention of the Colegio San Juan de Letran and Ateneo de Manila University, no mention of the buildings that once stood in Intramuros (except for those where stops were made). In other words, the tour guides failed to draw a picture of Intramuros during its heyday.

The three expert assessors gave a dismal rating as to the volume of information relayed as the narrative transmitted only well known facts and obvious information. All 3 rated the narrative on as having some historical inaccuracies.

7. On Manila Cathedral. All the tour guides said was it was a church older than San Agustin but the structure in existence now was new because nothing of the old structure was left due to the bombardment in World War II.

The unanimous opinion of the three groups of assessors is that the narrative on Manila Cathedral had relayed only obvious information and has not in any way significantly added information to the tourists’ knowledge. While the tour guide is right in saying that the establishment of the Manila Cathedral predates that of San Agustin, he did not explain that the structure being viewed is the 6th structure. He also failed to explain the evolution of the cathedral and its significance at the present time. Several significant facts of the Manila Cathedral were unmentioned.

A more comprehensive description written in the Manila Cathedral webpage relates that when Miguel Lopez de Legazpi founded the city of Manila on January 24, 1571, armed with the Spanish sword and the Cross, Legazpi, in his role as conquistador, he apportioned a parcel of Concepcion, thus to this day it is the Basilica of the Immaculate Conception. As Spain firmly established herself in the new colony through the succeeding years, so did the Church which witnessed the creation of the Diocese of Manila on February 6, 1579. The same write-up discloses that the present Manila Cathedral rose of the old cathedral, which was bombed mercilessly along with the rest of the Walled City during the Battle of Liberation in 1945.

The National Historical Institute (1993), now the NHCP declares that during the liberation of Manila in 1945, civilians were hostaged and massacred here by Japanese forces.

8. On San Agustin Church, Manila. Continuing their commentary on churches, the tour guides say that San Agustin Church was first built in 1586 but

completed only in 1607. Prior to this structures there were 2 other structures that were burned because it was made of wood. He reveals that the present structure survived the Battle of Manila in 1945 but one of the bell towers collapsed.

Contrary to some of the time periods of the tour guide, historians say:

San Agustin was burned in the fire of 1583. A third church was burned by another fire in 1586 before a stone church designed by Juan Macias was constructed in 1604. It was completed in 1606. (National Historical Institute, 1993, p. 205).

This church was stable enough to resist earthquakes with minimal damage. But in 1880, a tremor severely cracked one of the bell towers that authorities ordered it torn down. (de la Torre, 1981, p. 64).

Other relevant information that was left out of the narrative was that San Agustin was looted by the British in 1762 at the time of the British Occupation of Manila. They stripped the altars of their ornaments and desecrated the graves of the Spanish founders of the city. In 1898, during the Spanish-American war, it as a haven for refugees. (Gallende and Jose, 2000)

In a more detailed narrative, Galende and Jose (2000) add:

When the Battle of Manila (1945) almost at its end, Japanese soldiers hostaged hundreds of the city's residents inside the church. They hoarded both religious and civilians into an old basement, except for those who were seriously ill. With all exits blocked, the Japanese set the basement on fire with explosives. All were buried alive except for the few who managed to scrape a hole through the rubble.

The priests were locked up in the monastery; the women were raped while the men were transferred to the air raid shelter in the present site of the Palacio del Gobernador to be slaughtered. Although the convent was consumed by fire, the church survived with heavy damage (p. 33).

The only information the tour guides got right in their narrative was that the San Agustin Church survived the Battle of Manila in 1945. They however got their dates mixed up insofar as when the construction and re-construction of the church occurred. They likewise failed to relate the events of the British invasion of 1762 and the Battle of Manila in 1945.

9. On Miguel Lopez de Legazpi. At the San Agustin Church, the tour guides usher the group to a side chapel next to the main altar and pointed to a tomb and talked about a personality that is very significant to Philippine colonization: *“Legazpi was a Spanish conquistador searching for spices and discovered the Philippines. He reported this to Spain and that is how they sent Magellan to the Philippines. He was buried here because he became an Agustinian priest later on.”*

This aspect of the tour got a low rating from the assessors. Besides the historical inaccuracies, there is also a lack of information transmitted –in fact; the scant information transmitted was even flawed.

The whole narrative on Legazpi is packed with historical inaccuracies. It is clear from the accepted historical datum that the Magellan and Legazpi expeditions were forty-five years apart. It was Magellan who discovered the archipelago for Spain, not Legazpi. There is also no record that Legazpi became an Augustinian friar. Even the San Agustin brochure does not mention this. The iron sculpture on top of his tomb does not depict him as a friar – he is dressed like a conquistador. Prof. Alvin Campomanes of the History Department of the University of the Philippines Manila and an educational tour guide posits that Legazpi’s burial in the San Agustin Church may have been an expression of gratitude and recognition of the Spanish residents of Manila, a city he founded in 1571. He also says that the Augustinians arrived in the Philippines with the Legazpi expedition in 1565. The other leader of the Legazpi expedition was an able mariner who became an Augustinian, Fr. Andres de Urdaneta.

The tour guides could have fared better if he used Cushner (1971) and Agoncillo’s (1991) narratives as follows:

After Magellan’s death in Mactan in 1521, three Spanish expeditions followed with the objective of founding a settlement in the Philippines – Saavedra (1527-1529), Villalobos (1541-46) and Legazpi (1564). Only the Legazpi expedition succeeded.

Legazpi founded the pioneer Spanish settlement in the Philippines, the Villa de San Miguel in Cebu in 1565. Then, they sailed for Luzon, where they founded Manila in 1571. The Manila settlement will metamorphose into the walled city of Intramuros after his sudden death in 1572.

10. On Casa Manila, Manila. This site is an easy stop for a tour guides because it is fully labeled and an extensive description is written about each feature. The guides therefore in many instances, just read the descriptions in the Museum markers. The following excerpts from the narrative that are worthy to be critiqued – both on the architecture of the house and on the societal conditions at the time of Spanish colonization:

“Notice that the steps of the stair are wide and far from each other. This is so that guests approach the house slowly and bent in a gesture of humility”

“If you notice, there is an exit here in the kitchen. The alipin sa gigilid – which were the lowest level of servants were allowed only at this point. They would run errands for the house servants or alipin namamahay.

“While most Filipinos had their comfort rooms outside their houses, the Ilustrados had the Letrina which is a 2-seat toilet. Here, husband and wife talk about matters that are confidential and of course the baño”.

The three groups of expert assessors agree that there is no evidence to point out that staircases were constructed wide and far from each other so that guests approaching the house could do so slowly and bent in a gesture of humility. The educational tour guides, ADHIKA and the History and Anthropology Professors of State Universities and Colleges agree that this is mere conjecture.

In a related topic, the Philippine society is made up of different social classes, and the house servants, who form part of the working class is among them.

In explaining this, Scott (1994) writes on the house servants:

Aliping namamahay and aliping saguiguilid are social classes from Tagalog precolonial/prehispanic society. One becomes an alipin by captivity, birthright or debt. The aliping namamahay are tribute payers. They were expected to present a measure of threshed rice or a jar of wine for his master’s feasts and other foodstuff they may acquire; come at their master’s call to plant and harvest his fields, build his houses, carry his cargo, equip and row his boat, and help in any emergency. They owned their house (i.e. namamahay), personal belongings, and gold, and bequeathed them to his heirs. The alipin sa gigilid, on the other hand, were members of their master’s household and ate out of the master’s pot. They are completely dependent on the master as his own children and from this situation arose his moral right to sell them. The main source of alipin sa gigilid were the children born in their master’s house, who were often natural children by his own alipin (p. 226-227).

On the ilustrados, Cushner (1971) writes:

Ilustrado literally meant “enlightened”. Ilustrados, as they were collectively called, literally meant “the enlightened ones” – the recipients of higher education, the intellectual class. The people of means were called Principales (p. 265).

The narrative on Casa Manila garnered the lowest rating from the evaluators on both aspects because of wrong time periods and flawed use of terminology.

If the tour guides intended to discuss societal classes in the Philippines to emphasize the difference in lifestyles of the residents of the “bahay na bato” with the “alipins”, they could have gone a different route instead of referring to the “alipin sa namamahay and alipin saguiguilid” to make his point. The term alipin was never used to refer to house servants during the Spanish colonial period. It is

impossible for the principalia of the nineteenth century to use these terms. These terms belong to a different period in Philippine history! The word “ilustrado” was also wrongly used in the above context as the tour guide was referring to moneyed and not learned. The term “principales” would have been apt.

11. On Fort Santiago, Manila. In describing Fort Santiago, the tour guides relate: *“It served as a barracks and prison cells during the time of the Spanish, Americans and Japanese. This was also the place where the settlement of Rajah Sulayman was located. Fort Santiago is located along the Pasig River and served as the main fortress of the Spanish.*

During liberation, and the Japanese knew that the American army was very strong, they escaped from Fort Santiago.

Although there were no historical inaccuracies in the narrative of the tour guides, only obvious information was relayed. This is another case where tour guides just rely on the obvious information featured on markers and brochures. With an extensive availability of materials, a more industrious effort to provide additional details could have made the information relayed richer. Being the main feature of Intramuros, the commentary on Fort Santiago should have been more illustrative.

12. On the Dungeon and White Marble Cross (Fort Santiago), Manila. The tour guides point to a dungeon close to Manila Bay and relates that the Japanese had 600 American and Filipino prisoners of war whom they all put in this dungeon measuring about 100 square meters. They claim that all these prisoners died of suffocation and starvation. Because it was so packed, the people who came in first in the dungeon must have already been dead when the last ones were placed there. When discovered, they describe the stench of dead bodies as being “smelled” all over Intramuros. All the dead were buried in a common grave now marked by a marble cross.

The educational tour guides and ADHIKA rated the above narrative as having some historical inaccuracies while the History and Anthropology professors of State Universities and Colleges rated it as having numerous historical inaccuracies. All 3 assessors however are united in saying that there were more than well known facts that were transmitted with regards to the dungeon and white marble cross marker.

The objection of the History and Anthropology professors of State Universities in this narrative stems from the fact that there is no historical source for the claim that the stench of the dead bodies in Fort Santiago was “smelled all over Intramuros”. Inferences should be presented as such and not as facts.

13. On the Rizal Shrine and Dr. Jose Rizal. As the Rizal Shrine came into sight, the tour guides introduced Dr. Jose P. Rizal to the tourists in the following manner: *“This is the Rizal Shrine dedicated to Dr. Jose Rizal who is the foremost*

*national hero in the Philippines. He actually did not fight in the revolution but he inspired the revolution. He was an intellectual and he wrote letters and poems and books to inspire Filipinos then to revolt. It was here in Fort Santiago that he was imprisoned prior to his execution. This is his prison cell. It was here that he wrote the famous *Mi Ultimo Adios* or *My Last Farewell*, he put the poem in a lamp and gave it to his sister prior to his execution. All of these building that you see here were destroyed during the wars. Describing the events leading to Rizal's execution, the tour guide narrates: "From this cell, he was brought to a chapel, and from there he was led to Luneta – it was then called Bagumbayan and he was shot at the back. His footsteps are depicted here with the brass foot plates of his last steps prior to his death.*

He was accused of rebellion, sedition and forming of illegal societies. The trial took one day. The death sentence was read to him on December 29, 1896 at 6:00 AM and he was executed at 7:03AM December 30. He spent the last day here in this chapel. He also married his live-in partner Josephine Bracken.

If you look at the picture of his execution, you will notice he was shot in the back because he was considered a traitor by the Spaniards but he managed to turn around.

No family member witnessed the execution of Rizal - they all met him the night before his execution.

His remains were not released to the family and were buried with cholera victims in Paco Park. It was only Narcisa, his sister who knew where he was buried, so she asked some people to mark the grave RPJ.

In the early 1900s the remains of Dr. Jose Rizal were transferred to the Luneta in grand ceremonies.

The 3 assessors judged the narrative on the events surrounding the life and time of Rizal as containing some historical inaccuracies. However, they were divided as to assessing the volume of information with the educational tour guides of the opinion that there were more than well known facts relayed but ADHIKA and the alumni of the Professors of History and Anthropology of State Universities and Colleges as saying that only obvious facts were imparted.

We see here a narrative that appears fragmented because the premises leading to the main event were not laid. As early as 1907, Rizal biographers like Retana had already published their accounts. References on the life and times of Rizal are in profusion and most offer a detailed narrative on the trial the sentencing and execution of Rizal. The dramatic events can be brought to life by a well-researched narration by an effective story-teller. Unfortunately, such was not the case with the Manila tour guides in the tours evaluated.

Literature published by the National Historical Institute (1998), now National Historical Commission of the Philippines has crisp yet well rounded

accounts of persons, events and places associated with the national hero. Excerpts of these references would have brought to life an important chapter in Philippine history.

Table 1 depicts the level of accuracy and volume of information relayed by the oral narratives of the Manila city tours with those pertaining to personality as having scored the lowest and those pertaining to events as having scored the high-test.

Table 1. Summary of assessment on the historical accuracy and volume of information of oral narratives in Metro Manila.

Location	Historical Accuracy		Volume of Information	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Description</i>
Site	1.91	SI	1.29	O
Event	1.46	SI	1.26	O
Personality	1.00	NHI	1.09	O
Time Period	1.67	SI	1.15	O
General Information	1.75	SI	1.17	O
<i>Metro Manila Average</i>	<i>1.56</i>	<i>SI</i>	<i>1.19</i>	<i>O</i>

When grouped thematically, the narrative on general information and sites were rated the highest –because most attractions related to these two categories had markers or literature available to tourists. The Rizal Shrine in Fort Santiago for example, which scored the best, had detailed written narratives on boards relating the events leading to Rizal’s execution, burial, exhumation and reburial as part of the exhibit – and so had the different parts of the house in Casa Manila.

On the other hand, at the San Agustin Church and Museum, the three expert sources rated that oral narrative as having numerous historical inaccuracies (1) - and this can be explained by the fact that there were no brochures nor were there any information on the exhibits except that which was engraved at the church entrance.

Also, rather obvious that tour guides relay generally inadequate information inasmuch as they relate only obvious or well-known facts.

It is noteworthy that Event and Personality ranked the lowest. Jeff Rigenbach (2011), in his article *Conjecture and History*, argues that when one writes an account of some historical event or some individual's life and career and you come to a point where the available information thins out, you make your best

guess about what actually happened in order to tell a coherent story — one that does not leave nagging questions in the minds of your readers or listeners. But why did the study yield that conjecture is more common to events and personalities? In time periods, the guides rarely mentioned an exact year. They normally used the phrase “in the early 1800s” - this therefore gives them a whole century of “leeway” for purposes of veracity. As mentioned, sites normally have markers, and in many instances, all the guides did was read them – that narrowed options for assumptions.

Tour guides in Metro Manila bus tours are operated by private tour operators, and all the guides that conduct these tours are free lancers. Throughout the whole tour in both destinations, no brochures or materials were given out; hence there was no initial reference by which tourists could check the veracity of the narrative.

In the Focus Group Discussion with a group of freelance tour guides in Metro Manila, they disclosed that most of them were degree holders. In fact, most of their colleagues are too ---from various disciplines. When asked why they chose this profession, their major reasons were the chance for them to choose assignments and the flexibility of work days. More than half however also said, that they love interacting with people while two people said that although the fee they charge is limited, they derive additional income from commissions and tips. They also revealed that their primary reference for their narratives are transcripts shared to them by more senior guides and the internet. None of them admitted to updating their narratives every tour. They interject new trivia every now and then when they hear a good one from the others. Unfortunately, not one of the tour guides availed of government resources like the NHCP, NCCA, or private organizations that could provide them with more adequate and in-depth knowledge. At least three pointed out that they do use information they had in their notes which they had learned from their lecturer from NHCP during the 25-day seminar. Ironically though, even if the tour guides had inadequate preparation, they conveyed their disagreement to making the accreditation of guides more stringent and the training more substantial.

The researcher observed one big difference between educational tour guides and the tour guides in the tourism industry. All of the educational tour guides are teachers by profession and look at guiding as an extension of their chosen vocation.

The results of this study can be linked to The Narrative Paradigm Theory in the framework which asserts that human beings use narratives and stories to learn and reinforce values and make decisions or judgments. So, when a tour is bereft of the truth (whether it is an outright distortion, omission or exaggeration of facts), it has lost its educational value and is a disservice to the tourist and an

affront to the tourism industry because it steers tourists to form erroneous judgments and flawed views on the country. Sowing any damage to the tourism industry in the Philippines is putting at risk the fourth largest source of Philippine foreign exchange revenue (State Economic Planning Office [SEPO], 2014).

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the half day bus tours in Metro Manila have some historical inaccuracies and relay only to the tourists obvious and well-known facts. Tour guiding in the city is wanting. Despite accreditation, tour guides are not reliable sources of in-depth information on historical sites. Government involvement to ensure historical truthfulness in the tour guiding profession is limited as involvement begins and ends with accreditation.

Recommendations

In the light of the findings and conclusion, the following are suggested to improve tour guiding in the country:

1. Synergy between the Department of Tourism and agencies such as the National Historical Commission of the Philippines and the National Commission for Culture and the Arts as well as liaising with academe will improve the quality of historical tourism in the country.
2. Institutionalizing a code of ethics among tour guides that stresses the necessity of being honest, being accurate and being informative is necessary.
3. The identification of significant historical sites in the country is a necessary joint endeavor of the Department of Tourism and the National Historical Commission of the Philippines. It is not enough that the National Historical Commission of the Philippines has put up markers and plaques at some historical sites. It is impractical for tourists to be brought everywhere that there is a marker of the NHCP. Rather both the DOT and NHCP must identify those sites in the Philippines – linked to significant events and personalities in the country's history and that of the region – that should be visited by tourists considering the limitations of time and cost. Having identified these sites, adequate information can then be provided tourist agencies gathered from primary and secondary sources, commented on and evaluated by experts.
4. The enhancement of the Bachelor of Science in Tourism Management program that would include a major in Tour Guiding.
6. Adoption of a policy on the administration of tour guides and regulatory measures on tour operations as proposed in the next page.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abinales, P. & Amoroso, D. (2005). *State and society in the Philippines*. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing.
- Agoncillo, T. (1999). *History of the Filipino people*. Quezon City: Garotech Publishing.
- Conaughton, R. et al. (1995). *The battle for Manila*. Novato, CA: Presidio Press.
- Cushner, N. (1973). *Spain in the Philippines*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press
- de la Torre, V. (1981). *Landmarks of Manila 1571-1930*. Makati: Visitacion R. de la Torre and Filipinas Foundation Inc.
- Dudulao, M. (1996). *Makati; A vision of the city*. Makati: Japuzinni Publishing Division.
- Intramuros Administration (producer). (2011). *Intramuros*. Manila: Intramuros Administration.
- Lael, R. (1982). *The Yamashita precedent: War crimes and command responsibility*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Medina, I. (1994). Beyond Intramuros: The Beginnings of Extramuros de Manila to the 19th Century – A Historical Overview. In *Manila; Selected Papers of the Annual Conference of the Manila Studies Association (MSA), 1989-1993*, ed. Bernardita Churchill, 50-67. Manila: Manila Studies Association (MSA), Philippine National Historical Society (PNHS), National Center for Culture and the Arts (NCCA).
- National Historical Institute. (1993). *Historical Markers*. Manila: National Historical Institute.
- National Historical Institute. (1998). Panel Resolution. Unpublished report of the NHI formal inquiry on the Mazaua landfall. Manila.
- National Historical Insitute (1998). *Rizal shrine visitor's guide*. [brochure]. Manila: National Historical Institute.

Reel, A. F. (1949). *The case of General Yamashita*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press

Scott, WH. (1994). *Barangay: Sixteenth-century Philippine culture society*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press

Torres, JV. (2005). *Ciudad Murada: A walk through historic Intramuros*. Quezon City: Vibal Publishing and Intramuros Administration.

Journals

Fisher, Louis. (2003). Military Tribunals: A Sorry History. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*. 33 (3), The Permanent War (Sept., 2003), pp. 484-508

Prévost, A.M. (1992). Race and War Crimes: The 1945 War Crimes Trial of General Tomoyuki Yamashita. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 14 (2), 303-338.

Electronic Sources

American Battle Monuments Commission (producer) (n.d.). *Manila American Cemetery* [video file]. Retrieved from http://www.abmc.gov/learning-resources?field_monument_war_tid=All&field_monument_region_tid=10&field_cemetery_or_memorial_nid%5B%5D=3

Department of Tourism (2016). *Industry Performance*. Retrieved from: <http://www.tourism.gov.ph/Pages/IndustryPerformance.aspx#>

Economic Times. (n.d.). *World War 2 haunts treasure hunters*. http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2006-06-20/news/29486148_1_treasure-hunters-gold-bars-philippines

Filipinas Heritage Library (n.d.-a). *Nielson Airport*. Retrieved from the Filipinas Heritage Library official website, <http://www.filipinaslibrary.org.ph/component/content/article/35-history/48-nielson/>

Filipinas Heritage Library (n.d.-b). *FHL celebrates Nielson Tower's 75th anniversary with mini exhibit*. Retrieved from the Filipinas Heritage Library

official website: <http://www.filipinaslibrary.org.ph/news/40-filipiniana/243-fhl-celebrates-nielson-towers-75th-year-with-mini-exhibit/>

Manila American Cemetery and Memorial [Pamphlet]. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.abmc.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Manila_Booklet.pdf

Manila American Cemetery and Memorial [Visitor's Brochure]. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.abmc.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Manila_Brochure.pdf

Manila Hotel (n.d.). *Manila Hotel through the years*. Retrieved from <http://www.manila-hotel.com.ph/history>

Mueller, J (n.d.). *Authentic assessment tools*. Retrieved from the North Central College website: <http://jfmuellet.faculty.noctrl.edu/toolbox/rubrics.htm>

Philippine Statistics Authority (2016). *Contribution of tourism to the economy is 8.2 percent in 2015*. Retrieved from: <https://psa.gov.ph/content/contribution-tourism-economy-82-percent-2015-0>

Senate Economic and Planning Office (2014). *Tourism at a glance*. Retrieved from https://www.senate.gov.ph/publications/AAG%20Tourism_Final_15oct%202014.pdf

United Nations World Tourism Organization (2016). *International tourist arrivals up 4%, reach a record 1.2 billion in 2015*. Retrieved from <http://media.unwto.org/press-release/2016-01-18/international-tourist-arrivals-4-reach-record-12-billion-2015>

World Travel and Tourism Council (2016). *Economic Impact Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.wttc.org/>

Other Non-Print Sources

Heritage Conservation Society (producer). (2002). *Heritage: Here Today, Here Tomorrow? Landmarks that define our reality* [DVD recording]. Makati City: Vidtronics.

Intramuros Administration (producer). (2011). *Intramuros*. [DVD Recording]. Manila: Intramuros Administration.