

philippine studies: historical and ethnographic viewpoints

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

LeRoy's

**The Americans in the Philippines
and the History of Spanish Rule in the Philippines**

Glòria Cano

Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints
vol. 61 no. 1 (2013): 3–44

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints 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.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

LeRoy's *The Americans* in the Philippines and the History of Spanish Rule in the Philippines

James A. LeRoy emerged in 1905 as an authority on Philippine history. In *The Americans in the Philippines*, LeRoy's chapter on the Spanish regime showed his unmatched acquaintance with Spanish and English sources. But his knowledge of Spanish historiography enabled him to suppress important works on the last thirty years of Spanish rule, particularly those dealing with reforms, thereby shaping the image of a "dark age" of medievalism dominated by religious orders. This article explores the significance of LeRoy's book in shaping American colonial discourse and criticizes LeRoy's idea of a "dark age" by introducing part of the bibliography he omitted.

KEYWORDS: HISTORIOGRAPHY • BLACK LEGEND • SPANISH COLONIALISM • AMERICAN COLONIALISM • MODERNISM

I am aware that there are hiatuses and rather abrupt transitions in places, through this attempt at condensation of the events of the entire Spanish regime into a concise discussion and statement of the general tendencies and results of Spanish rule.

—James A. LeRoy (1904f)

In 1996 Lewis E. Gleeck wrote *Nine Years to Make a Difference: The Tragically Short Career of James A. LeRoy in the Philippines* in praise of James A. LeRoy. Certainly LeRoy is indispensable to understanding Philippine history from 1900 to 1909. He witnessed the work of the Taft Commission as Commissioner Dean C. Worcester's secretary, and wrote a first-hand account of the congressional trip in 1905. He was personal secretary and, above all, political adviser to William H. Taft. Although always in the shadows, LeRoy became essential for Taft to function.

Little known is that, from 1904 to 1907, LeRoy was the architect of *The Philippine Islands 1493–1898*, a massive collection of Spanish documents translated into English and edited by James A. Robertson and Emma H. Blair.¹ Nonetheless, LeRoy became famous for his articles in newspapers and journals² and his seminal books, *Philippine Life in Town and Country* (1905) and *The Americans in the Philippines* (1914).

For Gleeck, LeRoy was an American who had the rare gift of interpreting and influencing favorably and brilliantly the management of events in the Philippines. Gleeck (1996, ii) felt that he had a duty to restore LeRoy to public remembrance for

In the capacity of political adviser, LeRoy exhibited an immense capacity for the acquisition of political intelligence, together with [a] scholar's talent for the exploitation of the tools of that profession—the documents on which to base his writing, assembling a notable library both of books and personal papers.

Gleeck based LeRoy's major claim to fame as a scholar on the two-volume work, *The Americans in the Philippines*, which had originally been planned to cover the period of his active service in the US government. This work was important, according to Gleeck, as a review by an American of the last years of Spanish sovereignty in the Philippines. Gleeck notes in

particular that in this book LeRoy “dismisses most of the literature on the Philippines composed by Spanish authors as polemical, superficial, and partisan” (ibid., 90). In actuality, however, LeRoy relied at least in part on Spanish writers and historians for his ideas on the conduct of native affairs. Contrary to Gleeck's assertion, as explained in this article, LeRoy dismissed writings on the Philippines that undermined his arguments. In pursuit of his polemical goals, LeRoy did not hesitate to decry the Spaniards and advance very serious charges against their character and methods of government (Parker Willis 1907, 109).

The Black Legend

This article explores the definitive establishment of the Black Legend about Spanish colonial rule, which became widespread under the hegemony of the Spanish Habsburgs in Europe and with the acquisition of Spain's massive empire in the Americas. Although we can categorically state that this Black Legend became a powerful argument by the enemies of the Spanish monarchy, it was spread in part by Spaniards such as Bartolomé de las Casas, whose dissidence did not cause them to merit punishment of any kind. The enemies of the Spanish monarchy—especially Lutheran reformists, Dutch rebels, and expelled Jews—waged what was probably the first propaganda campaign in European history, launching the highly successful image of the Spaniard as an intolerant priest-inquisitor, bloody conquistador of the Indies, and brutal oppressor of Dutch Protestants. There was, of course, considerable truth to these images but their power as propaganda lay in two corollaries, both of which were totally false: that Spaniards were immensely more cruel than the people who denounced them; and that there was nothing more to Spain than cruelty and intolerance. For centuries the image of Spain as the epitome of absolutism and intolerance would remain fixed in the European collective mind. To the negative image of Spain, the Enlightenment added decadence. For Montesquieu and Voltaire, the decline of Spanish power was proof of the damaging consequences of despotism and intolerance (Alvarez Junco and Schubert 2010, 2).

Changes to Spain's image emerged in the eighteenth century, during which there prevailed a powerful presumption about Spain's lack of cultural value and modernity. This included a widespread impression of the disrepair of highways and inns, the bigotry and superstition of the people, the laziness and idleness of the aristocracy, and the horrific spectacles of the Inquisition's auto de fe and bullfighting. The nineteenth century saw a turnaround in

Spain's image in the wake of the war against Napoleon (1808–1814), which led to a romantic nationalism and the spread of the notion of the indomitable Spanish people. After the Napoleonic War, however, hundreds of British and French veterans published memoirs of their experiences in Spain, many of them exaggerating its dangers and exoticisms (ibid., 4–6). Thus the romantic revaluation of Spain in the early nineteenth century did not alter the inherited stereotype, and the characteristics that were considered typically Spanish were mere transpositions of those of the Black Legend.

The historian William H. Prescott did the most for this stereotype to take root in the United States. His *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Catholic* (1837) shaped the character and direction of historical research in Spanish studies for well over a century. Prescott's paradigm cast Spain's unhealthy combination of political despotism and religious bigotry as the antithesis to US Protestant republicanism. Against the notion of "American exceptionalism"—that the US possessed a unique history that destined it for greatness—Prescott described a Spanish mainstream and left it bereft of the progress and prosperity that flowed in its wake (ibid., 7). The Black Legend thus held sway in American academia and official circles, but it was especially deployed when the US crystallized its imperial ambitions toward Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and the US became the main rival of Spanish imperialism especially in relation to the direct occupation of the Philippine archipelago.

Jacob Schurman, the president of the first Philippine Commission who had studied Spanish institutions and undoubtedly had been influenced by Prescott, established American imperial discourse that represented Spanish colonial rule as a dark age characterized by three centuries dominated by medieval Spanish ecclesiastics, with absolute power in the hands of the religious orders. This argument has been perpetuated until now. It is important to note, however, that the religious orders were losing their power in the late nineteenth century, a point developed later in this article. However, Schurman (1900, 57) did not consider this decline in power, saying instead that until the end of Spanish rule, "It will be noticed that there is scarcely any branch of the municipal government in which the reverend parochial priest does not play an important part."

LeRoy followed and developed this line of thinking. In order to demonize and orientalize Spanish colonial rule, he did not hesitate to omit important Spanish, American, and Philippine texts that contradicted the picture he wanted to portray. He selected his bibliography carefully in order to present

to an American audience a particular construction of Philippine history. In other words, *The Americans in the Philippines* and *The Philippine Islands 1493–1898* gave to Spanish rule a seemingly complete form. From the time these seminal works were published, American scholars seemingly had no need for a Spanish bibliography because these two works of LeRoy appeared to provide them an accurate Spanish history of the Philippines written in English. However, this article questions this unfounded assumption about LeRoy's work.

LeRoy: Sketch of a Short Life

There are three official biographies of LeRoy. The first, a short introduction written by Taft in 1913 and found in *The Americans in the Philippines*, consisted of biographical notes introducing LeRoy as an erudite scholar and politician.³ The second biography, included in the same work, was written by Harry Coleman, editor of the Pontiac (Michigan) *Press Gazette*. The third was written by LeRoy's daughter, Elizabeth L. Kallock.⁴ These three biographic sketches were completely hagiographic, especially those written by Taft and Coleman. The latter pursued a specific objective: to mobilize LeRoy's work in order to reverse the new policy of Filipinization ordered in 1914 by Pres. Woodrow Wilson and implemented by Gov. Francis B. Harrison. In this light, it is not unusual to find some isomorphism between past and present in Coleman's biography. The interpolation of the past as origin of the present was aimed at mobilizing American public opinion through the voice of LeRoy, who had become known as the authority on matters connected with the Philippines. LeRoy was a convinced imperialist and a republican conservative able to suppress any work that could damage the imperial machinery of the US.

James A. LeRoy was born in Pontiac, Michigan, on 9 December 1875 to a farming family.⁵ At age 17 he graduated from high school where he took classical, Latin, and scientific courses and had shown considerable athletic and scholastic ability, "acquiring university attention" (to use Kallock's words) by winning track events. In the three years during which he completed the full four-year course in the Literary College, he participated in track and football and won the admiration of the third president of the University of Michigan, James Burrill Angell, the faculty, and his many friends. His articles on sports and other student activities, all written while he was working in *The Michigan Daily* as sports editor and managing editor, were bought by the Associated Press, which according to his daughter appreciated

the point of view of the participant who was also the writer. In his senior year he was director of the Athletic Association to which he had belonged all three years; captain of the track team; managing editor of the daily; member of the senior reception committee, aside from being a top-ranking student. He was Ann Arbor correspondent for a number of papers throughout these years, contributing to *The Michigan Daily*, *Detroit News*, *Detroit Free Press*, *Pontiac Gazette*, and other metropolitan papers.

He graduated in 1896 from the University of Michigan with the degree of Bachelor of Arts, with highest honors. After graduation he became principal at the Pontiac High School for one year (1896–1897), and probably continued writing for the press. He joined the *Detroit Free Press* and *Evening News* as political reporter. While in New York he made extensive connections with the best publications. Later he became Sunday editor of the *Baltimore Herald*. During his stint in this newspaper he was sent on assignment to Washington, DC, where he was placed in touch with members of the Philippine Commission that President McKinley had then only recently chosen. There he met his former professor and friend, Dean C. Worcester, who invited him to be his secretary and to tag along with the Second Philippine Commission. He took Philippine history and Spanish classes en route. In fact, Worcester (1902) said of LeRoy: “Knowing his excellent university record I selected him unhesitatingly from a large number of applicants for this position . . .”

During his term as secretary of the Philippine Commission in Manila, LeRoy became close to Taft, becoming his political analyst, advisor, and staunch defender. LeRoy kept in touch with the Filipino elite—the members of the recently founded Partido Federal—who provided him with bibliographical information about the Spanish period and the Filipino revolution, and never lost touch with them until he died in 1909.

LeRoy returned to the US with tuberculosis, which he had caught in the Philippines. Taking his doctors’ advice to live in a place with a dry climate, he went to Mexico; there he learned about Spanish politics from Spanish magazines. After his stay in Mexico, LeRoy was appointed consul at Durango (Mexico) in 1904.

LeRoy wrote articles for prestigious journals such as the *Political Science Quarterly*, *Americans Historical Review*, *The Independent*, and *The Atlantic Monthly*. He spent his short life collecting information to write what he considered his magnum opus, *The American in the Philippines*. His work

became a reference for scholars and a pattern for other books such as Charles B. Elliott’s *The Philippines to the End of the Military Regime* (1916), *The Philippines to the End of the Commission Government* (1917), Dean C. Worcester’s *The Philippines Past and Present* (1914), and William Cameron Forbes’s *The Philippine Islands* (1928).

LeRoy passed away in 1909 at the age of 34. Two months before his death, Gen. Clarence Edwards asked him to review the first two volumes of Capt. John R. M. Taylor’s manuscript, “The Philippine Insurrection against the United States: A Compilation of Documents with Notes and Introductions.”⁶ With his usual eloquence, he managed to keep this manuscript from getting published under the Washington Bureau. “I very decidedly believe this work should not be published as it is,” argued LeRoy (1909), because he thought it was not the business of government to furnish an official version of history, and even less so when a part of that history was still the subject of controversy. LeRoy suggested the publication of the insurgent documents without “colorful”⁷ comments, and through a private printing house rather than the government’s. He felt that Taylor’s manuscript, among others, lacked rigor because he used only a few Spanish sources, contained mistranslations, and above all drew upon distortions. This was LeRoy’s last advice to Taft, who would soon be elected president of the United States.

Despite his brief life, LeRoy’s work as a scholar, journalist, and even politician are important, more so because, as argued in this article, he established some stereotypes that influenced the scholarship of future generations and that have managed to survive to the present.

The Americans in the Philippines

Two volumes make up the book, *The Americans in the Philippines: A History of the Conquest and First Years of the American Occupation with an Introductory Account of the Spanish Rule*. The first volume, which spans 424 pages, is divided into ten chapters, which span the periods from the Spanish government to the military diplomacy. The second volume, which runs to 357 pages, is divided into sixteen chapters, which cover events that range from the Filipino appeal to arms to the religious questions. An entire chapter is devoted to the denial of the American promise of Filipino independence, a much-discussed topic in 1914.

LeRoy wrote a long chapter, 146 pages in all, devoted to the Spanish regime based on knowledge drawn from first-hand acquaintance with

leaders of the Filipino nationalist cause. This chapter is divided into three sections: (a) The Spanish Régime—A Three Century Prelude; (b) Municipal Reorganization; and (c) Revolt against Spain: A Race War. *The Americans in the Philippines* was not the first book to have discussed Spanish colonial administration. Worcester, for instance, wrote *The Philippine Islands and Their People* in 1898 and devoted a brief section to the history of the islands. Worcester based his arguments on John Foreman's work, *The Philippine Islands* (1899). In 1905 David Barrows wrote *A History of the Philippines*, which covers the entire period of the Spanish administration, for which he received advice and supervision from LeRoy.

However, it was LeRoy's work that stood out; it defined the author as the first scholarly authority on nineteenth-century and revolutionary Philippine history. Barrows (1914, 181) declared that LeRoy's work "is by far the ablest and most just account which has so far appeared upon the American possession of the Philippines." Having studied Spanish colonial history, LeRoy furnished his readers with an important bibliography based on personal and official records, a fact that conferred rigor to this work. No other writer on the Philippines had exhibited such wide acquaintance with Spanish and English sources. In fact, the author covered all the important works on the Philippines, and he introduced himself as the leading American authority on Philippine affairs.

In writing *The Americans in the Philippines*, LeRoy appeared to have determined in advance to focus on the negative stereotypes that has been associated not only with Spanish policies but also with the Spanish character and the Spanish race since the sixteenth century. He arrived at these portrayals by consulting the new edition of Bartolomé de las Casas's (1821) book, *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*, which dwelt on the maltreatment of Native Americans. LeRoy thus believed that the Spaniards destroyed Filipino institutions and customs, as they did in Mexico. He accused the conquistadors and friars of committing abuses to stifle all forms of native resistance. But he called Spaniards as "being somewhat Oriental" (LeRoy 1904e). LeRoy buttressed the image of Spain as the epitome of absolutism and intolerance. Supported by important bibliographical references, his work provided readers with an image of Spanish medievalism.

In truth, LeRoy's book was the culmination of the American construction of Philippine history started by the first Philippine Commission. It followed

in the wake of the Schurman report that stated the following observations on the Spanish regime:

It failed to accomplish even the primary ends of good government—the maintenance of peace and order, and the even administration of justice; nor can there be any doubt that it proved an engine of oppression and exploitation of the Filipinos . . .

The most prominent defects in this scheme of government were: (1) The boundless and autocratic powers of the governor-general; (2) the centralization of all governmental functions in Manila; (3) the absence of representative institutions in which the Filipinos might make their needs and desires known; (4) a pernicious system of taxation; (5) a plethora of officials who lived on the contrary and by their very number obstructed, like a circumlocution office, the public business they professed to transact; (6) division of minor responsibilities through the establishment of rival boards and offices; (7) the costliness of the system and the corruption it bred; (8) confusion between the functions of the state and the functions of the church and of the religious orders.⁸ (Schurman 1900, 81–82)

Such observations reflected the friars' omnipotent power and denied any efficacy to the Municipal Reform of 1893. By depicting a decrepit, tyrannical, and faltering Spanish rule, these conclusions regarding the Spanish regime were discrediting and tendentious. Schurman (ibid., 81) argued, therefore, that the unfitness of the Filipinos for self-government was due to Spain having "failed to accomplish even the primary ends of good government." He showed how the Filipinos had lived for more than three hundred years under a state of anarchy and chaos.

The defects that Schurman noted were elaborated upon in *The Americans in the Philippines*. As discussed further later in this article, LeRoy followed the dictum of the Schurman report and provided a partial and distorted history that suppressed important books that questioned his propositions. In fact, LeRoy (1909) admitted to General Edwards that his work was "strongly colored that I should not, and never have, considered it a proper work for government publications, else, when I found I could not get for the present at least, a publisher for it . . . what I wrote has too much 'color' so to speak for

a government publication . . .” By admitting his work was “colored,” LeRoy implied he was misrepresenting or distorting historical facts. Yet, it was to be his masterpiece. According to Barrows (1914, 181), LeRoy’s *The Americans in the Philippines* was the culmination of his work on behalf of Philippine scholarship.

Correspondence with *Ilustrados*

LeRoy’s personal correspondence reveals that he sought information from prominent Filipinos, such as Leon Ma. Guerrero, Clemente J. Zulueta, Trinidad Pardo de Tavera, José Albert, Isabelo de los Reyes, and Dominador Gomez, as well as from the Spanish historiographer Wenceslao Retana. He introduced himself as a scholar and always mentioned that he was writing a book that would explain the events from 1898 onwards.

Si me sea posible—y no sé todavía, por no haber hecho un arreglo con los publicadores—querré ilustrar el libro con clichés de Filipinos representativos de todas las clases de opinión entre los “ilustrados.” (Leroy 1904b)

If it is possible—and I do not know yet, because I have not made any arrangement with the publishers—I would like to illustrate the book with clichés of Filipino representatives of all classes of opinion among the “ilustrados.”

He sent letters to his informants asking for the Spanish bibliographical sources he needed to write his book, especially on the events from 1860 to 1896.

LeRoy needed to know as much as he could on the Spanish rule in order to build his arguments about the backwardness and resistance to change of America’s colonial predecessor. Moreover, the Spanish books would help him elaborate upon the “evils” that the Americans had inherited from the Spaniards. This knowledge had a specific purpose—to demonstrate to the anti-imperialists and Democrats the Filipinos’ unfitness for self-government and ultimate independence. By displaying to the *ilustrados*, the Filipino intelligentsia, a liberal acceptance of the goal of the future independence of the Philippines, LeRoy was able to know about the thoughts and feelings of his Filipino friends concerning the American policy in the archipelago.

In 1902 LeRoy drew the attention of Clemente J. Zulueta⁹ to whom he introduced himself as follows:

yo mismo, por ejemplo, tengo comprometida una obra sobre la Ocupación Americana en Filipinas (1898–1903) para el verano que viene . . . y procuraré en lo que podré obrar con justicia a ambos o mejor dicho a todos los partidos. (Leroy 1903a)

I have committed myself to write a work about the American Occupation in the Philippines (1898–1903) next summer . . . I shall try to be fair with all the parties involved.

He also wrote Isabelo de los Reyes,¹⁰ introducing himself as an American scholar:

Estoy estudiando la historia de las Filipinas y especialmente de los años más recientes . . . Me gustaría tener una lista o catálogo de todas sus obras sobre Filipinas. ¿Puede comprarse ahora una colección de los números del periódico “Filipinas ante Europa”? Quisiera comprarla y también colecciones de “La Solidaridad” y de “La Independencia.” Soy americano señor (como usted puede ver soy Cónsul de Americano aquí), pero no tengo prejuicios por eso, y quiero estudiar la revolución Filipina no solamente de nuestro lado sino especialmente del punto de vista de los filipinos, de todos partidos. (LeRoy 1903b)

I am studying Philippine history and especially the most recent years . . . I would like to have a list or catalogue of all your works about the Philippines. Could I buy a collection of the newspaper *Filipinas ante Europa*? I want to buy the collections of *La Solidaridad* and *La Independencia*. I am an American, sir (as you can see I am the American consul here), but I do not have prejudices and I want to study the Philippine revolution not only from an American standpoint but also especially from the Filipino point of view.

Isabelo de los Reyes never replied to LeRoy.

Despite the mention of the three periodicals *Filipinas ante Europa*, *La*

Solidaridad, and *La Independencia* in his letter to De Los Reyes, LeRoy decided to consult only *La Solidaridad* (1889 to 1890). In this way, he minimized Spanish reformism and articulated an evolutionist or developmental history that highlighted some events or markers while completely ignoring others. *La Independencia* became the first separatist newspaper and was subsidized by revolutionaries; it was suppressed by the American administration and LeRoy never used it as a source for his book. *Filipinas ante Europa* was critical of the American occupation of the Philippines; LeRoy also did not consult this periodical for which he had no respect, despite asking De los Reyes about it.

LeRoy (1904b) also sought information from León M. Guerrero,¹¹ saying:

Como Usted habrá podido observar, me he dedicado a escribir con más o menos discernimiento, pero siempre con buena fe—sobre los sucesos de Filipinas.

Ahora estoy preparando un libro, que promete ser muy extenso, sobre los sucesos de Filipinas de 1898 en adelante. Es más bien una revista de la mar de documentos, libros y escritos de todas clases que se han emitido durante los seis años pasados sobre lo ocurrido y muchas veces, lo no ocurrido, en las islas dichas, que una historia que revele un criterio; porque todavía no ha llegado la hora de poderse escribir la historia verdadera de esos sucesos, ni por Filipinos ni por Americanos. He prefijado un capítulo, algo extenso, sobre el régimen español.

As you will have been able to observe, I have devoted to write with more or less discernment, but always with good intention—about the events of the Philippines.

Now I am preparing a book, which promises to be very extensive, about the events of the Philippines from 1898 onward. It is a review with all kinds of documents, books, and works published during the past six years about what have happened or, in many cases, what have not happened in the said islands, a history with a point of view because the time has not come when it is possible to write the true history of those events, neither by Filipinos nor by Americans. I have decided to write a chapter, a rather long one, on the Spanish regime.

LeRoy's predisposition to read the works written by Filipinos and, above all, his claim that he wished to provide his fellow Americans with a history of the revolution captivated Zulueta and other ilustrados, but not De los Reyes and Guerrero. In fact LeRoy discredited De los Reyes and Guerrero because these two criticized the American administration, in particular William H. Taft, in the periodical *El Renacimiento*. Moreover, they were leaders and defenders of Latin customs and ideas. LeRoy (1905a) categorically wrote about De los Reyes and Guerrero as follows:

The Guerreros are about the choice of the young radical party of Filipinos, to my way of thinking. I regard them, with several others most congenial to them, to be perfectly sincere and patriotic, though often too easily excitable and inclined to be petty in their criticisms. Then, too, they give recognition, in their paper and otherwise, to rank demagogues, vicious liars, and mental weaklings of the Sandiko, Isabelo de los Reyes sort.

LeRoy's Book Project

One wonders if *The Americans in the Philippines* was truly the book that LeRoy was working on since 1902. We should not forget that this book appeared in 1914 and it is no coincidence that its publication followed that of James Blount's *The American Occupation of the Philippines 1898–1912*, which was an indictment of Taft's policy. We cannot even be sure if the title was actually selected by LeRoy. What he mentioned to Zulueta, in the extract cited above, and to Taft was a book about the "American Occupation of the Philippines (1898–1903)" that he would work on in the following summer, that is, in 1904.¹² It would appear that LeRoy had given his book the same working title as Blount's, but the latter appeared before his did.

When he wrote Zulueta he said he was to cover the American occupation until 1903. When he explained the contents of his manuscript to Robertson in 1904, he said he planned to cover the entire period during which he actively served the US government:

My original scheme covered in one chapter the substitution of American for Spanish sovereignty, everything, that is, from Dewey's

preparations and the negotiations with Aguinaldo to the outbreak of the insurrection in 1899 . . . My second chapter was to cover the entire year of 1899, after February 4, or the insurrection throughout the islands so far as it was an organized affair . . . My next chapter will be the period of guerrilla warfare, lasting till after the election in 1900—the warfare lasting in many places longer, but the break beginning in December, 1900, with the formation of the Federal Party and taking effect of some of the missionary labors of the Taft Commission. My next chapter will deal with the installation of civil government, carrying things through the midsummer of 1901. The next will tell of the recrudescence of fighting in Samar and Batangas, of the fight upon the civil government by the military and the attempt to turn backward the course of events. That will bring matter in some respects into the spring of 1902, and will touch upon the question of army conduct very intimately, thus dovetailing into my succeeding chapter, which will, for the first time, transfer the seat of Philippine activity to the United States, where the question was fought out in the Senate principally, centering about the charges of army cruelty and about the Taft plan for the final establishment of a progressive civil government. . . . Then I shall devote the next chapter to summing up the civil government as it has been constituted from early 1901 onward and a discussion of the actual workings of government, municipal, provincial and insular *up to the present time* (thus covering many of the more significant events since 1902). In the next chapter, all economic questions, such as Chinese labor, public lands, etc., will be treated. . . . My next chapter will be devoted to the friar and religious question, dealing with the whole question under American occupation, and of course incidentally containing many references to conditions in former times. Following this will be a chapter on the question of the government of the Moros and wild tribes. I have purposely saved these two chapters for a more logical and coherent discussion of these questions and of events related with them under American rule. Of course, the Aglipai schism will receive large attention in the chapter on the religious question. . . . I shall have a final chapter, summing up to the significant things brought out in my chapter dealing with 1898 and following years, and giving me a little chance for the expression of my views, as related, however, quite closely with what is there developed. (LeRoy 1904f)

This outline was mainly chronological. It does not fit the final form of *The Americans in the Philippines*. Although the book ends with a chapter dedicated to the religious question, it does not discuss the Aglipai schism in great detail, even though he had sought information from Father Aglipai to whom he wrote and who in reply sent him various issues of *La Iglesia Filipina Independiente* (LeRoy 1904a). *The Americans in the Philippines* does not deal with “the workings of government, municipal, provincial and insular up to the present,” referring to the period from 1902 until 1904, when LeRoy wrote this letter. In fact *The Americans in the Philippines* spans the period from 1898 to 1900 only.

Gleeck (1996, 89) tells us that LeRoy had to end his book prematurely due to his failing health. LeRoy was working on it until two months before he died in Fort Bayard. It was not very difficult for him to devote a chapter to the American civil government until 1904 since he already started to do this in his earlier books, *Our Spanish Inheritance in the Philippines* and *Philippine Life in Town and Country*. However, his analysis of the civil government from 1902 to 1905 was critical of Governors Luke E. Wright and Henry Clyde Ide and completely antagonistic to that of Dean Worcester. Worcester, in fact, wrote LeRoy a long letter in 1906 strongly criticizing his arguments. At the end of this letter he asked LeRoy to send an outline of his book,

So that I might be in a position to talk business to Ayer should he show any inclination to look favorably on backing its publication. . . . If the general average of your work on your book is up to that which you did on the translation of Mabini's memoirs I would do a good bit of hustling to get it published in the proper way because I should consider that it would be a contribution of great and permanent historic value. But if in covering the period during your absence from the Philippines you have fallen into serious errors of fact and I were to help get the thing out I should kick myself for all time to come. (Worcester 1906)

Thus Worcester was willing to help LeRoy publish his book on condition that the latter would ignore the years when he was not in the Philippines. LeRoy (1906a) replied to this letter, telling Worcester he read the Filipino press regularly, which gave him a good perspective on Philippine events.

I have done a good deal of reading, moreover, in Philippine history these five years past, especially in the political history of the last years of Spanish rule, and I am by that means in possession of a good deal of information of a general sort, sometimes also very particular and personal, which gives me some right to claim to know Filipino politics of today in a measure.

LeRoy was telling Worcester categorically that he was not about to change his mind, something Worcester knew. LeRoy preferred to leave his book unpublished rather than be forced to represent anything other than his own views. He offered his manuscript, “American Occupation,” to the Macmillan publishers but they did not approve a part of it. Thus it seems that LeRoy had practically finished working on the whole book, such as he explained in his letter to Robertson, but could not find a publisher.

LeRoy's Narrative Strategies

A careful analysis of the first part of the book devoted to Spanish colonial rule reveals that LeRoy showed his ability to decontextualize the subject of his discussion by bringing in arguments from the beginning of the nineteenth century and extrapolating them to the end of Spanish colonial rule. For instance, the Spanish assumption in 1810 of an “undeveloped state of the Philippine archipelago and its inability to sustain this burden” (LeRoy 1904c) was applied by LeRoy to have been true until 1898; he thus gave shape to the idea of a halting regime or the absence of institutions. As we will observe, LeRoy did the same with the reforms from 1868 to 1898 by harnessing the comments of Feodor Jagor's (1875) *Mis Viajes por Filipinas*,¹³ Sinibaldo de Mas's *Informe de las Islas Filipinas*, and some decrees of the Spanish Cortes from 1810. Although these works were written prior to the reform period, they were used as a dictum of the truth, leading LeRoy to conclude that the Spanish “reforms were a dead letter.” Thus the chapter devoted to Spanish rule served to confirm what Schurman had pointed out in volume 1 of his commission's report—that Spanish rule was medieval, ecclesiastic, and theocratic. The inevitable conclusion was that of a Spanish dark age, which until now has not been questioned. On the contrary, scholars have ascribed historical value to this chapter in which LeRoy displayed his knowledge of a tendentious Spanish historiography on Philippine studies. Barrows (1914, 183), in his review of *The Americans in the Philippines*, categorically stated:

“Mr. LeRoy's work embodies nearly all the information that is available to the historian.”

LeRoy used a number of specific narrative strategies in writing *The Americans in the Philippines*, such as the diachronic or chronological approach, as he told Robertson. The first chapter, devoted to more than three hundred years of the Spanish regime, leads to some general conclusions, as LeRoy (1904f) himself admitted:

I am well aware that the first two portions of my introductory chapter are general in their nature and that general conclusions I have there stated are not always brought out clearly by what my own text develops. I have, however, expected to put this clearly before the reader as merely a review of the general tendencies of the Spanish rule, and have aimed to fortify the text with references to bibliographical sources which will sustain what I have to say.

LeRoy presented an account of “general tendencies” of the Spanish regime, supported only by his deliberate cooptation and interpretation of the sources. No doubt, in order to understand the last thirty years of Spanish colonial rule, it was indispensable to consult Retana's *La Política de España en Filipinas*, such as some Filipinos had recommended to him for the book he was writing. However, LeRoy decided to omit it because he had very little respect for Retana's reliability. As mentioned, LeRoy distrusted Spanish arguments allegedly because of the dishonesty of Spanish officials. However, he relied, at least in part, on Spanish writers and historians for his ideas as to the conduct of affairs under the native government. He also felt little respect for Filipino scholars such as Pedro Paterno, Trinidad Pardo de Tavera, and Isabelo de los Reyes, in spite of their interest in his work, or Felipe Calderon and *Mis Memorias sobre la Revolución Filipina*, although he had stated that he wanted to write a history of the revolution from the American and Filipino points of view.

LeRoy rejected entirely the so-called Manila radicals. He refused the testimony of the Spanish with mixed blood who preferred “Latin” to “Anglo-Saxon” ideals (Parker Willis 1907, 106). Thus his chapter is full of hiatuses and abrupt transitions brought on by his attempt to condense all the events of three centuries of Spanish rule. The result was a tendency to make general conclusions that were not fully substantiated, such as the

notion that reforms in the Philippines were a dead letter because of the omnipotence of the friars, or that the Spanish administration of the islands was wholly corrupt and inefficient and unsuited to the needs of the people. These arguments would become prevalent in American, Filipino, and even Spanish textbooks.

In order to write about Spanish colonial rule, scholars would consult LeRoy's bibliography, which included the works of Feodor Jagor, Sinibaldo de Mas, Montero y Vidal, Schurman, Blair and Robertson, and above all, his *The Americans in the Philippines*. Most scholars, without using Spanish sources, would conclude that Spanish colonial rule was decrepit, tyrannical, medieval, and backward. It became necessary, as Professor Charles O. Houston stated in 1963, to have an almost complete revision of works on history printed about the Philippines since 1900.¹⁴

LeRoy used another important narrative strategy to shape how Americans would write and impose their official history. He argued that "the various reform programs of liberal and revolutionary governments in Spain must have some attention, but these, and the '1872 revolt,' are really to be relegated to secondary place" (LeRoy 1904d). However, he acknowledged that "in the eighties and nineties the propaganda for reforms, conducted on the part of the Filipinos, especially in Spain, laid the foundation for the later more radical movements in the Islands themselves, though it was itself not separatist propaganda" (ibid.). For him it was more worthwhile to trace this propaganda back to the writings of José Rizal, Graciano Lopez Jaena, Marcelo H. del Pilar, Ferdinand Blumentritt, and others "than to devote special attention to the Katipunan" (LeRoy 1904d). As elaborated by LeRoy and found *ad literam* in *The Americans in the Philippines*, this scheme relegated the reform programs and the revolt of 1872 to secondary place.

Readers were urged to consult *La Solidaridad*, the propagandists' organ that featured the writings of Rizal, Lopez Jaena, del Pilar, and Blumentritt. This advice came at the expense of periodicals and newspapers that emerged in Manila, such as *Diariong Tagalog*, published in 1882, which defended the most liberal solutions for the country; *La Opinión*, founded in 1887, which displayed reformist ideas and anticlerical sentiments; *El Ilocano*, which appeared in 1889 and was the first genuinely Filipino newspaper; and, above all *El Resumen*, nationalist newspaper and organ of *La Liga Filipina* that came out in 1889.¹⁵ LeRoy also deliberately ignored *La Política de España en Filipinas*. Instead he relied on the *Archivo del Bibliófilo Filipino*

and Manuel Sastrón's *Insurrección en Filipinas*, two sources that became standard references for American scholars.

Indeed, the press changed dramatically during the 1880s, when the liberal government passed a law known as the *policía de imprenta o Gullón* (Printing Order or Gullón) in 1883.¹⁶ As a result, the Manila newspapers discussed new topics of interest such as politics, art, literature, fashion, religion, medicine, and justice. The press law did away with censorship and special tribunals that judged crimes related to printing. *El Resumen* and *La Opinión*, even *La España Oriental* among others, defined themselves as nationalist and liberal and called for reforms. They also criticized the friars, as did *La Solidaridad*, but these were published in the Philippines instead of in Spain.

However, like other American scholars, LeRoy spread the idea that freedom of the press did not exist during the Spanish period. He suggested that Spanish censorship was such that one could "look almost in vain in these [local] periodicals prior to 1898 for expressions of the Filipino point of view, or, till the close of 1897, for any frank expression of liberal political views on the part of Spanish editors" (LeRoy 1907, 139). LeRoy's selective bibliography brought about widespread ignorance about the press during the Spanish colonial period. By omitting the Manila newspapers, LeRoy supported the argument about Spanish censorship of the press. In effect, he drew a dichotomy between American modernity and Spanish backwardness.

The following excerpt stated at the very beginning of the chapter sums up LeRoy's tendencies to form general, misleading conclusions. Here he presented to his readers his main argument about Spanish rule—that it was a long dark age when ignorance prevailed:

The people of the Philippine Islands were, on the 1st day of May in 1898, the product of a mixed Asiatic ancestry, both of blood and of environment; of more than three centuries of rule by medieval Spanish ecclesiastics; of commercial and political contact for that length of time with Spaniards of a more progressive type, and for a half-century back with the world in general; and of a generation of strife and of evolution, on the part of their somewhat homogeneous civilized elements, toward a more independent existence and a dimly recognized ideal of nationality. (LeRoy 1914, 1:1)

This summary of three centuries of Spanish rule sought to explain the problems the American administration had faced since May 1898.

The strongest argument—the medievalism imposed by the Spanish regime—was seemingly contradicted by LeRoy’s reference to “Spaniards of a more progressive type.” What did LeRoy mean? He knew perfectly well about the progressive reforms in the archipelago in the last decade of the nineteenth century such as he pointed out in private to José Albert:

Si no hubiera intervenido E.U. en 1898 ¿en qué estado estarían los Filipinos ahora? Los movimientos insurreccionales de 1898 habrían continuado, pero ¿qué esperanzas había de echar a España de las Islas? Y como resultado de las insurrecciones, los reaccionarios de España habrían podido, probablemente restringir más las libertades y cortar las reformas ya comenzadas bajo España (LeRoy 1906c)

If the United States had not interfered in 1898, in what state would the Filipinos be now? The insurgent movement of 1898 would have continued, but what hopes were there to expel Spain from the islands? And as a result of the insurgencies the Spanish reactionaries would probably have restricted more the liberties and cut the reforms already began under Spain.

However, all throughout this chapter in *The Americans in the Philippines*, LeRoy would deny the “reforms” he mentioned to Albert and instead invite the reader to consult the report of the Schurman Commission. Subsequently, he emphasized the opening of the Suez Canal, which led to the influx of liberal ideas to the archipelago. The so-called homogeneous civilized elements would learn of these ideas and proceed to fight against the tyrannical Spanish and friar caciquism. All the arguments laid out by LeRoy in the first paragraph of his book—heterogeneity, medievalism, and a dimly recognized nationality—led to the conclusion that the United States needed to protect the archipelago.

LeRoy constructed the whole chapter based on these generalizations. If we were to select a portion of his story about the Spanish regime that would best illustrate his narrative strategy, we would have to look at his account of the Spanish conquest. As LeRoy (1904f) admitted, “I still believe that the Spaniards did consciously endeavor to destroy native institutions and customs,

as they did in Mexico and as they did wherever else I have seen their work.” With this sweeping statement, he fostered the Black Legend of Spanish rule.

This argument is based on the 1542 *Las Leyes Nuevas*.¹⁸ The conquest of the Philippines had to follow ad literam the corollary of these laws, which LeRoy inferred were never enforced in the Philippines. He did not realize that he was contradicting himself, because in the chapter in *Philippine Life in Town and Country* devoted to “Caciquism and Local Self-Government,” he blamed the Spaniards for conniving with and nourishing native customs—by implication, the Spaniards did not destroy native institutions and customs: “Caciquism was a prime feature of the village life of the Filipinos during the entire three hundred odd years of Spanish control . . . But one may not blame the Spaniards for the existence of caciquism; it was a native institution before they came and they merely accepted . . .” (LeRoy 1905b, 173). This statement erases the Latin imprints in the archipelago. Yet in *The Americans in the Philippines* Spain was the ruthless destroyer of native customs.

When in 1898 the US finally engaged Spain in military conflict, the Black Legend was trotted out in all its sixteenth-century fullness. For instance, a new edition of Bartolomé de las Casas’s book¹⁷ on the Spanish maltreatment of Native Americans was published in New York; other works of propaganda carried the same message (Alvarez Junco and Schubert 2010, 7). Moreover, the Spanish regime until the nineteenth century, or specifically until the 1860s, was cast as the Golden Age of Spanish ecclesiastical rule, which was never to be overcome:

Patriotic, sometimes also intelligent *efforts* were made to avert it [the final collapse], and the nineteenth century in particular was in Spain a drawn-out wrestling bout between the blind power of the “old giant of medievalism” and reaction and the spasmodic and nervous exertions of the young man of Spanish liberalism, re-aroused at intervals to the movement of scientific and political progress. (LeRoy 1914, 15, italics added)

The seemingly innocent word, “efforts,” is central to understanding LeRoy’s further conclusion that the reforms or promises made by Spain were only efforts, but never enforced. He also established in this paragraph the axis of development from medievalism to liberalism, the former being so deep-rooted that liberalism failed to surmount it. Finally, for LeRoy, the

concessions made by Spain were generous and democratic in manner but Spain could not free herself from the iron hand that “bound her stationary to a past in whose glories she came more and more to live” (ibid.). LeRoy blamed Spain—the mother country—for being unable to implant modern ideas of government, education, politics, and religious tolerance in their full sense.¹⁹

LeRoy recognized that some progress had been made from 1863 onward, but ultimately denied them by using Sinibaldo de Mas’s *Informe Sobre el Estado de las Islas Filipinas*, which was published in 1843. LeRoy simplistically extended Mas’s conclusions to the period until 1898. He also found support for his argument in José Montero y Vidal’s *Historia General de Filipinas*, which was rabidly profriar, conservative, and antireformist, a book that fitted perfectly into the history the Americans were constructing. Note that Montero y Vidal finished writing his history of the Philippines in 1872.

LeRoy dismissed the ideas of Victor Balaguer, who suggested that revolutionary reforms be implemented.²⁰ These reforms were conceived as the product of the progress or exigencies of the nineteenth century. Balaguer’s *Islas Filipinas: Memoria* is a faithful reflection of his idea of progress. “It is necessary,” he stated, “to prepare those islands in order to respond to the expectations and promises of the future; it is necessary to foster the trade with the metropolis; to ‘hispanize’ the country” (Balaguer 1895, 7). The real intentions of Spain, no doubt, were the “re-colonization and Hispanization” of the archipelago—aims that were very different from what LeRoy stated in his book.

The Maura Law and Municipal Reforms

LeRoy devoted attention to a specific section entitled “municipal reorganization,” which was meant to support Schurman’s argument about the “absence of native institutions.” He explained in detail the municipal reorganization from 1886 to 1893, using information from the Schurman report, which he advised readers to consult as well. He started with the timid reform implemented by Manuel Becerra, minister of the colonies in 1890 and 1894, which ordered a royal decree on 18 January 1889 (Celdrán Ruano 1994, 207). This decree was to be a step toward giving the natives complete control over local and even provincial affairs. The first sentence—which reads, “It was, however, only a decree conferring upon a few of the larger towns the right to organize *en ayuntamiento* like those of the municipalities

of Spain . . .”—suggests that the reforms were a dead letter (LeRoy 1914, 42). LeRoy did not support this statement with any Spanish source, although Retana had written this in 1890, a year after the promulgation of Becerra’s *Reformas y otros excesos*, a clear indictment of the reforms implemented by Becerra (Cano 2008, 273–302).

Curiously, LeRoy explained in detail the reforms established by Becerra, but downplayed and distorted the royal decree of 19 May 1893 related to the municipal regime in the Philippines enacted by Antonio Maura, the minister of colonies from 1892 to 1894. This royal decree came to be known as the Maura Law, which was the loftiest and democratic reform of local administration implemented in the archipelago. It was to become a model for the municipal reforms introduced in Cuba and Puerto Rico in June 1893.

The royal decree was structured in three chapters: the first pertained to the organization of local government; the second to the administration and the treasury of villages; the third to general dispositions. On the whole, Filipinos would have representation in their pueblos (Marimon 1994, 111–38), with the friars losing their power to make decisions. This reform was lauded by some Filipinos such as Pedro Paterno, Manuel Artigas, and the writers of *La Solidaridad*. For this reform to be more popular and able to reach the entire population, it was published in 1896 as a newspaper written in Tagalog, *Ang Pliegong Tagalog*. In response, “Filipinos applaud enthusiastically because they observe how their rights are consolidated by law . . .” (Paterno 1893, 5).

LeRoy made no mention of this newspaper. For him the Maura Law remained, as with too many other reforms of Spain, mostly a promise. At this point readers were told that

For a resumé of the whole system of Spain in the Philippine Islands, see *Report of Philippine Commission*, 1900, vol. 1, part IV. The reader is, however, in danger of being misled if he does not understand that the organization, showing the governmental scheme as modified by recent laws, some of which had not at all, or had but lately, taken effect. (LeRoy 1914, 44, italics added)

This advice was essential for LeRoy’s summary negation of the implementation of the Maura Law. He informed readers that the organization

of the municipal and provincial government, such as was explained in the Schurman report, was either modified or had not taken effect. Schurman based his discussion of the Spanish government on the Maura Law since the Department of War had translated it into English. It was a tacit recognition that the Maura Law, like other decrees from the reform period, was implanted in the Philippines, but Schurman concluded that there were no representative native institutions since the Maura Law was only nominal. LeRoy advised the readers to consult page 81 of the Schurman report, which demonstrated the corruption, autocracy, and backwardness of the Spanish regime. But what for Schurman was an absence of representative institutions would be rendered in LeRoy's pen as a definite dead letter, with the law never having taken effect.

Note, however, that although LeRoy categorically denied the implementation of this municipal reform he recognized this law in private:

the provisions in the Maura law of 1893, and the fact that Blanco, in promulgating this law with the regulations for its practical enforcement in the towns, provided that the curates should not be interfered with in their time-honored right of school inspection, though the municipal councils were also to act as school boards. (LeRoy 1904g)

He did not make this statement in his published works. He assumed the religious orders would never lose their prominence; on the contrary, he portrayed a medieval Spain whose government was characterized by bigotry and its laws were the sacraments of an infamous religion.

To render his conclusion more effective, LeRoy advised the reader to consult the appendix to volume XVII of Blair and Robertson's *The Philippine Islands 1493–1898*, which had translations of sections of Mas's *Informe* of 1843 and Montero y Vidal's *Historia General de Filipinas*. LeRoy's objective was to tackle a topic without developing it, and instead point to bibliographical references. Parenthetically, this strategy is perhaps the true significance of this chapter, with LeRoy influencing future scholars of history by urging them from then on to use Blair and Robertson's multivolume compilation for a fuller idea of the Spanish system.

Mas and Montero y Vidal never wrote anything about Spanish reformism or the Maura Law since this law took effect long after the publication of

their books. LeRoy seemed to have provided a neat picture or structure of the Spanish system by suppressing important books. He did not mention Wenceslao Retana, who was very prolific during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and who in fact had published a large bibliography about the Maura Law.²¹ Although LeRoy was acquainted with some of the books from Retana's bibliography, he decided to ignore them. Certainly the years 1896 and 1897, as explored in the next section, were discussed in many publications, conservative as well as liberal. LeRoy was familiar with most of this huge historiography, and many of these books were found in the United States, but he was extremely selective in using them. This rich bibliography had all but been forgotten.

Instead, LeRoy's account was what subsequent scholars built on. One example is the Filipino scholar Eliodoro Robles (1969, 67), who stated in his seminal work, *The Philippines in the Nineteenth Century*, "Spain was not entirely averse to granting more powers to municipal and provincial government at the proper time as evinced by reforms in the last decades of the century when local capacity to rule began to merge. Unfortunately, time ran out on her." Robles recognized the reformist policy of the Spaniards, but he denied the Maura Law by using LeRoy's *The Americans in the Philippines* and Schurman.

Another example is Frank Golay's (1997, 60) assertion, "The maintenance of law and order at the local level was the responsibility of the priest who dominated the municipal government in his parish and could call upon the provincial detachment of the Guardia Civil." This statement sums up the notion of three hundred years of evangelizing mission under an autocratic regime, which remained imperturbable from 1565 to 1898, denying the reform program implemented at the end of the nineteenth century. Golay here follows the pattern displayed in *The Americans in the Philippines*.

In a narrative strategy akin to LeRoy, Glenn May (1988, 36) states in his widely cited essay, "Civic Ritual and Political Reality," that the Maura Law was never implemented in the Philippines. All the elections, he says, "were conducted according to the regulations established by the Municipal Reform Decree of 1847, despite the fact that a new municipal law specifying a new electoral procedure was passed in 1893." May sidesteps the issue using empirical examples drawn from elections held prior to 1893.

In sum the *ilustre filipinólogo americano* (distinguished American Filipinologist), as Manuel Artigas referred to LeRoy, became indispensable

to both the colonial government and the serious student of history, superior to anything that had yet appeared.

On Separatism and the Philippine Revolution

The Spanish regime in the Philippines from 1868 to 1898 was a modern system capable of modifying the old structures. This period witnessed the construction of the democratic state, which was initiated by “the democratic revolution” of 1868. If one would summarize the last thirty years of Spanish rule in the Philippines in a single word, it would be reformism—certainly not the medievalism asserted on the first page of *The Americans in the Philippines*. Spain decided to implement reforms in order to restructure the whole system. This reformist convulsion was reflected in a frantic publication of books and newspapers mostly between 1896 and 1898. Many of these books blamed the reformist policy for the outbreak of the Philippine revolution—books that LeRoy deliberately ignored.

This section analyzes some of those books. In doing so I do not mean to justify Spanish ideas. On the contrary, I seek to demonstrate that Spanish colonial rule, before its total collapse, was restructuring its colonial system. This was the main reason why reforms were implemented, what LeRoy and other scholars had ignored *sine die*, although they had not consulted old or modern Spanish bibliographies. Admittedly the Spanish regime established the reforms too late.

In fact LeRoy was careful in the last section of *The Americans in the Philippines* devoted to the Spanish regime by writing distinct and separate sections on the Filipino Propaganda and the Revolution of 1896 and 1898. LeRoy considered it essential to inform his American audience about the events of 1896–1898. To this end he used three sources on the 1896 revolution: Sastrón’s *Insurrección en Filipinas*, some portions of Retana’s *Archivo del Bibliófilo Filipino*, and also Retana’s *La Política de España en Filipinas* for some trivial information. LeRoy, who had serious animadversions of Retana and had very little respect for the latter’s reliability, cautioned the readers and scholars against the use of Retana’s works, especially *La Política de España en Filipinas*. In March 1905, he urged Robertson to suppress that journal: “you will find there sufficient internal evidence to *damn Retana completely*” (Cano 2009, 281, italics added). For LeRoy *La Política* was the organ subsidized for the purpose of combating the campaign for a liberal regime in the Philippines waged by Spaniards and Filipinos. However, *La Política* emerged to counteract

the influence of *La Solidaridad*. Actually the editors of both periodicals distributed their antagonistic papers among members of the Spanish parliament.

For 1897 LeRoy extracted a few notes from the memorial of Spanish Gov.- Gen. Fernando Primo de Rivera and his account of the Pact of Biak-na-Bato, the truce between Primo de Rivera and Emilio Aguinaldo to end the Philippine revolution. He also used Gen. Ramón Blanco’s memorial and some books close to the conservative trend. However, he omitted the parts of these books that concluded that the revolt of 1896 was the result of the implementation of reforms, which furnished the germ of separatism. LeRoy’s story of the revolution was a compendium of facts found in the abovementioned books that he depended upon (Sastrón 1901; Blanco 1897; Primo de Rivera y Sobremonte 1898). Although these sources considered the writings of the ilustrados as the catalyst of separatist ideas, LeRoy denied this argument. He made clear the absence of any relationship between the writings of the ilustrados and the Katipunan newspaper *Kalayaan*²² published by Retana (1897) in *Archivo del Bibliófilo Filipino*.²³

The Katipunan was perceived by the Spanish government of the nineteenth century as an excrescence of Masonry, which had coopted and made fanatics out of the masses. According to Spanish sources—Retana and Sastrón—Marcelo H. del Pilar advised the creation of another association in 1892, which would serve to attract the peasants and the illiterate. This association would come to be known as the Katipunan. In *La Política de España en Filipinas*, Retana published an article on 30 April 1896 and another on 15 May 1896, entitled “El Separatismo en Filipinas.” He echoed some letters sent to the newspaper *El Correo* by someone called Roque Rey, who explained the main reasons for the rise of separatism or *filibusterismo*, as it was called in the Philippines,²⁴ which were as follows: the reformism that prevailed in the archipelago, assimilationist sentiments, Masonry, republican ideas, hatred of the friars, and the policy of attraction followed by some governors. Here Retana denounced the policy implemented by General Blanco.

Important to note is the last reason pointed out by Retana—the implementation of the policy of attraction. LeRoy mentioned the same sources in *The Americans in the Philippines* and used the same arguments, but with a twist. General Blanco was deemed responsible for the uprising of 1896 by governing with tolerance and ignoring the secret meetings and the rumors of the advent of a revolution. Blanco had to justify his acts before

the Spanish senate. Among his many interesting statements was that many prominent people in the Philippines were not separatists. Many liberals and above all republicans regarded the Filipino ilustrados as reformist and above all assimilationist rather than separatist. Spanish republican politicians and journalists such as Victor Balaguer, Joan Sol i Ortega, Emili Junoy, Eusebi Coromines, Francesc Rahola, or Francesc Pi i Margall, among others, supported the Filipino nationalist cause. These politicians and journalists trusted the loyalty of Filipinos, inviting the latter to meetings that discussed freedom and emancipation of peoples. In turn, Filipinos such as Del Pilar, Lopez Jaena, and Rizal wrote in Spanish republican newspapers such as *El Imparcial*, *El Liberal*, *El Globo*, *La Justicia*, *El País*, *La Publicidad*, *La Vanguardia*, *El Noticiero Universal*, and *El Suplemento*. In fact Lopez Jaena was the editor of *El Latigo Nacional*, a republican newspaper based in Barcelona. These Spaniards saw separatism as something fostered by conservative and friar elements. On the contrary, Blanco justified his policy of attraction as preventing the implantation of separatism.

LeRoy overlooked the fact that Blanco came to the archipelago with the Maura Law. In implementing this law he founded native institutions and gave the *principalía* more political autonomy in ruling the municipalities. He also allowed freedom of the press, implementing the abovementioned printing order or Gullón. This new liberal turn fostered, according to conservative sources, the revolt of 1896.

It appears, therefore, that the reasons exposed by Roque Rey or Retana—assimilationism, Masonry, republican ideas, hatred of the friars—were the inevitable consequences of applying Blanco's policy of attraction. As a matter of fact, Retana wrote inflammatory articles against Blanco ever since his arrival. But the most fruitful literature about the evils of reformism came out in 1897, and was reiterated and radicalized in 1898. It is important to analyze some of the books and newspapers that considered the reforms as cause and effect of the revolt of 1896.

Eduardo Navarro (1897, 230), an Augustinian, wrote a book entitled *Filipinas: Estudio de algunos asuntos de actualidad*, in which he explained the implementation of reforms such as the new municipal regime, the enforcement of a civil and penal code, and the appointment of justices of the peace. He complained that the friars had been stripped of their power and that the revolt was an intrinsic effect of reformism. In a short period of time, barely five years, he said,

todas las reformas que dejamos mencionadas [regimen municipal, Códigos civil y penal, juzgados de paz y la masonería] excepción hecha de los Juzgados de paz que tuvieron lugar en 1893; la vida, costumbres y leyes patriarcales y tutelares habíansido en parte perturbadas, y en parte desaparecido

all the reforms we have mentioned [i.e., the municipal regime, penal and civil codes, justices of the peace, and Masonry], except for the justices of the peace which took place in 1893; the way of life, customs, and patriarchal laws were, in part, disrupted and in part obliterated . . .

Navarro's statement contradicted LeRoy's argument regarding the perpetuation of medievalism. He used Navarro's book but invited the reader to read only the last chapter entitled "La Masonería," and then concluded that the book was irrelevant. It would seem so because de facto it questioned LeRoy's arguments.

Camilo Millán, a recalcitrant journalist, explained the origins of the insurrection in the newspaper *El Español* as caused by the benevolence of the Spanish government, the municipal autonomy that gave shape to the formation of the "Katipunan," and the Spanish eagerness to assimilate the natives. In short, Spanish reformism encouraged the separatist movement by giving rights and preeminence to the natives. For Millán (1897, 119) these were important factors in the formation of the Katipunan,

porque la invasión de los Tribunales municipales por los mestizos de sangley ha sido mayor que la de Roma por los bárbaros del norte y mestizos de sangley han sido la mayor parte de los cabecillas y el mayor número de insurrectos calificados

because the invasion of the Municipal Courts by sangley *mestizos* have been greater than that of Rome by the barbarians from the north, and most of the leaders and qualified insurgents have been those sangley *mestizos*.

The Maura Law, said Millán (*ibid.*, 47),

no hizo otra cosa que cambiar los caracteres del mal y dar ocasión a que los enemigos de la Patria, prevaliéndose de la autonomía dada

a los nuevos municipios, completasen su organización y precipitaran los acontecimientos que todos deploramos.

did nothing else to change the characters of evil and give occasion to the enemies of the Patria, availing themselves of the autonomy given to the new *municipios* in order to complete their organization and precipitate the events which we all deplore.

The use of the past tense showed once more that the Maura Law was in force. In fact, Millán explained that the law was constituted as early as 1893, stating that by 1897 there had been four years of municipal autonomy. The different chapters of this book enumerated all the reforms the Spaniards implemented in the Philippines as that explained by Navarro.

More mordant is Juan Caro y Mora in *La Voz Española*, a conservative newspaper born under the banner, “The Philippines by Spain and for Spain.” Coming out on 5 March 1892, *La Voz Española* combated assimilationists and *politiquillos* (petty politicians), and at the same time championed the progress of the conservative’s claims defending the friars. Caro y Mora was Filipino but completely hispanized and was thought to be under the influence of the man of letters, Fr. Evaristo Fernández Arias, with whom he collaborated in this paper. In fact, Fr. Fernández Arias practically wrote all the articles signed by Caro y Mora.²⁵ Caro y Mora (1897, 10–11) subscribed to the same causes of the insurrection identified by other authors, but introduced something new in his explanation that would prove very useful for LeRoy and others.

Rasgo peculiarísimo y nuevo de esta rebelión es la forma en que se preparó. Idea esencialmente política, la de independencia . . . y de esa idea fue germinando lenta y reflexivamente en los caciques y promovedores, quienes a la sombra de las sociedades secretas le dieron forma y cuerpo y la propagaron en las masas.

The peculiarity and novelty of this rebellion is the way in which it was prepared. The idea was essentially political, independence . . . and this idea germinated slowly and reflexively among the caciques and promoters in the shadow of the secret societies [Masonic lodges] that gave it form and body and propagated it among the masses.

Finally, we should note in the statement of José M. Castillo y Jiménez in 1897 that Masonry had been the workshop that forged hatred toward Spain, and that municipal reform had fostered this filibusterismo. For Castillo those Filipinos residing in Spain, who were supported by Spanish politicians, incited their compatriots and engendered the revolution. Castillo regretted that the moral and Christian foundations established by Spain in the Philippines were collapsing because of the ideas introduced by Masonry.

These books and many others stated categorically that the evils then facing the archipelago had arisen because of the reforms implemented by the Spanish government. LeRoy knew and used all the abovementioned books, but gave a sectarian view: he suppressed the chapters devoted precisely to the establishment of the reforms.

The abovementioned books about the 1896 revolution had appeared during the signing of the Pact of Biak-na-Bato in mid-1897. All of them had a clear conservative trend and were useful for LeRoy. But he suppressed the liberal narratives that blamed the friars and spoke about the decline of their power. For instance, Pi i Margall, who continued to support the Filipino cause during the impasse of the revolution, wrote an editorial in *El País* dated 22 December 1896, and reissued in 1897, entitled “Filipinas,” declaring that the work of the friars was falling into pieces. He strongly believed that the true separatists were the friars since most of the separatist propaganda came from their printed works. Pi i Margall (1896, 2) concluded his editorial by declaring the disappearance of the friars’ preeminence *para la salud del reino* (for the health of the kingdom).

Moreover, the federal republican Miguel Morayta continued to be supportive of the Filipino cause, despite being accused of being a Mason and a traitor to Spain. Morayta founded in 1897 a political journal called *El Republicano* (Retana 1906, 1390), which offered news about the Philippines. Above all Morayta remonstrated against those who saw the revolt as a consequence of Masonry. *La Voz de Ultramar* was also a liberal journal. Felipe Trigo provided facts that were quite different from, indeed antithetical to, those published by Sastrón or Retana. A doctor, journalist, and writer, Trigo blamed all the causes of the revolution on the clergy. He defended the government of General Blanco who had to face up to the senate for the soft treatment of the rebels and his inaction during the revolution. Trigo asserted that Blanco could not be blamed for the revolution; on the contrary, the blame should be put on the friars.

The selective cooptation by LeRoy of the abovementioned sources or the suppression of other books allowed him to delineate a dark age of Spanish rule that would eventually dominate historiography. The denial of reformism facilitated the spread of the idea that Spanish rule was backward and immobile. *La Solidaridad* and the writings of some ilustrados such as Del Pilar and above all Rizal had earlier provided an image of the omnipotence of the friars until 1898. The image of oppression and tyranny under Spanish rule built up by the ilustrados became the driving force of the separatist movement. Ironically, however, selective and decontextualized images of Spanish rule showing a quasi-medieval obscurantism nicely suited the American argument that the Filipinos were unfit for self-government. Therefore, the Filipinos needed American tutelage.

An example of how LeRoy misused the ilustrados' works could be seen in a letter addressed to *El Renacimiento*. In this letter LeRoy (1906b, 15) accused the Filipinos of ignoring their own history:

La verdad es que muy pocos Filipinos demuestran saber la historia de su país, aún de estos diez años pasados, y hacen continuamente los periódicos filipinos asertos en cuanto a los sucesos de 1896 y 1898 y 1899 que carecen enteramente de fundamento histórico. Yo no digo que Andrés Bonifacio no era patriota y, hasta cierto grado, que hizo bien en organizar el katipunan. Pero, en vez de los mal considerados elogios de Bonifacio que se oyen ahora constantemente, y de labios de Filipinos que le despreciaron a él en su vida y se renegaron de su causa, daría yo a recordar a los Filipinos que lo que predicó él era una guerra de razas, y el asesinato (no hay otra palabra por ello) de los blancos. Y antes de llamar su trabajo "glorioso" y de querer glorificar también la rebelión de 1896 como una legítima etapa en la verdadera Revolución Filipina, es decir, en la evolución hacia más libertades sociales y políticas, recuérdese que ninguna nación estable se ha establecido sobre el asesinato y el crimen como base. Bonifacio se excusa en gran parte por su falta de luces, por el atmósfera medieval con que el gobierno de antes le había rodado lo mismo que a todos los Filipinos.

The truth is that few Filipinos know the history of their country, even that of the past ten years, and Filipino newspapers continuously make assertions regarding the events of 1896 and 1898 and 1899,

which lack any historical foundation. I do not say that Andrés Bonifacio was not a patriot since, to a certain extent, he did well in organizing the Katipunan. Yet, instead of the ill-considered eulogies of Bonifacio, which are now constantly heard from some Filipinos who despised him and renounced his cause, I would remind them that what he preached was a war of races and the assassination (for lack of a better word) of the whites. And before claiming that his work was "glorious" and before glorifying the revolt of 1896 as a legitimate phase in the real Filipino revolution, that is to say, in the evolution toward more social and political freedoms, it must be remembered that no stable nation has ever been established on the basis of assassination and crime. We can excuse Bonifacio because of his ignorance, not in vain was he educated under a medieval atmosphere as all Filipinos.

By underscoring Bonifacio's ignorance and how Filipinos had been educated under a medieval atmosphere, LeRoy was effectively denying self-government for the Philippines. He continued giving his version of historical lessons for Filipinos by arguing that, if Dewey had not helped them get rid of the Spanish yoke, the most reactionary party of Spain would have denied them any reform (Cano 2011, 76). He stated that Filipinos had forgotten Rizal's accounts and what he had advocated. LeRoy decontextualized Rizal's words by asserting that such words denounced the friars' tyranny although he and the ilustrados considered that the separation was for an indefinite future. LeRoy interpreted history by interpolating past and present. Finally, he expressed the Americans' real intentions, not the ilustrados' arguments.

LeRoy had constructed a much "colored" history of the Spanish Philippines to justify the US occupation of the archipelago. He had decided to ignore certain historiography in order to defend the record of Taft in the archipelago, the educational system, the political system, and the political ideals set up by the insular administration for the guidance of the natives, the introduction of American legal ideas into the islands, and the general attitude adopted toward the natives by the American administrators (Parker Willis 1907, 105–13).

LeRoy not only neglected Spanish historiography but also dismissed other voices such as those of the British John Foreman, Alleyne Ireland, or Frederick Sawyer because they were critics of the American occupation in

the Philippines. He also silenced the American scholar Henry Parker Willis, who in 1905 wrote *Our Philippine Problem* and in 1906 “The Philippines and the Filipinos: A Reply.” Willis had been very critical of the American administration in the Philippines, stating emphatically that the Americans were creating a dysfunctional system. Willis (1907, 109) claimed in 1906 that LeRoy

falls into the error too widely and too readily accepted in this country of supposing that the Spanish administration of the islands was wholly corrupt and inefficient and was unsuited to the needs of the people. In the Philippines their system of rule was much more acceptable to the natives during the greater part of their stay than is that of the Americans.

Willis’s perception was that there had been more profound dissatisfaction, more unrest, and more military activity in different parts of the islands since the Americans took charge, many times more than during the same number of years under Spanish rule. LeRoy could not accept this argument since for him all the problems the Americans were confronted with were inherited from Spanish [mis]rule. Lamentably, LeRoy’s argument has prevailed in the academe while scholars such as Parker Willis are hardly cited in textbooks.

Conclusion

In 1911 President Taft, traveling to Pontiac, reminded his audience of LeRoy’s imperishable work in the far-away Philippines:

Here near the school where he graduated, I wish to pay a debt of gratitude to his memory on behalf of the people of his nation. He went to the Philippine Islands, learned the people and their history, and he finally gave up his life on the field of battle, because he there became a victim of impaired health. (Gleeck 1996, 115)

LeRoy had done his best to serve the United States government.

Although his work served the interests of the US, his *The Americans in the Philippines* suppressed important works that contradicted or undermined his line of argument. One could say he was successful in

establishing a binary opposition between a liberal and modern US, on the one hand, and a medieval and decrepit Spain, on the other—which supported US imperial ambitions in the Philippines. David Barrows praised *The Americans in the Philippines* as “indispensable to the serious student of history and of colonial government, superior to anything that has yet appeared and far above the recent works of Blount and Worcester, not only in the range of materials employed, but in judicial tone and convincing power” (Barrows 1914, 183). As time passed, LeRoy would be remembered as a rigorous and objective historian. No one questioned his role in the US administration from 1900 to 1909. Ultimately his history triumphed in the academe, never mind that it was a political exercise in remembering and suppressing.

In the 1960s, Charles O. Houston (1963, 2), while researching in the Library of Congress about James A. Robertson, came across the figure of James A. LeRoy. He concluded that “efforts should be made to locate LeRoy’s papers. Enough is contained in his correspondence with JAR and Emma Blair to indicate that he was a person of great importance to the developing American policy in the Philippines in the early years of the century.” He was right. LeRoy was a person of great importance not only in the making of American policy but also as a scholar. His influence, although apparently attenuated, persists. If we look at the bibliography consulted and cited by American and Filipino scholars we immediately notice that they use *The Americans in the Philippines* as a creed to explain away Spanish rule. LeRoy had written a “definitive” history in his magnum opus. Future scholars, as Barrows stated in his review, henceforth did not need to use Spanish sources to write a history of the Spanish regime in the Philippines.

LeRoy represented Spanish rule as a dark age, which could be contrasted with the light of American progressivism and liberalism. The modernism of American institutions could also be contrasted with Filipino habits that were deeply rooted. The Americans were merely the inheritors of the problems created by medieval Spain. This was LeRoy’s legacy, if we do not look beyond Gleeck’s hagiography.

Notes

This work is part of a collective research project, Eclipse Imperial: Transición y emergencia de nuevas estructuras políticas en América, Asia y África (1750-1950), funded by the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad (MINECO) HAR2012- 39352-C02-01.

- 1 This argument is developed in Cano 2008a, 2008b.
- 2 For instance, "Taft as Administrator: Traits and methods as revealed by his work in the Philippines." This paper was totally propagandistic in promoting Taft's career bid for the presidency. Also see "The Philippines and the Filipinos" written in 1906 for the *Political Science Quarterly*, which is an indictment of Henry Parker Willis's *Our Philippine Problem*, and "Our Spanish Inheritance in the Philippines" published in the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1905. In this paper, LeRoy analyzes a corrupt system called *caciquism*; and "'The Philippine Assembly' or 'Philippine Problems After Ten Years' Experience.'" All these papers emerged with a definite purpose depending on the years they appeared.
- 3 LeRoy can be considered a true politician since he advised Taft and even President Roosevelt on all Filipino matters. An example was his recommendation to cultivate as far as possible the youth who had been the more radical and had in the majority of cases remained more suspicious of the Americans. LeRoy suggested to Taft and Roosevelt that they had to attract the members of the nationalist party. When Taft became US president he fulfilled LeRoy's recommendation to the letter.
- 4 I do not know if this biography was published although I found a draft among the papers of James A. LeRoy. This draft stated that this biography was written in 1979, but Gleeck (1996, 1) asserts that this biographic sketch was written in 1970.
- 5 To write most of this brief biographic approach I have followed Elizabeth L. Kallock's biography, although some parts are my own based on reading LeRoy's correspondence.
- 6 "The Philippine Insurrection Against the United States: A Compilation of Documents With Notes and Introduction" was never published in the United States. The Filipino historian Renato Constantino decided to publish it in the Philippines in 1971.
- 7 LeRoy considered Taylor's manuscript a misrepresentation and distorted history of the insurrection. He described the manuscript using the euphemism "colorful" by which he meant, "to distort" or "distortion."
- 8 These conclusions about the old regime, which have become the stereotypical images of the Spanish regime, were reproduced by Bourne 1903, 19–87; Barrows 1914; Cunningham 1919; LeRoy 1914; Hayden 1942.
- 9 Clemente J. Zulueta (1876–1904), a distinguished Filipino bibliographer, was born in Paco in 1876. He studied law at the University of Santo Tomás. Although he performed different activities as a journalist in *La Independencia*, he became well known as a historian. During Taft's term as governor of the Philippines, Zulueta was named the collecting librarian for which reason he traveled to Spain. He died in 1904.
- 10 Isabelo de los Reyes (1864–1938) was a prominent Filipino politician, writer, and labor activist. He was the cofounder of the Aglipayan Church, an independent Philippine national church. For his writings and activism with labor unions, he has been called the Father of Filipino Socialism.

- 11 León Maria Guerrero (1853–1935) was appointed member of the council of health of the Manila City Council and was enrolled as a member of the *Sociedad Española de Historia Natural*. Guerrero openly joined the independence struggle when the Philippine Revolution of 1896 broke out. He was named professor of pharmacy at the Universidad Literaria de Filipinas, which was founded by the Philippine Revolutionary Government on 19 Oct. 1898. He was a member of the Malolos Congress, which was convened on 15 Sept. 1898 and had approved the Malolos Constitution on 29 Nov. 1898. He also contributed to *La Independencia*, the official organ of the revolutionary movement, edited by revolutionary general Antonio Luna. When Pres. Emilio Aguinaldo formed his cabinet in 1899, he named Guerrero secretary of agriculture, industry, and commerce. He was among the founders of the Partido Democrata (Democratic Party), which advocated absolute Philippine independence from the United States but through peaceful means.
- 12 LeRoy (1903a) told Zulueta about his purpose in October 1903.
- 13 I consulted the Spanish edition of Feodor Jagor's *Reisen in den Philipinen*. In fact, Zulueta sent the Spanish edition to LeRoy, who translated and interpreted the excerpts cited in *The Americans in the Philippines*.
- 14 An example of how LeRoy's work has been consulted is Stanley's *A Nation in the Making* (1974). In the chapter devoted to Spanish administration, "The Philippines, 1565–1898," LeRoy's imprint can be discerned. The chapter is constructed with a similar structure, mentioning Spanish reforms but treating them as a dead letter. Another example is Wolff's (1991) *Little Brown Brother or Benevolent Assimilation*.
- 15 *La Liga Filipina* was founded by José Rizal in 1892. It was a civic organization that had five main objectives: to join all Filipinos as one united people, to extend mutual protection amid any difficulty, to defend against violence and injustice, to promote education, and to implement reforms.
- 16 Pío Gullón of the Ministro de Gobernación (Ministry of the Interior) signed the Law of Printing under the Liberal government of Prime Minister Práxedes Mateo Sagasta (1825–1903). For more information see Cano 2011a, 395–430; 2011b, 171–201.
- 17 Fray Bartolomé de las Casas, a Spanish colonist, priest, and founder of the Utopian Community or Utopian Anthropology, was a scholar and historian. Las Casas was the first one to denounce the *encomienda* system and he asked for its abolition to pave the way for the promulgation of *Las Leyes Nuevas* (the New Laws for the Indians), which advocated the good treatment of indigenous peoples. Las Casas has been considered the first defender of human rights. He has also been called the father of anti-imperialism and antiracism. The role of Las Casas has been magnified by modern scholarship. Las Casas advocated the new theories that emerged in Spain in the sixteenth century, which created an important theological-legal literature. This Spanish perspective emerged in the wake of the discovery and colonization of Latin America. These theories were interwoven with the idea of governing an inferior race that needed the paternalism of a superior civilization (Cano 2002).
- 18 The orders and decrees enacted for the Philippines were ruled by these New Laws from 1542. In fact, these were the first Laws of the Indies. The *Leyes Nuevas* lost their preeminence in relation to conquest and pacification when the *Ordenanzas sobre pacificaciones y poblaciones* (Ordinances concerning Pacification and Population) were enacted in 1573. Curiously these *Ordenanzas* were

not enacted in the Philippines until 1599. Blair and Robertson published ad hoc the “Memorial of Bishop Salazar” in order to indicate the abuses committed by the Spaniards in the Philippines. Bishop Salazar said these Ordenanzas were not being obeyed, but the Ordenanzas had not been sent to the Philippines (Cano 2008, 1–30).

- 19 This is a deeply rooted argument and modern scholars, without consulting Spanish documents or published works, state the same idea in a more sophisticated language. A case in point is the chapter devoted to the Philippines in *The Emergence of Modern Southeast Asia*, which repeats what LeRoy asserted in 1905: “Whether liberal or conservative, pro-church or antichurch, pro- or antimonarchy, Spain became a backwater, incapable of sustaining any policy that could win consensus, while its economy fell further and further behind the flourishing industrial centers of Europe” (Owen 2005, 151).
- 20 As a politician, Victor Balaguer (1824–1901) was minister for the colonies and public works. He was the founder of the Consejo de Ultramar, an institution for matters of the colonies. Moreover he encouraged public works, fostered agriculture, and promoted the creation of a library in the Philippines. On 12 Aug. 1887 the Museum-Library of Manila was inaugurated and its director, Pedro Paterno, started to publish the *Boletín de Museo Biblioteca de Filipinas* in 1894. See Retana 1906, 3:1773.
- 21 Retana suggested in 1907 that Maura probably did not realize the bibliographical extensions of his famous decree of 19 May 1893. It was published for the first time in *La Gaceta de Madrid* and reproduced in *La Gaceta de Manila* and all the newspapers published in the archipelago. It was also published in *La Solidaridad* and *La Política de España en Filipinas*. This decree can be found in *Royal Decree of 19th May 1893*; *Tribunales Municipales: Su organización, constitución y atribuciones* by D. Miguel de Liñán y Eguizábal, Manila 1893; *Reforma Municipal de Filipinas* by Camilo Millán; and *El Régimen Municipal en las Islas Filipinas* by Pedro Paterno (available at the Yale University and University of Michigan libraries); *El Municipio Filipino* in *El Faro Administrativo* directed by Manuel Artigas; *Diccionario de la Administración de Filipinas* by Miguel Rodríguez Berriz, Manila 1887–1895 (in the Special Collections Worcester, University of Michigan Library); *Compilación legislativa del Gobierno y Administración civil de Ultramar* by Manuel Fernández Martín; and the *Diccionario Alcubilla*. This decree was also commented upon in other works. LeRoy made references to Eduardo Navarro’s *Filipinas: Estudio de algunos asuntos de actualidad* but did not mention Navarro’s chapter which complained about the enforcement of the Maura Law. Cf. Retana 1907, 305–6.
- 22 According to Retana (1897), this paper started to be published at the beginning of 1896.
- 23 “Documentos políticos de actualidad. Primera Serie,” *Archivo del Bibliófilo Filipino*, vol. 3. In this volume Retana introduced many documents related to Masonry, which established a cause-and-effect relationship between Masonry and separatism.
- 24 I quote verbatim Wenceslao Retana (1896) who used the term *filibusterismo* as something unique to the Philippines. Cf. Aguilar 2011.
- 25 Fr. Evaristo Fernández Arias was a man of letters and a hotheaded patriot. He was a Dominican friar who argued with some newspapers, and wrote in 1893 *El Beato Sanz y Compañeros Mártires del orden de predicadores*.

References

- Aguilar, Filomeno. 2011. *Filibustero*, Rizal, and the Manilamen of the nineteenth century. *Philippine Studies* 59(4): 429–69.
- Alvárez Junco, José and Adrian Schubert, eds. 2010. *Spanish history since 1808*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Artigas y Cuerva, Manuel. 1894. *El Municipio Filipino: Compilación de cuanto se ha prescrito sobre este particular e historia municipal de Filipinas desde los primeros tiempos de la dominación española*. Manila: Imprenta de D. J. Ataide y Compañía.
- Balaguer, Victor. 1895. *Islas Filipinas: Memoria*. Madrid: Angles Imprenta.
- Barrows, David P. 1914. The Americans in the Philippines: A history of the conquest and first years of occupation, with an introductory account of the Spanish rule by James A. LeRoy. *American Historical Review* 20(1): 181–84.
- . 1905. *A history of the Philippines*. Rev. ed. New York: World Book Co.
- Blair, Emma H. and James A. Robertson, eds. 1903. *The Philippine Islands 1493-1898*, vol. 1. Ohio: Arthur H. Clark Company.
- Blanco, Ramón. 1897. *Memoria que al Senado dirige el General Blanco acerca de los Últimos Sucesos ocurridos en las Islas de Luzón*. Madrid: Establecimiento Tip. El Liberal.
- Bourne, Gaylord. 1903. Historical introduction. In *The Philippine Islands 1493–1898*, vol. 1, ed. Emma H. Blair and James A. Roberson, 19–87. Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Company.
- Cano, Glòria. 2002. *La Formación de una Colonia: Filipinas 1569–1614*. PhD diss., Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- . 2008a. Evidence for the deliberate distortion of the Spanish Philippine colonial historical record in *The Philippine Islands 1493–1898*. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 39(1): 1–30.
- . 2008b. Blair and Robertson’s *The Philippine Islands 1493–1898*: Scholarship or imperialist propaganda? *Philippine Studies* 56(1): 3–46.
- . 2008c. La cara oculta de Retana: Una nueva aproximación histórica a su obra. *Illes i Imperis* 10–11:273–302.
- . 2009. Wenceslao Retana revisited: A new historical assessment. In *More Hispanic than we admit: Insights into Philippine cultural history*, ed. Isaac Donoso, 263–301. Quezon City: Vibal Foundation.
- . 2011a. Filipino press between two empires: *El Renacimiento*, a newspaper with too much *alma Filipina*. *Southeast Asian Studies* 49(3): 395–430.
- . 2011b. ‘La Solidaridad’ y el periodismo en Filipinas en tiempos de Rizal. In *Entre España y Filipinas: José Rizal escritor*, ed. M. Dolores Elizalde, 171–201. Madrid: AECID/BNE.
- Caro y Mora, Juan. 1897. *La situación del País. Colección de artículos publicados por La Voz Española, acerca de la Insurrección Tagala, sus causas y principales cuestiones que afectan a Filipinas*. Manila: Imprenta de Amigos del País.
- de las Casas, Bartolomé. 1821. *Brevisima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*. Sevilla: Juan F. Hurtel.
- Castillo y Jiménez, José M. 1897. *El Katipunan o el Filibusterismo en Filipinas. Crónica ilustrada con documentos autógrafos y fotograbados*. Madrid: Imp. del Asilo de Huérfanos del S. C. de Jesús.

- Celdrán Ruano, Julia. 1994 *Instituciones Hispano filipinas del siglo XIX*. Madrid: Editorial Mapfre.
- Cunningham, Charles H. 1919. *The Audiencia in the Spanish colonies as illustrated by the Audiencia of Manila (1583–1800)*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Elliott, Charles B. 1916. *The Philippines to the end of the military regime*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- . 1917. *The Philippines to the end of the commission government: A study in tropical democracy*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Fernández Arias, Evaristo. 1893. *El Beato Sanz y Compañeros Mártires del orden de predicadores*. Manila: Establecimiento Tipográfico del Colegio de Santo Tomás.
- Forbes, William Cameron. 1928. *The Philippine Islands*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Foreman, John. 1899. *The Philippine Islands*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons.
- Gleeck, Lewis E. 1996. *Nine years to make a difference: The tragically short career of James A. LeRoy in the Philippines*. Metro Manila: Loyal Printing.
- Golay, Frank H. 1997. *Face of empire: United States-Philippine Relations, 1898–1946*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Hayden, Joseph Ralston. 1942. *The Philippines: A study in national development*. New York: Macmillan.
- Houston, Charles. Manuscripts and other materials relating to the Philippines in the Manuscript Division, US Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
- Jagor, Feodor. 1875. *Viajes por Filipinas*. Madrid: Imprenta esterotipia y galvanoplastia de Aribau i ca.
- La Solidaridad Quincenario Democrático*. 1893. La reforma Maura, 31 May: 240–58.
- LeRoy, James A. 1903a. Letter to Clemente J. Zulueta, 3 Oct. LeRoy, James Alfred, 1875–1909, Personal Letters, Box 1, Folder 1. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- . 1903b. Letter to Isabelo de los Reyes, 13 Oct. LeRoy, James Alfred 1875–1909, Personal Letters, Box 1, Folder 1. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- . 1904a. Letter to Father Aglipai, 9 Feb. LeRoy, James Alfred 1875–1909, Personal Letters, Box 1, Folder 1. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- . 1904b. Letter to Leon M. Guerrero, 17 Aug. LeRoy, James Alfred 1875–1909, Personal Letters, Box 1, Folder 1. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- . 1904c. Letter to James A. Robertson, 27 Jan. Robertson, James Alexander, Special Correspondence, Box 5. US Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- . 1904d. Letter to James A. Robertson, 13 May. Robertson, James Alexander, Special Correspondence, Box 5. US Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- . 1904e. Letter to Robertson, James A., 10 Aug. Robertson, James Alexander, Special Correspondence, Box 5. US Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- . 1904f. Letter to James A. Robertson, 24 Aug. Robertson, James Alexander, Special Correspondence, Box 5. US Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- . 1904g. Letter to James A. Robertson, 20 Oct. LeRoy, James Alfred 1875–1909, Box 1, Folder 1. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- . 1905a. Letter to James A. Robertson, 14 March. Robertson, James Alexander, Special Correspondence, Box 5. US Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- . 1905b. *Philippine life in town and country*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- . 1906a. Letter to Dean Worcester, 3 Aug. Robertson, James A., Box 2, Letters 1902–1906. Special Collections Library, Duke University.
- . 1906b. Letter to *El Renacimiento*, Durango, Mexico, 1 Nov. Published in supplements in *El Renacimiento* 17, 19, 22, and 24 Jan. 1907. Robertson James Alexander. Annapolis, Md. Manuscripts. Box 2, Folder Letters Nov.-Dec. 1906. Duke University, North Carolina.
- . 1906c. Letter to José Albert, 23 Nov. Robertson, James Alexander Manuscripts, Box 2, Letters Nov.-Dec. 1906. Special Collections Library, Duke University.
- . 1907. The Philippines, 1860–1898—Some comment and bibliographical notes. In *The Philippine Islands 1493–1898*, vol. 52, ed. Emma H. Blair and James A. Robertson, 112–207. Ohio: Arthur H. Clark Company.
- . 1909. Letter to General Edwards, 12 Jan. Robertson, James Alexander, Manuscripts, Box 3, Letters 1907–1939. Special Collections Library, Duke University.
- . 1914. *The Americans in the Philippines*. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Marimon, Antoni. 1994. *La política colonial d'Antonio Maura. Les colònies espanyoles de Cuba, Puerto Rico i les Filipines a finals del segle XIX*. Mallorca: Edicions documenta balear.
- Mas y Sanz, Sinibaldo. 1843. *Informe sobre el estado de las Islas Filipinas en 1843*, 3 vols. Madrid: N.p.
- May, Glenn A. 1988. Civic ritual and political reality: Municipal elections in the late nineteenth century. In *Philippine colonial democracy*, ed. Ruby R. Paredes, 13–40. Monograph Series 32. New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asian Studies.
- Millán y Villanueva, Camilo. 1897. *El gran problema de las reformas en Filipinas. Planteado por El Español—periódico diario de Manila y redactado por D. Camilo Millán y Villanueva*. Manila: Imp. J. Lafont.
- Mojares, Resil B. 2006. *Brains of the nation: Pedro Paterno, T. H. Pardo de Tavera, Isabelo de los Reyes and the production of modern knowledge*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Montero y Vidal, José. 1887. *Historia general de Filipinas. Desde el descubrimiento de dichas Islas hasta nuestros días*, vol. 1. Madrid: Imprenta y fundición de Manuel Tello.
- . 1894. *Historia general de Filipinas. Desde el descubrimiento de dichas Islas hasta nuestros días*, vol. 2. Madrid: Imprenta y fundición de Manuel Tello.
- . 1895. *Historia general de Filipinas. Desde el descubrimiento de dichas Islas hasta nuestros días*, vol. 3. Madrid: Imprenta y fundición de Manuel Tello.
- Navarro, Eduardo. 1897. *Filipinas. Estudio de algunos asuntos de actualidad*. Por el Procurador y Comisario de Agustinos Calzados. Madrid: Imprenta de la Viuda de M. de Minuesa de los Ríos.
- Owen, Norman G. 2005. *The emergence of modern Southeast Asia: A new history*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Parker Willis, H. 1907. The Philippines and the Filipinos: A reply. *Political Science Quarterly* 22:105–28.

- Paterno, Pedro. 1893. *El régimen municipal de las Islas Filipinas. Real Decreto de 19 de mayo de 1893*. Madrid: Estab. Tipog. de los Sucesores de Cuesta.
- Pi i Margall Francesc. 1896. Filipinas. *El País. Diario Republicano Progresista*, 22 Dec.: 3. Hemeroteca Digital.
- Prescott, William H. 1873. *History of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Catholic*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
- Primo de Rivera y Sobremonte, Fernando. 1898. *Memoria dirigida al Senado por el Capitán General D. Fernando Primo de Rivera y Sobremonte acerca de su gestión en Filipinas: Agosto de 1898*. Madrid: Imprenta y Litografía del Depósito de Guerra.
- Retana, Wenceslao E. 1896. El separatismo en Filipinas. *La política de España en Filipinas*, 30 Apr.: 148–53; 15 May: 164–67.
- . 1897. *Archivo del bibliófilo filipino*, vol. 3. Madrid: Imprenta de la Viuda de M. Minuesa de los Ríos.
- . 1906. *Aparato bibliográfico de la historia general de Filipinas: Deducido de la colección que posee en Barcelona La Compañía General de Tabacos de dichas Islas*, vol. 3: Años 1529–1905. Madrid: Sucesora M. Minuesa de los Ríos.
- . 1907. *Vida y escritos del Dr. José Rizal*. Madrid: Sucesora de M. Minuesa de los Ríos.
- Robles, Elidoro. 1969. *The Philippines in the nineteenth century*. Quezon City: Malaya Books.
- Sastrón, Manuel. 1901. *Insurrección en Filipinas*. Madrid: Imp. de la Viuda M. Minuesa de los Ríos.
- Schurman, Jacob G. 1900. *Report of the Philippine Commission to the president*, vol. 1. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Stanley, Peter W. 1974. *A nation in the making: The Philippines and the United States 1899–1921*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Taft, William. 1913. Introduction. In *The Americans in the Philippines*, James A. LeRoy, ix–xii. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Trigo, Felipe. 1897. *La campaña Filipina. El General Blanco y la insurrección*. Madrid: Fontanet.
- Wolff, Leon. 1991. *Little brown brother: How the United States purchased and pacified the Philippines*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Worcester Dean C. 1902. Letter to the Department of the Interior, Manila, 9 Jan. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- . 1906. Letter to James A. LeRoy, 27 Feb. Robertson, James A., Box 2, Letters 1902–1906. Special Collections Library, Duke University.
- . 1914. *The Philippines: Past and present*. New York: Macmillan Co.

Glòria Cano is a researcher in the Ramón y Cajal Program, Department of Humanities, Jaume I Bldg (Ciutadella campus), Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Ramon Trias Fargas 25–27, 08005 Barcelona, Spain. She pursued doctoral studies in the Southeast Asian Studies Program, National University of Singapore, which she completed in 2006. She is currently doing research on newspapers published in the Philippines between 1880 to 1920, studying the interaction between Catalan nationalism and the Propaganda Movement, and preparing her forthcoming book, “Victors’ History: Imperial Discourse and the American Construction of a Spanish Philippine Past (1898–1945).” <gloria.cano@upf.edu>