

philippine studies

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

The Hendrick Papers

Charles L. Higgins

Philippine Studies vol. 28, no. 4 (1980) 420–450

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

The Hendrick Papers

CHARLES L. HIGGINS

PRENOTE

The *Hendrick Papers* consist of 272 pieces of correspondence covering the years of Thomas Augustine Hendrick's episcopate at Cebu, Philippines (1903-1909) and are especially useful in illuminating the problems arising from the Philippine Revolution of 1896-1897 as these affected religious and social life in one of the four dioceses in the Philippines at that time. The file includes certain additional correspondence following Hendrick's death. A Calendar and Index prepared by the Historical Records Survey, accompanies the *Papers*. Much of the material is holographic; the lesser portion is typewritten. The collection is thought to be one of the most extensive primary records extant concerning the work of any of the first four American Roman Catholic bishops who were sent to the Philippines to replace the Spanish hierarchy following the war with Spain. The letters have been useful to several students of the period, notably Frederick Zwielerlein who quoted extensively from them in his *Theodore Roosevelt and Catholics, 1882-1919* (St. Louis, Mo.: Suren, 1956)

Despite the existence of the *Hendrick Papers* however, large gaps remain in the record of his episcopate. Although helpful to some extent, the resources of such repositories as the National Archives, the Presidential Papers, and the archives of the ecclesiastical jurisdictions of Manila, Guam, Baltimore, and Rochester (New York) do not bridge these gaps. The extent to which these holdings extend or significantly amplify the *Hendrick Papers* has been noted below. The secret Vatican archives are at present open to scholars only to the date of Leo XIII's death, July 20, 1903. Citations to Hendrick's letters in the following text employ the sequence found in the Calendar and Index. The *Papers*, together with the Calendar and Index, have been reproduced on microfilm, and are available at the Lorette Wilmot Library, Nazareth College of Rochester, New York.

The new Bishop of Cebu, Thomas A. Hendrick, stepped ashore for the first time on Friday, 11 March 1904, the twenty-second in

direct line of succession to Bishop Agurto, O.S.A., who took possession in 1598.¹ A native of Penn Yan, New York, Hendrick had received his undergraduate degree from Seton Hall College in 1870 followed by the A.M. in 1872. A year later he graduated from Saint Joseph's Theological Seminary in Troy, New York. He had been chosen for his task on the basis of his successful work as pastor in the Diocese of Rochester, New York, and in recognition of the general esteem he was held as leader in community affairs. Among other offices, he had been Regent of the State of New York from 1900 to 1903.

His was a commanding presence. Not yet fifty-five years of age, well over six feet in height and weighing over 200 pounds, he had been a popular athlete in his youth, and had gained recognition as a student of and writer on the trotting horse. He brought to his vocation a dynamic personality, was direct and forthright in his personal dealings, and was quite willing to face controversy where necessary. On the state and national scene he had been sufficiently well thought of to have been President Theodore Roosevelt's candidate for the archbishopric of Manila rather than the bishopric of Cebu.²

Having spent time at the Vatican in 1903 reviewing materials relative to the Church in the Philippines, followed by a week in Manila just prior to his arrival in Cebu being briefed on problems of the day, Hendrick's orientation to his new responsibility had been as thorough as circumstances permitted. Yet few men in his position could have fully comprehended the extent of the culture shock to which the Philippine archipelago had been subjected in the course of the intensifying civil disruptions of the preceding fifty years, culminating in the armed revolt of 1896-1897 and the military intervention of the United States in 1898.

American control of the islands had given rise to a dramatic clash of two divergent value systems. During four hundred years of Spanish rule, religion had been the dominant if not the determining cultural force in the islands. With the establishment of

1. No. 8, Hendrick to T. Roosevelt, 18 March 1904, Nonetheless in his "Diocese of Cebu" in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 3 (New York: Catholic Encyclopedia Press, 1907-1922), p. 471 Hendrick states he "took possession 6 March 1904."

2. Archives of the Diocese of Rochester (hereafter cited as ADR), Wynne to McQuaid, 22 April 1903. Hendrick was consecrated 23 Aug. 1903 by Cardinal F. Satolli in the Church of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary, No. 12 Via Giusti, Rome. Archbishop J.J. Harty of Manila and Archbishop P.M. Barone, Titular Bishop of Melitene, assisted.

American control, religion became one among several major forces in Philippine culture. No longer dominant, it would now begin making unaccustomed accommodations in the determination of new social goals for the archipelago.³

The new relationship would lie at the root of the several major problems which preempted Hendrick's attention immediately on his arrival. Perhaps Hayden stated this as cogently as any other chronicler:

The part which the Roman Catholic Church has played in the life of the Filipino people for nearly four hundred years has given that institution a position in the Philippines which is not artificial, but which reaches into the very roots of society and is different from that which any church occupies in the United States. History has created this position and it cannot be ignored.⁴

A more recent student was more specific in stating that the Filipinos under the Spanish regime had:

. . . found in the Church a new sense of human dignity. Catholicism had forged powerful bonds of social unity, thereby creating a much needed cushion against the severe economic stresses and strains. . . .⁵

But whereas under the Spanish regime, a major societal goal had been the spread of Christianity through the instrumentality of the Catholic Church, with the beginning of American control, toleration of all religious groups became the official policy. McKinley's instruction to the Taft Commission, dated 7 April 1900, had signalled the change. Thus the historic role of the Church in the Philippines exacerbated the tensions which would have been normal to an adjustment to this new situation. In addition, the emergence of Filipino nationalism had found its religious expression in Aglipayanism, a circumstance which is too well known to require description here.⁶ The aggressiveness, even the occasional

3. Among the several useful expositions of the new Church-State relationship, possibly the most informed and sensitive are the essays in *Church and State: The Philippine Experience* (Manila: Ateneo de Manila Univ. Press, 1976) by Horacio de la Costa, S.J., and John N. Schumacher, S.J., respectively, and Donald D. Parker's two dissertations, *Church and State in the Philippines, 1566-1896* (Univ. of Chicago, 1936) and *Church and State in the Philippines, 1896-1906* (Univ. of Chicago, 1936).

4. Joseph R. Hayden, *The Philippines. A Study in National Development* (New York: Macmillan, 1942), p. 560.

5. John L. Phelan, *The Hispanization of the Philippines. Spanish Aims and Filipino Responses, 1565-1700* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1959), p. 89.

6. The literature of this topic is extensive. Confer especially Pedro S. de Achdtegui, S.J., and Miguel A. Bernad, S.J., *Religious Revolution in the Philippines*, 2nd ed. (Manila: Ateneo de Manila Univ. Press, 1961-). See also James A. Robertson, "The Aglipay Schism in the Philippine Islands," *Catholic Historical Review* 4 (1918): 315-44.

stridency of Hendrick's letters, are a measure not alone of his personality, but also of the frequent abrasiveness of the confrontation between the old order and the new.

THE DIOCESE OF CEBU

The Diocese of Cebu, the See of which is in Cebu City on the island of Cebu, was incredibly large by Hendrick's standards, "larger in population than any in the United States, namely 1,935,000 souls, about fifteen times as large as the Diocese of Rochester [N.Y.] and harder to visit than the whole United States."⁷ It embraced the islands of Cebu, Negros, Leyte, Samar, Bohol, Siquijor, Camiguin, and the smaller islands adjacent together with the northern half of Mindanao.⁸ Some fifteen hundred miles to the east scattered over millions of square miles of ocean, lay the island chains of the Marianas and the Carolines. These too came under Hendrick's jurisdiction. His *Papers* make no reference to a visit to either.⁹ This is not surprising. There being no direct sea link between them and the Philippines at that time, Hendrick would have faced a voyage of up to six months duration involving sailing from Manila, with transshipment either at Hong Kong or a Japanese port, and thence to Honolulu and back to Guam. With Hendrick's approval, his tenuous connection to both islands chains was severed.¹⁰ His *Papers* contain a letter from the new Vicar Apostolic of the Marianas, dated 19 February 1908 from Saipan, formally advising Hendrick of the former's appointment, effective 3 August 1907.¹¹

Hendrick's immediate predecessor had been Bishop Martin de Alcorer, a Franciscan, under whose direction the old cathedral in Cebu City was in the process of being replaced at the time the

7. No. 107, Hendrick to Lee, 22 Dec. 1906.

8. Hendrick, "Diocese of Cebu," p. 471.

9. Nor do surviving records at Guam or Truk make reference to Hendrick. The Military Archives Division of the National Archives is also silent on this point.

10. No. 87, Hendrick to Card. Vives y Tuto, 11 July 1906.

11. No. 157, Kirchhausen to Hendrick, 19 Feb. 1908. Possibly it is well that distance prevented a visit to the Marianas. U.S. Naval Archives document the abrupt deportation of the Spanish monks from Guam by the U.S. Naval Commandant (Leary to SECNAV, 30 Aug. 1899 and 7 Sept. 1899) leaving just one native Chomorro priest, who had been trained at the diocesan seminary in Cebu, to minister to the islanders. The incident, which caused momentary stir in Washington, was briefly reported in the *New York Times*, 31 Oct. 1899, p. 6, col. 7. Cf. also the *New York Times*, 1 Nov. 1899 (5-1), 7 Jan. 1900 (4-3), 28 Jan. 1900 (3-2), and 6 Feb. 1900 (4-5).

revolt broke out in 1896. At that time the diocese boasted of "166 parishes, 15 parish mission, 213 parish priests or missionaries, and 125 native [i.e. secular] clergy." In 1898, there were almost 1,750,000 registered Catholics in the diocese. In Cebu City, the Recoletos maintained a church, the Augustinians a monastery, while the Paules operated the conciliar seminary. Two hospitals were supported by the diocese in Cebu City.¹² Revolutionary disruptions, followed by military operations which continued into the present century, destroyed not only much of the physical property of the diocese, but also induced serious dislocations and suspensions of many of the diocesan activities. Control of Cebu Province, the civil jurisdiction, had been returned to the provincial Governor only on 1 January 1902.¹³

PASTORAL VISITATIONS

Hendrick energetically set about the business of restoration. His first major concern was reestablishment of the church's "presence" in the form of the Bishop's person. To that end he began without delay a series of arduous visitations to the limits of his far-flung diocese. The difficulties and expense involved were considerable. Several of his letters describe these visitations. Some 2½ years after his arrival, he had the following to say to one of his Rochester friends:

You must think that I have forgotten you, since your letter bears the date July 10 [1906] but I plead the excuse that I have been very much absent from home, on long tours, the last one being more than 1,000 miles along the coast of northern Mindanao. These tours, as you may imagine, are not accomplished in Pullman cars or in comfortable steamers or in carriages, but in every class of transportation known to these islands. The last in a little launch of 45 tons gross, and two weeks and a half on the Pacific. Sometimes in bull carts, a little in carriages, in canoes, dugouts, on rafts and often on foot. The work is hard and continuous . . . Last lent I had a long visitation in Leyte, an island about fifty miles from here, 600,000 inhabitants. I visited twenty-seven towns in thirty-one days and confirmed 31,000 persons. A considerable part of this visitation was inland. As there were very few pieces of good road, the visit had to be made on horseback,

12. "Religion in the Philippines," *Encyclopedia of the Philippines*, vol. 5, *Education and Religion*, Book Two, Chapter III (Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1936).

13. Sen. Doc. 331, Pt. 2, 57th Cong., 1st Sess. I, "Hearings Before the Committee on the Philippines . . .," pp. 441-ff.

or on foot, where a carriage could not go. I preferred to walk, with a lot of porters to carry me through the muddy places on a palangin . . . After Alang-Alang we had a distance of about six miles to make, with a fairly good road, as roads go here. We had not got a mile out of town when the horses gave out under the tropical sun, so we walked the rest of the distance, abandoning our horses on the road . . .¹⁴

Travellers of this period commonly remarked upon the extremes of deprivation and hardship encountered. The Provincial Governor of Cebu Province reported that the actual condition of the pueblos could hardly deteriorate more and that "the roads, streets, squares, wharves and bridges are in bad condition, and the people have suffered from every kind of calamity."¹⁵ Such conditions when combined with the daily health hazards, prompted the advice that on any journey of more than a week from Cebu City, one should carry "half-a-dozen doses of Howard's sulphate of quinine, a small bottle of J. Collis Browne's chlorodyne, a few doses of Eno's fruit salt . . ."¹⁶

A few months after he arrived, Hendrick had written to another friend in America about:

. . . the enormous expense of getting around in a country without regular transportation. As most of my travel is by water . . . the priests are talking of buying me a boat. As the expense of a steamer is from seventy-five to one hundred dollars a day I think it would be economy to buy a gasoline boat about eighty feet long, to cost about \$8,000. This is the sum they talk of raising. Such a boat would be large enough to go to America. If the project materializes I will probably have it built in America, and sent out on one of the Standard Oil ships.¹⁷

Apparently he had also written to his good friend Bishop Rooker of Jaro about this. Writing to Hendrick, Rooker advised: "You had better not do so . . . I looked the same thing up and was led to the conclusion, after talking with some sea faring men, that the boat would never stand these waters."¹⁸ Sometime later, Hendrick's brother, Judge Peter Hendrick, wrote to say such a boat could not be shipped in one piece, and the cost would be prohibitive in any event.¹⁹

14. No. 107, Hendrick to Lee, 22 Dec. 1906.

15. Sen. Doc. 331, p. 447.

16. John Foreman, *The Philippine Islands*, 3rd ed. (New York: Scribner, 1906), p. 487.

17. No. 38, Hendrick to Minahan, 9 Nov. 1904.

18. No. 37, Rooker to Hendrick, 1 Nov. 1904.

19. No. 69, Peter Hendrick to Hendrick, 7 Dec. 1905.

The importance which Hendrick attached to his visitations reflects not alone the primacy of his religious functions, but also his realization that the deprivations the people suffered were of such magnitude that his presence in their pueblos was needed to symbolize the Church's understanding of their problems. It was but shortly after his arrival that he wrote to Bishop McQuaid:

The poor people have had not only the losses by war, but also have suffered successively from the bubonic plague, from cholera, from the loss of their native cattle by rindepest, and by the failure of their crops. They can do but little, but what they can do will be done cheerfully.²⁰

The recent hostilities had compounded the poverty indigenous to the diocese. Before the outbreak, Cebu City had been described as a place where:

There are no shops to speak of; a shanty or two containing a few faded pieces of printed cotton, bobbins and thread, piles of tinned stores, and some bottles. There is nothing to see and nothing to do, and it is too hot to do it if there were.²¹

The 1903 Census of the Philippines showed about 40 percent of the population did some farming, but land ownership was concentrated in the hands of a relatively few who rented out small parcels for subsistence farming. Less than 20 percent were engaged in weaving, both for personal and local consumption, and about 12 percent were day-laborers when work was available. About 5 percent were merchants and less than 4 percent were fishermen.²² Occupational distribution had not changed substantially in the previous one hundred years.²³

The effects of the bombardment of Cebu City in 1897 by the Spanish Navy were plainly visible to Hendrick as he stepped ashore some seven years later at the end of his two-day voyage from Manila, some 500 miles to the north. He found at Cebu a small British colony whose concern was trade; Cebu City was a port city handling principally sugar and hemp for export. The few retail shops were operated by immigrant Chinese.²⁴ A handful of American Protestant missionaries had preceded Hendrick,

20. ADR, Hendrick to McQuaid, 18 Mar. 1904.

21. Lewis Wingfield, *Wanderings of a Globe Trotter in the Far East*, (London: Bentley, 1889), vol. 2, p. 271.

22. *Census of the Philippine Islands. Taken Under the Direction of the Philippine Commission in 1903*, 4 vols. (Wash. D.C.: Bureau of the Census, 1905).

23. Tomas de Comyn, *State of the Philippine Islands in 1810*, trans. from the Spanish by W. Walton (London: Allman, 1821; Repr. Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1960).

24. Foreman, *Philippine Islands*, pp. 502-ff.

as well as some American teachers, one of whom, Samuel MacClintock, had already published an informative article on his travels around Cebu island in which he commented on the "miserably poor" condition of the population, and the absence of inns of any kind on the island outside Cebu City. Travelling principally on army horses he reported that:

Some of the churches [in Cebu City] are in excellent order and are somewhat impressive, though, owing to lack of art in them, there is not that same appeal . . . Most of the churches are poor and barren.²⁵

While Hendrick's impressions, following his initial contacts with the Cebuanos, were minimally favorable, he was soon to encounter the hostility, threats, indifference, and even violence which were to be so frequently the subjects of his letters.²⁶ Some six months after his arrival, he wrote as follows to Governor-General Wright about the occasion when:

walking on the beach [at Oroquieta] one evening an old woman cautioned me about going any further saying there were many Aglipayans beyond there. She stated that she was afraid to go to church . . . and she ought not to be talking to me. I was not any great distance from the church property, and probably not four blocks from the military headquarters. Several others expressed the same fear.

Further in the same letter Hendrick tells of arriving at Ozamis City, Mindanao. While he was eating dinner, a parade, including the local band, passed the house.

There was in the procession, first, the band, then quite a number of small children, then some men, and finally quite a large number of women. As it marched the cries of "Viva Katipunan", "Viva Aguinaldo," "Fueron (or mueron) los Romanistas," "Fueron los Frailes," etc. were plainly distinguishable.²⁷

Referring to the same incident, he wrote to Archbishop Harty of Manila that he had "just returned from Mindanao, the most terribly troubled part of this Diocese, where I was for three weeks. I still live to recollect my experiences . . . In Misamis, a mob organized by the Inspector of Customs shouted its willingness to take my life."²⁸ His undated letter to Salustiano Borja, Governor

25. Samuel MacClintock, "Around the Island of Cebu on Horseback," *American Journal of Sociology* 8 (Jan. 1903): 433-40.

26. No. 8, Hendrick to T. Roosevelt, 18 Mar. 1904.

27. Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore (hereafter cited as AAB) 10103, Hendrick to Gov. Wright, 28 Sept. 1904.

28. No. 31, Hendrick to Harty, 30 Sept. 1904.

of Bohol, advises of a similar incident there:

You will permit me to call to your attention certain unlawful acts against peace and order in the pueblo of Candijay. First: the priest whom I sent there was insulted publicly by a band of persons and stones were thrown at him. According to the letter of Governor Taft, these acts are seditious.²⁹

CALMING UNREST

Such incidents must have sorely tried Hendrick's patience and toleration, especially, as shall be noted, in view of his belief that American government officials were not always supportive. Nonetheless, he exerted his best efforts to aid the civil government in calming unrest in his diocese. One long letter to his brother Peter admirably sums up his attitude in the face of aggravation:

In my trip around Samar, the most disturbed province in these islands, I was accompanied by two priests, both natives of Samar. One of them, Father Nicanor Acebeda, parish priest of Basey, Samar, was water cured by Captain, now Major Edwin F. Glenn of the 5th U.S. Infantry, now stationed in Nebraska. At that time his brother was serving under the United States flag, as a sergeant of Scouts. His other people, as himself, were loyal to the Americans. His assistant priest was also water cured at the same time. Both were injured for life, the assistant's reason being impaired. The other priest in the visitation of Samar was Father Severino Picson whose brother, a priest, was water cured to death by Glenn, and whose sister was bayoneted to death by his order. Father Picson is a native of Samar. Now these two priests were chosen by me for the express purpose of preaching to the natives at every parish to be peaceful and not to stay in the field. It had a great effect on the natives, and helped Gov. Curry very materially toward his successful dealings with the natives. We went to every parish in Samar. All around Cebu, the same way, Father Severino preached the same sermon. All along the East and North Coast of Mindanao, for about a thousand miles, the same sermon was preached by Emiliano Mercado, a native of Cebu, who was tortured by shoulder-strapped "officer and gentleman" Edwin F. Feeter, Lieutenant of the 17th Infantry. He tied Father Emiliano's hands behind his back with a rope, one end of which he threw over the beam of a fanlight, and so strung him up for the ostensible purpose of getting information which Father Emiliano could not have, and because he had rice in his basement, which he received from the Vicar-General in Cebu, to feed his poor starv-

29. No. 71, Hendrick to Borja, 1905 (?).

ing people. I forgot to say that Father Nicanor was tortured because he rowed from Basey to Leyte to get rice for his people, which was against military orders. So in every parish where I went the same sermon was preached. Besides I sent a circular letter to the priests in Leyte, during the late uprising, telling them to go among their people and urge them to peace, and next Saturday I will go again to Leyte, at the urgent request of Captain W.R. Dashiell of the 24th U.S. Regulars, to do what I can toward the settlement of the uprising there, one of the worst in the islands. The people are good, but the uprising was a bad one, arising from the report, spread by their leader, that the United States intended to deprive them of their religion. My authority for this latter statement is Sr. Roberto [sic!] Romualdez, Fiscal (prosecuting attorney, similar to our District Attorney) Attorney of the Province of Leyte. Mr. Romualdez is known not only as an able lawyer, but also as one of the most conservative of the better educated Filipinos. I have done everything that [I] was asked, and everything that my mind could suggest in the interest of the government. This is well known to Gen. Smith and to all the Commissioners, to all the officials in all the islands of this diocese, and to many Americans now in the United States.³⁰

His efforts to abate civil unrest in the diocese were matched by constant striving to alleviate the grinding poverty he encountered. Perhaps as well as any of his letters, the following to Governor Wright will serve as an example in this regard:

I write to implore you and the [Philippine] Commission to postpone the operation of the tariff on rice. Many of the people on this island are dying of hunger and conditions are frightful. They are glad to get work at one peseta a day, twenty cents, and few can find employment even at that price. There has been no rain here since December, and even if there were to be rain immediately, it would be some months before the food situation could be changed. The rice market is cornered by the shipping houses. There is no corn to be had for the common people, because the price is far higher than ever was known. The only effect of the tariff will be to make conditions worse for a long time, and make the people desperate. I would be in favor of the tariff to protect the home grower, but I am not in favor of the tariff until the common tao has something to sell. They are literally without food and without the means to buy food at the present time.³¹

This widespread misery and deprivation was largely the result of war, pestilence, and crop failure. In such matters, Hendrick could seek assistance for his flock and, by his presence, offer the consolations of religion. Less amenable to his efforts were the results of

30. No. 111, Hendrick to P. Hendrick, 2 Jan. 1907.

31. No. 61, Hendrick to Gov. Wright, 27 Apr. 1905.

Aglipayanism, the source of the hostility and menace noted above.

During 1902 and 1903 the Aglipayan movement spread rapidly throughout a large proportion of the country. A considerable number of Filipino priests went over to the nationalist organization. In most cases, they retained possession of the church buildings which had passed under their control during the revolution, and in numerous other parishes the churches were seized by the new sect.³²

Among the most seriously affected areas of the Diocese of Cebu was the province of Misamis in northern Mindanao, where possibly 50 percent of the population were Aglipayans during Hendrick's episcopacy.³³

THE AGLIPAYAN ISSUE

There can be little doubt that much of the societal disarray which Hendrick encountered grew out of issues related to the religious factor in Philippine society. These had smoldered through a large part of the history of the Spanish regime, and came to a head in the revolt of 1896-1897. Defections among the native clergy and the laity grew. The Apostolic Delegate in Manila had been quoted as saying that 60 percent of the native priests were hostile to the new government (i.e. the Philippine Commission).³⁴ The number of Spanish friars in the countryside had long since dwindled alarmingly. Seizure of church property by the schismatics became bolder and more frequent, oftentimes encouraged by local officials. Violence, or the threat of violence became a commonplace. In sum, apart from its purely religious implications, Aglipayanism raised vexatious questions for Hendrick involving institutional relationships with a wholly new governmental apparatus which itself seemed to lack the cohesiveness needed in troubled times.

Characteristically, Hendrick's response was vigorous and direct. Within a week of his arrival at Cebu, he wrote to President Roosevelt in part as follows:

I wish to place before you some conclusions which I have formed from

32. Hayden, *National Development*, p. 572.

33. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, vol. 1, p. 529.

34. James H. Moynihan, *Life of Archbishop Ireland* (New York: Harper, 1953), p. 191. Later research indicates, however, that only thirty-six native priests had defected to the Philippine Independent Church.

what I have seen, and from information from persons who are in a position to speak authoritatively . . . As you said to me, the United States will have in the Church its great and powerful friend. I may with confidence go further and say that all classes look to the Church for stable conditions . . . At the same time it is absolutely necessary that the engagements of the Government in the Treaty of Paris should be carried out promptly, in good faith, and without embarrassment to the Church and its representatives.

. . . The revolutionary propaganda formerly known as the Katipunan has reorganized under the semblance of a Church for the better and more specious furtherance of its aims. Its ostensible head is one Aglipay who Governor Taft styled, to me, "A clever and unprincipled scoundrel." This so called Church was not in existence at the time when the treaty was made in Paris, and hence cannot be included in its provisions. Aglipay has claimed throughout the islands that he has the United States at his back, and although he is eight times a murderer, and although the connection between his so called Church and the revolutionary society is daily shown in the courts at Manila, color is given to his claims by the honors that have been shown him by prominent officials of the United States at social functions and by being carried through the islands at Government's expense, in company with the same officials. Naturally the logical result has followed. Catholics are all confused. His followers are holding office throughout the Islands, and priests and bishops have been the constant targets for his followers' insults, and have been embarrassed in every way. Many of his followers have now possession of the Churches and Church property, and yet we are told by the authorities that we must fight, for many years to come, for that which is ours by treaty. What is still more absurd is that his followers and dupes are being daily tried for sedition, and being committed to prisons, whilst he goes on with honor.

. . . It is necessary for me to recall to you the fact that the United States is not giving anything to the Church. It has agreed to protect and safeguard the ancient rights of Catholics in these Islands. These rights are supposed, taken as facts, in the Treaty of Paris . . .³⁵

Thus within a week of his arrival, Hendrick had clearly defined the issues which were to concern him most during his tenure. Very soon thereafter, his appeal for help to Cardinal Gibbons was to elicit an impatient response from the President and a lengthy reaction from Taft, then Secretary of War.³⁶ In the

35. No. 8, Hendrick to T. Roosevelt, 18 March 1904.

36. No. 11, Hendrick to Gibbons, 18 Apr. 1904; no. 18, T. Roosevelt to Hendrick, 2 May 1904; and no. 19, Taft to T. Roosevelt, 4 May 1904.

Fall of 1904, Hendrick sent a twenty-three page letter to Roosevelt which stands as a detailed record of specific instances which he and his fellow bishops believed substantiated their accusations of unlawful and discriminatory treatment at the hands of both Philippine and American officials.³⁷ The implication that the national government in Washington was involved in such matters was clear. Perhaps the most graphic description of the confrontation is found in Hendrick's lengthy letter to the editor of the *Irish World* a few years later, a seven-page fragment of which has been preserved in his *Papers*.³⁸

Roosevelt's reply to Hendrick, dated 2 May 1904, failed to meet the point at issue — *i.e.* that treaty obligations were not being met. The insertion in its place of the specious issue of recourse to the court system to recover property wrongfully alienated (as the Philippine Supreme Court subsequently affirmed in 1906) made clear the difficult road ahead for Hendrick and his fellow bishops. To say with Taft that a thief in "peaceful possession"³⁹ of stolen property would find his claim countenanced by the government was, in Hendrick's view, an obvious failure to live up to the provisions of the Treaty of Paris. Over the next few years his letters describe the difficulties he faced, and express his growing alarm at the mounting costs of litigation imposed upon him, and the structural repairs he would face when diocesan property was finally recovered, since, as he remarked, the Aglipayanos would not maintain the properties until the litigation was concluded.

It is at this point profitless to debate Taft's "peaceful possession" proclamation in terms of an alleged lack of perceptivity, or even alleged malice toward the Church. It is evident that his position, damaging as it was to the Church in the Philippines, had the outward appearance of reflecting the American position regarding separation of church and state. Taft simply failed to take into full account the historical fact that parish churches, buildings, and like properties of the Church were not vested in the local pastor or his assistants; on the contrary, title was explicitly held by the bishop of the diocese. Thus it was legally impossible for a

37. No. 30, Hendrick to T. Roosevelt, 26 Sept. 1904.

38. No. 147, Hendrick [to Patrick Ford], 31 Oct. 1907.

39. *Ibid.*

disaffected pastor or priest to take title to such structures; he had no rights since he merely occupied or used the structures by appointment of his bishop. Similarly, when such structures were abandoned, or unused by reason of expulsion of the pastor, as happened frequently during the lengthy hostilities, unilateral seizure by another agency of religion or by government was indefensible in law. Even so, in many instances, a local jurisdiction on its own initiative or in response to initiatives of others, readily bestowed a mantle of legality on such seizures.

There could be no doubt that the Treaty of Paris had guaranteed to religious organizations in the Philippines security in their property.⁴⁰ Taft did not give the appearance of wishing to modify this guarantee. He seems to have failed to understand that the *real patronato* system did not cloud the bishops' title, or that any amount of contributions to the erection of local church structures, whether in the form of labor, materials or money, could alter the basic reality that defecting priests, laity, or compliant local jurisdictions were in fact and in law expropriating church properties.⁴¹ In this matter, Taft can be viewed as a political administrator who wished, under the guise of separation of church and state, to stand aloof from controversy. So he referred it to the court system.

The unfortunate reality however was that Taft was in the position of designating as judges, in many instances, the very people who had, either directly or indirectly, seized the properties in the first place. This was the supreme irritant for Hendrick. The "law's delay," inevitable under the best of circumstances, coupled with a hostile or politically circumspect local judiciary, was galling to Hendrick, who saw in Taft's "peaceable possession" proclamation a disguised unwillingness to honor a treaty commitment at best, or at worst a design to cloak an injustice in an aura of legality.

So crucial to the survival of the Church in the Philippines was this controversy, that Hendrick's letters during the next two years are replete with references to it — whether describing progress in litigation, or detailing his efforts to assure proper registration of uncontested properties. Considering that "the consequence of Taft's proclamation was anarchy," and that "conditions in the

40. H.S. Commager, *Documents of American History*, 8th ed., (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968) vol. 2, pp. 7-8.

41. Horacio de la Costa, S.J., "Development of Native Clergy in the Philippines," *Theological Studies* 8 (1947): 219-50.

diocese of Cebu were . . . appalling” as a result, Hendrick made steady progress.⁴² A key in the eventual resolution was an enactment by the Philippine Commission of a law providing for speedy disposition of all law suits to recover such properties, and designating the Philippine Supreme Court as having original jurisdiction.⁴³ The provincial courts were thus effectively bypassed. On 24 November 1906, the Supreme Court decided *Barlin vs. Ramirez* in favor of the Church, and it became the binding precedent.⁴⁴ In retrospect, this decision came to be viewed as the “death blow” to Aglipayanism. During the following month all seized properties were returned to the Church.⁴⁵

For Hendrick, it meant a lessening of the hostility and violence of the preceding 2½ years. It also meant that the work of reconstruction and renewal could proceed confidently. But it did not mean a lessening of other vital activities, merely that more of Hendrick’s time could now go toward the rebuilding of the clergy of the diocese, reinvigorating the parish schools which had all but disappeared during the hostilities, expanding the vestigial welfare activities of the diocese, and finally, pressing for recompense from the U.S. government for war-related damage to church property.

Some measure of the effect of Aglipayanism on both the civil and religious sectors can be seen in its impact on the clergy of the archipelago.⁴⁶ It has already been noted that a generalized hostility toward the Spanish friars had resulted in a large number either leaving or being driven from their parishes. Specifically, of the 830 friars in 1898-99, some 40 had been killed and 403 imprisoned. Most of the remainder had sought the relative safety of the American-held sector of Manila.⁴⁷ Thirty six of the native clergy had defected to the schismatic church, while many others were wary of the new American bishops.⁴⁸

42. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, vol. 1, pp. 331, 333.

43. Philippine Comm. Act No. 1376, 24 July 1905.

44. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, vol. 1, pp. 341-48.

45. Donald D. Parker, “Church and State in the Philippines, 1896-1906,” *Philippine Social Science Review* 10 (Nov. 1938): 371.

46. Sen. Doc. 112, 56th Cong., 2nd Sess., Report of the Philippine Commission, Manila, 30 Nov. 1900. A summary of the conventional wisdom of the day on this topic.

47. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, vol. 3, p. 6.

48. De la Costa, “Native Clergy,” is possibly the most satisfactory treatment in English of the native clergy in the Philippines.

DEALING WITH THE SPANISH FRIARS

Clearly Hendrick faced not only a consequence of unsettled times, but also of certain factors deeply imbedded in Philippine history. The real patronato, an arrangement whereby the Spanish crown funded Church work in the colonies in return for which the Spanish friar served not only as a minister of religion but also as an agent of the crown, had worked well enough until altered social conditions in the nineteenth century brought the patronato to a point of diminished usefulness, if indeed it had not become a negative factor in both civil and religious affairs.⁴⁹

One observer reports that by 1 December 1903, only some 246 Spanish friars remained in the archipelago, of whom 80 Dominicans had decided not to return to parish work.⁵⁰ MacClintock wrote about this time that the people of Cebu had "no quarrel with the church or native priests, while against the *frailes* there [was] still the strongest feeling."⁵¹ In this respect, Cebu was not greatly different from sentiments elsewhere in the islands.⁵² Yet it is important to remember that while there was a "deeply settled opposition to . . . the Frailes . . . meaning thereby the Augustinians, Recoletos and the Dominicans," Hendrick found less hostility to other orders, notably to the Franciscans and Jesuits who had not been major land owning orders in the Philippines.⁵³

The *Hendrick Papers* leave no doubt about the deep concern this aroused in the new bishop.⁵⁴ His letters seek to encourage the return of the friars where he had reason to believe they would be welcomed, to attract members of these orders from English-speaking countries, to recruit and train Filipinos for the priesthood, and to attract various orders of nuns to staff diocesan schools and health services. Sometimes the response was negative, such as the letter from the Capuchin provincial in Manila who declined to accept an offer of control of all parishes on a particular island, giving as his reasons the isolation, the high cost of travel, the

49. Phelan, *Hispanization*, is excellent for this topic. See also pp. 199-210 for a survey of archival materials, and his "The Philippine Collection in the Newberry Library," *Newberry Library Bulletin* (March 1955): 229-36.

50. Homer C. Stuntz, *The Philippines and the Far East* (Cincinnati: Jennings and Pye, 1904), p. 319.

51. MacClintock, "Cebu on Horseback," p. 436.

52. Parker, "Church and State," p. 357.

53. No. 35, Hendrick to Wynne, 21 Oct. 1904.

54. Nos. 9, 28, 41, 46, 51 et. al.

extreme poverty of the islanders, and the "unpleasant demonstrations" three of his order had met on that island during a recent visit.⁵⁵ Hendrick found it necessary to agree that such refusals often were grounded in reality. Writing to Cardinal Satolli, he acknowledged that:

Among the common people, that is to say among the faithful Catholics, I have found a determined feeling against the Friars. The revolutionists make the anti-Friar sentiment their war cry, and no doubt this had some influence in the matter. I have been asked for Friars on the other hand, by people of vacant parishes, and have in every case requested the friars to take possession of the parishes immediately.⁵⁶

But he held firm to his belief that the religious orders had a place in the Philippines. Writing to an Augustinian in Manila, he said:

I am very sorry to hear that you and Father O'Mahoney are about to leave the islands . . . I have insisted from the first that the best interests of the religious orders, as well as of religion in general, would be promoted by bringing here English-speaking Friars to work with the Fathers from Spain. I hold the opinion now more firmly than ever. If I had in this diocese at least two or three Augustinian Friars whom I might send to places of special difficulty, I know that it would be a great help to me. As it is we are left to fight the battles of the Friars alone, and we have no assurances for the future. I think it will be a grave mistake if such a policy is not pursued.⁵⁷

Even so, the depth of the feeling against the three land-owning orders of Spanish friars in certain areas of his diocese was such as to lead him to say early in 1905:

In my judgment, the longer I stay here the more firm the judgment becomes, and concerning all the good that may be said of the Frailes, if it were not for them the Philippines might still be in the hands of Spain.⁵⁸

A typical Hendrick hyperbole perhaps, but useful as a measure of the intense concern with which he viewed the problem. As time passed however, there were successes to report. Irish Redemptorists were interested in coming to Cebu, and the Jesuits did "magnificent work" for Hendrick in Mindanao.⁵⁹ As late as 1 January 1907, in the course of a long letter to Governor General James Smith, Hendrick noted there were still "above fifty vacant pari-

55. No. 25, De Morentin to Hendrick, 3 Sept. 1904.

56. No. 42, Hendrick to Satolli, Nov. 1904.

57. No. 42, Hendrick to McErlaine, 10 Dec. 1904.

58. No. 48, Hendrick to Campbell, 7 Jan. 1905.

59. Nos. 65 and 67, Boylan to Hendrick, 5 June and 15 Aug. 1905; and no. 121, Hendrick to Gibbons, 26 Mar. 1907.

shes" in the diocese of Cebu, and "were it not for the [few] friars [whom Hendrick had induced to return] over 100 would be vacant." In the same letter he goes on to say that his diocesan seminary "graduates one or two priests, on an average, each year, and this about meets the death rate."⁶⁰

RECRUITING FILIPINO PRIESTS

His efforts to recruit Filipinos for the priesthood persisted until his death. Success was limited, for vocations were few, and funds to educate those who had been sent to American seminaries were not easily secured.⁶¹ His conviction that a native priesthood was vital to the well-being of the Church can be seen in this letter to the Apostolic Delegate in Manila:

. . . In my judgment, there should be a Filipino Bishop at Nueva Caceres and as soon as possible. I believe such an action on the part of the Holy See would do much to attach the Filipino to the Holy Father and to carry out the mind of Pope Leo XIII . . . I believe also that Filipino Bishops ought to be placed in some, at least, of the other sees, either already created, or to be created.⁶²

It was not until 1906 that Hendrick's letters begin to strike an optimistic note in the matter of recruitment. Writing to Cardinal Gibbons in that year, Hendrick remarks:

Am glad to say that conditions are brightening in the Diocese of Cebu. We received today six Redemptorist Priests from Limerick, Ireland, who will be ready in six or seven months to be giving missions in native towns. Two new academies for boys have been opened, and now the Sisters are beginning to take charge of the Parochial schools. The new hospital will be a great boon to the poor people and the Nuns will be able to teach the poor natives exactly the lessons they need in the care of the sick.⁶³

In much the same vein he wrote on the following day to his brother, Msgr. Joseph, in Ovid, New York:

Our prospects have been improving of late. Yesterday' six Redemptorist Priests and two Lay Brothers from Limerick, Ireland, sailed for Cebu to give missions in our Diocese — they will be a very great help. Father Boylan, their Provincial, is now in Cebu; his headquarters are at Limerick, from which place these Priests came. He already speaks some Vi-

60. No. 110, Hendrick to Smith, 1 Jan. 1907.

61. Nos. 24, 73, 79, 88, 97, 101 et al.

62. No. 51, Hendrick to Agius, 18 Feb. 1905.

63. No. 85, Hendrick to Gibbons, 28 June 1906.

sayan. These priests are all young, rugged and bright men and very eager to commence their work. I anticipate great results from their ministrations. The Millhill fathers who went to Bishop Rooker are now, after three months, hearing confessions and preaching in Visayan, and are having wonderful success with the people. We have already one colony of native sisters in our diocese; they went to Argao, thirty miles below Cebu about a week ago — others will follow. They are called the Madres Augustinas, and are very zealous, good little women and speak English. We have fourteen places already for the school sisters and I have no doubt we will fill all within two years. I am here in Manila for the consecration of Monsignor Jorge Barlin which takes place this morning in the Dominican Church. Monsignor Agius, Apostolic Delegate, assisted by Archbishop Harty and Bishop Rooker. There is great enthusiasm over the event. I am sure it will be productive of much good. The other Bishops tell me affairs are brightening all over the Islands, and we have many things for which to be thankful, although many conditions are still very hard. Aglipayanism is dying out. The Missions being given in Cebu province by the Jesuits are wonderfully successful, far beyond my hopeful expectations. Next year we will have them again, and also the Redemptorist fathers at work.⁶⁴

It was about this time that Hendrick wrote an article on his diocese for the new *Catholic Encyclopedia* in which he sums up the remarkable progress made since his arrival in 1904:

The chief evil, however, was the lack of priests. The parishes average about ten thousand souls. In the mountainous regions about half a million of souls were without spiritual succour. The Franciscans, by whom many churches were formerly supplied, began to return, and the Jesuits worked with great success in Mindanao. Redemptorist Fathers from Ireland are exclusively occupied in giving missions to the people. The Lazarists have two colleges for boys, one in Cebu with 600, another in Samar with 350 pupils. The same Fathers have also charge of the ecclesiastical seminary, in which there are 85 students. A college for girls is conducted in Cebu by the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, with 500 pupils. An orphan asylum and trade school under the same Sisters care for 85 girls and a few small boys. A leper hospital was maintained for fifty years until 1906. The diocese contains 135 secular priests and 123 religious, of the following communities: Augustinians, Recollects, Franciscans, Benedictines, Jesuits, Lazarists, and Redemptorists.⁶⁵

While Hendrick was able to make significant progress in rebuilding the clergy of his diocese within three years of his arrival, progress toward a settlement of claims for war damage to church

64. No. 86, Hendrick to J. Hendrick, 29 June 1906.

65. Hendrick, "Diocese of Cebu," p. 471.

property had been less impressive. With the Barlin vs Ramirez decision sustaining the Church's claim to its alienated property late in 1906, he and his fellow bishops moved to an urgent consideration of the most effective procedure in approaching Congress for reimbursement. The Barlin decision removed the last possible cloud to the titles. There remained now only the matter of detailing the specific grounds for the claims and the dollar value involved.

THE CLAIM FOR WAR DAMAGES

From the beginning of the American occupation, these matters had been concerns not only of church authorities; they had also been the object of close scrutiny by the American military and the Commission government.⁶⁶ While Taft had been Governor-General, he had ordered a survey of all such claims and had arrived at a total of over two million dollars at that time. Several categories were covered by this figure; damage sustained in the course of hostilities, damage inflicted directly by the revolutionaries, theft or destruction of liturgical objects, and sums due the church for occupation of church structures by American forces as barracks, hospitals, prisons and the like, together with damage consequent to this use. Hendrick had referred to this matter as early as September 1904 in writing to President Roosevelt.⁶⁷ Subsequently, he had stated that payment of damages "will be of direct and immediate relief to those dioceses which are laid prostrate by acts of war."⁶⁸ In 1906, he had been asked by his fellow bishops to go to Washington as their representative to press for payment. But Archbishop Harty decided himself to go instead.

Meantime Hendrick had grown increasingly impatient with the delays, and determined on a different approach, one not without risks. He wrote to his friend, Bishop Rooker:

I am determined to place our matters before the American people . . . I probably will not do it in my own name, but will supply a capable American lawyer with the facts, and let him, with the counsel of others, conduct the campaign, keeping myself in the background. Our policy of silence [heretofore] was a grand mistake.⁶⁹

66. Sen. Rep. 378, 60th Cong., 1st Sess., Insular Affairs Comm., 20 Jan. 1908.

67. No. 30, Hendrick to T. Roosevelt, 28 Sept. 1904.

68. No. 93, Hendrick [to Archbishop Farley], 19 Jan. 1906.

69. No. 94, Hendrick to Rooker, 6 Sept. 1906.

And Rooker replied:

As to the payment of these war claims, I hold, as I have from the beginning, that the government is simply playing us. I do not believe there is any serious intention of paying a cent of them.⁷⁰

Although Hendrick soon changed his mind in this matter, his mistrust appears shortly thereafter to have been given substance by Archbishop Harty's report from Washington in which Harty refers to his talks with President Roosevelt and Secretary Taft as well as members of Congress including Speaker Cannon, only to discover in the end that no bill had been introduced in Congress and that nothing further could be done until the next Session.⁷¹ But in the meantime, word of Hendrick's intention had reached many quarters in America. Father John Wynne, then editor of the influential *Messenger*, and soon to be founding editor of *America*, wrote as a long-time friend:

You know, dear Bishop, that no man on earth believes more firmly than I do in coming out publicly when there is no longer any hope of obtaining justice by remonstrances in private. That is precisely what I had in view when I suggested that you come to the States last fall, and I still have in view your visit with a view to being on the spot in case you should have to make your charges public, so that they could not be met with denials which it would take us two months or more to refute. If you come here well furnished with fact and with proof, knowing as you do what answers are likely to be made, and knowing also how to refute such answers, you need never do more than threaten to make exposures to make your point. But if you issue the charges from Cebu, they will be denied and the cable will be set at work to confirm the denial, and the press employed to create false impressions about you and your motive. Meantime, you are about thirty to forty-five days at a distance from your friends, so that it would take two to three months to get your replies to denials at Washington, and as you know, by that time people would have forgotten everything except the impression that somehow or other your story had been refuted. In some way it may be providential that the matter is not settled so that you will be needed here next year to see it through.⁷²

And within the month, Archbishop Ireland, one of the key figures in American Catholicism at the time, wrote this caution:

I am not so sure I can agree with the policy you once proposed to your-

70. No. 98, Rooker to Hendrick, 10 Oct. 1906.

71. No. 119, Harty to Agius, 2 Mar. 1907.

72. No. 122, Wynne to Hendrick, 26 Mar. 1907.

self of appealing to public opinion in the United States. Such a policy would not have been a success. It would have irritated those in power, divided the Catholics and made an unfavorable impression upon others. The way to do things is to appeal to the men in power and argue out the case with them. They are, on the whole, from President down, most kindly disposed and ready to do anything that is at all reasonable.⁷³

Ireland went on to say that he would speak to the President in the following week about Hendrick's concern.

While word of Hendrick's intention may have caused some alarm, his *Papers* show that support of his position in the Philippines was such as to enable him to write to Archbishop Farley of New York soon thereafter, enlisting Farley's support in the attempt to secure redress, and recording that his appeal had the support of both the Apostolic Delegate and the Archbishop of Manila. In this letter he repeats his belief that the U.S. government is unfriendly to the church, and that Secretary of War Taft, "despite his constant profession of friendship," had pigeon-holed the claims for over a year.⁷⁴

Early in 1908, Hendrick departed for Washington to provide the focus for efforts to secure a appropriation. Before he left, the Apostolic Delegate in Manila counselled as follows:

There is no need to warn you to be on your guard against the enemies of the administration, who will do their level best to wring out of you statements to fight Roosevelt and Taft. This would be fatal to our cause. They will be round you from the moment you land at San Francisco. You know also that Roosevelt has not yet got over the resentment he felt at the contents of some of your letters, and we should prevent exciting him to any action which might hurt us . . . I am persuaded that any attack upon the government will do us no good.⁷⁵

Awaiting his arrival in America was clear evidence that political figures at the highest level also were concerned. For 1908 was an election year. The Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee wrote to Hendrick saying:

At the suggestion of Mr. Bourke Cockran and also, I understand, of the representative of the Pope who is now here in Washington, Secretary Taft has requested me to write you asking you if you will kindly refrain from any public expression in regard to your views about the settlement with the church in the Philippine Islands until you reach Washington. Some of

73. No. 125, Ireland to Hendrick, 6 April 1907.

74. No. 144, Hendrick to Farley, 25 Sept. 1907.

75. No. 153, Agius to Hendrick, 4 Jan. 1908.

them apprehend it would be unwise and impolitic to interfere with the settlement that has already been made until after it is consummated. Then the question of injury to property because of the failure to protect from deprecations (sic!) of Aguinaldo (sic!) and his Philippine followers can be taken up for further negotiation . . . I know the Secretary, and I believe President Roosevelt whom I have not seen on the matter, would like to see you here.⁷⁶

The Chairman's letter was awaiting Hendrick on his arrival in the U.S., and its reference to the "settlement" already made was an indication of what lay ahead. Upon reaching Washington, he discovered that the imperatives of the coming political campaign had brought about an agreement to appropriate \$403,000 in settlement of all claims arising out of American military activities, but denying, in essence, all other compensation. Hendrick's best efforts to increase the award were unavailing. He later reported that "When I arrived in Washington, I found the question was simply whether we would receive what Congress was willing to vote us, or nothing at all."⁷⁷ The bill passed Congress in the Spring of 1908 without further delay.

This was a particularly stormy period for Hendrick. His prominence in political circles made him a personage of consequence in the power centers of the Capital. But his forthrightness in speaking his mind about public issues and personalities unsettled others who were his allies and friends. No doubt this was the root of a most distressing episode, involving his secretary, Father Rawlinson, who had accompanied him to Washington. At one point in his discussions there, Hendrick became aware that his secretary had given certain powerful figures the impression that he, Rawlinson, had the authority to supersede Hendrick in any negotiations Rawlinson might not approve of. While no lasting damage was done to Hendrick's mission the episode caused him intense concern.⁷⁸ His work in Washington concluded, Hendrick began a pilgrimage to Rome in August 1908.⁷⁹

The successful conclusion of the effort to secure compensation for war damages marked a turning point for Hendrick. His diocese had recouped its losses to Aglipayanism, the clergy had been re-

76. No. 158, Payne to Hendrick, 26 Feb. 1908.

77. No. 168, Hendrick to Harty, 1 June 1908.

78. No. 173, Hendrick to Agius, 29 July 1908.

79. Presidential Papers, Roosevelt Papers, Ser. I, Reel 84, Hendrick to Taft, 18 Aug. 1908.

built, and the diocesan share of the war damages appropriation meant that the work of rehabilitating the physical plant of the diocese could proceed on firmer ground. These had been his major concerns from the outset. But there had been other matters only slightly less urgent; now it seemed possible to give more of his time to these. For example, Hendrick had been greatly concerned about the formation of the new public school system in the islands, and had been striving from the outset to revivify the parish schools in the diocese.

INFLUENCING THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

The *Hendrick Papers* are less rewarding to the researcher in this area. While there is no uncertainty about his strong feeling about the place of religion in the curriculum of the public schools, of the need to establish a diocesan school system, of his concern for adequately trained teachers, and similar matters, his *Papers* are less full in their treatment than of the major items thus far covered. Nevertheless, it was only one week after his arrival at Cebu that Hendrick wrote to Bishop McQuaid with regard to the condition of education in his diocese:

There is not in all this vast diocese one Catholic free school, and Catholic schools are the *one* supreme need of the Philippines . . . I want to beg of you [to send] me five sisters of Saint Joseph to open the Cathedral parochial school next fall . . . The diocese is desperately poor, but if Your Lordship will say that you will let these sisters come, I will provide for their expenses . . . There is no common language here. Not one percent of the natives speak Spanish, and there are some thirty languages and dialects in this diocese alone. English therefore is the one hope for the future and if the Church will not furnish it, the Government will; though the public school has for many reasons not gained the confidence of the people . . .⁸⁰

Hendrick alludes here to some of the serious questions regarding the education policy of the insular government which had arisen before he arrived. Catholics were particularly disturbed by the decision to exclude religion from the curriculum of the new public school system; they viewed the provision of after-hours facilities for such instruction as wholly inadequate in a nation almost entirely Catholic. In later years, Hayden summed up the

80. ADR, Hendrick to McQuaid, 18 Mar. 1904.

dispute as follows:

The Church has never been satisfied with the existing arrangement. Aside from the matter of principle involved, the Roman Catholic authorities have felt first, that the time allotted [for religious instruction] is insufficient and, second that in making and enforcing the regulations under the law, the Bureau of Education has not gone as far as it should to facilitate the work of the classes in religion.⁸¹

From the viewpoint of Philippine history, this dissatisfaction was well-grounded. Under the Spanish regime, public education had indeed centered around religious education.⁸² The Philippine Commission however, acting under the provisions of the "School Act," felt itself bound to restructure public education on the American model.⁸³ The decision to adopt English as the national language involved, among other things, the recruitment of English-speaking teachers from the United States. Hundreds were brought over prior to Hendrick's arrival in 1904, but this process gave rise to a charge well-founded in the view of many, "that virtually all the teachers brought to the Philippines were Protestants who were using the public schools to proselytize in favor of Protestantism, and that top American administrators were themselves of no faith or of a faith at variance with the teachings of Catholicity."⁸⁴ Hendrick's letter to Governor-General Smith (previously Commissioner of Education) makes these points:

What I object to is the palpable discrimination in your former department against Catholic teachers. As has often been said, only one Superintendent out of thirty-five, or more, is a Catholic, and less than five percent are Catholics. These facts are in themselves an answer to all claims of fair play. I do know that advancement was refused to Catholic teachers on the ground that they were not qualified for the office of Superintendent, when Protestant teachers equally unqualified were given such positions.⁸⁵

Apart from matters such as these, there were others of a physical nature. At the time Hendrick wrote to McQuaid, one observer of the schools in Cebu reported as follows:

The conditions were the rudest. A bamboo schoolhouse, a backless bench

81. Hayden, *National Development*, pp. 166-67.

82. James A. LeRoy, *Philippine Life in Town and Country* (New York: Putnam's, 1905), pp. 202-45. Cf. also Sen. Doc. 112, 56th Cong., 2nd Sess., pp. 105-13.

83. Philippine Commission Act No. 74, 21 Jan. 1901.

84. Stuntz, *Far East*, pp. 193, 201; and Oscar L. Evangelista, "Religious Problems in the Philippines and the American Catholic Church," *Asian Studies* 6 (1968): 257.

85. No. 100, Hendrick to Smith, 1 Jan. 1907.

along the sides of the room, some children squatting on the floor, no chairs, tables boards or charts, a book containing the catechism in Viza-gan (sic!) — this was the school layout. All the children study aloud, and the best scholar is he who can make the most noise. The ignorance of the native country teacher is unfathomable, and when we found the salaries paid them we did not wonder at the class attracted, or rather driven, into the service. One woman — a fat old matron of fifty or more — received one and a half pesos per month — something less than seventy-five cents. From this amount salaries range up to thirty dollars, the highest paid in Cebu.⁸⁶

Moreover, under the Spanish regime, such schools as existed had been poorly attended.⁸⁷ Although Spanish had been mandated by the Crown as the language of instruction over forty years previously, the 1903 Census reported that only a minority of the population spoke Spanish.⁸⁸ The teacher training institutions had not been productive, and the decision to adopt English as the national tongue complicated an already difficult situation.

Although Hendrick met with a measure of success as evidenced in letters previously cited, and by his article in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*,⁸⁹ the problem of the schools was so persistent, and the urgency of the diocesan effort in education such, that in 1908 Hendrick addressed to Cardinal Gibbons a plea that the Cardinal support an approach to the Pope asking the latter to intervene with the superiors of religious orders in the Philippines, requesting that such orders in the Philippines send English-speaking members to the archipelago as teachers.

We might thus introduce American friars (Franciscans) into Samar, to establish a College; American Jesuits into Leyte or Cebu, and American Lazarists into Cebu, and preserve the comities of the situation. I am afraid that unless some solution is speedily reached, the situation will pass beyond our control. A word from the Holy Father to the Generals would settle all difficulties.⁹⁰

WORKING FOR IMPROVED HEALTH CONDITIONS

Hendrick's attention had also been claimed by the deplorable

86. MacClintock, "Cebu on Horseback," p. 440.

87. Dean C. Worcester, *The Philippines, Past and Present*, (New York: Macmillan, 1914), vol. 2, pp. 501-31. A thorough summary of the topic.

88. Cf. Ferdinand Blumentritt, *The Philippines*, trans. D.J. Doherty (Chicago: Donohue Brothers, 1900), p. 30.

89. Hendrick, "Diocese of Cebu."

90. No. 169, Hendrick to Gibbons, 2 June 1902.

condition of public health provisions, and the almost total lack of health care at the individual level.⁹¹ Even as pacification got underway, the military began work on the sewerage, particularly noisesome in the cities and towns. For example, in Manila no sewerage system existed. "All garbage, household waste and night soil, when simply not thrown onto the streets and alleys with the hope that it would be disposed of by hogs and other animals, was handled in the crudest possible manner."⁹² As a result, Hendrick found that dysentery was endemic. Typhoid and malaria were common. There had been several cholera epidemics during the nineteenth century. Diphtheria, smallpox, and leprosy took a heavy toll. Beriberi re-appeared early in the American occupation. Bubonic plague had been found in Cebu City. For many years the death rate had been so high that the population was at a standstill.⁹³ The infant mortality rate stood at about 50 percent.

By 1904, a beginning had been made to mitigate some of the most serious shortcomings in the public health field in some urban areas. Hospital and other medical facilities for individual treatment, however, particularly in the provinces, were rudimentary. Hendrick wrote to a friend:

The state of medical and surgical practice here is, as you doubtless know, in a primitive condition. The natives are very much prejudiced against doctors, and especially against surgeons . . . We have two priests in this diocese who have cataracts . . . I advised them strongly to go to Manila to have the cataracts removed, citing the case of Archbishop Williams of Boston, who was almost completely blind, and had both cataracts removed most successfully. I had good doctors also go to them but could not persuade them . . . There is a military hospital here, but it is not in a good location, and I can hardly speak of it to the Surgeon — he talks so strongly. Although the military have been very good to the people, they dislike to admit outsiders. We have no other hospital here for a population which includes about two million souls. We have two so-called hospitals, one of which is under the Sisters of Charity, but it is very small (and) owing to lack of means, it is unable to do very much. The good sisters are very charitable, most willing to do *anything* I ask them . . .⁹⁴

91. Worcester, *Past and Present*, vol. 2, pp. 408-48. Cf. also David J. Doherty, "Medicine and Disease in the Philippines," *Journal of the American Medical Association* (16 June 1900): 1526-31.

92. Charles B. Elliot, *The Philippines to the End of the Commission Government* (Indianapolis: Bobbs, Merrill, 1917), p. 187.

93. *Ibid.*, p. 186.

94. No. 107, Hendrick to Lee, 22 Dec. 1906.

Hendrick's efforts to improve the lot of his people were constant, but largely unavailing. At one point, after a lengthy exchange of letters with an order of nuns in Baltimore, he had reason to believe that they would indeed provide the personnel he needed for a hospital in Cebu City. This too was a disappointment, the depth of which is hardly concealed in his wry comment in closing the matter:

I have known the good holy nuns for fifty years, since 1856, when my sister became one, but I have learned more of their idiosyncracies since I came here than in all my life before. [The superior in question] is the fifth Mother Superior who definitely promised and afterwards changed her mind.⁹⁵

While in the States in 1908, he wrote to an old friend, a resident at the Saranac Club:

One of the gravest needs of the poor people is that of hospitals. There are four hospitals in Manila; for over seven million people there is no hospital at all . . .

and goes on to ask his friend if he could think of any way to approach Andrew Carnegie in search of funds to build a hospital in his diocese.⁹⁶ In 1909, Hendrick received a letter from the District Health Officer of the Commission government with whom Hendrick had been working with the goal of having the Commission build a hospital in Cebu for American personnel which could also serve the native population:

With reference to the proposed hospital scheme about which we have talked so often, I wish to tell you that during my stay in Manila I hope to be able to get somebody at headquarters interested to the extent of giving us government assistance . . . The Bureau of Health several years ago had a scheme for a provincial hospital which fell through because of lack of funds and there is less money available now than there was then . . . Manila has six well-equipped hospitals and there is a mission hospital in Iloilo, which last is the only provincial hospital that I know of. It is five hundred miles from here [i.e. Cebu] to Manila, and half that distance to Iloilo with but few boats running between these points, so you see an acutely sick man in this district can get but little hospital treatment.⁹⁷

The words of Dean Worcester, written some time after Hendrick's death, sum up the matter:

95. No. 105, Hendrick to Demetrius, 3 Dec. 1906.

96. No. 171, Hendrick to Jenkins, 18 July 1908.

97. No. 191, Pond to Hendrick, 3 April 1909.

In the educational campaign which we have thus far conducted with some considerable degree of success two agencies have proved invaluable, namely the Catholic Church and the public schools. Again and again I have begged Apostolic Delegate Monsignor Agius and Archbishop Harty (*Manila*) to bring to bear the influence of the Church in favor of simple sanitary regulations, the general adoption of which was imperatively necessary in combating some epidemic of disease. They have invariably given me invaluable assistance.⁹⁸

He also notes that not long after Hendrick's death "at Cebu, a thoroughly up-to-date sixty-bed institution is now open . . ."⁹⁹

THE DECISION TO STAY

It is perhaps most indicative of Hendrick's ability and personality, as well as his wide circle of friends in America, that his assignment to Cebu did not remove him from notice in his homeland. Many letters from friends survive in his *Papers*, testifying to this. Scarcely eighteen months after his arrival in Cebu, his brother Peter, in the course of a lengthy letter bringing him up to date on family matters, told him:

There is a movement on foot here to make you Archbishop of New Orleans. Mrs. Kerens who was here at the Holland House a few months ago sent for me and told me that she had every hope that result would be accomplished. She told me that the Archbishop of St. Louis, Archbishop Ireland and Archbishop Ryan and some others were for you, and would do everything possible to that end. Mr. Minahan has been out west and was to have a talk with Archbishop Messmer, who is an intimate personal friend of his, in relation to the matter. If the Cardinal [i.e. Gibbons] should favor your appointment, I have no doubt you will receive it . . . If there is anything that you can do in the New Orleans matter, do not fail to do it.¹⁰⁰

The interest persisted. Shortly before his death he received the following:

Not long ago I spoke with the Apostolic Delegate at Washington about the subject of your transfer from the Philippines . . . He told me that President Taft had urged the matter upon his attention, and that naturally, he was very much interested in it, both because of his regard for you and of the possibility that you might do very good work here for the Filipinos . . . When I asked him what would be the best method of procedure in this case he said that by all means the initiative should be taken by Your

98. Worcester, *Past and Present*, vol. 1, p. 445.

99. *Ibid.*, p. 435.

100. No. 69, P. Hendrick to Hendrick, 7 Dec. 1905.

Lordship. In other words you should represent to the authorities in Rome if they saw fit and could provide a See for you here [that] you on your part would be pleased with the transfer.¹⁰¹

Hendrick decided however not to pursue the matter. While in Rome in 1908, he had indicated his wish to remain in Cebu.

Doubtless Hendrick found much encouragement in such evidences of esteem. At times his letters testify to the disillusionment and suspicion with which he came to view some of the significant political figures of his time. He had vigorously opposed the appointment of James F. Smith as Governor-General of the Philippines because of what he viewed as character deficiencies, holding to his position in the face of President Roosevelt's determination to make the appointment.¹⁰² He came to feel that President Roosevelt had publicly belittled him in a message to Congress, and wrote that Taft, despite the latter's support on several occasions, was "a wise man with his mouth, with a pusillanimous and dishonest heart."¹⁰³ Yet he could magnanimously forgive a political foe when developments indicated the causes of enmity had been removed.¹⁰⁴

Even under the strain of his work in the Philippines, Hendrick's letters make reference to his continuing good health. But shortly after his return from Rome, his health began to fail. In the spring of 1909, he experienced a severe attack of "rheumatism."¹⁰⁵ Early in September, a diagnosis of acute nephritis was made.¹⁰⁶ Notifications of serious illness were sent to his family in September, and in October he wrote:

I have been sick so many months, confined to my room, that it was only a day or two ago, that I could manage to get off the letter, a copy of which I enclose. I hope it may do some good. I was four days delirious from a sudden attack of inflammation of the kidneys, and it left me extremely prostrate. After the delirium I was incapable of much mental effort of any kind, and the letter was written contrary to the strict orders of the doctors . . . Msgr. Hendrick, my brother, sailed yesterday from San Francisco to take me home. I am still extremely weak and my chief complaint is nervous prostration . . .¹⁰⁷

101. No. 192, Wynne to Hendrick, 5 April 1909.

102. No. 24, Hendrick to Gibbons, 5 Aug. 1904.

103. No. 48, Hendrick to Compbell, 7 Jan. 1905.

104. No. 111, Hendrick to J. Hendrick, 2 Jan. 1907.

105. No. 194, Harty to Hendrick, 10 May 1909.

106. No. 207, Laboratory Report, 9 Sept. 1909.

107. No. 218, Hendrick to Kerens, 6 Oct. 1909.

Late in November, he wrote to another friend:

I was indeed very sick, very close to death, being unconscious for three days afterwards, and have since then been gaining strength very slowly.

The doctors have ordered me to the United States, but they do not promise that I shall reach there alive.¹⁰⁸

Nor did he. Early Tuesday, 30 November 1909, on the eve of his departure for Manila to sail for home, Hendrick died of cholera. Bishop Dougherty, later Cardinal Archbishop of Philadelphia, who had succeeded Bishop Rooker of Jaro, administered the last rites. His brother, Monsignor Joseph, was present. He was buried the same day in his cathedral at Cebu City following solemn funeral services.¹⁰⁹

108. No. 221, Hendrick to Sullivan, 24 Nov. 1909.

109. Bernard L. Heffernan, *Some Cross Bearers of the Finger Lakes Region* (Chicago: Anderson, 1925), pp. 155-56. Cf. also extensive newspaper clipping file in ADR.