

# philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

---

## **A Nation in the Making: The Philippines and the United States, 1899-1921**

Review Author: John N. Schumacher

*Philippine Studies* vol. 22, no. 1-2 (1974) 217–219

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

---

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at [philstudies@admu.edu.ph](mailto:philstudies@admu.edu.ph).

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>  
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

often little noticed, but it is only the work of men like Schurhammer which makes possible solidly written books on a level more accessible to the wider public. Philippine historians should look forward to the translation of the subsequent volumes.

John N. Schumacher

**A NATION IN THE MAKING: THE PHILIPPINES AND THE UNITED STATES, 1899—1921.** By Peter W. Stanley. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974. ix, 340 pp. \$12 cloth.

Though there have been several studies of the Philippines under American rule in recent years, numerous gaps in our knowledge remain. The book under review is an important study of American policy and Filipino response to it to the end of the Harrison regime. Unlike the work of Grunder and Livezey, its focus is on events in the Philippines rather than the United States, and it has both a wider scope and covers a longer time period than Salamanca's work. For the Harrison regime it is the first archive-based published study. The author has made good use of manuscript sources both in the United States and in the Philippines, particularly in his extensive use of the Forbes Papers and the Quezon Papers, hitherto little exploited for this period.

Stanley argues that the Philippine Revolution was a "modernizing convulsion" whose nationalism cemented together such related but diverse aspirations as economic development, liberalization and secularization of society, racial assertion, and political independence. After the political defeat of the Revolution, the American regime under Taft adopted a policy of attraction emphasizing the elements of modernization, liberal reform, secularization, and economic development. With this program it hoped to win over the *ilustrado* leaders of the Revolution and gain their support for, or at least neutralize opposition to, the American regime. For this purpose Taft encouraged the founding of the conservative Federal Party with an annexationist platform and gave it his patronage and favor. By 1906, however, this policy was foundering on the rocks of the independence platform of the Nacionalista party, which successfully challenged the Federalista monopoly. It was then given new life by Forbes with a shift in tactics. Realizing the changing power relationships among Filipino political leaders, Forbes allied himself with Osmeña and Quezon rather than with the Federalistas turned Progresistas, while continuing to pursue the essential Taft goals of prosperity and economic development without any defined policy on independence.

Though sincerely devoted to the interests of the Filipino people, as they saw them, Taft and Forbes likewise hoped that material prosperity and modernization would "divert their mind from political matters" such

as independence, and perhaps even bring the Filipino people so to appreciate the benefits of American rule as to forget the aspiration for independence for the indefinite future. But the admission of Filipinos into the political process, necessary if the policy of attraction was to be viable, in the end made this policy bankrupt. Though middle-of-the-road Nacionalista leaders like Osmeña and Quezon were quite willing to postpone independence until the gains that had been made were more secure, the failure of the Republicans to set a date, even a distant date, for independence meant the eventual breakdown of their policy. The events of the Harrison regime made clear that most Filipino leaders were more concerned with self-government than with actual independence. It was the increase in Filipino control of their own affairs that made the Harrison administration congenial to them, and neither Quezon nor Osmeña shared Harrison's enthusiasm for immediate independence. But the failure to provide a definite alternative left them no other political choice than to support independence immediately.

In addition to the main argument outlined above, the author's archival research casts light on numerous other points hitherto unstudied, or further illuminates what had only been alluded to elsewhere. Such points include the varied positions taken by Quezon and Osmeña on independence, the economic development under Harrison and the efforts to use the Philippine National Bank to promote nationalist aims, the relationship between nationalism and elite class interests. Harrison's regime receives a more balanced treatment than has generally been the case, illuminating both the effectiveness of his Filipinization program and the recklessness and arbitrariness with which he often proceeded.

The only weakness this reviewer found in the book was the rather loosely connected two introductory chapters in which the author summarizes the development of Hispano-Philippine society before 1898. He sees the result of Spanish and Filipino contact as a "culture that was not simply hybrid or eclectic, but often quite specifically dysfunctional." Once the isolation in which this culture subsisted was broken down, the fragile structure gave way under the pressure of modernization and thus led to the Revolution. Though it is true that all societies undergoing modernization find many elements dysfunctional, it does not seem clear to the reviewer that these dysfunctions were the result of a mere veneer of Hispanic culture having been overlaid the Malay substructure. Rather it is equally arguable that a culture which was neither 16th-century Malay nor Hispanic, but specifically Filipino had come into being in the 19th century. If some aspects of it proved dysfunctional in the face of modernization, this was not peculiar to Philippine society, but characteristic of modernizing nations. Similarly, though one can readily agree that Philippine Catholicism suffered considerable decay in the 19th century, to reduce the whole to sheer syncretism as Stanley does, goes far beyond the facts, to say the least. Besides a rather facile generalization based chiefly on the unreliable and sensationalist Foreman, the supposition which underlies the author's conclusions is that if Filipino Catholicism did not conform totally to the European pattern it was not authentic, just as he finds

Filipino culture dysfunctional because it was not fully Spanish or Malay.

These conceptualizations of the 19th century background are not, however, integral to the main body of the work, and do not detract from the main argument of the book nor from the value of its account. It seems safe to say that the book will be the starting point of any future work on the period it covers. Moreover it is a major contribution towards the understanding of the entire period of American rule and its relevance to post-independence Filipino-American relations.

*John N. Schumacher*