

philippine studies

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

The Filipino Reaction to American Rule 1901-13

Review Author: Jose S. Arcilla S.J.

Philippine Studies vol. 33, no. 2(1985) 242–243

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>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

browse through the text. While the summary of all the accounts may interest the historian and sleuth, a coherent highlighting of the key testimonies would have served the general reader better. The story line wanders and gets lost in a mass of facts, personalities and details.

The remainder of the book: "The Exhibits," "The Photochronology," "The Board Counsel's Report," "The Board Members' Report" and "The Chairman's Report" reads more like an appendix—it contains important information, but things one would not normally read through. The 150-slide photochronology, the master stroke of Andres Narvasa, General Counsel of the Board, is a priceless historical documentation of the two murders. Save for the fatal few moments of the murder, the photochronology will always make the event vividly familiar. The Majority Report appears in full for posterity—a gutsy challenge to the official stand.

The book ends with Chairwoman Corazon Agrava's closing signature of the Minority Report. But while the Board has signed its finis, the painful fact remains that, despite fifteen months of intense investigations and public pressure, neither the actual killers, nor the mastermind, were identified.

The Aquino story continues to alternately unravel and get knotted to this day. Yesterday, it was fifteen months of the Agrava commission. Today, who can say what the Sandigang Bayan will conclude? But perhaps the results of the judicial proceedings are not what the people are really interested in. The idea left unsaid in the *Reports* is that even if the triggerman is identified and meted the legal penalties, we are still not assured of justice. We still would have left the question unanswered: who is responsible for the murder of Ninoy Aquino? When the real conclusion is finally drawn, the *Reports* will most certainly be part of that event in history.

Fabian Dayrit
Department of Chemistry
Ateneo de Manila University

THE FILIPINO REACTION TO AMERICAN RULE 1901-1913. By Bonifacio S. Salamanca. Quezon City: New Day Publishers, xii, 267 pages.

This book has already been reviewed in this periodical by Fr. Schumacher, S.J. (18 [1970] 429-435). My remarks, therefore, are additional observations prompted by the advance in scholarship during the decade and a half after its first issuance in 1968.

This is, of course, a better edited book. Gone are the misprints of the older edition, except, alas! one on page 229, note 75, where the line should be "... mention [not mentioned] might be made" The bibliography has been

updated, and the appendix is now the full text of McKinley's instructions to the Taft Commission.

BSS emphasizes the political reaction of the Filipinos, which is understandable, given the American program of political tutorship to prepare them for self-government. Education, economic development, and even religious policies were merely ancillary to the political aims of the American government. Given the number of studies now available, it is a little surprising that the book is not more forthright and still hesitates about the real sentiments of either Quezon or Osmeña regarding Philippine independence.

As noted in the earlier review of this book, there is a superficiality in the treatment of the religious problem. Again, given recent publications on the subject, it is still surprising that BSS has not modified his views. It is true the friars in the Philippines were, by and large, a block to the modernization of the Islands. But this requires an explanation, for, after all, those friars could not have been all monsters of iniquity or obscurantism! We must keep in mind that they were the victims of nineteenth-century anticlerical liberalism in Spain which favored the friars only as long as they were pliant political tools to serve the purposes of the government. Hence, it was a big problem of conscience for them, knowing that unless they cooperated with the colonial government, they were in no position to perform their basic task as missionaries of the Christian gospel.

Filipino reaction to American rule was, according to the book, basically the reaction of the local élite. Perhaps this could be qualified. What about the reaction of the early playwrights, poets, composers? Politically ineffective, they were still a not insignificant portion of the Philippine population which remained for sometime unreconciled to the American presence in the Philippines. One wishes a chapter had been written about them. After studies like Iletto's *Pasyon*, one cannot prescind from at least being aware of its possibilities.

Finally, I don't think it would have distracted from the main theme of this study if a deeper analysis of Taft's mission to Rome had been included.

I mentioned that there is only one misprint in the text. Let me add another, the one on page 140, which to all appearances should have on line 24 "Comite de Intereses (not Interés) Filipinos," an error in language, not printing!

The above should not in any way lessen the importance of the book. *The Filipino Reaction* is a *sine-qua-non* for every Filipino.

José S. Arcilla, S.J.
Department of History
Ateneo de Manila University