

philippine studies

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

Spanish Hostility to Friendship

Jose S. Arcilla, S.J.

Philippine Studies vol. 47, no. 4 (1999): 532–549

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

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

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

Spanish Hostility to Friendship

Jose S. Arcilla, S. J.



Hostility and mutual suspicion characterized the relations between the Spaniards and the Filipinos toward the end of the last century;¹ but the statement needs to be qualified. Neither all the Spaniards hated all the Filipinos, nor were all the Spaniards the object of Filipino hatred. The revolution 1896 neither involved all the Filipinos nor spread to all parts of the Philippine archipelago. A chronicler of the revolution in Bikol recalled that people in Albay were expecting no changes and had no reason to demand them. They accepted social ranking the existence of a privileged class as inherent to society. They blamed the Tagalogs for the devastation and ill effects the fighting had occasioned, and readied themselves to resist the Tagalogs (Ataviado 1936).

From distant Mindanao, a Jesuit missionary reported that in Cotabato reaction to the news of an uprising in Manila was decidedly negative. He wrote that there the people "neither dream of such things nor understand them." An old man, several times *gobernadorcillo*, became furious and tagged the revolutionaries as ingrates and people without a future (Suarez 1896).

Not even the Filipinos who did take up arms against the colonial government were all hostile to the Spaniards. Their treatment of the Spanish friars during and after the fighting clearly proved this. Despite widespread accusation of friar aberration, one cannot say their faults seriously affected the sentiments of the vast majority of the Filipinos. When a petition for their expulsion was drawn up in San Francisco de Malabon (today, Tanza), Cavite in 1896, some retorted,

A modified English version of a paper presented at the international symposium ("The Meaning of 1898") at Ottawa, Canada, 8-11 October 1998.

"If the Spanish priests go, which priests will remain? The Tagalog? In that case, most of us might just as well become Jews."²

From some of the friars prisoners' memoirs and chronicles, it is clear that outside of the hardened group of Katipunan leaders, or where people had had unfortunate experiences with individual friars, there was massive support and popular sympathy for the Spanish friars. Asking for example a simple Katipunan fighter why the latter had more esteem and even affection for the friars, a Spanish medical officer in prison received an unexpected lecture on how good the priests had been. They had, the man said, "taught us to be what they are. They founded schools for us. They forbade vice or vagrancy. In all the bitter times we, good Filipinos, experienced or suffered from the Spanish provincial chiefs, the priests, besides good advice, have taken our side and helped us. Now that we see bad people go against priests, we the good ought to do for the priests what is in our obligation and capacity" (*Libertas* 1899).

And as soon as peace returned, petitions from the provinces reached both the superiors of the religious orders and the new civil government in Manila to send back "their priests." One letter from Vuelva, Agusan del Sur, for example, asked that the Jesuit superior in Manila "assign our priests to return to us soon, for soon the Church which the Society of Jesus has raised will quickly fall to the earth. If it falls, it will be difficult to raise it up. If possible, it would be good to inform the President [i.e., Governor] of the Philippines. . . ." To make sure their request was answered, the petitioners sent "50 pesos to purchase one priest, that justice may reign in the town and people become good" (*Cartas* 1903).

It would be wrong, on the other hand, to deny that sufficient Filipinos felt nothing but hostility for the Spaniards. Marcelo H. del Pilar, for example, was quite vocal in his anti-friar animus and openly campaigned to expel the friars as the only solution to the ills in the country.³ To Blumentritt he wrote that actually their "aspirations are really not much, identify our interests with those of the peninsula, think and feel with them, respect what they respect, reject what they reject. In a word, forge our duties and rights with the duties and rights of the Metropolis. The only obstacle against it is the monastic interest because racial hostility is the basis of its progress. And Spain insists on ignoring this, subjecting to a very severe test the loyalty and endurance of the faithful Filipinos" (del Pilar 1954; 1:54).

In more passionate language, Isabelo de los Reyes wrote that the friars opposed with machiavellic malice all growth and with their

sinister influence were a drag against the progress of the Filipinos whom they "brutalized . . . by their satanic selfishness and jealousy," in their desire to appear as masters, the "only ones who were wise, wealthy, outstanding and powerful before the eyes of the fanaticized Filipino beholder." Not only that, he continued, they did not spare "means to initiate at all cost conspiracies and implicate all the rich and the educated in the Archipelago . . . even in the most remote provinces."⁴

On the other hand, Jose Rizal, admittedly the foremost propagandist against Spanish misrule in the Philippines, conceded that the friars could be allowed to remain in the Philippines provided they acted only as friars.

Many see in the Cavite mutiny of 1872 a warning to the government. Crushed with surprising ease, it resulted in the summary execution or exile of many unjustly implicated. And people became embittered, as the causes for discontent continued. Worse, appeals for colonial reforms were sanctioned as subversive plots and suspects were found everywhere. At this time, significantly, there was hardly any talk of separation, while the Madrid government hardened its stance behind the traditional "*principio de autoridad*." This unfortunately was the root of dissatisfaction.

By the last decade of the nineteenth century, there seemed no longer any possibility of reconciliation between the Spaniards and the Filipinos. Spain, embroiled in the Cuban uprising, was not in a position to attend to the Philippines. Rizal who continued to eschew violence, drew up the rules of a secret *Liga filipina* aimed to promote cooperation and unity among his countrymen. But allowed to return home on the implicit condition that he abstain from political activity, he helped establish the Liga with some of his friends. The government felt betrayed. And yet although simultaneous raids in his friends' houses uncovered not a single evidence to accuse them of subversion; although according to the governor at the time, Eulogio Despujol (1891-93), the Filipinos had legitimate grievances for which they were properly seeking a solution despite some of the more desperate who were threatening to break away; and although Rizal's writings did not advocate revolution—still the government felt it had to employ the full force of the law and as a measure of prudence exiled the future national hero of the Philippines.

Rizal's departure aborted his Liga. Its members bravely regrouped themselves and established a *Cuerpo de Compromisarios* to continue

with their financial contributions the peaceful propaganda in Spain. Unknown to them, however, Andres Bonifacio who had probably been present at the founding of the Liga, felt it was the last straw. Convinced that peaceful agitation for reform was useless, he began to recruit members to his own secret society, purposely organized to end Spanish rule in the Philippines.⁵ Lest they be implicated by Bonifacio, the *Compromisarios* discontinued their activities and disbanded, leaving the field open for him.⁶

Lack of the means delayed the decision to rise in arms, until clear evidence for the existence of a subversive plot was uncovered by the Augustinian Fray Mariano Gil, pastor of Tondo on the north bank of Pasig river. Reports had lately continued to reach the Governor's office, but Ramon Blanco (1893-96) dismissed them as products of the overactive imagination of the friars on a witch hunt. Faced with evidence Fr. Gil discovered, however, he was forced to act, and Katipunan, left with no other option after its discovery, decided to strike. But in less than a year, a crisis in the revolutionary leadership eliminated the man who had precipitated the events.⁷

But neither Aguinaldo, the new revolutionary leader, nor the colonial government had the capability of delivering the decisive blow. The resulting stalemate and exhaustion on both sides found an honorable way out with the signing of the truce of Biaknabato in mid-December 1897. Mutual congratulations and pledges of peace and brotherhood seemed to augur a new era in the Philippines. But, on the other side of the globe, the Cuban crisis had worsened. Taking up the role of defenders of justice and freedom for Cuba, the United States declared war against Spain and sent a force to destroy the decrepit Spanish navy idling off Cavite.

With unbelievable ease, Dewey fulfilled his mission. But normal military tactics dictated that he stay on to consolidate his gains and prevent the enemy from rising again, a decision that changed the course of Philippine history.

Meantime, contrary to the terms of the truce, Aguinaldo in exile in Hongkong, immediately time-deposited the truce money meant to compensate the victims of the revolution, and refused to share it according to the terms of the pact. Sued in equity by one of his former subordinates, Aguinaldo escaped incognito to Singapore. This trip complicated the story of the Philippine revolution.⁸

There will never be agreement on what transpired in Singapore during the exchange between a revolutionary leader who knew no English and an American consul who knew no Spanish. They talked

through an interpreter whom an author described as one who "talked too much." Enthused over what he insisted had been a promise of recognition by the "great American nation" of his country's independence, Aguinaldo agreed to support the American forces against the Spaniards in the Philippines. But rebuked by his superiors for apparently having committed his government to obligations it was unwilling to fulfill, Consul Pratt in Singapore subsequently disappeared from history. For the moment, however, there was a strong possibility of an alliance between the Filipinos and the Americans.

The alliance never materialized. Cautioned against any "entangling alliances," Dewey denied having made any promises to Aguinaldo, although the former encouraged attacks on the Spanish by Aguinaldo's men. When American occupation forces began to arrive, the latter slowly realized the "great American nation" was not going to be any more friendly than the Spaniards. And in what could be described as a "cat and mouse" sizing up, Aguinaldo began to rally his people to fight for their independence, while warily watching American moves. Since then, Philippine historians have repeated the story of American duplicity.⁹

There is no need to rehearse the subsequent outbreak of hostilities between the American occupation forces and the Filipinos under Aguinaldo. But while the Spaniards had earlier faced rebels only from eight provinces around Manila, this time, the Americans had to reckon with a newly awakened nation rallying behind Aguinaldo. Ataviado, the chronicler of the revolution in Bikol, wrote that the pact of Biaknabato had changed Filipino attitudes and perspectives. Clauses in the pact that provided for Philippine representation in the Spanish legislature, equal treatment of Filipinos and Spaniards alike, the chance to serve in government positions, and the declaration of the individual rights for the brown-skinned inhabitants of the Philippines or the *Indios*, were "a surprising revelation." And the Filipinos realized "the Spaniards had after all been brought down . . . that the Filipino had, after all, more abilities than the Spaniards had been willing to admit, and more than they had claimed for themselves . . . The Pact was

unwittingly Aguinaldo's strongest weapon of victory. When he surrendered his guns to the enemy in voluntary defeat, he won thereby a far mightier weapon: the hearts of his countrymen. For the Pact revealed that he consented to lose the war only if his countrymen should win the peace and the conditions in which they live that peace. Equal-

ity of the Indio with the Spaniard before the law was one of these conditions. . . . The Pact clearly belied the motives imputed to the Tagalog insurgents; first, because the terms were unmistakably applicable to all Filipinos, not to Tagalogs alone; and secondly, because there were discernible in the utterances of the Insurrecto leaders a note of a genuinely national, not regional way of thinking, and a clear indication of a feeling for the national weal rather than for Tagalog ascendancy. (Ataviado 1936, 61-63)¹⁰

In other words, it was a new situation altogether, and not merely a continuation of an uprising against the Spanish colonial government in Manila. And the actors now seemed to be united in one cause, the independence of their nation. The fight was no longer, as previously, between a limited number of anticlerical liberals against the friars backing a reactionary government, but all Filipinos whatever their ideological preferences conscious of their dignity against a more serious threat to their existence as a people.

Before the Spanish naval catastrophe of 1 May 1898, the educated elite was both hostile to the colonial government and indifferent to the Katipunan. Less than four months later, however, the American occupation of Manila united all the Filipinos in their mistrust and antipathy towards the American invaders. They were not going to allow a new colonial master to nullify what they had fought and died for. Tension naturally began to build up as soon as the first American reinforcements landed, and when the Americans entered Manila on 13 August 1898, the Filipinos found the road closed to them. Half a year later, a minor incident among several subsequent irritants sufficed to cause an explosion.

The problem of the relations between the Americans and the Filipinos, and paradoxically its solution came from American ignorance of the Philippines. Washington had studied the British colonial system but rejected it as inapplicable to the Philippines. Instead, the American President sent a special commission to study conditions in the new colony and submit recommendations for its reorganization. Without intending to, President McKinley found a key that changed Filipino antagonism into friendship with the Americans.

Meantime, when news of the outbreak of war between Spain and the United States reached Manila, a crowd of "all classes of the people" wound its way towards the governor's palace to demonstrate their loyalty to Spain against the United States. Three days later, the Archbishop of Manila issued a pastoral letter urging the faithful to

offer their services in the "holy war and fight with prayers and material weapons" (*Diario* 1898, entries for 24 and 27 April). And the day following the defeat of the Spanish navy, the Board of Authorities approved in an emergency session specific measures to win the allegiance of the Filipinos and forestall the Americans from arming them. However, although these measures were intended as incentives for the Filipinos, the Board refused to go as far as approving reforms "inspired by modern liberalism."¹¹

In the interval between Dewey's victory and Aguinaldo's return on 19 May, the Manila government sent feelers to win over the former revolutionary leaders in Cavite. And on 11, 12, 13, and 17 May, word from the town of San Francisco de Malabon (today General Trias) reached the Governor General that in Cavite Viejo (today Kawit) "many people were very well disposed towards Spain, " and that it would be very easy to win over the revolutionary leaders.¹²

Aguinaldo's return changed all this. With understandable ease, he rallied his fellow countrymen. They had never fully accepted the truce of Biaknabato, and during the lull following his exile in Hongkong, sporadic fighting had been taking place in various places in and around Manila. With him back in Cavite, it was only a matter of providing the necessary leadership to resume the fight against the Spaniards. They had no other choice, Aguinaldo pointed out in a proclamation soon after his return, than to use force, since the Filipino people "no longer seeks integration with Spain under her political constitution, but definitive separation from her."¹³ The Americans who had shown no interest in acquiring the island of Cuba which lay at their footsteps, would much less be interested in taking the Philippines, but instead, he assured them, stand beside them.

The subsequent story is well known. Aguinaldo's ranks grew. Significantly, Baldomero Aguinaldo, his brother and commandant of Kawit and Bacoar towns, wrote the Governor General that he could not bring himself to fight his own brother and was therefore retiring from public service (*Diario*, entry for 23 May). But other former revolutionary leaders did not hesitate to throw in their lot with Aguinaldo.¹⁴ As mentioned, however, the ban against Filipinos entering Manila after its occupation by the Americans finally ended all illusions about the "friendly" Americans. Six months later, fighting erupted between the two groups.

A month after the outbreak of fighting between the Filipinos and the Americans, the commission McKinley had sent to investigate the Philippine situation installed itself in Manila and immediately an-

nounced the reason for the presence.¹⁵ The aim of the United States government was "the well-being, the prosperity, and the happiness of the Philippine people, and their elevation and advancement to a position among the most civilized peoples in the world." There was no real conflict between exercising American sovereignty over the Filipinos, it insisted, and the latter's "rights and liberties." Although the United States was ready with military and naval resources to defend its sovereignty, it was "more solicitous to spread peace and happiness . . . freedom . . . and self government." These aims were possible only on the acceptance of American authority (Reports).

McKinley urged Schurman and his colleagues to look for means to ameliorate the people's lives, or what improvements could be introduced into the public order. The commissioners were expected to "exercise due respect for all the ideals, customs, and institutions of the tribes which compose the population, emphasizing on all occasions the just and beneficent intentions of the Government of the United States." But perhaps it was the promise of "alleviate" taxation (to the Americans the worst aspect of Spanish colonial policy), initiate "industrial and commercial prosperity," besides the assurance that life and property would be protected that immediately converted many doubters.

Hostilities had already started when the Commission arrived, and forcibly it had to look into their cause. The commissioners sought information through public inquiries and interviews in Manila and the provinces. They read widely about the country and its history, studied official documents and pertinent materials in the government archives.

The commissioners reported daily fires and empty streets, frequent rifle shots, a "reign of error" in Manila, and "some of the best in the city" who showed friendship for the Americans received death threats. Outside of Manila, however, Aguinaldo had convened in Malolos, Bulacan the best Filipino minds to draw up a constitution. He had already declared the independence of the Philippines on 12 June, five months previously, an act that not only created a wedge between the Filipinos and the Americans, but had also won *ilustrado* support for the new nations. Thus, as mentioned, there was now a common Filipino front against the Americans.

Meantime, people sought safety behind the American lines. They were escaping from areas where there was open anti-American feeling.¹⁶ If the Schurman report can be trusted, the fighting was a "Tagalog rebellion" viewed with indifference and later with fear by

non-Tagalogs. Trouble was concentrated only where Aguinaldo's armed emissaries had reached, and installed some form of local government. But this served only for "*plunderizing*" under the pretext of levying "war contributions," while a number of revolutionary leaders were quickly amassing wealth.

Significantly, an imprisoned Dominican friar recalled later the same situation. The simple Filipinos, he wrote, were "wildly enthused" over the prospect of becoming a single, self-governing nation, although they did not understand what that meant. They were "out of themselves, stupified, and misguided" by the idea that they were also a "glorious race, comparable and perhaps better than the legendary races of history." They deified Aguinaldo who with mere bolos had defeated the Spaniards and was challenging the American rifles and cannons. But witnessing how many others enriched themselves, while they themselves

suffered pillage, extortion, and all manners of abuse from their "liberation army" that disdained Church laws. . . [how] the Tagalogs, especially the Caviteños and Bulaqueños, wanted to lord it over and exploit them, [how] finally nothing happened despite Aguinaldo's and the Katipunan's premature and boastful promise of independence, as they began to see the Americans increase their forces and, as a final hammer-blow the former began to fight among their old allies, this people began to feel offended . . . in the Ilocos especially, they awaited the soldiers of the [United States], clearly not out of love for the new lords, but to free themselves from the abuses of the Katipunan. (Herrero 1900, 812-13)

Actually, the friar added, it was the booming American cannon that roused the people from their "sweet dreams of independence lulling them like innocent infants." Rather condescending perhaps, but this was the situation with the coming of the Americans. Filipino unity was quickly undone by the Filipinos themselves. Not surprising, for Philippine society could be classed in three categories: 1) the educated property owners who quickly saw that, since it was evident further fighting was futile, peace with the Americans was the best for their country;¹⁷ 2) the middle class of teachers, clerks, writers, and government employees who convinced the people they were capable of self-rule; and 3) the unlettered poor who formed the majority and were indifferent to public issues unless these affected them personally.

One is not surprised, therefore, that while the simple people feared openly siding with the Americans, the educated elite volunteered information as the Commission publicly requested. Without intending to, these articulate, well-educated group became the spokesmen for the Filipinos at large.¹⁸

Filipino historians now condemn this "easy surrender" to the enemy. They overlook that fact that the announcement of American intentions won over a significant number of Filipinos, both in the fighting ranks and among the non-combatants. Where Aguinaldo's followers had no control, the Americans were welcomed and American military personnel immediately reestablished local governments, of course, according to the American democratic model. The Supreme Court had begun to function in Manila, while courts of first instance were established in the provinces.

From the Filipino camp, a delegation under Col. Arguelles appeared before the Commission, and asked for a two-week truce to allow them to reassess their situation. Lest it serve as a ruse for time to prepare a greater military offensive, Gen. Otis denied the request. Sent back to the Commission a second time, Arguelles was shown a hospital tent where wounded Filipino fighters were receiving treatment. The Filipino emissary was won over and he left, hoping to convince Mabini, Aguinaldo's intransigent confidant, to accept the American offer of peace. He was almost immediately executed for his pains. Had Antonio Luna not provided him earlier with a pistol, Mabini's sentinel would have gunned him down.

Not much later, Mabini fell from power, and Pedro A. Paterno assumed the presidency of the Malolos Congress. His first act was to send a delegation to Manila. Luna blocked it, but Paterno sent others instead.

These incidents are not insignificant. They show a worsening rift in the ranks of the Filipinos. To conclude that the wealthy ilustrados had remained on the side-lines until they were sure where the wind was blowing is to ignore a basic fact. Surprisingly to some, the Schurman Commission had to depend on Filipino cooperation in order to succeed in their task. If McKinley's commissioners remained true to their democratic tradition, especially in view of the split between the imperialists and anti-imperialists in the United States, they had to prove that they were not going to impose their own politics but would recognize what the Filipinos wanted. They would have played right into the anti-imperialist charge that they were govern-

ing without the consent of the governed, thus violating a provision in the Treaty of Paris that local traditions and culture be respected. And this was the door through which the ilustrados entered and, in a sense, imposed on the Americans what they wanted for the country.

Paramount in their thinking was that they had fought the Spanish colonial program which had shackled and, more or less, enslaved them. Clamoring for equality, they chafed under the underdeveloped condition of the Philippines, they wanted better schools, and the introduction of a sane national economic policy. And confident of their ability to rule themselves, they were ready to ally with whoever would grant them self-rule.

But meantime, the reality of the military situation forced them, for the time being, to bide their time, time they used to bargain successfully for essential political rights.¹⁹

Before the Schurman Commission arrived, Gen. Otis had already asked the medical graduate from the Sorbonne, Trinidad Hermenegildo Pardo de Tavera, to join the Board of Health as an honorary member. Not much later, impressed by Florentino Torres, one of Aguinaldo's emissaries in the peace conferences, Otis asked him for information on how to reorganize the courts of justice. A few days before the outbreak of hostilities between the Filipinos and the Americans, on 29 January 1899, Otis had also appointed Cayetano Arellano as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to replace the old *Audiencia Real*, and to reorganize the entire system of justice under the new government.²⁰ Thus, on arrival, Schurman had at hand a group of ilustrados eminent in talent and patriotism who, after some serious exchange, were willing to be of help.

Encouraged by the new air of freedom, Pardo de Tavera founded a new daily newspaper, *La Democracia*,²¹ and in its maiden issue, he wrote that the Filipinos must ask from the newcomers recognition of their demands for legislative representation, adequate schools, infrastructure, the promotion of trade, commerce, justice, and the freedom of conscience, all of which he summed up in a single word, "autonomy."²²

Reaction from other Philippine sectors was not long in coming. Strangely, for Pardo's autonomy program was identical with the reforms petitioned during the pre-Revolutionary propaganda movement. In the initial dialogues with the Commission, the Americans insisted as the point of departure the acceptance of American sovereignty, while the Filipinos declared certain rights were non-negotiable, primarily the right to self-rule, the "greatest blessing of any

nation," in Mabini's words (Mabini 1931, 2:322). The impossibility of reconciling the two positions led to the fighting, which, as the casualties increased, convinced the autonomists and apparently the majority of the Filipinos as the sequel showed, that further resistance was useless and that perhaps even under the Americans they would enjoy political freedom. If the new government, as announced, could be just and responsive to Filipino needs, the autonomists' demands would be met. Their program thus stood in clear contrast to that of the "irreconcilables" who were convinced the gun was the only means to settle differences.

The use of arms became more and more untenable. The American military machine was too powerful, while the majority of Aguinaldo's advisers were beginning to have second thoughts and thinking of the possibility of autonomy. Then, following a debate on the extent of the president's legislative faculties, Mabini fell from power. His successor immediately embarked on a policy of prosperity and human and political rights through what he called suitable and honorable means.

Meantime, before the unstoppable American advance, Aguinaldo moved his capital from farther north. On 19 November 1900, the last seat of his government, Bayombong, Nueva Ecija, fell and Aguinaldo ordered his forces to resort to guerilla tactics. But one by one, his military leaders either surrendered or were captured by the Americans.

The republican victory in the elections of 1900 in the United States doused Aguinaldo's last hopes for independence. It became a matter of time before even the most intransigent would be forced to admit the chances of independence were remote. Felipe Buencamino and Pedro Paterno, taking advantage of the amnesty, organized meetings to agree on the most advantageous conditions for peace. For his part, Taft, the head of the second Philippine Commission, felt he had to prove to the anti-imperialists at home that he could get full support from the Filipinos, bring about peace, and establish civil government in the islands. He did—with the help of American military power and the autonomists.

He had come, he announced on arrival, to implement, not to formulate policies. This meant reorganizing municipal governments behind the American lines and in this way the Filipinos would see for themselves what the American government could do for them. His immediate problem was whom to choose from the autonomists as his immediate helpers. Encouraged, Paterno published his plans for

a "Free State of the Philippines" under American protection. Apprehended on the pretext of having failed to obtain prior license, he took the mandatory oath of allegiance to the United States and was released from prison.

Paterno's rebuff gave Buencamino his chance. He approached Taft with a "counter-revolutionary" plan. This did not mean that the Filipinos with the Americans would continue the military campaign against Aguinaldo. It was rather a far-reaching policy to counter the violence and terrorism the intransigent used to cow down the people to rally behind Aguinaldo. Buencamino felt that without terrorism, the revolution would collapse.

Observing that the strongest allies the Americans had won over were the wounded who cured in the military hospitals and the prisoners released after tasting the humane treatment by their captors, Taft mulled the plan over. On 1 November 1900, Buencamino repeated his proposal to Taft. Other groups were forming and drawing up their specific political platforms, and Buencamino stressed the advantages of having only one political party. He said this could be the basis on which the "most intelligent, the most influential, the most energetic and industrious" of the country could be mustered to support McKinley's plans for peace. The Filipinos, Buencamino added, were not unanimous in their clamor for independence, nor were they all agreed it was the best thing for them in those "historic moments." On the other hand, the counter-revolutions would be a moral force against Aguinaldo.

McKinley's reelection convinced Taft in Manila that the time for a peace party had come. The Filipinos had already seen that the Spanish propaganda of American cowardice or cruelty was not true and, although initially hesitant, many Filipinos had already been returning to their towns and cities. There was now less mistrust, less suspicion, less hostility towards the new rulers.

This climate of friendliness led the more observant to come together on 23 December 1900 for concrete action. Florentino Torres read before the group a manifesto outlining a political party he had planned earlier. He also announced its political platform which received unanimous approval from the group.²³ Elected as the first president of the party, Pardo de Tavera (1901, 1:62) wrote that "full of faith and confidence in their success, [they] went to work and were able to complete their tasks . . . and thus was the Federal Party organized.

As its name indicates, the party aimed at membership as a new state in the federation of the United States of America. But the immediate task was to show that nothing would be gained from continuing the fight, while with peace, the Filipinos would, through the party, achieve a "steadily increasing autonomy, the separation of church and state, representation of the Philippines in the Federal Congress, and the adoption of the American constitution, culminating at last in the admission of the islands as one of the States of the Union." All the party's efforts would be directed toward the Americanization of the Filipinos and the spread of the English language to infuse the American spirit, its principles and political usage. Progress and civilization lay in a complete adoption of the American spirit (p. 164).

Pardo admitted initial doubts about the party's immediate success, and that some joined it lest they appear as anti-Americans. But there was no doubt membership was growing, assassinations and kidnappings diminished, for there was a more open acceptance of the new dispensation. On 22 February 1901, just three months later, more than 7,000 "belonging to all classes of society" joined a public demonstration of support for the Americanism of the Federal Party.

Fighting still continued in parts of the country as late as the second half of 1901, and pockets of resistance persisted. But in southern Luzon, Vicente Lukban surrendered on 22 February 1902; in Batangas, Miguel Malvar yielded on 16 April of the same year. His surrender led President Theodore Roosevelt of the United States to announce the end of the Philippine insurrection (to Philippine nationalist historians, the "war") and granted amnesty to all who had taken an active part against the American government in the Philippines.²⁴

Perhaps the more important political right the Filipinos immediately enjoyed was the national elections of 1907 for representatives to the first Philippine National Assembly, the lower chamber of the legislature. In preparation for the elections, a second political party appeared, the "National Party," which advocated absolute and immediate independence. For their part, the Federalists, aware of the sentiments of the people, changed their name to "Nationalist Progressive Party" with an amended platform of *ultimate independence*, not federation into the United States, after the Philippines should have progressed properly. Statehood was clearly unpalatable to the voting public. But the Federalists insisted that progress would be possible only through cooperation with the new regime.

The conquest of the Americans in the sixteenth century was characterized by a similar fight for justice and human rights, championed by such geniuses as Bartolome de las Casas and Francisco de Vitoria. At the end of the nineteenth century, the same fight for justice and human rights repeated itself in the Philippines, but with a difference. Then, it was based on the Christian doctrine of human dignity and equality of the people of God; now, it was based on rationalist liberalism.

Notes

1. Philippine colonial historians distinguish the "*indio*," from either the "*mestizo*" (Spanish-Filipino or Chinese-Filipino, or Spanish-Chinese), and the "*criollo*" or "Filipino." In this essay "Filipino" refers to all the Philippine inhabitants, but when needed, the two other terms are used.

2. "*Cung aalis and mga Pareng Castila, sinong matitirang pare? Ang mga Tagalog? Cung ganoon ang caramihan natin ay magiging hudio*" (Canseco 1896).

3. The best introduction to the topic is John N. Schumacher, S. J. (1997).

4. Isabelo de los Reyes, Sr. *Memoria sobre la revolucion filipina por un procesado como jefe insurrecto*: Arxiu de la Companya (Sant Cugat), E-II-a-21 (old sign.), 20. De los Reyes noted that no would perhaps believe him, "not even the friars themselves, as some of them told me—but names could be cited." Both del Pilar and Rizal at one time criticized his writings for their apparent inaccuracies. See the exchange between these two in *Epistolario Rizalino* (T. M. Kalaw 1931, 2:111–12, 116–18). Interestingly, the man who accused the friars of concocting uprisings, and naturally implicating others, himself implicated a number of leading figures in Manila when he founded the Philippine Independence Church in 1902. When public denials were issued, de los Reyes sued them. See Pedro S. de Achutegui, S.J. and Miguel A. Bernard, S.J. (1961).

5. *Kataastaasang Kagalangalang Katipunan nang manga Anak nang Bayan*, or *Katipunan* for short (Venerable and Supreme Union of Sons of the Nation).

6. Estimates of the extent of the spread of the Katipunan and its membership vary since it was a secret society. But both before and after its discovery, Bonifacio had been implicating a number of the Manila elite to force them to join and as an incentive to those who doubted the wisdom of joining it. When the revolution occurred, many of those unjustly implicated but had absolutely nothing to do with the Katipunan were executed. Rizal's trial and death can also be blamed on this tactic, although we cannot deny that he did indeed inspire all of them.

7. Literature is abundant on Bonifacio's death. See Agoncillo 1956, 1997, 1963; Palma-Bonifacio 1963, 1964; Mabini 1931.

8. See among others, de Jesus, Jr. 1966, 125–67; Leroy 1914; Taylor 1971.

9. See Aguinaldo 1899; Aguinaldo and Pacis 1957; Dewey 1913. Dewey cannot acquit himself so easily. While Gen. Merritt had absolutely no use for Aguinaldo, Dewey's actions gave the impression he had apparently confirmed Aguinaldo's status in the eyes of his followers, by having him escorted ashore by the U.S. Navy Guard on his return from exile on 19 May, besides allowing him the use of the vacated provincial governor's residence-office in Cavite, and distributing Spanish arms to the Fili-

pinos. Finally, he ferried across the bay the fighters who began to reenlist under Aguinaldo's command. Likewise, the American military always asked Aguinaldo's permission for their early moves immediately on arriving in Manila.

10. Most probably this was how the pact of Biaknabato had been explained to the Filipinos at large, for the text, "as Aguinaldo remembered it" does not include the reforms Ataviado lists. In his declaration before the Senate, former Governor Fernando Primo de Rivera denied having mentioned any reforms. See his *Memoria dirigida al senado* (1898). For a copy of one of the texts of the pact, see de Achutegui, S. J. and Bernad 1972, 535-36.

11. Three specific measures received the Board's approval: 1) create a militia of native volunteers who could be promoted as high as the rank of Colonel, without prejudice to their civilian positions in the local government; 2) create a "Philippine Constitutive Assembly" without administrative functions, into which qualified natives, even those of "suspicious patriotism," would be coopted, but without giving them arms; and 3) titles of nobility for natives as a reward for their "patriotism," and the possibility of appointment to public positions of confidence for those who deserved them. See *Diario*, entry for 2 May.

12. (*Diario*, entries for 11, 12, 13, 17 May). On 17 May, Mariano Trias, Artemio Ricarte, and Ladislao Diwa, three revolutionary leaders, paid their respects to the Governor General and the Archbishop of Manila.

13. (Retana 1905, 14-17). Literature is abundant on Aguinaldo's activities soon after returning from Hongkong. Authors constantly mention his justification for resuming the fight against Spain, namely, the latter's failure to institute reforms allegedly promised in the truce. Filipino historians in general accept Aguinaldo's explanation, but a good number, mainly non-Filipinos, think otherwise. See, for example, Taylor, Vol. I. A key document is Fernando Primo de Rivera's *Memoria* mentioned in note 10 above.

14. An extreme case was Artemio Ricarte who refused to accept American rule and exiled himself to live in Japan.

15. Headed by Jacob G. Schurman, president of Cornell University, and who did not hesitate to tell Pres. McKinley he was opposed to American presence in the Philippines (1902; 1900); Sullivan (1901).

16. Anti-American feeling was strong in the provinces around Manila: Cavite, Batangas, Laguna, Morong (today, Rizal), Bulacan, Nueva Ecija, Principe (today, part of Quezon), Infanta (today Aurora), and Zambales, whose population was 1.5 million. The entire Philippine population totalled 6 million.

17. Between May 1900 and June 1901, there were 34,714 Filipino and only 837 American casualties.

18. Among them were Pedro A. Paterno, Felipe Buencamino, Fernando Guerrero, Cayetano Arellano, Trinidad Hermenegildo Pardo de Tavera (soon president of the Partido Federalista, the first Philippine political party), Clemente Jose Zulueta, Gregorio Araneta, and others.

19. The next few ideas are summarized from Paredes (1989).

20. Actually, the Supreme Court was fully inaugurated in September 1900, with, as mentioned, Cayetano Arellano as the Chief Justice, the rest of the bench being Gregorio Araneta, Manuel Araullo, Ambrosio Rianzares Bautista, Julio Llorent, Raymundo Mlliza, and Florentino Torres. Arellano also was the head of a Board that drew up the plan for the reorganization of the municipal governments and which was subsequently issued as General Orders No. 40.

21. The paper was short-lived and ceased publication after a conviction of libel.

22. Schurman recalled how the ilustrado autonomists "presented themselves to the Commission . . . laid their ideas and aspirations before it, and accepted . . . the principles upon which an autonomous administration is founded." *Philippine Affairs*, 9.

23. This group consisted of the ilustrados Isabelo Artacho, Daniel Tirona, Jose Ner, Jose Santa Maria, Melecio Roxas, Francisco Macabulos, Servillano Aquino, and Arturo Dancel. But the last two were strictly not among the founders of the Federal Party.

24. Mariano Sakay continued guerrilla activities, some say, banditry, in the Sierra Madre Mountains until 1907.

References

- Agoncillo, Teodoro A. 1956. *The revolt of the masses: The story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan*. Quezon City: University of the Philippine Press.
- . 1963. *The writings and trial of Andres Bonifacio*. Manila.
- . 1960. *Malolos: The crisis of the Republic*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines.
- Aguinaldo, Emilio. 1899. *Resena veridica de la revolucion Filipina*.
Tarlac.
- Aguinaldo, Emilio and Vicente A. Pacis. 1957. *A second look at America*. New York.
- Ataviato, Elias M. 1938. *Lucha y libertad: Conmonitorio de la revolucion Filipina en las tierras Albanyas*. Vol. 1. Manila: Benipayo Press.
- Achutegui, Pedro S. and Miguel A. Bernard. 1960. *Religious revolution in the Philippines*. Vol. 1. Manila: Ateneo de Manila.
- . 1972. *Aguinaldo and the revolution of 1896: A documentary history*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila.
- Canseco, Telesforo. 1896. *Historia de la insurreccion Filipina en Cavite*. Manila: Archivo de la Provincia Dominicana del Santisimo Rosario.
- Cartas edificantes de la mision de la compania de Jesus en Filipinas*. 1903. The town leaders to the Jesuit Mission Superior.
- De Jesus, Edilberto C. 1966. Aguinaldo and the American consuls. *Philippine Historical Review* 1:125-67.
- De los Reyes, Isabelo Sr. *Memora sobre la revolucion Filipina por un procesado como jefe insurrecto*.
- Del Pilar, Marcelo H. 1954. Marcelo H. del Pilar to Ferdinand Blumentritt. *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar*. Quezon City.
- Dewey, George. 1913. *Autobiography*. New York.
- Diario de los sucesos ocurridos durante la guerra de Espana contra los Estados Unidos*, 1898. 24 and 27 April. 24 and 27 April; 2, 11, 12, 13, and 17 May.
- Herrero, Ulpiano. 1900. *Nuestra prision en poder de los revolucionarios*. Manila.
- Kalaw, T.M., ed. 1931. *Epistolario Rizalino*. Manila.
- Leroy, James A. 1914. *The Americans in the Philippines*. 2 vols. Boston.
- Libertas*. 1899. Anonymous letter 26 September.

- Mabini, Apolinario. 1931. *La revolucion Filipina*. 2 vols. Manila.
- Paredes, Ruby. R. 1989. The partido federal, 1900-1907: Political collaboration in colonial Manila. Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan.
- Quiron, Carlos, ed. 1964. *Minutes of the Katipunan*. Manila.
- Retana, Wenceslao E. 1905. *Archivo del bibliofilo Filipino*. Vol. 5, no.6. Madrid.
- Suarez, Mariano. 1896. *Cortas ineditas*.
- Schumacher, John N. 1997. *The propaganda movement 1880-1895*. Rev. ed. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Schurman, Jacob. G. 1900. *Reports of the Philippine commission*. 4 vols. Washington, D.C.
- . 1902. *Philippine affairs: A retrospect and outlook*. New York.
- Sullivan, Rodney. 1901. *Exemplar of americanism*. Dean C. Worcester. Ann Arbor.
- Taylor, John R. 1971. *The Philippine insurrection against the United States*. 5 vols. Pasay.