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ABSTRACT

The Philippine revolution of 1896 was the critical moment for the emergence of an authentically Filipino national community. The revolution was significant as an inner struggle to overcome internal social and cultural divisions between elite and masses as much as a political struggle to gain independence from Spain. The leaders of the 1896 revolution articulated the aspirations and values comprehensible within an indigenous religious tradition which had manifested itself in earlier millenarian movements and peasant revolts. This tradition drew on apocalyptic and liminal Christian ideas as well as older, pre-Hispanic beliefs and perceptions of the world, and posited a radical tension between the everyday world of appearances and an ideal world or 'new Eden' of perfect community, brotherhood, and direct union with God. This new world could only be achieved through suffering, inner purification and fraternal love. By the end of 1898 a very different leadership assumed control of the revolution and its official ideology shifted to a position explicitly hostile to the radical folk tradition. The new leadership of Hispanicised nationalist ilustrados drew its inspiration from the European Enlightenment and the French Revolution via Spanish Liberalism. The subsequent confrontation between these two kinds of revolutionaries exposed the contradictions of a society formed during three centuries of colonialism and divided between two classes and two cultures. The cooption of the ilustrado elite after 1898 by the incoming American administration confirmed this internal confrontation between elite and masses.

The clearest evidence of the kind of divisions within Philippine society before, during, and after the revolution can be found in the
religious disputes which were a constant preoccupation of Spaniards, Filipinos and, later, Americans. Given the nature of Spanish colonisation and the pervasive influence of the institutional church both as the key instrument of colonial rule and the vehicle for acculturation, religious issues were central to the revolutionary struggle. The battles fought within the church between Spanish regular clergy and Filipino secular clergy, between Spanish friar landlords and Filipino tenants, between Spanish priest-administrators and the local Filipino principes helped provoke the revolution and expressed the broader struggle of various groups to control the colony and to shape its institutions and values in their own image. Even more profoundly, the confrontation between groups holding quite incompatible views of man, God, and society brought into question the fundamental assumptions of Philippine society. The three-sided struggle between Spanish clergy, ilustrado liberal nationalists, and folk revolutionaries—a struggle which became four sided with American intervention—was concerned with what definition of man and society would prevail in the Philippines.

To understand the nature of this struggle and to suggest reasons for the failure of the revolution to overcome the cultural dualism of the colonial Philippines, this study traces the religious controversies which preceded and followed the revolution. It begins with an analysis of the colonial church and the process by which Spanish Roman Catholic ideas and values were adapted and transformed within an indigenous tradition. The world-view of the Spanish friars is then examined and their opposition to reform is placed in its historical, theological, and international context. The Filipino clergy formed an ambiguous and symbolically critical group
in a colony founded and administered as a mission and their long struggle to gain recognition inspired both the secular nationalist and the folk radical movements of the latter part of the nineteenth century. Their importance during the revolution is analysed in Chapter Three. With the collapse of Spanish rule and the transfer of sovereignty to the United States the terms of the religious struggle were radically altered. In this new situation, the various groups competing for control of the church and of the colony looked to the Vatican to solve the problems of a racially divided clergy, the friar estates, and the question of religious authority itself. The debate over the proper function of the Filipino clergy continued as a bitterly divisive issue after 1899 as did the apparent determination of the religious orders to regain control of their extensive properties and the parishes they had held before the revolution.

Contrary to accepted views of the religious settlement worked out under the Americans, these problems were not solved. The Apostolic Delegate sent to the Philippines by the Holy See in early 1900 immediately allied himself with the Spanish hierarchy and endorsed its absolute opposition to religious change in the islands. The failure of the Delegate and of Rome to recognise the needs of the Philippine Church meant that religious controversies which had so deeply divided the colony under Spain were perpetuated under American rule. The Vatican solution, as contained in the Apostolic Constitution, Quae mari Sinico, of 1902, provoked widespread anger and broadened a schism which had broken out among a section of the Filipino clergy and laity some months earlier.

The Iglesia Filipina Independiente, the independent national church which emerged from the schism of 1902, contained within itself all the contradictions evident in Philippine society. The opposed class
interests and incompatible 'cosmologies' of its leaders, clergy, and mass following, reflected the dilemmas confronting the colony. The ambivalence of the IFI leadership towards the religious traditions of its followers; towards the revolution; and towards American rule and independence were the first substantial indications of the consequences of the failure of the revolution to establish a Filipino cultural identity, a core of fundamental, shared values and beliefs relevant to the historical experience and the inherited traditions of the Filipino people.
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EPISCOPAL DIVISION OF THE PHILIPPINES 1898
The people of the Philippines have experienced perhaps more
acutely than most other colonised peoples the dilemmas and
ambiguities which the colonial relationship produces. As
O. Mannoni pointed out some years ago, the unequal relationship
between colonist and colonised itself has an ambivalent and dis-
torting effect on the psychology of dependent peoples.¹ In the
Philippines this effect was exaggerated, first, because exposure
to the West was sustained over a remarkably long period; second,
because the two colonial systems which were successively imposed
on the indigenous tribal society were the most culturally ambitious
and extreme forms of the old and new types of Western imperialism;
and third, because those two imposed systems contradicted each other
in their fundamental assumptions. Over three and a half centuries,
Spanish priests laboured to remould the original pre-Hispanic
culture to resemble the Hispanic Catholic culture of sixteenth
century Spain. Although other European powers involved in Asia
had their proselytising aspects, the Spaniards most emphatically
and consciously directed their efforts to the transformation of the
beliefs and values of the peoples under their influence. After
a brief period of independence, Filipinos were then subjected to
the secular but equally fervent attentions of the United States at
a time when American confidence in the mission of the United States
to civilise the world was at its height. Not surprisingly, the

¹ O. Mannoni, Prospero and Caliban; The Psychology of Colonization
national culture which emerged under the influence of two such extreme and incompatible forms of colonialism contains deep internal contradictions. It will be a major aim of this study to identify these contradictions, first as they were exposed by the revolution against Spain and then as they were further complicated under American rule.

However different their understanding of their task and the means of achieving it, Spanish and American colonists had one thing in common: they both believed with extraordinary self-confidence that they had a mandate to convert the rest of mankind to the values which they thought absolute. The colonial administrations they set up in the Philippines were both concerned, as a primary goal, with the transformation of the way the indigenous people under their control saw themselves and their society. The reorganisation of political, social, and economic structures; educational policies; the fact of colonial rule itself: both Spaniards and Americans, although in radically different terms, explained these as directed to the uplifting of the people of the archipelago. No doubt there was a great deal of unconscious and sometimes conscious hypocrisy in such claims. Many Spanish officials of the latter nineteenth century, for instance, denied in Spain and did not privately believe in religious principles which they found expedient to support in the colony. Many Americans were more interested in a quick profit or in using the Philippines for strategic purposes than in making little brown Americans of the Filipinos. But however much the goal of 'civilising' the 'natives'
was obscured or perverted in practice, its force as the ultimate justification and rationalisation for the policies adopted by the colonial administrations of Spain and the United States should not be ignored. Despite the shabby greed and sometimes ruthless injustice the rhetoric of colonialism concealed, the rhetoric was an indication of something real: a set of assumptions which defined and controlled the colonist as well as the colonised, even as Europeans appeared to manipulate their Asian subjects for specific advantages. When the Spaniard talked of his 'Divine mission' to unite the indio with all mankind in the Kingdom of God, or when the American proclaimed his 'manifest destiny' to introduce the Filipino to science and progress, both acknowledged values which conditioned their own behaviour as well as shaping the response to their rule of the people in the colony.

While Spaniards and Americans shared an aggressive self-confidence, they differed fundamentally on their definition of the ultimate goals of colonial rule and on the means necessary to attain them. Their disagreement was reflected in their mutually hostile understanding of the basic institutions of government and religion, their view of the relationship between church and state, of material progress, culture and the nature of man. It will be a major concern of this study to identify the areas of conflict between Spanish and American colonial policies in this broader sense, as well as in particular areas concerned with the church, and to suggest the consequences of such conflicts for Filipino conceptions of church and religion. It was inescapable
that irreducible contradictions between Spanish, American and indigenous systems of values and beliefs should be perpetuated in a national culture which attempted to incorporate such incompatible elements into a synthesis. The unresolved tensions apparent in the Philippines since 1946 are a consequence of the contradictory experiences of the colonial past and the failure of liberal nationalist leaders to articulate a set of universally recognised values upon which to build an authentic national identity.²

The confusion at the level of values and beliefs apparent in Philippine society is an expression of class and sectional conflict as well as a consequence of a contradictory colonial past. Contact with the colonial rulers varied in intensity and character depending on the position of the individual or his family. The cultural polarities between Hispanicised ilustrado and rural tao, between Manila and the provinces, between elite and masses, landowner and peasant, priest and layman, mestizo and indio were also political, economic and social polarities. Even before the intrusion of the United States or the outbreak of revolution, a chasm had opened up in the nineteenth century Philippines between the minority of Filipinos who successfully adopted aspects of secular Spanish urban culture and the great mass of those who remained within the world of Filipino folk Catholicism.

The revolution, as Apolinario Mabini recognised, was not

² The ideological confusion apparent in the propaganda put out in defence of the New Society since September, 1972, clearly indicates that the problems created by colonial domination have not been resolved.
only an anti-colonial uprising against foreign domination but an internal confrontation; a struggle to achieve a transformation of Philippine society. In their own terms, *ilustrado* nationalists and Katipunan folk revolutionaries were equally aware of the need for unity, for a shared core of values and aspirations with which to overcome the widening gulf between the two cultures of the elite and the masses. Whether this perceived need for unity was expressed in terms of a 'New Eden' or the concepts of European liberalism, it acknowledged the contradictions in Philippine society and the problem of finding a collective identity within which all Filipinos could rediscover a sense of community.

Because of the common bond of Spanish-Philippine Catholicism linking Spaniard and Filipino and because of the inter-dependence bred of three and a half centuries of colonialism, the revolutionary task confronting the leaders of the anti-colonial movements of 1896 and 1898 was a complex and difficult one, obliging them in effect to produce a new definition of man and his society in the Philippines without allowing deep internal divisions to destroy national cohesion.

---


4 Cesar Adib Majul stresses this broader goal of the revolution in his *The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution*, rev. ed. (Quezon City, 1967), 16-17.
This task of finding a new identity uniting all regional and class elements was further complicated by the dilemma that, as liberal nationalists took control of the revolution they could not escape the fact that one of the few effective bonds uniting the different linguistic and sectional groups of the islands was a religion and a church introduced and controlled by a Spanish clergy absolutely opposed to their aspirations. When they tried to repudiate the colonial past they found that it persisted in the church. In challenging the spiritual as well as the colonial authority of the friars, the revolutionaries were faced with the dilemma of confronting the basic values of a colonial culture which had been internalised by their forefathers for something like thirteen generations. The ilustrado leaders of the revolution after 1898 showed that they could not understand or accept the radical folk religious, apocalyptic alternative to Spanish authority, just as the supporters of such movements were outside the liberal nationalist ideology derived by the elite from Spanish liberalism and ultimately the French Revolution.5

Despite this chasm between the aspirations and perceptions as well as the material self-interest of elite and masses, for a moment in 1898 it appeared that radical groups from both sides were capable of the extraordinary creative effort required to forge a

5 Teodoro Agoncillo, in his study of the first phase of the revolution, suggests that the execution of Andres Bonifacio in May, 1897, revealed the growing conflict within the revolution and that even by this stage the 'virus of distrust' had undermined the idealism of the struggle; The Revolt of the Masses (Quezon City, 1956), 291-311.
coherent common identity out of the culturally and racially divided society which had developed under Spain. A powerful image, apparent in the writings of educated ilustrados as well as in the folk literature of the masses, which expressed the anguish at separation from Spain and the need to create a new identity was that of Mother and Daughter. Hispanicised intellectuals like Mariano Ponce as well as members of the Katipunan and the Rizalista and Colorum sects which were active during the revolution shared this image. Ponce wrote to Ferdinand Blumentritt in 1897 that 'we have all the thirst of love and we want to love Spain as a true mother'. Spain had acted as a bad and tyrannical parent, particularly in her defence of the friars who, by their abuses, had brought the Mother Country into hatred. The image of separation from the Mother was a universal one which could be understood in terms of the life experience of every individual but it also evoked potent ideas of suffering and separation expressed in the central themes of Spanish-Philippine Catholicism. Mother Spain, in one aspect, was the Blessed Mother, Queen of Heaven, the Virgin at the foot of the cross. The Virgin was also identified with Mother Church and so the circle of associations was

6 This was the judgement of one of the most sensitive American observers during the later phase of the revolution: James A. LeRoy, Philippine Life in Town and Country, first published 19 (Manila, 1968), 145 et passim.

7 Ponce to Blumentritt, Hong Kong, 21 October, 1897, Cartas sobre La Revolución, 1897-1900 (Manila, 1932), 56.

8 See the prayers in Marcelino Foronda, Cults Honoring Rizal (Manila, 1961) and see Ileto, op. cit., 66 et passim.
complete: Catholic Spain, the Mother Country, protector of Mother Church. With Christ on the cross, the Philippines had to leave her mother:

Oh Mother Spain, we Filipinos born of you, ask for forgiveness
In these years [that] are already fulfilled
And the Philippines already independent.  

The task of the revolution, as seen from this folk viewpoint, was to bid farewell to Mother Spain and to create a new 'family': Mother Filipinas. Thus the Katipuneros were exhorted to 'redeem the Mother Country from slavery'. Filipinos found their identity as 'sons of the one mother'. The concept of 'brotherhood' in the revolutionary movement was a recognition of a shared origin and loyalty as much as a recognition of lateral obligations between equal men: 'we should look to each other as more than mere brothers .... This is our real origin; that we are not of different races - we are not only relatives, but also sons of one mother'.

In this way, the struggle for freedom from Spanish rule involved a profound moral and emotional transformation which engaged the primary values of syncretic Filipino culture; both the Spanish Catholic ideas of suffering and estrangement from the Mother, and originally indigenous concepts of family loyalty, utang na lo-ob and so on.

9 'Mother Spain', Foronda, ibid., 80.

10 Pangaral or short lecture given as part of the initiation ceremony into the Katipunan, quoted in Teodoro A. Agoncillo, The Revolt of the Masses (Quezon City, 1956), 50.

11 Ileto, op. cit.
The gulf between elite and masses could be bridged through certain pervasive images understood by both. The war against Spain provided all revolutionary elements with a common cause just as the martyrdom of three priests in 1872, the execution of José Rizal in 1896, and pervasive images of the suffering mother country, provided all revolutionaries with shared symbols and a mythology. However incomprehensible their respective views of the revolution, ilustrado nationalist and Katipunan folk revolutionary had the beginnings of a unified vision. At the very least, as David Joel Steinberg has pointed out, the revolution forced an articulation of values and ideals which otherwise would have remained inchoate. The contradiction apparent in the goals of the various revolutionary groups was left unresolved, however. The American presence introduced a totally alien element into an already complex situation and obscured from Filipinos themselves the issues exposed by the revolution. The revolution was the critical moment which was lost: as Steinberg has perceptively written

...the Philippines is plagued with doubts about its identity. It is without a functional historical anchor. The sacrosanct moments clearly exist in the nation's memory, but their meaning has become so clouded that they have lost their effectiveness ... There exists a sense that history has double-crossed the nation, leaving it cursing rather than celebrating its rendezvous with destiny.

12 David Joel Steinberg, 'An Ambiguous Legacy: Years at War in the Philippines', Pacific Affairs, XLII, Summer, 1972, 165.

13 Ibid., 166-7.
The revolution, although a failure, could have provided Filipinos with national myths necessary for cultural as well as political cohesion. One historian has described it in this sense, as 'a moral triumph of the people': 'It catalyzed Filipino society and exposed the harmful elements to the critical analysis of posterity'. In fact, critical analysis of the significance of the revolution has only just begun. Historians need to find new ways of approaching the revolution in order to adequately explain it.

The clearest insight into the 'inner history' of the revolution and the nature of the colonial dilemma which confronted the Philippines can be gained by analysing the religious struggles which were a fundamental preoccupation of the colonial and anti-colonial forces struggling to reshape the Philippines in their image. More particularly, the Roman Catholic Church provides the key to the issues raised by the revolution and American intervention and much of this study will be directed to what might be called the conventional history of the institutional church. Changes in its ecclesiastical organisation, the composition of its clergy, its finances and property rights, legal status, relations with the colonial authorities, and educational and social functions are all interesting in their own right. But the church was significant in a much more important sense. The priests who acted as

---

Teodoro A. Agoncillo, Malolos, The Crisis of the Republic (Quezon City, 1960), 670.
missionaries of the Kingdom of God and agents of the Spanish empire taught a religion which claimed a divine origin for Spanish rule. Acceptance of the Gospels, in their view, necessarily entailed acceptance of colonial authority and of values which were more properly Spanish than Christian. Rebellion, or even demands for reform, were heretical as well as treasonable.\(^\text{15}\) The confusion of Christian universalist and Spanish imperialist motives and the identification of the institutional church with colonial administration, brought into question the teachings as well as the privileges of the church, so soon as any questioning of Spanish rule appeared in the colony.

Later in this study, the role of the church under Spanish rule will be examined in greater detail but it should be stressed here that the Philippine situation was probably unique even within the Spanish empire. The Philippine mission was established at a critical time for the Spanish religious orders. Their first successes in New Spain were fading: after a bitter struggle with the bishops and secular clergy for control of the new churches, the Spanish friars could draw on early Medieval as well as sixteenth century Spanish church traditions to justify their identification of 'throne and altar'. The parallel between the 'ecclesiastical colony' of the Philippines and the Carolingian Church is obvious: as Gordon Leff has observed of the latter, its most distinctive characteristic was 'the belief in a universal society' where 'there was no such thing as a church or a state as distinct bodies; but rather one Christian commonwealth in which there were both secular and spiritual powers /both/ deriving from God'; *Medieval Thought*, Harmondsworth, 1958), 74.
they found 'their special privileges restricted, their sphere of action progressively confined' and the necessity to make a choice between 'settling down to routine parish duties under episcopal discipline until secular priests could be found to replace them, or going out to found new missions on the periphery of the colonial world'. Many of them exercised the second choice by travelling half way round the world again to the Philippines. There, they eventually had to fight the same battles to preserve their independence from the episcopal authorities that they had fought in Mexico. The struggle continued throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and beyond, but with the opposite result to that in Spanish America. For a period, between 1774 and 1826, the Spanish crown gave some support to a policy of secularisation in the Philippine Church, and in an attempt to assert tighter state control over the religious orders encouraged royalist bishops to exert greater supervision of the clergy. But, despite these efforts, the religious succeeded in the nineteenth century in holding on to their privileges and regaining those parishes lost to the secular clergy during the late eighteenth century.

16 J. H. Parry, The Spanish Seaborne Empire (Harmondsworth, 1973), 158.

17 For an account of the controversies over secularisation and episcopal visitation see Salvador P. Escoto, 'The Ecclesiastical Controversy of 1767-1776: A Catalyst of Philippine Nationalism', Journal of Asian History, X, No. 2, 1976, 97-133; John N. Schumacher S.J., Father José Burgos, Priest and Nationalist (Loyola Heights, Quezon City, 1972), 8-11; Horacio da La Costa, S.J., 'Episcopal Jurisdiction in the Philippines during the Spanish Regime', in Gerald H. Anderson (ed), Studies in Philippine Church History (Ithaca and London, 1969), 44-64. As late as 1870 one of the few secular priests to be Archbishop of Manila, Gregorio Melitón Martínez, was still engaged in prolonged struggles with the religious corporations. His successors, the last two Archbishops of Manila under Spain, Pedro Payo and Bernardino No Kalea, were both friars, as were all the bishops of the Philippine Church in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.
Not only did the friars maintain their unique privileges in the Philippines until the very end of the nineteenth century; they also appear to have emphasised those elements in the Spanish Catholic tradition which most distinguished between colonist and colonised in the missionary field. Their justification for their authority and their identification of the Kingdom of God with the Kingdom of Spain echo the arguments of the sixteenth century Aristotelian scholar, Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda. Sepúlveda claimed that 'by virtue of its cultural superiority, the Spanish nation had the right and the duty to assume the legal guardianship of the Indian race'. The responsibility of Spaniards was 'not only to Christianize their wards but to Hispanicize them'.

This same defence of the dual mission of the empire can be found over three hundred years later in works by Spanish church apologists during the revolution.

It will be argued that the colony was a more explicit and thorough example of Spanish evangelical-imperialism than could be found in the Spanish American colonies or in Spain itself. The Philippines was the most remote colony in the empire; partly because

---

18 See the readings from Sepúlveda and the introductory comments by John Leddy Phelan, in Frederick B. Pike (ed), Latin American History: Select Problems (New York, etc., 1969), 41; 47-52.

19 The orthodox justification of Spanish rule as a divine commission from the popes to evangelise the pagan world, and the peculiarly Spanish claim that Hispanic culture itself expressed the Divine will, were still being asserted in sixteenth century terms in 1896: see Francisco Foradada, La Soberanía de España en Filipinas (Barcelona, 1897).
of this isolation, the Spanish religious orders were able to command considerable influence over its administration. Colonial policy reflected the basic assumption that the Philippines was 'essentially a missionary enterprise'. The relative economic unimportance of the colony to Spain and the absence of a large, landowning criollo class, also meant that the religious character of the conquest lasted longer than in the Spanish American colonies. The islands were deliberately kept in quarantine from the 'modern heresies' of contemporary Europe: even a century after the church had lost its exclusive hold in the cultures of Latin American peoples the Philippines remained confined in a mould set in the sixteenth century. The closest parallel with the influence claimed by the church in the Philippines is not found in the contemporary world but in the first period of Medieval Christendom. Like the church of the Carolingian Empire, the Philippine Church wielded extraordinary temporal and spiritual authority.

The church is the obvious subject for the historian of the Philippines interested in the cultural impact of colonialism on subject peoples and in the processes by which alien ideas and values are absorbed and transformed by indigenous societies. The church was deliberately and consciously concerned with transmitting new ways of seeing man, his society, and the nature of reality itself.


21 Phelan, ibid., 13-14; 157.
Because of its self-conscious preoccupation with explaining what it is doing, and maintaining correct doctrine, it offers the historian a rich literature from which to reconstruct its perceptions of itself and its role.

The revolutionaries themselves insisted that the nature and role of the church was a central issue of the revolution. Partly this was because the Spanish bishops and friars were their most determined enemies. Partly it was because the church functioned as a department of the colonial administration in the political sense. Partly, also, the controversies over the church expressed a struggle over control of its educational and charitable foundations, its church buildings, conventos and cemeteries, and its large, rich estates. But more importantly, the religious struggles of 1896-1907 were concerned with what kind of society the Philippines should be and what kind of values Filipinos should live by. The struggle over the church symbolised in concrete form the internal struggle of opposed groups to gain control of the religious culture of the Philippines as an essential first step in reshaping the colony in their image. Without coming to terms with the Roman Catholic Church no group could win the commitment of the majority of the people of the Philippines to the goals and 'ultimate' values that group supported. This remained true even after the Americans had dismantled many of the secular functions of the church and decreed the 'absolute' separation of church and state.

In the last twenty years a considerable number of scholarly
works have appeared by Filipino, American and Spanish writers which examine the religious problems exposed by the revolution. Many of them are particularly concerned with the formation of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente but the Roman Catholic Church has also received attention. Nevertheless, despite the work which has been published there is still much basic research to be done and many important factual questions to be answered. Bishop Stephen Neill, in his foreword to Studies in Philippine Church History, pointed out that Philippine religious history remained 'an almost unlimited field for the attention of the historian, the ecclesiastic, and the sociologist'. The role of the Filipino clergy during and after the revolution has not yet received adequate attention although the Filipino priest occupied a critical and significant


24 In Anderson (ed), op. cit., ix.
There is need for an account of the slow reorganisation of the Roman Catholic Church between the publication of *Quae mari sinico* in 1902 and the implementation of the decisions of the 1907 Manila Council. There is a great deal of interesting material on the thinking and policies of the American bishops who assumed control of the hierarchy from 1903.

The role of the Filipino clergy in the revolution and the reorganisation of the church after 1902 are questions which will be examined in the course of this study. New evidence, particularly the minutes of a series of secret conferences in early 1900, make it possible to fill in a gap in the existing account of the transfer of ecclesiastical authority from Spaniards to Americans. This evidence reveals clearly the direction of church thinking on the need to preserve as much as possible of the special powers exercised by the Spanish colonial church despite the revolution and the separation of church and state decreed by the new United States administration.

The historian who attempts to recreate the subjective context of the past by analysing the conscious and unconscious values and prejudices of its participants is on difficult theoretical ground. A number of objections have been raised, even to the asking of such questions. Before discussing these objections, it is necessary to review the historiography of the church and revolution so as to

---

25 John N. Schumacher, who has already published a book on Father José Burgos, is currently completing a book on the Filipino clergy in the period up to the first years of American rule.
identify what has and has not been done and try to identify those problems which need most illumination. A full understanding of the revolution has been obscured by the preoccupations and ideological divisions apparent within Philippine historical writing. Despite the volume of work which has appeared there is still a need for new interpretations and new questions: "The fact that the post 1872 period has been "overstudied" does not mean that new perspectives have been continually brought in." Rather, old prejudices have been perpetuated. Distance from the revolution has not yet produced general agreement among Philippine historians either on the significance of the revolution or on the nature of the religious problem which figured so prominently during it. The mutual incomprehension and ideological conflict apparent in the contemporary writings of friar apologists and their critics can still be detected in work written sixty or seventy years later. Perhaps the polarity in present Philippine historical work is another symptom of the internal contradictions exposed by the revolution but left unresolved after the assumption of colonial power by the United States.

Broadly, there seem to be two positions: that adopted by Catholic historians, many of them priests belonging to the same religious corporations caught up in the revolution; and what could be called the 'secular-nationalist' position adopted by Filipino

26 Ileto, cop. cit. 2.
historians of the state universities, notably the University of the Philippines. The student who comes to the Philippines from a very different background is conscious of a form of schizophrenia in the historical output of the past twenty years. There almost seem to be two histories being written of the revolution; both concerned with the same events but starting from mutually incompatible assumptions and ending with mutually incompatible conclusions. There appears to be less debate and interaction between the two 'schools' than an attempt to write parallel histories independently of one another.

In its crudest form the secular-nationalist argument presents the friars as unprincipled villains in a contest between progress and reaction, enlightenment and fanaticism, science and superstition. The anonymous anti-friar pamphlets and broadsheets which were produced from the 1880s and well into the twentieth

27 Of course, this is an oversimplification. There are obvious differences in approach within the historians working in Catholic universities in the Philippines. The Jesuit historians, John N. Schumacher and Horacio de la Costa, for instance, assume an objective attitude towards the controversy over the friars; two other Jesuit scholars, Pedro S. de Achutegui and Miguel A. Bernad, while making use of extensive documentation and intense research, adopt a partisan attitude. In the fifties and sixties there also appeared to be a difference in perspective and approach between scholars working in the Ateneo and those at the Dominican University of Santo Tomas. For a discussion of the confrontation between Catholic and secular nationalist intellectuals see Jaime Bulatao, S.J., 'A Social-Psychological View of the Philippine Church', in Jose Vicente Braganza (ed), The Encounter (Manila, 1965).
Ilustrado propagandists such as Marcelo H. del Pilar and Graciano López Jaena were no less violent in their denunciations of the Spanish regular clergy. Del Pilar distributed accounts of 'imbecile and lascivious priests... using the confessional [for] amorous intrigues' as part of the campaign to destroy their authority. López Jaena attacked them as 'parasites sucking and feeding upon the organic, social, moral and political life of the Malayan nation'; teachers of 'fanaticism' and 'idiocy'.

The ilustrado nationalists of the 1880s and 1890s had good reason to use every argument to discredit the friars. Many of their charges were undoubtedly valid: the friars did all they could to resist change in the colony and to crush signs of liberal reformist thought. But the historian who accepts the simplistic propaganda of the ideological struggles of the late nineteenth century ignores the complexity of the contradictions dividing colonial society. Rather than seeking to define this complexity,

28 El Anti-Fraile, a periodical denouncing 'friar plots' to reinstate theocracy in the Philippines, was started as late as May, 1919. Numerous anti-friar cartoons continued to appear in the Filipino press a decade after Spanish rule had ended: see, for example, La Vanguardia, of August and September, 1910.


however, much recent historical writing perpetuates the mutual blindness which characterised the opponents in the struggle. López Jaena's conclusion of 1889 that 'since it is not possible to unite light and darkness, day and night, therefore it is not possible for monachism and progress to live together' is still a basic assumption of present historians in the secular-nationalist tradition.

This is not to deny that the nationalist reformers and revolutionaries of 1889-1898 themselves saw the friars in manichean terms, although some understood the significance of the revolution and the need for religious change more deeply than others. 31 Ilustrado nationalists and folk revolutionaries were agreed that the first of their demands was 'expulsion of the friars and restitution to the townships of the lands which the friars have appropriated'. 32 The educated elite and the urban and rural masses perceived the friars in different terms but there was support from elite and masses for expelling Spanish regulars from the

31 Notably, Apolinario Mabini and José Rizal, whose views on the church and on Spanish-Philippine Catholicism are discussed in Chapter III. For an account of the anti-friar campaign of 1888-1895, see John N. Schumacher, The Propaganda Movement, 102-113; 270-77.

32 The 'Malabar Proclamation' of Emilio Aguinaldo's revolutionary government, July, 1897, document 123 in Pedro S. Achútegui and Miguel A. Bernad, Aguinaldo and the Revolution of 1896, A Documentary History (Quezon City, 1972), 432. See also Aguinaldo's declaration 'To the Brave Sons of the Philippines', July, 1897, in Teodoro A. Agoncillo, Malolos; The Crisis of the Republic (Quezon City, 1960), 13.
parishes. The political objective of the Katipunan was, according to its most noted historian, separation from the mother country 'if the government of Spain continued to resist the clamor for the expulsion of the friars'. The revolutionary governments established in 1897 and 1898 made the same demand:

that no friar set his foot on any part of the Archipelago, and that no convent or monastery or center of corruption, or partisans of that theocracy which has made this land another inquisitorial Spain, shall remain.

The attacks on the Spanish regular clergy and on Spanish 'medieval theocracy' made by the liberal nationalist elements within the Philippine elite went beyond anti-clericalism, although nationalist propagandists were careful to claim that while they rejected the authority of Spanish bishops and friars they did not reject Catholicism. In fact, the clear implication of the nationalist position was a redefinition of the role and nature of the church which challenged Roman Catholic dogma as well as the specifically Spanish claims for the authority of the colonial church. Individual ilustrado nationalists varied in their realisa-

33 Teodoro A. Agoncillo, The Revolt of the Masses (Quezon City, 1956), 44.


35 Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 277; and see Chapter IV.
tion of the consequences of the secular position: Trinidad
H. Pardo de Tavera, who continued to write attacks against the
religious orders during the American regime, was representative of
the agnostic and atheistic thought influential within the elite. 36
For Pardo de Tavera, the friars had not only dominated 'a regime
opposed to [the Filipino people's] progress and happiness',
'deeming us eternal indios of inferior mentality'; they had
taught 'new superstitions more powerful than the original [old
Pagan superstitions]' . He explicitly refers to Corridos and
Novenas and the Pasión, religious literature published during the
Spanish period, as 'exaggerated, puerile and absurd in the extreme',
in the case of the Corridos, and comparable to 'the enchantments,
магics and sorceries of the primitive Filipinos' in the case of the
Novenas. 38 The effect of this literature was pernicious because a

36 Marcelo H. del Pilar and López Jaena were others. The anti-
Catholic strand in the propaganda movement and among ilustrado
revolutionaries in 1898 is quite clear; see John N.
Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 277.

37 Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera, 'The Legacy of Ignorantism
( Ignorantismo )', address delivered before the Teachers,
Assembly, Baguio, 23 April, 1920 (Manila, 1921), 6.

38 Ibid., 16-35. Unfortunately, Pardo de Tavera does not discuss
the Pasión at any length, merely describing it as 'a work in
verse in the different Filipino dialects' that is 'not only the
passion of Christ, but ... a sort of abridged edition of
sacred history'. Contrast his treatment of this literature
with Reynaldo C. Ileto's analysis of the Pasión as an expression
of a profound syncretic world view; in 'Pasión and the
Interpretation of Change in Tagalog Society (ca. 1840-1912)',
'logical mentality cannot be developed when the absurd is fomented and cultivated, especially when it is presented under the false veneer of religion'. Pardo de Tavera believed such religious teachings explained the moral faults of the Filipinos by producing a 'puerile mentality' that paralysed any effort for progress. The Novenas in particular contained pernicious teachings which undermined the real moral needs of society. 39

One of the most influential of modern Filipino historians has explicitly identified his approach to the religious culture taught by Spain with that of Pardo de Tavera. Teodoro A. Agoncillo quotes 'The Legacy of Ignorantism' approvingly: 'the totality of the literature developed during the Spanish period was ably summarized by the scholar Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera as "the heritage of ignorance"'. 40

The 'black legend' of the despotic friar established in the nineteenth century in the Philippines corresponded to a long anti-Spanish and anti-clerical 'black legend' influential in the Protestant West. 41 It was easy for American Protestant writers

39 Ibid., 35ff.


to incorporate the liberal nationalists' charges against the religious orders into this existing prejudice against priestcraft and Romanism. Indeed, many Protestants interested in rescuing the Philippines from Romanism appeared to assume that the American military authorities would actively assist them. The most influential critic of the friars in the formative years of American attitudes to the Philippine Church was probably John Foreman. In his book, *The Philippine Islands*, Foreman argued that the Filipinos had become 'an easy prey to fantastic promises of eternal bliss, or the threats of everlasting perdition'. They were the victims of a 'priestcraft' practised by 'low born' 'bigots'. It is symptomatic of nineteenth Protestant opinion that Foreman, 'himself a Romanist', should be recommended 'for an unprejudiced view of priestly intelligence and morality'.

Other Americans, whose interest in the colony was more pragmatic than evangelical, were less harsh in their criticism but basically just as unsympathetic to the Spanish Catholic view. James A. LeRoy conceded that probably the friars were 'honest and sincere in [their]

---


44 Dean, op.cit., 65-66. This American Protestant suspicion of Rome influenced the writings of Filipino Protestants decades after 1900: see, for instance, Camilo Osias and Avelina Lorenzana, *Evangelical Christianity in the Philippines* (Dayton, Ohio, 1931), 30.
attitude of horror toward modern progress in general, toward Liberalism, toward scientific education', but 'they asked for and expected the impossible when they fought to perpetuate medieval conditions in a country opened to trade and commerce and to modern thought and contact with the world at large'.

William Howard Taft identified the resistance of the friars to 'progress' as consistent with their claims to champion the rights of native populations against exploitation, but their 'medievalism' was incompatible with the spirit of what he called 'Anglo-Saxon Individualism'. Their 'superstition' had no place in the modern world. In fact, the educational system established by the Americans taught values which were consciously antithetical to those of Spanish Catholic education.

Fred W. Atkinson, the first General Superintendent of Education under United States rule, believed that the friars had kept the Filipinos like 'children, and, childlike, [they] do not know what is best for

James A. LeRoy, 'The Philippines, 1860-1898 - Some comments and bibliographical notes', in Blair and Robertson, The Philippine Islands, LII, 120. See also LeRoy's The Americans in the Philippines, vol. I, first published 1914 (New York, 1970), 57. He also described the friars as 'probably the most reactionary and medieval in the world, the most backward monastic products of the most backward of the old nations of Europe': Philippine Life in Town and Country (Manila, 1968), 84.

William H. Taft, 'The Church and Our Government in the Philippines', an address delivered before the faculty and students of the University of Notre Dame, 5 October, 1904, Notre Dame, Indiana, The University Press, 1904. See also his testimony before the Senate Committee of January, 1902, quoted in Henry F. Graff (ed), American Imperialism and the Philippine Insurrection; Testimony of the Times: Selections from Congressional Hearings (Boston, 1969), 42.
them'. Americans, 'by the very fact of our superiority of 
civilization and our greater capacity for industrial activity...
are bound to exercise over them a profound moral influence'.

The original nationalist condemnation of the friars and of 
Spanish 'theocracy', reaffirmed by the first generation of American 
administrators and commentators, has persisted as the dominant bias 
of the writings of American and American-educated Filipinos ever 
since. From the beginning, the history of the church and the 
revolution has been confined, in the secular-nationalist tradition, 
within a set of assumptions about religion, Spanish Catholicism and 
the church which goes beyond anti-clericalism or scholarly 
'objectivity'. The idea that the friars were obstacles to progress and 
the enemies of Filipino aspirations became mixed up with a later assump-
tion that they were 'un-American'. It was usual to dismiss the friars 
as 'anachronisms, seeking to perpetuate a despotism which had gone 
out of date'. In time, these assumptions, without being re-examined, 
have become part of the orthodoxy of one of the two major schools of

47 Fred W. Atkinson, The Philippine Islands (Boston, New York, 
Chicago, London. 1905), 6, 11.

48 There are exceptions, of course. Gregorio F. Zaide, whose 
books have had a great influence on the teaching of Philippine 
history in Philippine schools is a Knight of Columbus and a 
Catholic. Even his works, in so far as they are modelled on 
American writing, contain American assumptions.

49 Frank Charles Laubach, The People of the Philippines (New York, 
1925), 115.
thought in Philippine history.

If Teodoro A. Agoncillo can be taken as perhaps the most influential writer in the secular-nationalist tradition in the past twenty years, it is apparent that the mutual incomprehension and hostility which divided Spanish Catholic apologists and Filipino revolutionary nationalists in 1898 has not yet been overcome. The friars were the nationalists' worst enemies: they suspected every Filipino of being an insurgent. They launched a campaign of vilification and false accusations against all Filipinos.

They advocated torture, even of Filipino priests. Speaking of Felipe Calderon and the Malolos debates on religion, Agoncillo condemns 'the conservative mind, deeply rooted in the marriage of church and state.... protruding like a buoy swaying in all directions but unable to free itself from its anchorage'. Again: 'one of the most severe indictments against the Spanish colonial rule was the predominance of the priestly caste in all sectors of life'. The abuses committed by the friars caused the revolution of 1896:

That the Katipunan had succeeded in extending its sway to many places and had won the faith and confidence of the masses was due less to the

50 Malolos, op. cit., 10.

51 Ibid., 298.

52 A Short History of the Philippines, op.cit., 59.
extraordinary brilliance of the men who led it than to the insolence of the friars who, in conducting their campaign of bitter and tenacious opposition to the reformers, had exasperated the hitherto tolerant masses.\textsuperscript{53}

The religious legacy of Spanish Catholicism was 'characterised by "outward ritual formalism rather than solid doctrinal knowledge [and] the tendency toward idolatry, superstition, and magic"'.\textsuperscript{54}

The intellectual traditions which shaped the ilustrado nationalists' condemnation of the friars and the colonial church were equally hostile to the apocalyptic beliefs of mass movements. Of all the ilustrado leaders of the revolution in its second phase, Apolinario Mabini, possibly because of his humble origins, was most responsive to the aspirations of the people. He also had what might be called a religious vision of the ultimate goals of the revolution: in the dedication in his history of the revolution he wrote that though he was not fated to fulfil his mother's wish that he become a priest, he was convinced 'that the true minister of God is not one who wears a cassock, but everyone who proclaims His glory by good works, of service to the greatest number of His creatures.\textsuperscript{55} Yet even Mabini, when he argued that 'all authority over the people

\textsuperscript{53} The Revolt of the Masses, op. cit., 61.

\textsuperscript{54} Teodoro A. Agoncillo and Oscar M. Alfonso, History of the Filipino People (Quezon City, 1967), 114.

resides, by natural law, in the people themselves', was thinking in European rather than indigenous Filipino terms. The 'reason and science' which explained the 'immutable order of things' for Mabini were alien to the way the great majority of Filipinos understood themselves and the revolution. With Rizal, he believed that the people had to be educated so that Filipino 'civilisation' could approximate what he considered to be universal but were in fact Western values. Mabini was uneasy about the goals and methods of the Katipunan and suggested it did not represent the 'true needs of the Filipinos' which were for 'reforms demanded by [their] advancing civilization'.

Other ilustrado nationalists were less sensitive to the popular view of the revolution. Their condemnation of the 'fanaticism' and 'superstition' taught by the friars was also a condemnation of the syncretic folk-Catholic beliefs which inspired the revitalisation movements which prepared Filipinos for the revolution. As Reynaldo Ileto has pointed out, the revolutionary society, the Katipunan, although influenced by ilustrado liberal nationalist thought, conceived its goals in terms of the apocalyptic tradition of such religious movements as the Cofradía de San José of 1840-41 and the Colorum movements which accompanied the revolution.

The inability of ilustrado nationalists to understand or

56 Ibid., 7.
57 Ibid., 9.
58 Ileto, op. cit., 7-8
approve the world-view of illiterate poor townsmen and peasants was not overcome even by those post-war historians most dedicated to rediscovering the revolution from below by emphasising the importance of the Katipunan. Agoncillo's pioneering study, although it is premised on the need to see the revolution through the role of the Katipunan leader, Andrés Bonifacio, nevertheless is ambivalent if not hostile to the indigenous radical tradition. Agoncillo, picturing the Spanish Philippines as being enveloped by the 'Dark Ages', assumed that redemption could only come from Western ideas of political equality and liberalism: 'Hence it was that the Filipino students and intellectuals, unable to steer through the thick darkness in their native land, sought light in Europe'.

He emphasises the ilustrado influence upon the formation of the Katipunan although 'none of its charter members were of the middle or aristocratic class'.

In studying the method, procedure and structure of the Katipunan, one is inevitably moved to the conclusion that the society, such as it was, drew its inspiration from Masonry in matters of initiation rites, and partly from Rizal's La Liga Filipina in matters affecting its structure.

59 The Revolt of the Masses, 17.

60 Ibid., 45.

61 Ibid., 48. Contrast this neglect of the indigenous radical tradition on the Katipunan with Ileto's treatment, Chapter III, 'Colorum and Katipunan in the War Against Spain, 1896-1897', op.cit., 92-138
Rather than reconstructing what Max Weber called the 'implicit logic' of folk religious movements and identifying the influence of inherited religious values and cultural assumptions upon popular participation in the revolution, the secular nationalists have concentrated on the influence of elite leaders whose rationalist approach to the revolution matches their own as historians.  

Onofre D. Corpuz, for instance, in his overview of peasant uprisings preceding the revolution of 1896 presents them as more or less interesting depending upon how 'political' there were. This approach is anachronistic because it judges the past according to an assumed goal - that of establishing a modern nation-state - which is only defined in the future by other groups. It is also unnecessarily restrictive because it leaves out of count the way folk revolutionaries saw their task.

It is paradoxical that the secular-nationalist view of the revolution and of the Spanish-Philippine church attempts to assert the authenticity of an indigenous Filipino identity while internalising Spanish anti-clerical liberal and, most markedly, American cultural assumptions. The nationalist historians


who have shaped Filipino perceptions of the revolution since 1946 are the second and third generations of Filipinos educated either in the United States or in Philippine universities modelled on those in the United States. Even as they questioned American claims to represent progress and civilisation, they accepted the assumption of superiority implicit in Western 'rationalist', 'objective' intellectual traditions. They asserted the cultural independence of the Philippines but they did this in terms of alien models of culture and society: the revolution was interpreted in a Western, political sense to prove that Filipinos shared in the general movement begun by the French Revolution toward republican, nation-states.

Filipino nationalist historians are not peculiar in seeing revitalisation movements and the religious values which inspire them, from the outside. The dominant assumptions of the social sciences which concern themselves with religion and with peasant societies until fairly recently, have been unsympathetic to what are seen as the 'irrational' and 'retarded' characteristics common to both. Evans-Pritchard has summarised this attitude of the social sciences to religion as 'bleakly hostile': religion is assumed to be 'false' or, at best, a distorted, symbolic reflection of 'real' phenomena. Alternatively, religious culture is presented as an inferior stage in man's progress towards a scientific understanding of society.64

Nineteenth century positivist assumptions have been modified but not repudiated by the most important intellectual movements of the twentieth century even when these movements appear to offer alternative perspectives. Peasant 'cognitive systems' and peasant religious culture have suffered equally from the value judgements implicit in Western rationalist scholarship. The rural masses are described as 'irrational', 'fatalistic', 'traditionalist', 'passive', 'naive' and so on. 'Third World populism', as George Lichtheim called it, has been denounced as 'a clearly unscientific' response to the 'disintegration' caused by colonialism. Liberal bourgeois and Marxist thinkers agree in attacking peasant

65 Marx explained religious values as an opiate administered to the poor by the rich, as the 'heart of a heartless world'. Freud condemned religion as 'patently infantile' and 'a mass delusion hostile to reality'. Social anthropologists and sociologists generally accepted these judgements. For a discussion of Marx and Engels' On Religion (Moscow, 1957) see R. C. Zaehner, Dialectical Christianity and Christian Materialism (London, 1971), 11ff. Freud's views can be found in his The Future of an Illusion (1928) and Civilization and its Discontents (1930). See also Evans-Pritchard, op. cit., 36.

66 Sutti Ortiz, 'Reflections on the Concept of "Peasant Culture" and "Peasant Cognitive Systems"', in Teodor Shanin (ed), Peasants and Peasant Societies (Harmondsworth, 1971), 322-36. For a typical statement of the unsympathetic view see Rupert Emerson, 'Paradoxes of Asian Nationalism', in Robert O. Tilman, Man, State, and Society in Contemporary Southeast Asia (London, 1969), 251: 'In general, the evidence indicates that the rural masses, bound to their villages and continuing the traditional cultivation of their fields, have either been indifferent to the new currents or, at best, and belatedly, passive adherents to the nationalist creed'.
movements. Even those social scientists who are interested in writing the history of the 'Little Tradition' of radical movements among the Filipino rural masses such as David Sturtevant and David Sweet 'explained away rather than articulated' the creative impulses in such movements by stressing the futility of their behaviour. As Ileto has pointed out, these writers have worked almost entirely from non-indigenous sources and so have viewed popular movements through two distorting lens - their own assumptions and those of the educated elite upon whom they rely. The elite had powerful reasons of economic and political self-interest as well as their inability to see any worth in mass 'superstition', to misrepresent popular participation in the revolution. This bias has been reinforced by the positivist assumptions of modern scholarship: the

The Chinese Revolution has stimulated a reappraisal in the West of the nature of mass participation in revolutions. For an introduction to the debate, see Maurice Meisner, 'Leninism and Maoism: Some Populist Perspectives in Marxism-Leninism in China', The China Quarterly, vol. XLV, January-March, 1971, 2-36. For an unsympathetic view of the peasant capacity for radical aspirations, see George Lichtheim, Imperialism (Harmondsworth, 1974) 156-57. Filipino and American Marxist writers on the Philippine Revolution have usually condemned the revolution from below as lacking 'true' consciousness and being manipulated by bourgeois nationalists: see William J. Pomeroy, An American-Made Tragedy: Neo-Colonialism and Dictatorship in the Philippines. (New York, 1974), 11; Amado Guerrero (José Ma. Sison), Philippine Society and Revolution (Hong Kong, 1971), 27.

See Ileto's comments on their work, op.cit., 7-8. The distinction between the great and little traditions has been stressed in the writings of Robert Redfield. See also the discussion by Clifford C. Geertz in Robert N. Bellah, (ed), Religion and Progress in Modern Asia (New York, 1965), 151.
result is that the 1896 revolution is not seen in its own terms as
the manifestation of a long and potent radical tradition expressing
profound responses to the world but as a negative reaction to
'dislocation' and stress which needed positive direction and guidance
from the elite. 69

For their part, the apologists for the Spanish clergy and
Spanish Catholicism have adopted equally crude and prejudiced
assumptions which also reflect the positions adopted before and during
the revolution. The Spanish clergy believed that the revolution
was a Masonic plot, ultimately inspired by Satan, to exterminate the
Spanish religious 'as one of the first articles of [a] program of
race hatred'. 70 They believed they were defending the Philippines
against the 'enemies of God' and against 'false modern heresies
condemned by the church'. Because they identified their mission as
priests with their imperial function as agents of Spanish civilization,
they argued that rebellion against Spanish colonial rule was heresy

69 These assumptions are under challenge by Western scholars
such as Clifford Geertz, James Siegel, and Benedict R. O'G.
Anderson. For a recent overview of Southeast Asian responses
to the West, see Anthony Reid, 'Heaven's Will and Man's Fault';
the Rise of the West as a Southeast Asian Dilemma',

70 Memorial addressed by the Superiors of the Augustinian,
Franciscan, Recollect, Dominican, and Jesuit Orders to the
Minister of Colonies, Manila, 21 April, 1898 (the 'Friar Memorial
of 1898'), in Blair and Robertson, The Philippine Islands, LII,
234-37; also in John R. M. Taylor, The Philippine Insurrection
Against the United States; A Compilation of Documents.
as well as treason. To protect the faith, they believed, they had to support absolute Spanish control of the colony and keep the church in Spanish hands. The revolution provoked extravagant attacks by Catholic apologists. The Filipinos were 'a savage people', 'ferocious and bloodthirsty', motivated by race-hatred and led by a 'band of assassins' inspired by Masonry and the Devil. Spanish Catholic writers believed that the revolution was one more manifestation of a world conspiracy to destroy the church and in this belief they had ample encouragement from Rome.

The 'citadel mentality' of the nineteenth century church and the ruthlessness which marked clerical opposition to the revolution have passed but much Catholic writing on the period 1896-1907 is based on the same assumptions of conspiracy and evil. One Catholic historian, writing in 1965, expresses a persistent unwillingness in some church circles to acknowledge the significance of the revolution:

> What transpired during the national uprising and how this national movement took a violent form of anti-religion and anti-clericalism, is a historical fact

---

71 P. Francisco Foradada, S.J., La Soberanía de España en Filipinas, was perhaps one of the fairest commentators on the revolution but although he acknowledged there were innate and natural feelings which prompted the Filipinos to independence, the insurrection against Spain was unjust and illicit, an outrage against authority. José Ma. del Castillo y Jiménez is more representative of the hysteria evident in contemporary denunciations of the revolution: see his El Katipunan ó el Filibusterismo en Filipinas (Madrid, 1897).

72 This conspiracy thesis is discussed in Chapter II.
quite known to everyone. It is perfectly legitimate for a people to aspire for national independence; in this there can be no question. But the Masons distorted everything when it directed this movement principally against the Church and the religious clergy ...73

The same author is also frankly critical of the new order the Americans imposed:

Unfortunately however, with the change of government, the principle of separation of church and state was imposed...given the circumstances of 1898 in the Islands, such an abrupt and absolute separation of Church and State was gravely prejudicial to the Church. Furthermore, it was also unjust and undemocratic.74

American rule had encouraged 'indifferentism and immorality' and 'the reduction of the Catholic Church to the level of other religious sects'. Much other recent Catholic history has been written with the implicit intention of discrediting the schismatic Aglipayan Church.75

While a number of distinguished Catholic historians have made a remarkable contribution to the history of the revolution as much as to that of the Philippine Church, the intellectual divisions which have been indicated prevent an integrated treatment of the revolution


74 Ibid., 341.

75 Gerald H. Anderson comments in the bibliographical survey in Studies in Philippine Church History that Achútegui and Bernad do not conceal their prejudice against Aglipay and his church in their multi-volume history of Aglipayanism.
and the church by historians of the Philippines. This study will attempt to suggest ways that developments in church history and revolutionary history could be encouraged to bridge the gulf between the assumptions of the two historical schools. Two very different studies have been of great influence on my approach. The first suggests new ways of defining what the church in the Philippines was and insights into the historical traditions which shaped the response of ordinary Filipino Catholics to the revolution. The other reveals a world of values and meaning which restores to the revolution a significance which it began to lose when it was taken over by the Hispanicised elite. John Leddy Phelan's study of the first one hundred and thirty-five years of Spanish colonisation is concerned with the 'inner history' of the conquest and the quality of the indigenous response. Phelan is concerned with values and ways of responding to change. He traces the process of acculturation which produced a syncretic culture from dissimilar cultures in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Although Phelan's book appeared in 1959, his questions have not been asked of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The character of Spanish

---

evangelical-imperial institutions was set in the sixteenth century in the Philippines so that an analysis of the assumptions and methods of the conquest is directly relevant to the last years of Spanish rule three centuries later, but the syncretic culture which Spanish Catholicism influenced went through important transformations after 1700. The revolution itself was an attempt by Filipinos to radically redefine their relationship not only with Spain but with the values and beliefs of Spanish-Philippine culture. It will be the thesis of this study that the colonial experience of the Philippines produced internal contradictions in Filipino society and in the way Filipinos saw themselves and their world, and that the revolution was a creative effort to resolve these contradictions. To understand the significance of the revolution requires a more profound understanding of the nature of the colonial dilemma which confronted Filipinos in 1896, and to achieve this, the kind of questions Phelan asked of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries must be asked of the nineteenth.

The other work which has provided me with a new way of understanding the religious problems of the revolution is the study of Tagalog perceptions of change between 1840 and 1912 by Reynaldo C. Ileto. Ileto has re-examined current interpretations of Philippine nationalism, the revolution, and the role of the tao, or common people, in the movement towards revolution, offering an

alternative to the secular nationalist view of Philippine history. He is concerned to rediscover the 'units of meaning which shaped the masses' perceptions of events and their participation in events' and how certain types of behaviour, 'previously regarded as foolish or irrational, are the external manifestations of creative attempts to restructure the world in order to render it meaningful'.

Ileto's work provides an insight into the way the revolution was seen 'from below' and so recovers much of the lost history of the revolution. He uses the verse account of the Crucifixion, the Pasión, as a key to the world-view of the urban and rural masses. The values of the Pasión challenged the orthodox teachings of the Spanish clergy who stressed obedience to the colonial and ecclesiastical hierarchies and acceptance of a vertical, descending understanding of authority. Even more interestingly, Pasión values challenged internalised Filipino social values which some commentators have assumed to be primary:

In many ways the Pasión is a negation of [traditional society]. For example, the extensive treatment of Jesus' departure from home and separation from Mary examines the possibility of breaking traditional ties to home and family in order to undertake a redemptive act. Traditional notions of social status based upon wealth and education are contradicted by the examples of Christ and those who follow him, i.e. the "poor and ignorant" people. In certain situations, personal loyalties and debt relationships are purposely broken; traditional authority figures are ignored or challenged. The ideal form of loyalties is based upon love and

78 Ibid., 8.
It will be argued in this study that rejection of usually dominant social values and the effort to create a transcendent community of love, a 'New Eden', were more than an attempt to rediscover social cohesion because of 'dislocation' and the alienation caused by shifting patron-client relationships or 'the breakdown of ascriptive status systems'. Rather, there was a creative effort to realise in human society values which were considered more important and real than those regulating day to day existence. In the Philippines, it can be argued that the universal impulse to restructure the world and to penetrate beyond appearances to a more primary reality assumed a cultural form influenced by the long process of acculturation under the Spanish church. Ileto and Phelan's works together suggest a new perspective on the ideational origins of the revolution and on the meaning it had for those who participated in it.

All the groups involved in the revolution, whether they

---

79 Ibid., 18.

80 For a functionalist and negative explanation of sectarian response to the world in pre-industrial societies, see Bryan Wilson, Magic and the Millennium, (Frogmore, St. Albans, 1975), 38ff. 'Dislocation' explanations of religious movements originate with Emile Durkheim's discussion of anomie. Marxist writers, while identifying 'the disintegration typically entailed by the capitalist form of modernisation' as the source of 'negative' and 'clearly unscientific' religious responses in the Third World, share this idea of anxiety produced by dislocation as being the motive for such responses; see George Lichtheim, Imperialism, (Harmondsworth, 1974), 156-57.
supported it or opposed it, can be better understood if the historian attempts to reconstruct the way they perceived the revolution in terms of their cultural assumptions and values as well as their economic and political self-interest. The folk revolutionaries who joined the Katipunan, or the followers of the Colorum and Guardia de Honor sects, have suffered most at the hands of historians who have either ignored or misunderstood them. But, in a similar sense, the prevailing rationalist interpretations of the revolution fail to adequately explain the motivation and quality of response of all groups involved in the revolution. The conventional history has left out of count an essential dimension of the past: the subjective context without which an explanation of the revolution is mechanical and simplistic. This study will attempt to reconstruct the essential elements of the system of values and beliefs or world-view of six key groups: the Spanish regular clergy (including the Spanish bishops who were all friars in 1896); the Filipino clergy who remained loyal to the hierarchy and the Filipino clergy who joined the religious schism of 1902; the members of the Katipunan; the liberal, secular nationalists who joined the revolution in 1898; American colonial administrators and American Protestant missionaries; and the American Roman Catholic bishops who assumed control of the hierarchy after 1903. This may appear an overly ambitious task but, because the specifically religious issues raised by the revolution will be singled out, it will be possible to define the responses of these six groups to the
revolution in terms of particular questions involving the nature of the church and of Philippine religious culture. Important statements of the viewpoints of these groups will be analysed so as to reconstruct the 'implicit logic' beyond the specific arguments they used to defend their case. I will try to identify the areas of mutual incomprehension and conflict between the aspirations and assumptions of the six groups and try to suggest cultural and historical as well as material reasons why they responded as they did to the revolution.

Other ways of approaching the history of the church in the Philippine Revolution have their own validity. The history of ideas and values cannot totally explain the past. There is a need, for instance, for a sustained analysis of the material determinants defining the kinds of conflicts and struggles for power exposed by the revolution, although a history which was written only in terms of economic relationships and class conflicts would also be incomplete. The historian, whether Marxist or not, must be concerned with the inherited values and assumptions of the participants in history and with the kinds of goals which motivate them as understood in their own terms. As the authors of an examination of working-class consciousness in Latin America point out, 'the actor [in social change] does not merely act in response to a situation. He contributes to its definition as a function of his own ends'.

81 Alain Touraine and Daniel Pécaut, 'Working-Class Consciousness and Economic Development in Latin America', in Irving Louis Horowitz (ed), Masses in Latin America (New York, 1970), 73.
A materialist analysis leaves out this essential element of the past: the subjective matrix in which the response of individuals and groups is formed. The debate on consciousness also needs to take account of the unconscious values, myths, assumptions and so on which determine the kind of response made by different sections of a society to external events. To be 'real', basic economic and social structures have to be apprehended by the people affected by them; to acquire meaning within a world-view which is itself real.

It will also be argued in this study that the world-view shared by most Filipinos was a religious culture in the sense defined by Clifford Geertz. The core values of Filipino mass culture derived from a religious cultural system which provided a way of perceiving and interpreting reality, 'an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols'. The word 'pattern' should not be taken to imply a rigidity and consistency which actual religious systems do not exhibit. By comparison to Western secular cultures with their sharp distinction between religious and non-religious areas of experience, the Filipino response to the world was monistic: 'sacred and profane were often indistinguishable' and religious beliefs permeated all aspects of life. Not only did

82 Clifford Geertz, 'Religion as a Cultural System', in

the great majority of Filipinos communicate in the one church; they shared a culture which assumed that there was a superempirical as well as an empirical reality, a transcendent reality beyond appearances. But while most Filipinos shared this orientation, the religious culture itself was by no means homogeneous. The Christian religion which the friars preached in the Philippines was itself ambiguous, containing diverse and even contradictory traditions. Moreover, Filipinos showed themselves 'remarkably selective in stressing and de-emphasising certain features of Spanish Catholicism'. The revolution revealed the tensions within Filipino religious culture. It may be that there was also a more universal process operating in the fundamental shift in the system of values and beliefs which the revolution represented. Leonardo M. Mercado has discussed this question by approaching Filipino values from a 'metalinguist approach'. Language itself orders the way its users sort out and distinguish experiences and so is the primary vehicle of the


85 Phelan, op.cit., 72. The syncretic religious culture which emerged under Spanish rule is discussed in more detail in Chapter One.
cultural tradition. 86 By examining the key terms and images which recur in the literature of each group involved in the revolution it may be possible to identify the core values each held.

Another theoretical approach is suggested by the evidence from the Katipunan and from folk religious movements involved in the revolution. The syncretic religious culture of the urban and rural masses contained within itself a dualism which perhaps can be most usefully explained in terms of Victor Turner's thesis of the perpetual dialectic between structure and anti-structure, expressed through the process whereby communities pass through stages of separation, liminality and reincorporation. 87 In Turner's terms, the Philippine Revolution can be viewed as the liminal moment in Philippine history. The intervention of the United States and the betrayal of the revolution by much of the elite destroyed the resolution of this process in a new, reconstructed cultural system more appropriate to the aspirations expressed in the revolution. Religion, in this view, is both the institutionalised past, the structure to be overcome, and the source of the impulse to transcend the past. Not all social scientists would accept Turner's thesis but it is capable of fruitful application as a working hypothesis by the historian. In the Philippine context, the Spanish-Philippine Church, in its institutional forms, provided colonial


society with orthodox values which emphasised cohesion, obedience to authority, formal social relationships and an official ritual for everyday life. But it also provided contrary, apocalyptical values which challenged its own social teachings. By responding to one or the other traditions, friars and revolutionaries could confront one another within the complex dual values of Philippine religious culture. 88

Of course, there are many historians who would reject the approach which is adopted in this study. David Hackett Fischer would probably condemn it under his heading, 'the fallacy of essences'. One should not ask questions about 'fundamental significance' or 'the inner core of reality', he advises. 89 He agrees with Karl Popper that 'the progress of empirical knowledge requires not a search for essences, which cannot be found by any empirical method but rather a search for patterns of external behaviour. 90 Our proper business, G. R. Elton informs us, should

88 Generally, Sociologists of religion emphasise the function of religion as upholding the dominant, 'official' values of the community. Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark, for instance, claim that 'one of the abiding general propositions of sociology is that religion serves the central and crucial function in society of supporting what has been variously called social integration, social solidarity, and social cohesion'; Religion and Society in Tension (Chicago, 1965), 170.


be with 'things that happen and not things as they are'.\textsuperscript{91} If, however, the historian explains the past merely by analysing its quantifiable parts, if he restricts himself to empirical questions about what people did and ignores how they perceived what they were doing, he cannot explain crucial differences in the way peoples from different cultures respond to parallel situations. The cultural prism through which men see their world is as real as the world itself.

\textsuperscript{91} G. R. Elton, \textit{The Practice of History} (Sydney, 1967).
CHAPTER ONE

THE COLONIAL CHURCH

The Philippine Church in the last year of Spanish rule was still recognisably the mission church created by the Spanish religious orders in the last decades of the sixteenth century. After more than three centuries all its bishops and most of its parish clergy were still Spaniards who also belonged to the five religious orders which began the mission.\(^1\) In 1898 as in 1565 the Philippine Church remained a foreign institution, a missionary church dependent upon foreign clergy and a colonial church absolutely committed to continued Spanish sovereignty.

Paradoxically, the men who kept the church a foreign, colonial institution were the missionaries themselves. Among all their achievements over the long period of Spanish rule this was their great failure: they did not realise the basic goal of missionary work which was the establishment of a self-sufficient, indigenous church served by its own

---

\(^1\) Regular or religious clergy take vows of poverty, chastity and obedience and belong to orders or congregations under their own superiors. Normally they live communally and are dedicated to a particular role. The Augustinians, Recollects, Dominicans and Franciscans are collectively referred to as the friars in the Philippines. The fifth major order, the Society of Jesus, although its members take vows and obey their own superiors, differs from the other orders in its central organisation under a General in Rome and in the absence of a communal liturgical life or rule. The secular or diocesan clergy are usually trained in seminaries conducted in the diocese in which they will serve as parish priests under the local bishop. In the Philippines, the regulars acted as parish clergy while retaining practical independence of the bishop, thus causing severe tensions in the church and weakening the disciplinary powers of the hierarchy.
diocesan clergy. Their very success in gaining an early predominance in the colony enabled them to perpetuate their hold on the church. In the eighteenth century, the religious orders in the Philippines successfully resisted the attempts by the Bourbon kings and some bishops to reduce their influence and to replace them in the parishes with secular clergy. In Spanish America, by contrast, the Bourbons managed to gradually remove the friars from the doctrinas, or Indian parishes, and to establish the authority of the bishops and the secular clergy. The independence movements in the Americas confirmed the ascendancy of the secular clergy in the nineteenth century at a time when, in the Philippines, the religious orders actually managed to tighten their hold on the church.

2 The first secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Francesco Ingoli, defined the primary aim of mission work as the development of indigenous, secular clergies serving churches which were fully part of the local community. As early as the 1620s, when he took office, the Holy See was concerned that in the Spanish and Portuguese empires 'the Christian faith must be delivered from those colonial associations which condemned it to be everywhere and in permanence a foreign religion': Stephen Neill, A History of Christian Missions (Harmondsworth, 1964), 179. See also Horacio de la Costa, S.J., 'The Development of the Native Clergy in the Philippines', in Gerald H. Anderson (ed), Studies in Philippine Church History (Ithaca and London, 1969), 66-68. For the history of relations between the Holy See and Spanish America see Pedro de Leturia, S.J., Relaciones entre la Santa Sede e Hispanoamérica, 1493-1835, 4 vols. (Rome, 1959).


The religious orders retained control of the Philippine Church at great cost. They survived only because they were able to convince even hostile liberal governments in Madrid that they were essential to the maintenance of colonial authority but this obliged them to become apologists for Spanish rule whether the home government was busy suppressing their fellow religious in Spain or whether it was a conservative government claiming to support king and church. In the nineteenth century, the church degenerated into an instrument of colonial rule to an extent which earlier generations of bishops and friars had managed to avoid. Its claims to be universal and to exercise spiritual authority distinct from the political authority of the state were seriously compromised just at a time when a new, educated elite was emerging in the Philippines able to critically evaluate the assumptions of Spanish rule. The identification of the church with the colonial system and its abuses was confirmed by the determined policy of the regular clergy to confine the native clergy to secondary, inferior positions within the church. Finally, as the largest landholders in the colony, the religious orders stood directly in the way of the ambitions of those inquilinos, particularly in the Tagalog provinces, who wanted to convert their tenancies into more profitable personal estates. The church, seen as a foreign landowner, was embroiled in the economic struggles provoked by the redefinition of Philippine agriculture and the growth of lucrative export markets for sugar and abaca and other cash crops in the nineteenth century. When the revolution came, it was inevitable that the religious orders and the church they controlled should be at the very centre of the struggle.

Relations between the church and the colonial administration in the Philippines had changed by the second half of the nineteenth century and it is necessary to examine the nature of this change if the vulnerable position of the Spanish regular clergy in 1896-1898 is to be fully understood. At the same time, the religious orders asserted until the last moment of Spanish rule and even into the American period that the fundamental character of the Philippine Church worked out in the late sixteenth century still applied three centuries later. Against anti-clerical liberal governments in Spain, against Filipino nationalists and revolutionaires, and against an American administration unsympathetic to such claims they insisted that the Philippine Church remain within a mould set in the period of the 'universal empire' of Philip II. It is also necessary, then, to identify the main features of the traditional model of church and state in the colony as the Spanish religious orders understood it if their absolute opposition to the revolution and, indeed, to significant reform, is to be explained. In this chapter, the structures and organisation of the colonial church will be discussed in terms of their historical origin and the peculiar factors affecting the church in the Philippines. In the following chapter, I will identify and analyse the set of ideas and assumptions which shaped the perceptions of the Spanish clergy during the revolution. Any objective description of the institutional church is inadequate without an understanding of the subjective values and perceptions of the people who controlled it.

The Philippine Church was shaped by the nature of Spanish colonialism. The strength of the Spanish empire in the sixteenth century lay in its colonial institutions which, in contrast to the later trading empires
of the British and the Dutch, enabled Spain to exercise direct control over her new subjects. In the Philippines, as in Spanish America, the three major institutions of Spanish rule were the colonial bureaucracy, the encomienda, and the Church. All three institutions were originally intended to further the evangelical purpose of Spanish colonisation, whatever the abuses associated with them in practice. While some historians have tended to present Spanish motives in the conquest of the Philippines as starkly economic and imperialist, the evidence from the late sixteenth century suggests that the Spaniards took seriously their declared aim of converting and civilising the Indian as well as adding to the wealth and glory of Spain.

Spanish colonialism in the sixteenth century was remarkable for its peculiar mixture of aims where the search for imperial power and private wealth were seen as compatible with the creation of a universal empire in the service of the Kingdom of God. John Leddy Phelan has remarked that no other colonial system in modern


7 Conquered territory was divided into encomiendas delegated to individual Spanish colonists whose duty was to maintain law and order within their jurisdictions, protect the local people, and provide them with the opportunity to learn the Christian faith. In return, the encomendero had the right to levy tribute and statute labour subject to government regulation. The encomendero was legally obliged to 'discharge the conscience of the king' in supporting the Christian faith. See Horacio de la Costa, S.J., The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581-1768 (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), 13,31, 256-57.

8 Renato Constantino, for instance, explains Spanish motivation as imperial rivalries with the Portuguese and the search for gold and spices thought to be abundant in the East Indies. The 'dual purpose' of the conquest was to strengthen Spanish sovereignty and to enrich the conquerors: The Philippines: A Past Revisited (Quezon City, 1975), 40-41. (Elsewhere he describes the conquest as a 'theo-political enterprise'; ibid., 64)
times was built upon 'so extensive a philosophical and theological foundation as that empire which the Spaniards created for themselves in the New World'.

It was because they were concerned with the souls and minds of their subjects as much as because they were bureaucrats and settlers that the Spaniards had such a complex and long-term influence on the peoples they colonised. Rather than the bureaucracy or the encomienda, it was the Church which was, from the beginning, the most effective agent of Spanish colonisation, permanently altering the culture as well as the social structure and organisation of pre-Hispanic society. Its missions were the primary instrument of the political pacification and social transformation of the local peoples as well as the centres of Christian evangelisation. The predominance of the Church in the conquest reflected the proselytising purposes of Spanish colonialism as much as the experience and dedication brought to the islands by the religious orders themselves. The Church in the Philippines, as in the Americas, operated as an instrument of conquest, colonisation and governance although its clergy always stressed that it was a religious

9 The Millennial Kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1970), 5.

10 For a discussion of the mission as the most effective frontier institution in the Spanish colonies see Herbert E. Bolton, 'The Mission as a Frontier Institution in the Spanish-American Colonies', The American Historical Review, XXIII, 1917-1918, 43ff. The colonial bureaucracy did not have immediate or significant influence on the existing social organisation in the islands outside a few urban centres: in the first century of the period of Spanish rule, Horacio de la Costa has commented, the Spaniards 'merely superimposed their rule on the social structure, making no direct effort to change it, at least in the beginning'; The Jesuits in the Philippines, 13.
institution concerned above all with the salvation of its converts.  

Indeed, this dual role of priest and colonist, as Renato Constantino has pointed out, was crucial in determining the nature of Spanish rule in the Philippines. The Spanish priest made a degree of psychological control possible in the islands unique in colonial Asia:

The fact that the people became Catholics made God the powerful ally of their rulers. The friars enlisted God on the side of colonialism. To the fear of physical punishment was added the infinitely more potent fear of supernatural retribution. Thus one priest was usually enough to control a village, for rebellion against the priest was equated with rebellion against God and therefore with eternal damnation. The priest was their accepted ruler, the representative of their God on earth and the intermediary for their souls after death.

While it is possible Constantino oversimplifies the positive support the priest attracted as spiritual leader of the local community and over-estimates the degree of spiritual control the priest actually exercised over a people who retained much of their pre-Spanish religious beliefs, it is a unique factor in Philippine colonial society that the religion of the conquerors came to be the religion of the conquered and that the Spanish priest was the effective point of contact between the two cultures.

Bolton, while stressing the political and civilising roles of the missionaries, also stresses that from the viewpoint of the Church and as viewed by the missionaries themselves, 'their principal work was to spread the Faith, first, last and always. To doubt this is to confess a complete and disqualifying ignorance of the great mass of existing missionary correspondence'; op. cit., 46-47. Writing of the American situation, C.H. Haring has also argued that it was through its spiritual and moral influence that the Church became the principal agent of Spanish rule: The Spanish Empire in America 166, 169.


The unique relationship between church and state in the Spanish empire, and the material resources and effective organisation of the regular clergy, provide the practical explanation for the success of the orders in establishing and consolidating their position in the Philippines. There was, however, a less tangible but crucial factor behind their success. The friars drew strength from a complex of ideas and values which derived from the shaping of the Christian tradition during the centuries of the reconquista in Spain. They believed themselves chosen by God as priests and as Spaniards to bring the gospel and Christian civilisation to peoples living in the darkness of idolatry and barbarism (although prevailing opinion in the sixteenth century allowed the unconverted indio some share in the natural virtues). The empire which they helped rule was a spiritual as well as temporal empire whose king was patron of the church as well as head of state. The Philippines was colonised according to a set of ideas about the nature of man and human history whose force explains the importance of the church in the islands. These ideas will be examined in the following chapter but it is impossible to fully understand the working of the institutional church in the colony without referring to them here. The mutual and explicit inter-dependence of church and state which grew out of the historical experience of the Spanish people set the basic structure for the Philippine church, a structure which still dominated the church over three hundred years later.

The islands were colonised as part of the outward expansion of a theocratic and evangelising state. Empire confirmed an idea that had begun to take shape during the reconquest of the peninsula: all Spaniards, laymen and religious alike, shared the duty to Christianize the whole
The aim of empire was perceived differently by individuals within the Spanish Church but John Leddy Phelan has identified three major strands in the political-ecclesiastical thinking which influenced Spain's creation of its 'universal empire'. One tradition was represented by Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda who stressed a 'non-ecclesiastical' civilizing mission by which the morally and culturally superior Spaniards would impose order on the New World. A second was the 'essentially ecclesiastical and juridical conception' of the conquest defended by such theologians as Francisco de Vitoria and Bartolomé de las Casas, within which the natural rights of the Indians and the origin and nature of Spanish sovereignty were carefully debated. The third was the mystical interpretation of the conquest expressed in the writings of the Franciscan, Gerónimo de Mendieta. To those who saw the extension of Spanish rule in mystical terms it was the fulfilment of the prophecies of the Apocalypse in preparation for the second coming of Christ and the Last Judgement. For prophets of Spain's millennial kingdom such as Mendieta, 'the Spanish race under the leadership of her "blessed kings" had been chosen to undertake the final conversion of the Jews, the Moslems, and the Gentiles', an event which was to foreshadow the approaching end of the world. God had raised Spain above all the kingdoms of the earth and designated the Spaniards His new chosen people. Not all Spaniards responded to this vision but it was implicit in the confidence with which the Spanish clergy committed themselves to a lifetime of work

14 In this summary of Spanish motives and ideology in the sixteenth century I have drawn on Lewis Hanke, 'The Theological Significance of the Discovery of America' in Fredi Chiapelli (ed), First Images of America; The Impact of the New World on the Old (Berkeley and Los Angeles and London, 1976), 367ff; Phelan, Millennial Kingdom, 11ff; Phelan, Hispanization, 4ff; and Antonine Tibesar, 'The Church in Latin America', The New Catholic Encyclopedia (New York, 1967), VIII, 449.
on the mission frontier. The ecclesiastical-juridical view of Spanish evangelism also assumed the eschatological nature of the mission. That the empire furthered the purposes of the Kingdom of God was the final assumption on which the whole case for Spanish authority in the New World rested and it was the dedication of the orders to that vision that provided their strength.

The mutual dependence of church and state in Spain, where the king, 'by the Grace of God, annointed and consecrated by the Church' defended the altar 'by the sword and the law', was even stronger in the colonies. In the Spanish colonial system, 'civil and sacred interests were intertwined in a system so thorough and complex as scarcely to be separated'. While the spiritual and temporal worlds were theoretically distinguished, the functions and authority of church and state in the Spanish colonies were easily confused, a confusion which became greater under the regalist policies of the eighteenth century Bourbon kings. The reconquest of Spain had confirmed the view that religious orthodoxy was a political as well as a religious necessity essential to the integrity of the state. Heresy and treason were both religious and political crimes. The Spanish kings ensured that they exercised as complete a control as possible over the colonial churches. By the early seventeenth century, the Spanish crown had gained papal recognition for its right to exercise direct and immediate control over all ecclesiastical affairs in the New World except in matters of doctrine


and religious discipline. At the time of the defeat of Muslim Granada in 1492 the Spanish sovereigns already possessed the privileges of ecclesiastical patronage granted by Pope Innocent VIII in a bull of 1486. In the same year as the defeat of Granada Columbus opened the Americas to Spain and the rights of royal patronage granted over the Muslim conquest were extended to the conquests of the New World through a series of letters from Pope Alexander VI in 1493. The Pope conceded to Ferdinand and Isabella absolute control of the new territories and extensive powers of ecclesiastical patronage. In 1501 Alexander VI also granted the Spanish sovereigns use of the church tithes on condition that they made themselves responsible for the introduction and maintenance of the church in the New World and for the conversion of the Indians. Ambiguities concerning the appointment of bishops in the colonies were finally removed in 1508 and the full powers of patronage finally set out in the bull Universalis ecclesiae regimini published by Pope Julius II.

17 Haring, op.cit., 167. See also J.Lloyd Mecham, Church and State in Latin America; A History of Political-ecclesiastical relations (Chapel Hill, 1934), 10.

18 The first of these documents was issued on 3 May and granted exclusive rights to all the lands discovered in the Americas (excepting those belonging to the Portuguese) and apostolic privileges in return for Spanish responsibility for Christianising the Indians. The second, Piis fidelium, of 25 June, granted vicarial power to appoint missionaries. Inter caetera (possibly June 28) widened the scope of royal patronage as did Eximiae devotionis (possibly July 2). Dudum siquidem annulled these bulls and made a new, general and unconditional grant, by which the Kings of Castile and León with their heirs and successors were made 'lords of these lands, with free and absolute power, authority and jurisdiction'. Ecclesiastically, they were entitled to govern the whole region which was subject to 'the king's direction, administration, or nomination, or to those who acted in his stead....'. See W.M. Porras, 'Patronato Real', in New Catholic Encyclopedia, X, 1115; Shiels, op.cit., 72-81; Diffie, op. cit., 238.

19 Haring, op. cit., 167. The crown redonated most of the tithe after the Concordat of Burgos of 1512; Shiels, op.cit., 6.
It was the definition of the Patronato Real between 1493 and 1508 which formed the basis of the ecclesiastical government of the Philippines until 1898. The Philippines, with Cuba and Puerto Rico, was subject to the religious settlement worked out in the early sixteenth century until the end of the nineteenth century, long after the loss of most of the American empire and even though the Patronato in Spain itself was dismantled by the Concordat with the Holy See of 1851. The terms of this Concordat expressly sanctioned and reconfirmed the absolute control of the Spanish crown over the church in the remaining Spanish colonies. In effect, the Spanish state, through the Patronato Real, assumed the authority of the Holy See in its control of the colonial churches:

They regulated the procedure of ecclesiastical courts, the manner and time of worship, and rules for lay and clerical behaviour, even to the causes of excommunication and the lifting of the same. They were masters of all local patronage and of the presentation of every incumbent, as they also guided his choice of policies and his local movements from that time onwards. Frequently they placed clerics in civil offices and sometimes had them investigate the whole gamut of civil administration .... A multiplicity of landed investments, connected with tithes, benefices, and church properties and the supervision of missions, encomiendas, and parishes were likewise under the control of the Patronato.

The powers exercised by the crown were greater in the colonies than in

---

20 Mecham, op.cit., 12. In the earlier concordat between Ferdinand VI and Pope Benedict XIV of 1753, the papacy unconditionally reconfirmed the absolute powers of patronage of the Spanish Kings in the Spanish territories 'forever', agreeing that they could present and nominate bishops who would receive 'institution and canonical collation from their respective ordinaries with no expediting of apostolic bulls aside from the confirming of elections...'; Shiels, op. cit., 238.

21 Shiels, ibid., 6-7. The Spanish monarchs also 'selected every cleric who would cross the seas for religious purposes' and 'singled out the location of every cathedral and minor chapel'.

Spain itself. The kings altered the boundaries of dioceses. Ecclesiastical disputes were referred to Madrid, not to Rome. Revenues of vacant benefices accrued to the royal treasury. Bishops could not remove a priest from his benefice without justifying their decisions to the king or his deputy. Papal bulls and all other communications from Rome required previous examination and approval by the Council of the Indies. C.H. Haring has commented that the power exercised by the crown under the Patronato Real made the church 'in a very real sense another branch of royal government, another means of political control over the colonists...in fact a national church, living within the orbit not of the Roman Papacy but of the Council of the Indies, and attached to Rome by very tenuous bonds'.

The danger of the church being subjugated to the imperialist policies of the state was recognised very early in the colonial period. Long before the settlement of the Philippines, members of the Spanish clergy, including the famous Dominicans Francisco de Vitoria and Bartolomé de las Casas, disputed the temporal claims of the Spanish crown in the New World. In the sixteenth century, the vigorous debate on the

22 Empire encouraged the adoption of 'a quasi-pontifical' authority by the Spanish state. Shiels argues that in the very concept of the Patronato there lay a 'radical distortion and antagonism'; ibid., 2.

23 Shiels, op.cit., 12; and Haring, op.cit., 167ff.

24 Haring, ibid., 169.

25 Vitoria argued that papal concessions, while giving the Spanish kings religious responsibilities in the Americas, did not give them temporal authority over its peoples because the pope himself was a spiritual and not a temporal ruler. Las Casas believed that the crown did possess temporal authority over the Indies 'by the authority, concession, and donation of the Holy See' but that this authority did not negate the sovereignty already exercised by the Indians over themselves according to natural law and the law of nations. See Lewis Hanke, The Spanish
justification and extent of Spanish authority in the New World tended to limit and define rather than endorse unreservedly the pretensions of secular authority. The members of the religious orders who first came to the Philippines had a strong sense of their own authority as priests over and beyond their allegiance to the Spanish king and, led by the Augustinian friar, Andrés de Urdaneta, questioned the legality of the Spanish conquest. The first bishop of Manila, the Dominican Domingo de Salazar, and his clergy, while concluding that Spanish rule was valid, continued this independent tradition when they resolved at the First Synod of Manila in 1582 that Spanish sovereignty in the islands could only claim authority in so far as it furthered the preaching of the gospel. The authority the king possessed in the islands did not belong to him by natural right but solely by papal concession.


For a discussion of tensions between Philip II and Pope Pius V over the limits of the Patronato Real and the independence of the Spanish Church see Shiels, op.cit., 195-228. The debate between the canonists, who argued that the state acquired ecclesiastical patronage only by the concession of the Holy See which possessed primary spiritual authority, and the regalists, who believed royal patronage was laical in origin, inherent in temporal sovereignty and possessed by the sovereign direct from God, became more acute in the eighteenth century: see Shiels, 243ff; Mecham, op.cit., 1; Haring, op.cit., 170.


See Aragón, ibid., 10ff., and de la Costa, Jesuits, 26ff. Father Miguel de Benavides, O.P., who served as the third bishop of Manila, proposed that the native rulers retained their temporal authority and that the Spanish king exercised an overall sovereignty emanating from the papal grant and 'categorically denied that the King of Spain had any authority over the pagan natives', being responsible only for those who had converted. The natives should rule themselves. Aragón, op.cit.
Concern for the rights and welfare of the Indians as well as jealousy for the spiritual primacy of the church both informed the movement to limit the authority of the state while admitting its religious patronage. The drawn-out intellectual struggle which formed the background to the conquest of the Philippines resulted in a series of laws and decrees beginning with those known as the Laws of Burgos of 1512 and leading to the general ordinance promulgated by Philip II in 1573 which attempted to regulate relations between Spaniard and Indian and to define the legitimate claims of Spanish authority. The provisions of the 1573 decree stressed that the clergy had the primary role of teaching the Indians Christian doctrine and leading them to the faith and that this role alone justified Spanish rule over native peoples. While the crown's claim to temporal authority exceeded that admitted by many Spanish religious, the justification for that temporal authority derived from the church which, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was conceded by the state to possess a divine authority and a spiritual jurisdiction greater than its own.

The spiritual claims of the Philippine Church as part of the universal church founded by Jesus Christ, independent from and ultimately superior to the state, did not lapse but from the very beginning of

---


30 There was a divergence of opinion among the religious orders in the Philippines on this question of temporal authority over the islands, the Augustinians and Jesuits tending to support the legitimacy of Spanish sovereignty and the Dominicans rejecting it. The question was taken up by a royal council which issued a decree on June 11, 1594, asserting the royal power, but reconsidered the matter in October, 1596. The following year means of legitimising the conquest were debated as tribute thought to be unjustly collected was returned: Aragón, op.cit., 19-20.
colonial rule they were seriously compromised by the **Patronato Real**. As in the Americas, the control of the church granted to the king limited the action of the church and hindered its full development. While royal patronage increased the material resources of the institutional church and gave it legal and physical protection it bound the church to a colonial system which, although it did last over three centuries, was eventually more dangerous than beneficial to the Christian mission. The costs of royal patronage became increasingly evident in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Its original spirit as a means of evangelising the New World under special concession from the papacy was seriously perverted, in W.E. Shiels' view, by the Bourbon regalists of the eighteenth century who were determined to subjugate the spiritual authority of the church to the temporal and spiritual authority of absolute, divine monarchy. By the nineteenth century, although the external form of the original Patronato remained, the early, vigorous independence of the clergy had long been eroded. They had become apologists for a perpetual Spanish colonialism even when the state that administered that colonialism was anti-clerical.

Long before the Philippine Revolution the paradox had emerged in the Philippines of a colonial church caught in the structures and assumptions of sixteenth century Spanish Catholicism when in fact the basis of those

---

32 Shiels, op.cit., 1-2.
33 For the contrasts between Philip II's centralism and Charles III's absolutism see Shiels, op.cit., 254. In common with the other European Roman Catholic churches, the Spanish Church was committed to a theory of absolute monarchy in the eighteenth and nineteenth century which, by the time of the *Syllabus of Errors* of Pope Pius IX (1864) was assumed part of Catholic truth. See the discussion of the Syllabus in the following chapter.
structures and assumptions had fundamentally changed. The intervening three centuries between the establishment of a Philippine Church and the Revolution had seen the collapse of the commitment of the state to the church's mission which gave the Patronato its meaning. The consequences of the eighteenth century Enlightenment and of the French Revolution were profound for the Spanish Church. Hostility to the religious orders and to the church itself became a recurrent motif of nineteenth century Spanish politics. Moves against the church by the state were accompanied by mass rioting which sometimes led to the killing of regular clergy as well as the looting and burning of church property. It has been claimed that by 1870 the majority of working people in Spain were estranged from the Catholic Church and that only a small minority of rural people actually participated actively in church religious ceremonies. 34 The Church in Spain was identified with the attempt to restore absolute monarchy after the French Revolution and, increasingly in the first decades of the nineteenth century, the religious orders came to depend on conservative and reactionary political factions in Madrid against those liberal, republican, radical and anticlerical movements which supported the principles which were expressed in the Revolution of 1868. One of the acts of the 1820 liberal revolutionaries imitated the Bourbon Charles III when they expelled the Jesuits once more from Spain and curtailed the activities of the other religious orders. 35

34 Guenter Lewy, Religion and Revolution (New York, 1974), 414.

35 Carr, Spain, 142. The religious orders became the 'most violent and outspoken enemies' of the 1820 constitution and continued to oppose liberal and republican movements for the rest of the century. For a summary of the periodic suppression of the religious orders, beginning with the Cortes of Cadiz (1812) see 'Spain', New Catholic Encyclopedia, XIII, 511.
The attacks on the orders and on the church in Spain in 1820, 1834, 1848, and 1868 and the hostility to the orders from urban crowds as well as anti-clerical liberals and republicans demonstrated, as Raymond Carr has pointed out, that it was impossible to speak of a consensus in Spain in the nineteenth century on the relations between church and state or even on the rights and truth of Christianity.  

The papacy recognised the dissolution of the conditions for the Patronato Real in the Concordat of 1851. The restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in 1874 did not mean that traditional concepts of 'religious unity' and the 'union of altar and throne' had returned to Spain; rather, the Spanish regular clergy temporarily benefitted from the factional politics of a divided nation.

In the Philippines, although the orders survived, they felt the effects of religious conflict in Spain. From 1804, the friars in the Philippines were separated from the rest of their orders outside the Spanish dominions and made responsible to vicars-general resident in Spain rather than to superiors in Rome. The Jesuits, who returned to the Philippines in 1859 after being expelled in 1768, were less cut off from Rome for much of the rest of the century despite the exile of the Society's General from the city between 1870 and 1893.

36 Carr, op.cit., 344.

37 Ibid., 351-55.


39 Christopher Hollis, A History of the Jesuits (London, 1968), 211. The Society had been expelled from Rome earlier in 1848 and was persecuted elsewhere in Italy from 1859.
The Philippine religious were further isolated from their fellow religious in Spain as the orders in the peninsula were subjected to periodic suppression. After 1836, the friars in the Philippines could no longer depend upon the support of their Spanish provinces following the decision of the liberal government of that year to suppress the monasteries and resume their houses and properties. John N. Schumacher has observed that the isolation of the Philippine friars naturally increased their exclusively national character and made them 'much more closely subject to the interference of the Spanish government in religious affairs, rarely to the advantage of religious life'. They survived liberal and anti-clerical administrations only because they managed to convince all Spanish governments that they were essential in maintaining colonial authority, but they retained control of the Philippine Church at the cost of committing it without reservation to the policies of the colonial power.

Almost in defiance of the fundamental changes affecting Spain, the Philippines, and Catholicism itself in the nineteenth century, the religious orders continued to define their role, the church's authority, and its union with the state in terms of the juridical theories of the Laws of the Indies, the Siete Partidas, and Philip II's Instructions to Legazpi. When the spokesmen of the five major religious orders drew

40 Schumacher, op.cit., 12-13; and see Carr, op.cit., 173-5.
41 Ibid.
42 The Recopilación de las Leyes de los Reynos de las Indias were brought together in Mexico in 1545 and given royal approval in 1548 but not published until 1681. In the Novisima Recopilación of the laws in 1805 the crown reaffirmed its role of 'exclusive and joint patrons' of the Indies with the right of making all ecclesiastical appointments. The Siete Partidas of Alfonso X (1252-84) was a collection of traditional
up their Memorial to the Minister for the Colonies in April, 1898, they used quotations from these sources to reaffirm a traditional vision of 'the union of God and His Church with Spain and the Spanish Crown':

We have come to the islands to preach and preserve the Christian faith, and to instruct these natives with the celestial food of the sacraments and the maxims of the gospel; to prove that the spiritual intent of Spain, on incorporating this territory with its crown, was to Christianize and civilize the natives.

The state's primary obligation in 1898 as in 1565, according to the orders, was to send to the colony bishops and priests to maintain the Catholic faith, 'for nothing must be desired ahead of the publication and extension of the evangelical law and the conversion and conservation of the Indians in the holy Catholic faith'.

The Memorial of 1898 is an important document for the insight it provides into the thinking of the religious orders during the Revolution and it will be discussed further in the following chapter but it is mentioned here as evidence of the tenacity with which the Spanish clergy held to their original vision of their role in the Philippines. It is remarkable not, of course, because it defends the church and the religious orders, or even, given the mood of contemporary Catholicism, for its outright condemnation of an anti-colonial revolution. What is remarkable is that the religious orders made their demands for protection

Spanish law. Except for brief periods in the nineteenth century when the Spanish constitution applied, these laws formed the legal basis of Spanish rule in the Philippines. See Gregorio F. Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, rev. ed. (Manila, 1957), I, 162-63; Rafael Gomez Hoyos, Las Leyes de Indies y el derecho eclesiastico en la América Española y las Islas Filipinas (Medellín, Colombia, 1945); and Diffie, op.cit., 236; 570-71

43 'The Friar Memorial of 1898', Manila, 21 April, 1898, in Blair and Robertson, Philippine Islands Lll, 227-86.
from the state in uncompromising terms which assumed the mutual obligations between church and state had not changed since the time of Philip II. The Memorial is evidence both of the strength of the orders in maintaining their identity in the face of all the changes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and their weakness in being unable to adapt the church's structures and policies to the demands of the new age. In a century of revolutions they remained absolutely committed to a form of theocratic absolute monarchy which no longer existed even in Spain. They were fully aware that the religious orders were opposed in Spain as well as in the Philippines by followers of what they called 'the false modern theories' and 'false modern liberties condemned by the Church'.

Nevertheless, they demanded that every Spanish official, 'from the governor-general to the lowest dependant of the state, ought to exert themselves to demonstrate by their word and example, in public and in private .... that they love and respect the Catholic religion, and that they esteem more the duties toward God and His Holy Church that proceed from it, than any other duty and obligation, however exalted and respectable may be the institution that imposes it'.

The definition of church and state set out in the Patronato Real, they

44 They recognised that their political enemies in Spain were only persuaded to tolerate their presence in the colony because of the 'infamous idea' spread after 1868 that the religious orders were 'an evil necessity', an 'archaic institution with which differences were composed for reasons of state, as a purely political resource'; Memorial, 275, 277.

45 Ibid. The implication is that religious duty is higher even than civil duty, a view which possibly explains del Pilar's belief that the friars were unpatriotic Spaniards owning no country but Rome; Monastic Supremacy, op.cit., 13. By assuming the Spanish state was necessarily bound to support their mission the friars denied that their patriotic and religious duties clashed.
assumed, was part of unchangeable truth and embodied the proper relationship between the two in a Catholic society.

There were, of course, practical as well as religious-ideological reasons for the importance of the Spanish clergy in defining the character of Spanish rule in the Philippines. Corporately, the Church commanded greater resources than the local Spanish elite or even than the colonial administration. Colonists from Spain (peninsulares) and locally-born Spaniards (criollos or insulares) were numerically insignificant throughout the colonial period. The Spanish clergy, therefore, had proportionally more influence. It has been estimated that some 12,000 or more missionaries came to the islands between 1565 and 1898. Outside Manila they were often the only representatives of the colonial power. In 1810, Tomas de Comyn noted that 'besides the friars, it sometimes happens that no other white person is to be found in an entire province, but the presiding magistrate'.

By the 1770s there were still only some 348 peninsulares, 1,436 criollos and 4,275 Spanish mestizos in the Archdiocese of Manila; Salvador P. Escoto, 'The Ecclesiastical Controversy of 1767-76', op. cit., II, n.30. Outside the capital there was only a handful of Spaniards who were not clergy. In Mexico, by contrast, forty years after the conquest there were 17,000 to 18,000 Spaniards and by the 1570's Mexico City alone contained over 10,000 Spaniards: Francois Chevalier, Land and Society in Colonial Mexico (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1970), 29,41. Misiones Catolicas (Manila, 1926), 36-63. Of these, 1563 were Recollects (127 of whom were professed in Manila), 2900 Augustinians, perhaps 1300 or more Jesuits (some 1000 in the period 1581-1768 and the majority of the 534 who came between 1859 and 1924), 2350 Dominicans and 4,128 Franciscans. By 1622 the Franciscans alone had 114,200 Christians under their care; 255,602 by 1797; and 1,124,278 by 1896. By 1656 the Jesuits served in 79 towns with some 71,724 people under their care: de la Costa, The Jesuits, 433-34.

Tomas de Comyn, State of the Philippines in 1810 (Manila, 1969), 106. Even by the nineteenth century in a province as close to Manila as Pampanga, the Spanish friar was still the only European with effective local influence; see John A. Larkin, The Pampangans (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1972), 89-90. In the 1565-1700 period, the number of foreign clergy in the Philippines varied from 254 to 400 priests; Phelan, Hispanization, op. cit., 41.
priest was generally 'the only peninsular, and therefore, the only representative of the mother country in the majority of the Filipino villages'. Their influence was even greater than the numbers alone suggest: de Comyn claimed that the friars were the real conquerors of the Philippines who 'without any other arms than their virtues...gave to the King, as it were by a miracle, two millions more of submissive and Christian subjects'.

Nor were the Spanish colonists in the Philippines able to match the economic strength of the colonial church. Although some encomenderos made private fortunes quickly they could lose them just as quickly and as a class they did not control the great wealth and large private empires seized by the conquistadores of Mexico and Peru. The growth of encomiendas was restricted by law and the system generally failed to be viable. The Church, less spectacularly but steadily acquired extensive landed property as well as the churches, conventos, colleges,

49 'The Friar Memorial of 1898', Manila, 21 April, 1898, 227-86.
51 Chirino mentions one encomendero who amassed a fortune of more than 150,000 pesos in a few years: Pedro Chirino, S.J., Relación de las Islas Filipinas; the Philippines in 1600 (Manila, 1969), 240. Such fortunes, however, were usually temporary and 'many who were rich in the morning found themselves destitute at night'. No great criollo family dynasties seem to have emerged in the Philippines: see J.S. Cummins' edition of Antonio de Morga's Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas (Cambridge, 1971), 19, 302, n.1, and de la Costa, Jesuits, 20.
52 Larkin, op. cit., 29. In Spanish America the encomienda also declined as a viable framework for economic exploitation. The system was gradually, though slowly, abolished, partly in response to protests against abuses associated with it but also because it proved unprofitable in outlying districts where the mission replaced it as the effective means of pacification and control: Bolton, op. cit., 44-45.
seminaries, hospitals and other properties used for ecclesiastical purposes.

In their accumulation of land the religious orders enjoyed significant advantages over individual landowners. They passed on their estates from generation to generation without the need to periodically divide them up among the heirs. As generally the best educated men in the colony with a wide collective experience of the judicial system they were able to use the legal system to protect the titles to their estates and to ward off challenges from other claimants or from occasionally hostile administrations. They also enjoyed tax exemptions and other privileges as religious corporations. Despite the attacks of anticlerical governments in nineteenth century Spain, where the orders lost their estates, the friars in the Philippines were able to hold onto their property. Those provisions of the Laws of the Indies which prohibited the sale of land to 'the church, monastery, or any other ecclesiastical person' did not prevent their emergence in the seventeenth century as the largest and most successful landowners in the colony.\(^{53}\) They were also able to have reversed royal regulations which forbade the alienation of church lands without prior official approval.\(^{54}\) In the last two decades

---

53 For royal policy on church lands in the Spanish colonies see Diffie, op. cit., 267; and Sobre una "Reseña Histórica de Filipinas" (Manila, 1906), 85ff, a reply by the orders to allegations made in T.H. Pardo de Tavera's Reseña Historica de Filipinas desde su descubrimiento hasta 1903 (Manila, 1906), published in English in the Census of 1903 (Manila, 1905), vol. I, 337ff.

54 Pardo de Tavera argued that until 1889 the religious orders held their estates only as usufruct, enjoying the use of the lands but not absolute ownership of them which was retained by the Spanish state. The state, exercising this ownership, required its permission to be obtained before the orders could alienate any of their holdings; Reseña, op. cit., 39. In their reply the orders argued that despite the anti-monastic laws of liberal governments in 1821, 1834 and 1849, the orders regained full ownership of their lands in 1851 with the Concordat signed between Spain and the Holy See, op. cit., 85-88.
of the nineteenth century they actually managed to regain tax exemptions lost earlier.55

The friar estates remained a controversial issue from the latter part of the seventeenth century until the Philippine Revolution of 1896 and beyond into the American period. The extent of the landed wealth of the religious orders and alleged abuses associated with their acquisition prompted a series of royal enquiries between 1687 and the 1750s. A succession of royal commissioners who attempted to investigate the friar estates in this period all retired unable to enforce royal control over them, principally because the friars were prepared to threaten to leave the colony altogether if they were not left in undisturbed control of their estates.56 Despite local revolts in the Tagalog provinces in the 1740s and 1750s provoked by the Dominicans, Jesuits and Augustinians acquiring further agricultural lands, and despite the vigilance of the royal commissioners against further abuses, the orders succeeded in gaining state recognition of their full title to their estates. In 1851, as part of the settlement between the Spanish state and the Holy See the orders in the Philippines were reaffirmed in their right 'to acquire, hold and enjoy in propriety and without limitations or reserve, all kinds of possessions...'. In 1890, the orders won the further right to dispose of their holdings and possessions in the islands

55 From 1880, the Taft Commission noted, the orders paid no taxes on their Philippine estates: Report of the Philippine Commission, Washington, 1901, 30.

56 For a study of these investigations and the political battles which accompanied them see Charles H. Cunningham, 'Origin of the Friar Lands Question in the Philippines', The American Political Science Review, X, No. 3, August, 1916. 465-80.
'in accordance with the canon law and the legislation of the Indies'.

By 1896 the Dominicans, Augustinians and Recollects collectively controlled perhaps some 420,000 acres of the best agricultural land in the colony, or between 8 and 13 per cent of all cultivated land in the islands. Nearly three-fourths of this land was concentrated in the Tagalog-speaking provinces around Manila. Some 48 per cent of the total agricultural land in the five provinces of Cavite, Laguna, Manila, Bulacan and Morong belonged to the three religious orders. The orders virtually owned the province of Cavite where they controlled up to 82 per cent of the cultivated land. The Taft Commission identified some 403,713 acres in 1900 which the orders eventually sold for $7,239,000 after negotiations between the orders and the United States government:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cavite</td>
<td>121,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna</td>
<td>62,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manila prov.</td>
<td>50,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulaban</td>
<td>39,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morong</td>
<td>4,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bataan</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cagayan</td>
<td>49,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebu</td>
<td>16,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindoro</td>
<td>58,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57 Ibid., 479-80; and see Pardo de Tavera, op. cit., 39.


59 Majul, ibid., 125, and see the Census of the Philippine Islands for 1903, IV.(Manila, 1905), 199, and Senate Document No. 331, part iii, 57th Congress, 1st session, 2405.

60 Majul, ibid.

Income from these lands in the late Spanish period was about $450,000 (Mexican) a year according to the Taft Commission which calculated its distribution the following way:

- **Dominican estates**: 161,953 acres $211,356 p.a.
- **Augustinian estates**: 151,742 acres $150,000
- **Recollect estates**: 93,035 acres $90,000 (estimated)

In an effort to forestall seizure of their lands the orders began to transfer legal title to their estates to joint stock companies with foreign directors from 1893. The Dominicans were the largest and wealthiest landowners and the last to protect their holdings in this way. In August, 1898 they transferred eight estates to the control of a company directed by the English businessman, Richard H. Andrews. The transfer was on condition that the Dominican owners retained control of the company anonymously as majority shareholders operating through a second Dominican company, the Sociedad Universal Comun de Bienes, set up in Haiphong.

The revenues from the estates in this transfer were potentially as high as 250,000 pesos a year but from 1896 the collection of rents was interrupted then stopped by the revolution. The new company, The Philippine Sugar Estates Development Company, administered the following estates for the Dominicans:

- 'Report of the Philippine Commission', 24 January, 1900, op. cit., 28. Hermengildo J. Torres estimated annual income from the estates as one million pesos ($500,000); Testimony in 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses in the Philippine Islands, etc.', Senate Document No.190, 56th Congress, 2nd session, 281.


63 See also Pablo Fernandez, O.P., article in preparation for the Boletin Eclesiastico de Filipinas lent to the author in 1972; and the testimony of Father Paya in 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', op. cit., 52-55. Father Paya thought all Dominican lands had a capital value of between four and five million dollars in 1896.
Dominican Estates Transferred to
The Philippine Sugar Estates Development Co.Ltd.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Calamba</th>
<th>Santa Rosa</th>
<th>Binan</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
<th>Naic</th>
<th>Lolomboy</th>
<th>Pandi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Acres-</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddy</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>4,715</td>
<td>5,082</td>
<td>6,482</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>11,385</td>
<td>16,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Cane</td>
<td>12.680</td>
<td>6,767</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Crops</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other land</td>
<td>23,959</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>13,209</td>
<td>11,919</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>8,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41,024</td>
<td>12,549</td>
<td>8,649</td>
<td>21,631</td>
<td>20,216</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>24,757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The estate of Oriong which was also transferred was held by the revolutionaries at the time of this survey and no figures were available.

Rents paid to the order for land under rice cultivation totalled $178,147 according to this report, those on sugar lands totalled $33,200, and other rents $15,650. The Dominican estates were particularly valuable because so much of them were planted with the highly profitable export crop, sugar-cane. In 1896, the three estates of Calamba, Santa Rosa, and Binan had 21,999 acres under sugar cultivation producing 528,556 piculs annually worth $1,586,268. Of this income, the Dominicans received only $33,200 rent. The annual rent supposed to be charged for every two and a half acres of sugar land was $5-00 but in 1896 the order received less than $4-00. Another 15,932 acres in the Calamba estate were also under sugar in 1896 but tenants were not then required to pay rent under an agreement whereby the proprietor forewent payment until the new crops were well established. 64

64 See the Report by the Philippine Sugar Estates Development Company Limited, op. cit., 2364-66.
The Augustinian province owned approximately 60,000 hectares (150,000 acres) throughout the archipelago of which 20,000 hectares were in the Cagayan Valley in the Province of Isabela. Other estates were nearer Manila in the provinces of Cavite and Manila itself. The hacienda of San Francisco de Malabon in Cavite contained 13,000 hectares; that of Malinta in Manila, 12,233 hectares; Talisay in Cebu, 6,645 hectares; and smaller estates of between 600 and 1,000 hectares in other parts of Luzon. In 1893 the Province transferred legal title to their holdings to a Spanish corporation, La Sociedad Agricola de Ultramar, with an Englishman as one of the directors. The Augustinian Provincial claimed in 1900 that these estates had been rented out to tenants at only one-half of the rates paid to other landlords. The total rental paid in 1891 was $150,000.\(^65\) The Provincial of the Recollect Province told the Taft Commission in 1900 that the Recollects had owned estates at Imus in Cavite of 11,000 hectares, a hacienda in Mindoro called San Jose of 23,666 hectares, which was in the process of being sold to a Mr. Christy representing an American company, and a number of other properties.\(^66\)

The orders did not cultivate their estates themselves, even before the transfer sales of the 1890s, but leased them to tenants who exercised in practice most of the rights of landowners. Generally, the orders required only an 'earth-rent', a fixed sum calculated periodically

\(^65\) Testimony of Father José Lobo in 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', op. cit., 75-80.
\(^66\) Testimony of Father Araya, ibid., 84-95. The Imus estate was transferred to a Spanish corporation in 1894 which in turn sold it to an English company called the British Manila Corporation Company, Ltd., represented by a Mr. McGregor. The Province held shares in this company. Another estimate of the Imus estate in the Manila Times of 19 December, 1903, is 18,000 hectares.
(usually every three years). The tenant was not obliged to give up any of his produce, unless he opted to pay his rent in kind, in contrast to the share-cropping arrangements on many private estates where the tenant was obliged to surrender half or more of his crop to the landowners under one system, or all of it, except for a small portion returned as payment in kind for his labour under another prevalent system. In the latter case, the landowner provided the tenant with seed, cash advances or other necessities for cultivation. On the friar estates, the lessee could transfer his holding by will to his heirs, sell it to another tenant or use it as security for a mortgage. To do any of this he required only the prior permission of the proprietor which, the orders claimed, was usually forthcoming. Each estate was administered by a manager appointed by the order who was responsible for the collection of rents and for supervising general improvements such as the building and maintenance of dams and irrigation canals. The orders also usually allocated one or two of their religious to keep a direct eye on the larger estates. Leases were considered valuable and were eagerly sought after by rising families in the provincial elite.

An interesting description of the relations between the religious proprietors and their tenants can be found in the English-language defence published by the orders for American consumption in The Civilizers of the Philippines (Manila, 1900), 48-49. For details of the contemporary criticisms against and defences of the friar estates see Isacio R. Rodriguez, O.S.A., Gregorio Aglipay y los Origenes de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente (1898-1917), 2 vols, (Madrid, 1960), I, 51-52 and notes 1, 2, 3, and 4; and Majul, op. cit., 127-32. American opinion was probably influenced against the religious orders on the question of the friar lands by John Foreman's The Philippine Islands, 2nd ed. (New York, 1899), 226ff. The question was vigorously debated in the American Catholic press, and the orders were defended by such American confreres as Father Ambrose Coleman, O.P., 'The Friar Estates in the Philippines', American Catholic Quarterly Review, XXX, January, 1905, 57-79.
The conjunction of large friar estates and a rising, landed provincial elite in the second half of the nineteenth century created acute tensions in those provinces around Manila where the orders held their richest and most populated estates. The agrarian crises which resulted provided a material basis for the liberal, anti-clerical ideas which educated Filipinos were absorbing from Spain in the same period. Disputes such as the notorious case in Calamba in 1887-1890 led to armed violence involving the military. The reformers of the 1880s and 1890s and the revolutionaries of 1896-1898 attacked the religious orders for acquiring their best estates by fraud and for imposing a tyrannical system of abuse and exploitation on their tenants. Apologists for the orders replied that compared to the tenancy agreements usual on private estates, the friar lands were characterised by a 'gentle system' 'eminently paternal and beneficial' to the tenants. The importance of the friar estates as a cause of the Philippine Revolution will be discussed further in Chapter III but, in identifying the structures of the colonial church, these large properties clustered around the centre of government are significant in explaining both the material organisation of the church and its hostility to social and economic change. The estates were a central issue for the religious orders and the nationalists. It was more than a coincidence that the revolution gained its strongest


69 Ibid., 127ff. See also Foreman, op. cit., 226.

70 The Civilizers of the Philippines, op. cit., 49, 51. Even among the Filipino reformers, the friars had at least one sympathetic voice: Pedro de Govantes wrote that tenants enjoyed liberal conditions on the friar estates; Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 47.
support in the Tagalog provinces with the richest lands, and above all in Cavite. In Pampanga, by contrast, where the church maintained no large estates and the local elite owned most of the arable land, support for the revolution was later in coming and less intense than in the Tagalog provinces.

Hostility towards the friars because of their landed wealth was not necessarily greatest among their poorest tenants. The orders claimed that their opponents among the elite saw the campaign against them as a chance to seize properties which had been improved over generations rather than accepting the effort required to build up their own estates in areas where uncultivated land was plentiful. John R.M. Taylor also saw the demand for the secularisation of the property of the friars as serving the interests of that section of the elite hoping to profit personally from it. This was also the opinion of such American Roman Catholic

Testimony of Felipe Calderon in 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical and Religious Uses, etc.', op. cit., 35. Calderon was involved in agitation concerning the friar estates in Cavite in 1899; Affairs in the Philippine Islands (Washington, 1900 and 1902), 2353-73. William Howard Taft and his fellow Commissioners also believed the revolution in the Tagalog provinces was 'largely due to the agrarian question and the feeling against the friars': see 'Report of the Philippine Commission', op. cit., 30; and Senate Document No. 331, part i, 57th Congress, 1st session, 180-81.

Larkin, The Pampangas, 110-11. There were other factors at work determining the commitment of provincial elites to the revolution. Larkin suggests that the Pampangan elite was 'deeply religious and attracted to Spanish culture' as well as being more suspicious of popular rebellion than the elite in Cavite.

The Civilizers of the Philippines, 51. Of course, settling unused lands had social and cultural costs as well as economic ones.

newspapers as the *New Century* which commented at the time of the sale of the friar estates that 'the possession of these lands excited the cupidty of Americans and Filipinos alike .... Greed inspired the cry that was so insistent some time ago that "the friars must go" and that their "lands must be confiscated". The actual situation was more complex. Some lessees were large, wealthy landholders lacking only full title to enjoy all the rights of owners in their own right. While the land rent and the supervision of the estate manager were annoyances, their situation was completely different to that of their sub-tenants who lived on subsistence level. The interests of the large tenants and the small cultivators were opposed rather than identical. In the agitation over the friar estates in the Tagalog provinces the small tenant saw the issue as one of a radical redistribution of wealth downwards whereas the local elite, as they demonstrated during the revolution, were concerned to shift landownership sideways from the religious orders to themselves. The perspective of the small tenant was castigated by such spokesmen for the elite as Florentino Torres as 'socialist'.

The estates formed an essential part of the economic organisation of the Philippine Church because their revenues paid for the training and

---

75 Quoted in *The Manila Cablenews*, 20 February, 1904, 5.

76 Ileto quotes Apolinario Mabini who observed in early 1900 that 'the complaint was made to [him] by certain alarmed individuals that this talk of liberties had caused to germinate in the minds of the masses certain socialistic or communistic ideas which forebode no good for the future of certain properties of doubtful origin...', *El Comercio*, 1 February, 1900; 'Pasión and the Interpretation of Change in Tagalog Society', 142.

77 Testimony in 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses, etc.', op. cit., 191. Constantino identifies their property interests as the persistent motive behind elite manipulation of the revolution: *A Past Revisited*, 211; and see Ileto, op. cit., 199.
support of the Philippine provinces of the religious orders. The orders argued, with some justification, that their rents were not intended to keep individual religious in luxury but to provide money for the charitable and educational as well as the parish work carried out by the orders in the colony. Each order maintained in Spain three, four, or as many as five convents or houses in which, by 1896, some 260 men received instruction to prepare themselves for work in the islands. To meet their needs, the Philippine provinces sent from 80,000 to 90,000 pesos a year back to the peninsula. Other money was set aside for missions conducted by the Dominicans, for example, in China, Tonking and Formosa. The laity in the Philippines were generally too poor to support the costs of maintaining the various functions assumed by the orders. The dioceses, with the exception of the Archdiocese of Manila, lacked the capital funds necessary to undertake church projects in education and charitable work and income from parish congregations was too small to provide an alternative. The result was that the Philippine Church depended even more completely on the orders while the orders depended on the retention of their estates in the face of growing criticism from the ambitious or idealistic elements within the elite and


79 The Civilizers of the Philippines, 36-37. The Church in the Philippines subsisted on the allowance from the Spanish state but this only met 'present needs', while donations or bequests outside Manila were rare and insignificant. The other four bishoprics could not even afford to keep up Cathedral Chapters. With the termination of state allowances in 1898 the Philippine Church became 'not only poorer than any other church of Europe and America, but as poor as poverty itself'; ibid., 37-38.
growing unrest among small tenants. During the Spanish period the religious orders had other important sources of income besides the rents from their estates. In the early period, Spanish colonists contributed to the erection of church missions and the upkeep of the Spanish clergy. The encomendero was obliged to honour his promise of material support for the local missionary. As in Spain, the religious orders were educators, employers, and in charge of charitable institutions as well as landlords. They also enjoyed sources of income directly guaranteed by the state. As in Spain, they were accepted as necessary to the civil as well as the ecclesiastical administration and accordingly were awarded funds from the royal

The loss of state allowances with the end of Spanish rule was not offset by the $7,237,000 paid to the three orders for their estates by the U.S. Government, despite newspaper reports in late 1903 that the money would stay in the islands to be used for the Philippine Church; see The Manila Times, 18 December, 1903, 1. Taft, in an address delivered a few days before actual payment of the money, commented that there was some question 'as to the division of the money between the religious orders and the Church. The Vatican has intimated that a very considerable part of the money paid ought to be retained in the Philippines for the purpose of maintaining the Church .... It would seem that the Church might very well say to the friars that much of the money which they had accumulated was earned through their administration of Church matters as parish priests, and that the money at least ought to be retained for general church purposes in the islands'; The Hon. William H. Taft, Secretary of War, 'The Church and Our Government in the Philippines', An Address delivered before the Faculty and Students of the University of Notre Dame, October 5, 1904 (Notre Dame, 1904), 40-41. The orders kept the money from the sale and invested it; not always wisely. The Dominicans used their $3,522,700 (after donating 3 million lira to the Vatican) to invest in Russian and Japanese bonds, the Russian bonds being totally lost after the revolution of 1917 and the Japanese bonds also proving unprofitable: Pablo Fernandez, O.P., unpublished article, 1972, 11.

Raymond Carr argues that in pre-nineteenth century Spain the Church exercised more power than the nobility: Spain, 1808-1939 (Oxford, 1966), 45ff. It has been estimated that almost half the land in sixteenth century Spain belonged to the Church: Diffie, ibid., 233.
treasury. Although the papacy had conceded the Spanish kings control of the tithe in recognition of royal patronage of the Church, only one-ninth of this tax was retained by the state, the rest returning to the Church. The state awarded each missionary a subsidy of 500 ducats for equipment and travel expenses to the mission and an annual stipend of 100 pesos and a rice allowance once in the colony. The king also made individual grants to the bishops and religious orders such as the 12,000 ducats authorised for the construction of a cathedral in Manila or the annual 1,000 pesos subsidy for the Jesuit College of Manila. By the nineteenth century this stipend had increased, according to the importance of the parish, to $500, $600, $800, $900 or $1200 a year. The bishops of the four dioceses in the islands received an annual income of $6000 from the state in the nineteenth century and the Archbishop of Manila, $12,000. These salaries, including that of parish clergy and bishops, were subject

83 The papal concession was made in 1501: Diffie, op. cit., 251; 258. Contemporary estimates in Spain claimed that from 12 to 30 of every 100 of the population were priests, brothers, nuns or other ecclesiastics. The 1797 census recorded 148,409 ecclesiastics in the peninsula: José Manuel Castells, Las asociaciones religiosas en la España contemporánea (Madrid, 1973), 18-22. The state was even more willing to support the clergy in the colonies; see Bolton, op.cit., 47.

84 De la Costa, op. cit., 277; Pardo de Tavera incorrectly gives the stipend as $100, op. cit., 36.

85 De la Costa, ibid., 97, 134.

86 Testimony of Archbishop Nozaleda, 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses, etc.' , op. cit., 103. Only ten to twelve parishes received the highest stipend. Foreman claims that salaries actually reached as high as $2,200 per annum, citing the missionary of Vergara, Davao Province as an example; op. cit., 225.

87 The Civilizers of the Philippines, 31. Early in the century, the Archbishop's income was $4,000 and that of the bishops $3,000: 'Remarks on the Philippine Islands and on their Capital, Manila, 1819 to 1822', by 'an Englishman', in Blair and Robertson, LI, 112.
to a ten per cent tax. According to one defender of the Philippine Church, what was left was a 'miserable sum' given the needs of the church in such a poor country. From early in the colonisation of the islands, the religious derived a further income from sacramental fees, ignoring a royal order of 1596 prohibiting the collection of such fees from the Indians in case they were discouraged from baptism or church marriage. A final schedule was set out in 1772 by Archbishop Sancho de Santa Justa which operated in theory for the rest of the Spanish period although it became increasingly irrelevant. The parish priest distinguished between Spaniards, Mestizos and Indians in charging fees for church services, according to the schedule: for marriages, for example, pledges, nuptial benedictions and mass fees were set at $7-00 for Spaniards, $4-00 for Mestizos, and $3-00 for Indians. Burial services were $3-50, $2-00 and $1-50 respectively, with additional fees for burial in the church cemetery and for sung offices of the dead and responsory processions. 'Destitute or poor people, who had no other way of paying their baptisms, burials and marriages, but that of selling or

88 Ibid., 31. The total was less than $1,000,000, the authors claim.

89 See Majul, pp.99-100. Schedules of charges were drawn up by Bishop Salazar in the 1580s and by Archbishop Camacho in 1698 but the regular clergy often ignored them; John Leddy Phelan, The Hispanization of the Philippines, Spanish Aims and Filipino Responses, 1565-1700 (Madison, 1959), 63-54. Salvador Gómez de Espinosa, an oidor [judge] of the Royal Audiencia of Manila, listed abuses committed by the regulars such as collecting compulsory contributions for fiestas and bullying parishioners to give up part of the rice harvest as 'alms' even though this left them hungry: Discurso Parenetico (Manila, 1657), particularly part 2, and see de la Costa, op. cit., 477-80.

90 Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 138-39. Nevertheless, the schedule was reaffirmed by a meeting of all the bishops in Manila in 1896; The Civilizers of the Philippines, 32.
pledging their sown lands, or their work implements' were given the sacraments free. Opponents of the friars alleged that they ignored the official schedule and charged excessive fees at will. Many of the Filipino witnesses before the Taft Commission in 1900 repeated such claims, blaming the high number of de facto marriages in the islands on such fees and even accusing the friars of deporting relatives for not paying costly funeral expenses.

The allowances made by the state for the clergy caused increasing friction in the 1880s and 1890s with a decree of 18 July, 1884 which calculated the stipend of the parish priest at 180 pesos for every 1,000 cedula (personal certificate) taxes, payable quarterly. In 1888, this was modified to 12.5 per cent of the cedula tax but not according to the amount actually paid but rather to the number of persons on the census of the parish. The friars were accused of boosting the census figures, for which they had an official responsibility, in order to increase their income.

91 The Civilizers of the Philippines, 33.

92 In 1890 the Propagandists circulated a pamphlet containing a Tagalog translation of the 1772 schedule in an attempt to arouse popular opposition to high fees: see Schumacher, op. cit., 138-39, and notes 17 and 18.

93 José Templo of Lipa, Batangas, claimed that burials there could cost up to 220 pesos and that the friars kept secret the official fees: 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses, etc', 208. See also the testimony of Calderon, Infanta, Constantino, Viola, Torres and the submission of the principala of Aringay, La Unión, ibid., 138, 146, 150, 156, 169, 200. All these witnesses had grievances against the orders and represented the landed and professional elites in conflict with them before the revolution.

94 Marcelo H. del Pilar, Monastic Supremacy in the Philippines (Manila 1898), 31-42.
One further important source of income for the church was the Obras Pías fund.\textsuperscript{95} This fund was confined to the Manila area, and the four dioceses that made up the rest of the Philippine Church were entirely dependent on their bishops' state allowances, reducing them according to the authors of The Civilizers of the Philippines to a state 'as poor as any Parochial Church, without owning any real estate or chattels, wanting of all kinds of wealth and [unable] to keep up their own Chapters'.\textsuperscript{96}

The withdrawal of Spanish support faced these four dioceses with financial ruin. The apparent paradox of a church commanding extensive state support and considerable material resources suffering serious financial problems even before the revolution can be explained by two factors: the uneven distribution of its resources between the religious orders and the dioceses and the imbalance in wealth between the Archdiocese of Manila and the four dioceses of Nueva Segovia, Nueva Cáceres, Cebú, and Jaro; and the very great demands made on the church in the Spanish colonial system.

The income the Church received it spent on churches, colleges, orphanages, hospitals, and other institutions. Members of the religious orders

\textsuperscript{95} The Obras Pías were funds created from gifts and bequests from wealthy Manila families, most of them Spanish, intended for various charitable works. The Mitra fund was an Obras Pías fund directly administered by the Archbishop of Manila. In 1850 various obras pías were centralised and by 1898 the main fund, in Manila, was made up of four parts, that of Santo Domingo, San Francisco, Isabel, and the Recollect fund. The Spanish Government used the board of the fund to establish the Spanish-Filipino Bank. Some income returned to the descendants of the donors, some was used for charitable work and some to pay for masses. The board of the fund consisted of the Archbishop of Manila, three senior members of the Audiencia and a secretary. See Guia Oficial de las Islas Filipinas (Manila, 1898) 293-95; Testimony of Archbishop of Manila, 'Land Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses, etc.', 195-106; and Civilizers of the Philippines, 38.

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., 38.
took vows of poverty and despite allegations of clerical avarice this meant that the church was able to use its human resources at less expense than the civil bureaucracy. But the commitments of the religious orders overtaxed even their resources. The Jesuits, despite generous endowments for the College of Manila and income set aside for it from real estate around Manila, were indebted for more than 40,000 pesos because of it for much of the seventeenth century. Over two hundred years later, the orders were still dependent upon state help and the revolution meant the collapse of their work.

The material strengths and weaknesses of the colonial church were intimately connected to its two most characteristic organisational features: its dependence on the religious orders and its dependence on the state. Although the presence of the religious orders eventually created serious hostility to the church, over the three and a half centuries of Spanish rule the unique organisation of the orders constituted a basic strength of the Philippine Church. Working with the hierarchy (except during periods of attempted reform) the friars gave the central ecclesiastical bureaucracy of bishops and religious superiors effective administrative flexibility at the local level and brought the church into the most remote población. The parish-mission system was better organised and more efficient than the civil bureaucracy. When the first Spanish missionaries arrived in the colony in 1565 they brought with them the accumulated

---

97 De la Costa, op. cit., 274, and see Phelan, Hispanicization, 38, where he notes that in order to meet the deficit of their Bisayan mission the Jesuits engaged in the beeswax trade.

98 See for instance Bernardo Martínez, O.S.A., Apuntes Históricos de la Provincia Agustiniana del Santísimo Nombre de Jesús de Filipinas (Madrid, 1909), 527, where he writes that the revolution meant that the province was unable even to meet the cost of training novices and the existence of the province was in jeopardy.
experience of almost three generations of missionary work in the Americas. The long training in Spain and in the Philippines which later missionaries completed was designed to produce individuals committed to the order and possessed of the psychological and practical abilities necessary for long periods in isolated missions. The colonial environment was particularly conducive to inefficiency and corruption because of its remoteness from Spain and the position of privileged colonists in a dependent culture but, while the maintenance of discipline in all the orders posed serious problems from the early seventeenth century onwards, the endurance and practical effectiveness of the Spanish regular clergy were remarkable. The authors of the Friar Memorial of 1898 had some justification in claiming that the religious orders were 'the only permanently and deeply rooted Spanish institution in the islands, with a suitable and rigorous organisation, perfectly adapted to these regions'. While other Spaniards spent more or less time in the


100 The Augustinians suffered the most severe disciplinary crises in the seventeenth century but all the orders, including the Jesuits whose selection of men and whose training were most rigorous, experienced problems. See Phelan, *Hispanization*, 36-38, and de la Costa, op. cit., 481.

101 'The Friar Memorial of 1898', Manila, 21 April, 1898, translation in Blair and Robertson, LII, 238-39. The authors were Manuel Gutierrez, Augustinian Provincial, Gilberto Martín, Commissary-Provincial of the Franciscans, Francisco Ayarra, Recollect Provincial, Cándido García Valles, Vice-Provincial of the Dominicans and Pio Pi, Jesuit Superior. Before it could be presented the American fleet blockaded Manila Bay.
Philippines according to their private interests or the short term of their appointments, 'being ignorant of the language of the country' and having only 'superficial' relations with the natives, the religious came to 'sacrifice our whole life' forming 'a network of soldiers of religion and the fatherland ... scattered even to the remotest village of the islands'.

The achievement of the friars in building an ecclesiastical structure throughout the islands was remarkable but it was a qualified success. In the towns and larger villages where there was a resident priest he dominated the public life of the community as clearly as the stone iglesia dominated the town plaza. But there were many Filipinos who saw a priest as seldom as once a year and even in the centres in regular contact with Spanish missionaries the priest's authority was superimposed on a local religious life which had its own momentum and character. The 'geographical particularism' of the islands, where communities were small and scattered under no overriding political authority, facilitated the early stage of the conquest but that same decentralisation became a formidable obstacle to missionary efforts to impose religious uniformity on the population. Spanish Catholicism was premised, as John Leddy Phelan has pointed out, on an urban definition of Christian civilisation. The hierarchical structures of the church could not be supported by fragmented, small communities. In the 1580s and 1590s, the crown decided to pursue an ambitious programme of resettlement which aimed at concentrating these scattered communities into larger villages, the misiones and their connected visitas. It was a slow

102 Ibid.

103 Phelan, Hispanization, 44.
and uneven process. The limited success of the reducción policy was largely attributable to the friars who founded many hundreds of pueblos. The resident priest of the pueblo periodically visited surrounding visitas and celebrated mass in the chapels erected in them. As the friars brought their converts 'within the sound of the bells' they promoted a social reorganisation of Philippine society which, while gradual, made possible effective civil as well as ecclesiastical control. But the degree of this control varied and in provinces far from Manila, particularly if they were subject to Muslim raids from the south, the mission could remain an embattled outpost with little influence over the majority of the many thousands of Christians listed in the records. A serious difficulty which further isolated the influence of the priest was the variety of languages and dialects which could make even elementary instruction in the catechism a problem where the mission included different linguistic groups. Also, even in Luzon, some areas stubbornly resisted the missionary effort to concentrate them into towns and to instil Christian cultural patterns.

From the viewpoint of Manila, in the descending hierarchy of colonial rule the network of parishes, missions and visitas was widespread and widespread and

---

104 There is some disagreement over how drastic this reorganisation was. Phelan emphasizes the difficulties faced by the colonialists as does Daniel Doeppers, 'The Evolution of the geography of religious adherence in the Philippines before 1898', Journal of Historical Geography, II, No. 2, 1976, 103-104. M.N. Pearson concludes that the Spanish 'retained the basic structure of the barangay' which became the smallest unit of local government with merely a Spanish superstructure erected on deeply-rooted indigenous institutions; 'The Spanish "Impact" on the Philippines, 1565-1770', Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient, XII, part II, April 1969, 167. The orders claimed great success in founding towns: see Misiones Catolicas (Manila, 1926), 37-63.

the most effective vehicle of cultural control. The visitas, or small chapels in the rural barrios, were the nerve endings of a system which was connected, through the convento of the parish priest in the poblacion to the bishop's palace in the provincial capital, then to the Archbishop's palace in Manila, and to the provincial houses of the religious orders also in Intramuros. Through this system, the peoples of the islands were ultimately linked to Madrid and, less practically, to Rome. Schools, convents, religious foundations, religious brotherhoods, fraternities, colleges and a university, agricultural estates, orphanages, libraries and the houses of the religious orders, a bank, and a good part of the civil administration were all connected within this ecclesiastical system. The parish-mission system was intended to place the priest in direct and sustained contact with his parishioners and proved to be the principal institution affecting indigenous society under Spanish rule. The mission (doctrina) or parish was the vehicle of transcultural influence, not only because it functioned as an extension of civil government but because the friars were concerned to remould the way their parishioners thought and acted. The ideal of a Spanish priest available to every local Christian community was difficult to achieve in practice owing to the shortage of priests throughout the colonial period and to the formidable problems of communication and travel over vast dioceses divided by sea and mountain ranges and served by rudimentary or non-existent roads. The support that his religious order gave him meant that the friar could fall back on resources specifically designed to cope with the administrative and psychological problems of exerting authority over a culturally different people in a colonial situation. As missions were regularised into full parishes they were used as bases for further misiones activas so that the priest in the most
remote mission station had a structure to support him as well as clear precedents to follow in establishing his religious authority. His training and his vows fitted him for the isolated and difficult task of living in a community from which he was, as a foreigner and a celibate priest, essentially aloof while being its directing figure in its religious and social life. His religious superiors remained in office while colonial governors came and went and so they were able to protect him against attempts to challenge his authority. Because he was bilingual and most other Spaniards and indios were not he acted as the indispensable link between colonist and colonised, interpreting the indio to the Spaniard and the Spaniard to the indio. As a priest he exercised sacred authority in a unique way and had the exclusive power to celebrate the sacraments which were understood as essential to the major occasions of personal and communal life.

The members of the Taft Commission, after their interviews with witnesses in Manila in 1900, concluded that 'the truth is that the whole government of Spain in these Islands rested on the friars'. Their removal would have caused 'the whole structure to topple over'.

The friar as a parish priest was usually the only man of intelligence and education who knew both the native dialect and the Spanish language well in his parish. His position as spiritual guide of the people necessarily led to his acting as intermediary between them and the rest of the world in secular matters. In only a few of the parishes was there any other Spanish representative of the Government of Spain than the friar priest. At first actually, and afterwards by law he came to discharge many civil functions.

T.H. Pardo de Tavera described the friars as 'the only interpreters between [the Indians] and the Government'; Testimony in 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', 160. He also pointed out that there was no continuous administrative policy in the colony while the religious corporations 'went on forever, and therefore they perforce governed the country' following 'traditional lines without change'.
and to supervise, correct, or veto everything which was
done or sought to be done in the pueblo which was his
parish.

The Commission gave an exhaustive list of the civil functions performed
by the friar, including his role as inspector of primary schools, president
of the local board of health, the board of charities, urban taxation,
inspector of taxation, supervisor of the issue of cédulas, president
of the board of statistics and census, referee for official reports on
the character of individuals in his parish, censor of the municipal
budget, president of the local prison board, member of the provincial
board and the board for partitioning crown lands, and counsellor for the
municipal council. There is some evidence that their increasing
dependence on anti-clerical administrations in the nineteenth century
compelled the Spanish regulars to stress their civil functions as proof
of their right to continue in the parishes. Apologists for the
orders always denied that they were civil officials in the strict sense,
although the Dominicans, for example, conceded that their priests acted
as agents of the government reporting on 'bad conduct' (although with
reluctance) and that this could indirectly lead to the deportation of
some of the faithful. In such centres of ilustrado reform as Malolos,
this function caused great friction. The Taft Commission reported that
'whenever any resident of any pueblo was suspected of being a disturber
of the peace or a plotter against the Government, or a dangerous character

107 'Report', op. cit., 122-26. See also Taylor, Philippine
Insurrection, I, 35.

108 Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 276.

109 Relaciones Historicas sobre la labor educacional y apostolica de
los Dominicos en Filipinas, Tomo II, Report, 1900, 1; 7. The
friar, it was claimed, exercised a moral rather than a political
influence. See also Rodriguez, op. cit., I, 70-74.
in other respects, no action was taken until the parish priest was consulted by the head of the insular government'.

The Spanish religious orders were also involved in colonial affairs at the provincial, colonial and metropolitan levels. The Archbishop of Manila had a seat on the Junta de Autoridades, a cabinet presided over by the governor-general, whose function was to advise the governor-general on questions of unusual importance. He was also entitled to sit on the Consejo de Administración, a larger consultative body which also included the superiors of the religious orders. This was the situation by the middle of the nineteenth century. In the preceding century, bishops acted on four occasions as ad interim governors of the colony, after an order of 1719 gave the Archbishop of Manila the right to assume the reins of office in the eventuality of the governor's death or absence. As in colonial Latin America, the church was 'an instrument of conquest, colonisation, and governance', acting in practice as a 'bureau of the royal government' dependent upon the Royal Council for the Indies or, from 1863, on the newly created Ministerio de Ultramar, for almost everything except doctrine. Within the colony, however, the


111 This practice was discontinued in 1762 when the office of lieutenant-governor was created. The Junta de Autoridades was established by royal decree on 16 April, 1850, and the Consejo de Administración on 4 July, 1861. See Zaide, op. cit., I, 165; and Majul, op. cit., 98. The Church had its own courts including the Archbishop's Court and the Commission of the Inquisition with jurisdiction over Spaniards.
Spanish clergy were able to act with considerable independence while functioning within a general ecclesiastical system bound to the decisions of the crown and its representatives. On occasion, the Philippine bishops and religious orders could and did prevail over the civil authorities and conflicts between the two were a persistent theme of Philippine colonial history. Such a conflict was being fought out between the church and the colonial administration in 1896 on the eve of the revolution. Despite an unsympathetic government in Spain and a Minister for the Colonies who personally opposed them, the bishops and religious superiors were able to gain the removal of Governor-General Blanco and to have him replaced with General Camilo de Polavieja. Polavieja's successor found that one of his most difficult tasks was containing the activities of the religious corporations. He reported that they suffered from an 'obsession' that 'by right they should be independent of all power which does not emanate from them'. They saw an outrage in every attempt to reform the church or the colonial administration: 'an ill-placed spirit of conservatism and a worse spirit of loyalty to the corporation leads to everything remaining unpunished, or at least punished only in appearance, and this is the reason for the struggle between the authorities and the religious orders'. The friars were 'indispensable' and impossible to replace but they had to be shown that they were not 'the law incarnate, imposing their will with whips and blows'. More usually, the religious orders did not have to

112 General Primo de Rivera, 'The Religious Orders in the Philippines', Report to the Government in Madrid, 7 July, 1897, John R.M. Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, I, Exhibit 5, 156-57. For an account of the political battle between Primo de Rivera and the orders see Taylor, ibid., 20-21. See also Frank Charles Laubach, The People of the Philippines (New York, 1925), 107ff; and Zaide, op. cit., I, 205-21, for general accounts of struggles between the ecclesiastical
engage in outright warfare with the civil administration in order to protect their independence: when it came to uncomfortable royal decrees there was always the time-honoured colonial response 'se obedece, pero no se cumple'. The law was to be obeyed but not necessarily followed.

That the orders could successfully ward off the challenge of the Governor-General, even as the revolution raged against them, proved their hold on the colonial system, but in its organisation as much as in its economic supports, the church they dominated was extremely vulnerable in the last years of Spanish rule. Again, this organisational weakness was a consequence of the previous success of the Spanish clergy in preserving intact the ecclesiastical structures of the first century of evangelisation. Even without the revolution organisational inadequacy in the face of great demographic and other social changes would have made basic structural change inevitable in the Philippine Church. The church's diocesan organisation was much the same in 1898 as it had been in 1600. It was not until 1910, after the revolution, intervention from Rome, and a Council in Manila, that four new dioceses and an Apostolic Prefecture were created. Until then, the ecclesiastical division of the archipelago was the same as that created in the late sixteenth century with the one modification of the new diocese of Jaro formed in 1865 from a

and civil authorities. Polavieja was responsible for ordering the execution of José Rizal a few weeks after taking up his appointment thus committing 'perhaps one of the greatest political blunders committed under the Spanish regime'; Pedro S. de Achútegui, S.J.; and Miguel A. Bernad, S.J., Aquinaldo and the Revolution of 1896; A Documentary History (Manila, 1972), 233-34.
part of the Diocese of Cebú. The five dioceses were still administered according to constitutions agreed upon by the Spanish kings, the Holy See, and their first bishops at the time of their foundation. Thus, for the Archdiocese and three of its four suffragan sees, the basic structure was sixteenth century although the population of the islands had grown from a few hundred thousands to almost seven million during Spanish rule. Nor did church organisation take account of the social and economic changes which transformed parts of the archipelago from the late eighteenth century onwards. In the organisational sense, there was some justification in the allegation of 'medievalism' made against the Philippine Church by its nineteenth century critics.

113 The Metropolitan Archdiocese of Manila was erected in 1578 as a suffragan diocese of Mexico and elevated into an Archdiocese in 1585. In 1595 the Philippines were made an ecclesiastical province with three suffragan dioceses, those of Cebú, Nueva Segovia and Nueva Cáceres, together with the Metropolitan see of Manila. This organisation remained unchanged until the 27 May, 1865, when the fourth suffragan diocese of Jaro was created. In 1898 the Archdiocese of Manila included the provinces and districts of Manila itself, Bulacan, Bataan, Batangas, Cavité, Infanta, Laguna, Mindoro, Morong, Nueva Ecija, Pampanga, Príncipe, part of Tarlac, and Zambales. The Diocese of Cebú included, in 1898, the provinces and districts of Cebú, Bohol, Leyte, Samar, Misamis, Surigao, and the Marianas Islands. The Diocese of Nueva Cáceres covered the provinces and districts of Camarines Norte and Camarines Sur, Albay, Sorsogon, Tayabas, Masbate, Ticao, and Burías. The Diocese of Nueva Segovia included the provinces and districts of Pangasinan, Tarlac, Cagayan, Isabela, Nueva Vizcaya, Ilocos Norte, Ilocos Sur, Union, Abra, Lepanto, Benguet, Bontoc, Tiagan, Amburayan, Cabugasan, Capaya, Quangan, Itaves, Apayao, and the Batanes Islands. The bishop's seat in Nueva Segovia was originally at Lal-ló in the Cagayan Valley but was transferred to Vigan in 1758. The Diocese of Jaro, formed from part of the Diocese of Cebú, covered Iloilo, Concepción, Cápiz, Antique, Negros, Calamianes, Romblón, Paragua, Balabac, Zamboanga, Isabela de Basílan, Cotabato, Davao and Joló. In 1910 the four new dioceses created were those of Lipa, Calbayog, Zamboanga, and Tuguegarao as well as the Apostolic Prefecture of Palawan (Paragua). See the entries under the individual dioceses in The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York, 1910-1911); Misiones Católicas (Manila, 1926), 22; Guía Oficial de las Islas Filipinas (Manila, 1898), 276-79.
While ecclesiastical organisation failed to adapt to demographic, economic and other changes, it was a weakness of the colonial church that from the beginning it approximated too closely to those regional differences which divided the various peoples of the islands at the time of the church's establishment. When the diocesan boundaries were laid down in 1595 they followed the major geographical divisions of the archipelago. Daniel Doeppers has argued that on the regional level 'an enduring hierarchy of centres and territorial units was established during the first generation of missionary effort' which was extraordinarily long-lasting and confirmed and perpetuated existing linguistic, cultural and regional differences. The division between the Archdiocese and the suffragan sees was the most striking. Manila was the centre of urban Spanish-Philippine civilisation, the commercial centre, the centre of education and government. The Archdiocese was wealthy and controlled far greater resources than the other dioceses. The degree of Hispanisation in the provinces included in the Archdiocese was deeper and more significant than elsewhere, but the success of the church there was at the expense of the poorer dioceses. Ecclesiastical divisions were reinforced by the decision of the Council of the Indies in April, 1594 to divide up the islands into missionary districts each controlled by one of the four religious orders then established. This division again 'rigorously followed geoethnic lines'. The church was weakened in its overall impact on indigenous society by tensions between Manila and the provinces, between the few urban centres and the remoter towns and barrios, between regions and linguistic and culturally different

114 Doeppers, op. cit., 110.
The Muslim threat in the Visayas was an important factor affecting the work of the missionaries there. Communities furthest from regular contact with Spanish clergy tended to retain more of their pre-Hispanic religious beliefs and practices. Indeed, during the colonial period a wide spectrum of religious beliefs and traditions evolved from the sophisticated anti-clericalism of the ilustrado elite's spokesmen to the almost untouched paganism of the cultural minorities.¹¹⁵

Nor did the colonial church overcome the basic physical problems of missionary work during the Spanish period. The problems of the Diocese of Jaro between 1865 and the revolution clearly reveal that despite its long history the Philippine Church was still struggling in the second half of the nineteenth century with many of the elementary problems of a mission frontier. Poor communications and inadequate transport, linguistic and regional diversities and the physical isolation of many communities, all made it difficult for the five bishops to effectively administer their dioceses or even for the priest in the parish and mission to have regular personal contact with the people in his area. The third and last Spanish bishop of Jaro, Monsignor Andrés Ferrero, O.S.A., assumed responsibility in 1898 but he had served earlier in the diocese as a parish priest. He told the Taft Commission that when he came to the diocese in 1875 he found only four Spaniards in the province of 300,000 people to which he was assigned. When he arrived in his parish there was no church or convento and no parish organisation. This was on the eve of profound changes in the region. Iloilo, the

¹¹⁵ Doeppers, ibid., and Phelan, Hispanization, 51-52.
port opposite Negros, grew in twenty years from 'nothing but a group of houses' to a major commercial town. By 1896 the youngest diocese already contained 1,310,754 Christians served by 200 Spanish priests and 73 secular Filipino priests. The island of Negros, which was developed in a generation by the infusion of foreign capital into sugar production, had a population of 30,000 in 1850 divided into seventeen parishes administered by eleven Filipino priests. By 1880 the population had risen to some 200,000 people divided among forty-two parishes controlled exclusively by Spanish Recollects, 'the native priests', as one observer saw it, 'fortunately having ceased to hold ecclesiastical office in the island'. Jaro was a dramatic example of the general decline in both the total number of Filipino priests and in the number of parishes administered by them as the campaign by the Spanish regulars to regain parishes given to native priests in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries took effect (see Chapter III). By 1896 there were perhaps two or three hundred fewer Filipino priests in the islands than there had been ninety years earlier. In the same period the population

116 Testimony of the Bishop of Jaro in 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', 112-14; and see the figures in 'El Archipelago Filipino, hechos por algunos padres de la Misión de la Compañía de Jesús en estas islas' (Washington, 1900), reproduced in Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, I, Exhibit 5, 155. In 1896, the Archdiocese contained 1,811,445 Christians served by 219 priests in parish work (and at least as many in other positions); for details of the other dioceses see Appendix A, Table 6.

117 W. Brecknock-Watson, Vexatio Quaestio or What Shall We Do with the Friar? (Manila, 1901), 22.

118 Tomas de Comyn reported in 1810 that there were more than 1,000 'Indian Clergymen' including parish priests, coadjutors and assistants, and 300 Spanish priests, 'including the superannuated, those exempt from service, and lay brothers'. Despite the 'excessive scarcity of regular clergy' (he thought 700 friars were needed altogether) he recommended that Filipino priests 'should be deprived of their parishes because they were unworthy to act as priests'; op. cit., 190-15.
of the Philippines had increased from 1,741,234 to almost seven million. The proportion of Filipinos who were served by priests from their own community thus declined sharply in the nineteenth century.

The number of priests, foreign as well as Filipino, available for parish work also declined overall as a proportion to the growing Filipino population of the 1800s. In 1810, on Tomas de Comyn's figures, there was one priest for every 1,400 or so inhabitants. By 1896, the number of priests had increased slightly but population growth had increased the ratio to one priest for every 3,600 inhabitants. Although the Spanish religious orders could not provide enough priests to maintain existing parishes at the level of contact achieved the previous century and despite the growing need for reform and expansion of the parish system, the regulars resisted change until it was forced on them. In

By 1896 there were between 650 and 750 Filipino priests and the number of parishes they controlled had declined from about 200 to 150. By 1896 only 967,000 Filipinos were served by Filipino priests out of a Christian population of six and a half million; 'El Archipelago Filipino', op. cit., 155.

See the Census of the Philippine Islands (Washington, 1905), II, 14-18; and Eladio Zamora, O.S.A., Las Corporaciones Religiosas en Filipinas (Valladolid, 1901), 216.

One contemporary calculated that in the Philippines in the last decade of Spanish rule there was one priest for every 3,311 Christians, whereas in Spain there was one priest for every 500 Christians. Because many of the Spanish clergy were involved in education, charitable work, were not yet ordained or were retired, the actual number of priests in the field was much less; [Juan Caro y Mora?], La Situación del País, colección de artículos publicados por 'La Voz España', 2nd ed. (Manila, 1897), 174. Working on total figures for a Catholic population of 6,559,998 souls ministered to by 1642 priests (including those not engaged in parish work), Father Thomas Middleton, O.S.A., calculated that in 1898 there were 3,995 Christians to every priest in the Philippines; Religion and Education in the Philippines, A Review of the Commission's Reports (Philadelphia, 1903), 5.
practice, parishes could include 10,000, 20,000 or even 50,000 inhabitants, served by one or two parish priests and perhaps a coad­jutor. Many parishes were too heavily populated and physically too large for the priest to administer. The largest parish in terms of numbers was the Dominican parish of Binondo in Manila which contained 51,040 parishioners in 1896. San Carlos, Pangasinan, which was also a Dominican parish, included 25,610 parishioners. The average number of Catholics to ordained priests in the field in Dominican parishes was between 5,189 and 5,250 in 1895-1896. The averages for the Franciscan Fathers and the Augustinians were even higher. There were 184 Franciscans active in parish work serving 1,124,278 Catholics prior to the revolution according to one source, or an average of 6,110 inhabitants for every priest. The Augustinians numbered 255, according to

121 These statistics are taken from the Estado General de los religiosos y religiosas de la Provincia del Santísimo Rosario del Sagrado Orden de Predicadores de Filipinas en el año 1896 (Manila, 1897), and that for 1895 (Manila, 1896). Since the revolution the situation has worsened. The Catholic Directory of the Philippines for 1965 gives an average of one priest for every 5,600 Christians for that year. Commenting on these figures, Horacio de la Costa argues that actually there was one priest in the field for every 10,000 or 15,000 Christians; 'Development of the Native Clergy', op. cit., 69.

122 Estado General of 1895 and of 1896. These averages are a little lower than those given by La Situación del País which used statistics from Archbishop Payo's time in the 1880s. La Situación del País identifies 136 Dominicans as engaged in parish work ministering to 795,396 Christians or an average of 5,554 to every priest. The Estado of 1896 lists 233 Dominicans, 204 of whom were ordained and 140 of whom were actually involved in the field ministering to 735,396 Christians. For details of the numbers of clergy and parishes administered in 1896-1898, see Appendix A, Table 1-5.

123 La Situación del País, 174. Father Juan Villegas, the Franciscan Superior, said that there were 229 ordained Franciscans in the islands in 1896 and eleven lay brothers; Testimony before the Taft Commission, 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', 67.
Situación del País, in the 1880s, and 249 in 1896, according to the diocesan totals given by Father Eladio Zamora in his Las Corporaciones Religiosas en Filipinas. Assuming that all the Augustinian friars were available for parish and mission work, the 2,320,667 Christians under their care averaged 9,320 parishioners for every priest. The Recollect Fathers had some 249 priests working in their missions ministering to a Christian population of 1,268,618 or an average of one priest for every 5,174 Christians. The Provincial of the Recollects, Father Francisco Araya, told the Taft Commission that in 1896 there were 317 ordained Recollect Fathers and 26 lay brothers in the islands. The Jesuits had 105 Fathers in mission work in the late 1880s ministering to 188,742 Christians, or one religious for every 1,797 inhabitants, according to La Situación del País. By 1896, Father Miguel Saderra Mata, S.J., standing in for the Society's Superior, Father Pio Pi, told the Taft Commission that there were 167 Jesuits in the islands including 24 priests, 13 Scholastics, and 25 laymen in Manila, and 62 priests and 43 unordained members of the Society in Mindanao. The distribution of priests in the five dioceses has been

124 Op. cit., 217. See Appendix A, Table III.

125 La Situación del País mentions 255 Augustinians ministering to 2,345,681 souls, or one priest for every 9,198 Christians. The Superior of the Augustinian Order, Father José Lobo, told the Taft Commission that in 1896 there were 297 ordained Augustinians and twenty-one lay brothers; 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', 72.

126 Testimony in 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', 81. For full details see Francisco Sadaba del Carmen, Catálogo de los Religiosos Agustinos Recoletos de la Provincia de San Nicolás de Tolentino de Filipinas (Madrid, 1906), 850ff.

127 See Appendix A, Table II, for details taken from Misión de la Compañía de Jesús en las islas Filipinas, Estado General al principiar el año 1896 (Manila, 1896).
calculated the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Spanish Clergy</th>
<th>Filipino Clergy</th>
<th>Laity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1,811,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Segovia</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>997,629*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Cáceres</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>691,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebú</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,748,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaro</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,310,754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals       | 967            | 675             | 6,559,998   |

* the Segovia and Cáceres laity figures are confused in the original.

The institutional church in the Philippines, by the time of the revolution, remained very much a Spanish creation dependent upon too few Spanish regular priests and on the patronage of a sometimes less than sympathetic government in Madrid. Its collective resources, although considerable, were inadequate for the many functions the church was expected to perform. Its organisation, although still effective, had become outdated and in need of thorough reform to allow the church to cope with the demands of a changing society. It remained a colonial and a mission church, bound to the interests of the Spanish state and

dominated by Spanish friars and friar-bishops who opposed reform as irreligious and treasonable. The strengths of the institution were strengths only so long as Spanish colonial authority continued and only if the Spanish government continued to accept responsibility for protecting and supporting it. These strengths turned to weaknesses once colonial authority faced serious challenge. The revolution was a crisis not only for the Spanish clergy but for the Philippine Church because of its subservience to the colonial power.

It may be useful to conclude this examination of the institutional church by recognising that the church was more than the clergy and the ecclesiastical organisations they controlled. It was also the community of the faithful although the hierarchy often appears to have assumed the laity were 'below' the 'church' and the objects of its benevolent but authoritarian care. The Filipino laity were sustained by folk Catholic and popular religious traditions which were beyond the control of the Spanish clergy. Despite the hierarchy's efforts to enforce religious orthodoxy, popular religious beliefs and practices continued as vital movements within the Philippine Church but largely outside the official structures. The religious life of the Filipino laity drew on aspects of Christian teaching which were egalitarian, 'liminal', and mystical in contrast to the hierarchical, authoritarian, and juridical definition of the church held by the friars. Folk beliefs combined these Christian elements with values and beliefs from the pre-Christian past. In an important sense the Philippine Revolution provoked a confrontation between the different 'churches' of the Spanish clergy and the supporters of folk Catholic and millennarian movements. The educated elite who created the new institutions of the Malolos Republic had yet
another understanding of the Philippine Church. The conflict of these
different conceptions of the church and the religious struggle culminat-
ing in the revolution will be discussed in Chapter III.
CHAPTER TWO

THE FRIAR WORLD-VIEW

Considering the critical position of the Spanish religious orders during the period of the revolution and early American rule it is surprising that their values and ideals, the sources of their prejudices and commitment have not since received the analysis they deserve. Later apologists for the religious orders have generally been content to repeat the defences offered by the friars against their critics at the time. Unsympathetic nationalist historians have tended to concentrate on the material interests at stake: the struggle over the friar estates and the orders' attempt to hold on to their authority and privileges.

In fact any understanding of the religious crisis of 1896-1907 must take account of the inherited system of beliefs and assumptions within which the friars interpreted the reform movement and the revolution and, later, the imposition of American rule. The world-view through which the Spanish regular clergy perceived the changes culminating in the revolution was a prism which refracted what the Filipino reformers and ilustrado nationalists believed to be sane and reasonable demands for progress into heresy and treason. The radical movement expressed through the Katipunan, interpreted in this world-view, appeared to the friars as part of a world-wide plot, evident in Italy and Spain as much as in the Philippines, to destroy the church and realise the monstrous designs of the Devil. ¹ It may be that the vehemence of friar denunciations of the reform movement and the revolution has encouraged the neglect of their

¹ See, for instance, Fr. Bartolomé Alvarez del Manzano, O.P., Circular to Minister for Overseas, 24 August, 1897 (Manila, 1897), 11-12.
ideology. It has already been suggested that from the nationalist point of view the Spanish clergy were seen in largely negative terms as 'enemies of progress', 'obscurantists', 'medieval despots', 'anachronisms' and defenders of a system of 'frailocracia' opposed to the needs of a people seeking independence. By extension, in the nationalist historical tradition, the friar view of the revolution and the broader view of man and his universe within which the revolution was judged, have been treated superficially as reactionary and superstitious. When historians in the nationalist tradition have taken up the friar view of the revolution they have done so merely to reject it. Pardo de Tavera argued that the friars were absurd if they believed the revolution was a plot devised by a handful of sectarian Masons and Katipuneros 'inspired by Lucifer and other more or less infernal spirits'. While he thought the popular religious literature produced by the friars worth discussion he was less concerned to reconstruct the ideas and values expressed through such literature than to denounce it as 'puerile' and 'superstitious' and the 'legacy of ignorantism'.

It is impossible to assume that the friars thought of themselves as anachronisms championing a dead past or as superstitious reactionaries, not only because human beings do not see themselves in such terms, but because their endurance and tenacity during and after the revolution demonstrate the opposite. They drew strength from a vision of themselves as defending the church and Catholic faith against the enemies of religion.

---

2 Trinidad H. Pardo de Tavera, 'Los Frailes en Filipinas', Address given before the Club Internacional, Manila, 9 June, 1901 (Manila 1901), 3; and 'The Legacy of Ignorantism (Ignorantismo)', An Address delivered before the Teachers Assembly, Baguio, 23 April, 1920 (Manila, 1921). See Introduction, pp. 23-24.
They were sustained by their conviction that they represented the Kingdom of God against the local agents of an international Masonic conspiracy. This belief that they were the victims of a vast conspiracy led to a strain of paranoia clearly apparent in the books and pamphlets written by Spanish regulars between 1896 and 1907 but they were strengthened at the same time by a confidence in 'the protection of Divine Providence', a by no means rhetorical phrase which indicated the basic assumption of the friar position. The conviction held by the friars that they were defenders of the true faith surrounded by heretics, conspirators and traitors outlasted the revolution and was confirmed by the challenge of American Protestant missions and the religious schism of 1902 which lost the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippines perhaps a quarter of its adherents for a generation. The Americans could not convince them to leave the islands or to give up parish work and they reacted with vigorous energy to the competition of the American secular education system.

In 1907 the Manila Council condemned the Iglesia Filipina Independiente as the 'Synagogue of Antichrist', a judgement which indicated that the Roman Catholic hierarchy continued to denounce its opponents in terms of heretical conspiracies although American bishops had by then replaced Spaniards. Indeed, despite the hopes of the American administration

3 For examples of this identification of Masonry as the 'cause' of the revolution see 'The Friar Memorial of 1898', Manila, 21 April, 1898, in Blair and Robertson, LII, 234, 255; [Pablo Pastells, S.J.] La Masonización de Filipinas: Rizal y su obra (Barcelona, 1897), 10-11; and Alvarez del Manzano, op. cit., 22-23.

4 'Friar Memorial of 1898', 231.

5 Pedro S. de Achútegui, S.J., and Miguel A. Bernad, S.J., Religious Revolution in the Philippines, I, 362; and see Acta Concilii provincialis Insularum Philippinarum (Manila, 1907), Titulus I, 3.
that the appointment of American bishops would 'normalise' the religious situation, the new bishops adopted within months of their arrival the conspiracy mentality passed on to them by the Spanish friars who became their advisers.6

The Spanish friars' thesis of an embattled church surrounded by 'impiety, secret societies, apostacy and scandals', freemasons, sectarians, heresy, schism, 'crafty hypocrites' and revolutionaries certainly reflected their own threatened situation between 1896 and 1907 but it was a thesis which they could support with references to contemporary statements by the Holy See.7 Furthermore, the position they adopted during the revolutionary period was entirely consistent with the religious culture they inherited from the Spanish Catholic tradition, at least in the form assumed by that tradition in the Philippines by the early nineteenth century. The 'theology of counter-revolution' employed by the friars to construct a reactionary political ideology corresponded with the vested interests of the religious orders, as their critics pointed out, but it was not simply as landlords, colonialists, and privileged members of a colonial church that they absolutely condemned the revolution.

6 Dennis J. Dougherty, Bishop of Nueva Segovia and later Jaro (arrived 6 October, 1903), and Frederick Rooker, Bishop of Jaro (arrived also in October, 1903), became involved in clashes with the civil administration almost immediately. Governor Taft, who hoped the coming of American bishops would end the hold of 'a particular class of priests' over the church and lead to religious peace, rebuked Rooker within two months of his arrival for accepting uncritically the friar interpretation of the religious situation; Taft to Rooker, Manila, 8 December, 1903, Theodore Roosevelt Papers, 'Letters to and from Archbishop Ireland, Bishops Rooker, Hendrick, Brent, and Archbishop Harty', Washington.

7 For a succinct statement of the conspiracy thesis by the last Spanish bishop in the islands, see Martin García Alcocer, Bishop of Cebú and Apostolic Administrator of Manila, Pastoral Letter, About the Catholic Unity (Manila, 1902), 1-3.
Above all they condemned it as defenders of what they conceived to be Catholic Truth. Their political position was determined more by their ideology than their ideology was determined by their political position.

That there were contradictions in their position is evident in their statements made at the time and even more when the orders' public writings are supplemented with their private opinions expressed in meetings such as the secret council of January, 1900. These contradictions will be discussed but it is necessary first to identify the basic elements which made up the friar view of their role and the church in 1896 and to trace the origins of that view from the original sixteenth century Spanish Catholic model, through the modifications of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In this chapter, the historical development of the friar world-view will be examined and then, using a selection of important statements by the orders during the revolutionary period, the values, ideas and assumptions which comprised that world-view in the revolutionary period will be analysed.
Spanish colonial rule and the institutional forms established in the late sixteenth century were defended as if they were part of unchanging Catholic truth. In this sense, at least, the sixteenth century model of church and state in the Philippines is relevant to understanding the friar position in 1898. They believed they were preserving intact the original character of the Philippine Church as set out in the *Patronato* and the Laws of the Indies. Considering the great changes which had taken place in Spain and the Spanish empire as well as in the Roman Catholic Church it was remarkable that much of the sixteenth century church actually did survive into the last years of the nineteenth century in the Philippines, as was pointed out in the preceding chapter. There were, nevertheless, crucial differences between the church of 1600 and that of 1898. Quite apart from the challenge of the revolution and the social changes which produced it, the religious orders themselves and the Spanish Catholicism they represented had, beneath the formal continuity of legal codes and theological language, subtly changed. Important elements in the original vision of the mission enunciated, for instance, in the Synod of 1582, had been lost and other elements exaggerated or reinterpreted. Time itself altered the character of the mission: what had begun as a spiritual adventure had long since become a fixed, inherited ecclesiastical system bound to a particular colonial structure. Conservatism and even reaction rather than sensitivity to the changing needs of the faithful were the dominant qualities of the thinking of the orders in the nineteenth century. Nor were the religious orders immune to the intellectual and social changes they condemned. Beneath the

---

8 'The Friar Memorial of 1898', *op. cit.*, 265-66.
theological language of church pronouncements, echoes of the new nationalist and racialist theories of nineteenth century imperialism and even of contemporary Social Darwinism can be detected in friar writings towards the end of the 1800s. An adequate evaluation, then, of the friar worldview during the revolutionary period must take account of both the perceived and actual continuities in their position and of changes in the Spanish Catholic tradition which were not always apparent to the religious themselves.

The way the Spanish religious in the Philippines understood their role and defined their missionary labour cannot be understood except in the context of the great debates on the nature of Spanish sovereignty in the New World and the nature of the Indian and his civilisation. Whether or not the Indian had a soul capable of responding to Christian truth and whether or not his pagan culture was to be destroyed or respected were questions which preoccupied the religious orders and the crown for most of the sixteenth century. We have already referred to this debate in so far as it determined church-state relations in the Philippines but it is necessary in attempting to analyse the system of values and ideas held by the religious to examine the conflicting theories of the nature of the Indians upon which the other theories of church and state depended. Were the Indians capable of entering equally with the Spaniards into the city of God? Were they slaves of the devil given over to idolatry or were they innocent children whose blank souls needed only the right instruction to achieve spiritual perfection? The controversy over these questions above all others divided Spaniards in the sixteenth century and had fundamental and practical consequences for the formulation and implementation of colonial policy. Three centuries later in the Philippines its repercussions were still being felt as the Spanish religious condemned
the demands for reform and independence.

The debate on the nature of the Indian and his culture expressed the intellectual preoccupations of a society transformed by a religious and cultural renaissance which saw the foundation of great universities, the integration of the new learning and of Christian humanism into Spanish Catholic thought, a general theological revival and the reform of the existing religious orders culminating in the foundation of a new, great order, the Society of Jesus. Within twenty years of Columbus' voyage, the Spanish crown had enunciated the Laws of Burgos of 1512 in an attempt to regulate and formalise the relations between Spaniards and Indians in the new American territories, although royal concern with the justice of the conquest and the treatment of the Indians actually went back into the late fifteenth century. The Laws of Burgos, while commanding the colonists to treat the Indians humanely, expressed, nevertheless, a poor opinion of them. They were to be brought into settled townships under the eye of the Spaniards where good example could teach them civilisation, 'since by nature they are inclined to idleness and vice, and have no manner of virtue or doctrine'. The Laws of Burgos were not, in the event, definitive, but they began the formal attempt by the Spanish kings to set out the moral and legal basis of race relations in the empire. The New Laws of 1542 advanced the recognition of native rights and protected them from the exactions of Spanish colonists limiting the rights


of the encomenderos in defence of 'our free vassals', the Indians.\textsuperscript{11}

The Dominicans, in particular, contributed to the reversal of royal policy contained in the New Laws. In the attempt to define the rights and nature of the Indians it was the religious orders, with their scholarship, religious training, moral authority, and first-hand experience of the peoples of the New World, who contributed most. Because of their pre-eminence in theology and the theory of international relations, the Dominicans exercised the greatest influence on Spanish responses in the sixteenth century to the problems of empire, race relations and international law through the work of such theologians as Francisco de Vitoria (1480-1546), Melchor Cano (1509-1560), and Domingo de Soto (1494-156).\textsuperscript{12}

The struggle to protect the Indian against exploitation and degradation became a public issue a year before the promulgation of the Laws of Burgos when in 1511 another Dominican, Antonio de Montesinos, preached a sermon in Hispaniola condemning the abuses committed against the people of that island by Spanish colonists. Montesinos set the Dominican position in the subsequent debate when he asked of the Indians: 'Are these not men? Have they not rational souls? Are you not bound to love them as you love yourselves?'.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{11}Text in Hanke (ed), Latin American Civilization, I, 144-49; and see the discussion in Hanke, Struggle for Justice, 83-95.


\textsuperscript{13}Sermon on the Sunday Before Christmas, 1511, in Hanke (ed), ibid., 121-23.
Montesinos was one of a number of distinguished Dominicans who carried on the tradition of treating the Indians as rational men, equal in the sight of God with the Spaniards and possessing rights and dignity according to natural law. Francisco de Vitoria, as the leading professor of theology at the University of Salamanca, passed on this view through his lectures and writings to a generation of missionaries. But, above all, it was Bartolomé de las Casas (1475-1566) who emerged as the most famous and influential defender of the peoples of the New World. It was his arguments, put forward in thirty propositions during the debate on the justice of waging war against the Indians held at Valladolid in 1550-1551, that had most influence on the provisions of the standard law of 1573 which thereafter defined Spanish colonial policy towards the natives of the empire. It has been remarked that the conquest of the Philippines was carried on by relatively peaceful means because Las Casas' view prevailed during the 1550s. Las Casas' argument was that the Spaniards should take to the Indians of the New World 'a good, gentle, and just God'. To wage war against them was contrary 'to the law, gentle yoke, light load, and sweetness of Jesus Christ'. He argued, in opposition to the thesis derived from Aristotle that certain peoples were by nature born to slavery, that:


15 Proposition XXIII, in Phelan, *ibid.*, 56.
no nation exists, no matter how rude, uncultivated, barbarous, gross, or almost brutal its people may be, which may not be persuaded and brought to good order and way of life, and made domestic, mild and tractable, provided that the method that is proper and natural to men is used: namely, love, gentleness, and kindness.

Rather than being enslaved by the devil, Las Casas saw the Indians as innocent and gentle, lacking only the gospel to be true children of God:

God created these simple people without evil and without guile. They are most obedient and faithful to their natural lords and to the Christians whom they serve. They are most submissive, patient, peaceful and virtuous. Nor are they quarrelsome, rancorous, querulous or vengeful. Moreover, they are more delicate than princes and die easily from work or illness. They neither possess nor desire to possess worldly wealth. Surely these people would be the most blessed in the world if only they worshipped the true God?

For Las Casas, all the people of the world were men with understanding and will. All were attracted to goodness and regretted and abhored evil. All, Christians and infidels alike, were rational beings. All could become Christians, a religion adapted to all the nations of the world. No nation was a nation of natural slaves and the Indians, specifically, were free men with natural rights and their own lawful rulers. Any sin or idolatry or any other sin however grave did not justify the Spaniards depriving them of their rights and properties.

The Dominican defenders of the Indians were moved by considerations of justice and morality inherited in the Thomistic tradition then enjoying a revival in Spain. The Thomistic tradition was juridical in its

16 From 'How All Nations May Be Brought to a Good Way of Life', in the Apologetic History, quoted in Hanke, Struggle for Justice, 126.

17 Colección de tratados, 1552-1553, quoted in Hanke, ibid., 11.

18 Hanke, ibid., 125-126; and Phelan, 'Conflicting Spanish Imperial Ideologies', op. cit., 52-57.
concern for justice according to Roman and canon law, ecclesiastical
in its preoccupation with maintaining the structures and institutions
of the church, and rational in its philosophical attachment to the method-
ology of Aristotelian logic. In this tradition man is seen as a
free agent who nevertheless accomplishes good only by the grace of God
whereas the evil he commits is due to his volition alone. God moves all
things according to their nature and man's nature is to act as a free
agent. Man is unique because of his rational soul characterised by
intellect and will. By nature he has the right to cooperate with others
in society in the pursuit of personal happiness and the common good. This
pursuit of happiness is guided by conscience, by both natural and positive
law and by natural virtues. In common with other scholastic theologies,
Thomism attempted to systematise revealed truth in a human manner so as to
make revelation better conform to the orderly, logical, scientific mind.
Aquinas, in opposition to the Augustinian view of the proper relations
among the peoples of the world, denied the pope temporal jurisdiction
over infidels. Mere infidelity was no justification for depriving the
non-believer of his natural rights, which were derived from natural law
and the law of nations. The Council of Trent, in its condemnation
of the Protestant view that man was by nature entirely given over to sin
and utterly dependent on grace in its decrees on Original Sin (17 June,
1546) and Justification (13 January 1547), confirmed the Thomist view that

19 Phelan, Millennial Kingdom, 5; 65ff.
21 Phelan, 'Conflicting Spanish Imperial Ideologies', 42-43.
man possessed natural virtues and could freely choose to cooperate with prevenient grace. The heathen, by his natural inclination towards good, was predisposed to seek and accept the faith even if he could not, alone, without the salvation offered through Christ reach a state of grace and adoption as one of the children of God.\textsuperscript{22} Thus, even when ignorant of the gospel he was not 'wholly depraved' or totally lost to Original Sin. The implications of the authoritative statement on the nature of peoples outside the church were important for the debate in Spain on the rights and nature of the Indian in so far as the church gave its full support theologically to those Spanish religious like Las Casas and Mendieta who denounced racialist and 'natural slavery' theories of the Indian character.

The Franciscan friar, Geronimo de Mendieta, represented another tradition within the Spanish Church, that which John Leddy Phelan has identified as a mystical and apocalyptic strain in Spanish Catholic thought, presenting the conversion of the Indians as the completion of God's plan for human history in preparation for the Last Judgement. Mendieta, if on different grounds, supported the Dominican opponents of the 'natural slavery' thesis. God had revealed to him directly, rather than through legal and theological arguments, that 'no race or generation of people were more disposed to save their souls or more capable of doing so than the natives of New Spain'. He stressed the Indians' meekness, gentleness, simplicity of heart, humility, obedience, patience and contentment with poverty, arguing that they instinctively practised those virtues enjoined in the Sermon on the Mount. They possessed natural reason and were capable

\textsuperscript{22} Kidd, \textit{The Counter Reformation}, 63-65.
of receiving grace but, being simpler and less corrupted than Europeans, they needed the special protection of the religious orders against exploitation. Their childlike innocence made them soft wax, vulnerable to the imprint of good or evil influences. Rather than requiring the elaborate legal and social institutions of Spain and its sophisticated civilisation, the Indians needed to remain in a simple, protective social system where the priest guarded and instructed them as a father guarded his children. Mendieta, like Las Casas, rejected the Aristotelian thesis that some men were born natural slaves and with him denied the extension of that thesis to condemn the Indians as a race to natural inferiority and subservience to the Spaniards. In the terms of St. Paul’s doctrine that Greek and Jew (and Spaniard and Indian) were equal in the sight of God, Mendieta argued that Aristotle’s classification of human beings into masters and slaves had been superseded by Christian universalism.

Influenced by the arguments of their leading theologians and supported by church teaching, the religious orders generally assumed a benevolent and protective position in their attitude to the peoples of the new empire, but it would be a dangerous simplification to assume that even within the orders there was a uniform consensus based on principles of Christian humanitarianism favorable to the rights and dignity of the Indians. The sixteenth century debate was not a clear confrontation between colonists eager to conquer and exploit the natives and friars anxious to protect and respect them. There were alternative opinions

23 Phelan, Millennial Kingdom, 59-65.

24 Phelan, 'Conflicting Spanish Imperial Ideologies', 44.
within the Franciscan and Dominican orders in Spain, for instance, which found even greater support in the colonies. In 1549 a Dominican, Domingo de Betanzos, confessed that during his years in the Americas he had thought and written of the Indians as bestias [beasts] and although he repudiated it on his deathbed, there were undoubtedly others who shared that view in his order. The Dominicans were fortunate to include a number of preeminent defenders of the Indians but the other orders were more ambivalent in their attitude. More typical of Franciscan thought than Mendieta's vision of the Indians as noble savages was the opinion of Pedro de Azuaga that they were timid, opportunistic and hypocritical, kept in order only by Spanish military power and ready to accept the faith out of fear rather than positive conviction.

It is also true that even the most benevolent defenders of the Indians displayed serious prejudices in their arguments which had negative consequences for the place assigned to the new converts in the colonial churches. In a colonial situation, benevolent paternalism could hardly escape becoming discriminatory authoritarianism. Mendieta himself argued that the Indians were made 'to be pupils, not teachers, parishioners, not priests', a view which colonial experience inevitably encouraged given the reality of exploitation and conflict of interest in the New World.

25 Hanke, Aristotle and the American Indians, 23.

26 Phelan, Millennial Kingdom, 60. There were Spanish bishops also willing to use Aristotelian ideas of natural slavery against the Indians such as Juan Quevedo, Bishop of Darien, who advanced this argument in a debate with Las Casas in 1519 before the Emperor Charles V at Barcelona; Hanke, Aristotle and the American Indians, 16.

27 Phelan, Millennial Kingdom, 69.
The daily exercise of direct power over deferential Indians encouraged some religious in the habit of domination rather than service. Despite their knowledge of Indian languages and their direct experience of Indian cultures, the friars were also limited by assumptions and values which they brought with them to the New World. For the Spaniards, religious and laymen alike, the 'Indian' whether Mexican or Peruvian or Filipino, agriculturalist, fisherman, or hunter, existed as an abstraction, an archetypical figure possessing a precise list of either good or bad qualities. The various schools of thought regarding the peoples of the empire shared in common this disposition to generalise about the Indians as if they all belonged to one race. It is for this reason that an understanding of friar attitudes towards the peoples of the Philippine Islands in the late sixteenth century requires some knowledge of the debate on the Indians of the Americas. Three centuries later, Spanish bishops and friars were still speaking of the indio as if he were a single type made up of specific, fixed racial qualities.

Sixteenth century Spanish theories of colonial peoples were thus implicitly racialist even when benign and the same theologians who defended the Indians were prepared to accept the enslavement and exploitation of Negroes. Inevitably, too, the most sublime theories became embroiled with self-interest once the missionaries had established churches, estates, parishes and missions and all the institutions of the colonial...

28 Hanke, Aristotle and the American Indians, 10.

29 See the examples given later in this chapter. The religious who gave testimony before the Taft Commission distinguished between Visayans, Ilocanos and Tagalogs (as did Chirino in 1604) and between mestizos and pure indios but in little else; see 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses, etc.', 97; 98-100; 113; etc.

30 Hanke, Aristotle, 9; Hanke, Latin American Civilisation, 188.
churches. It has been argued that there were other than altruistic reasons behind the benevolent policy and that the crown was inclined to Thomistic appeals to the sanctity of natural law and the law of nations as a 'smokescreen' behind which it could restrict the economic power of the colonists and maintain central control of the empire. Similarly, it has been argued that Mendieta's conception of an indio Eden, protected by the religious orders, provided the Franciscans with a justification for establishing and jealously retaining a Franciscan 'empire' secure against royal and colonial interference.  

As the church settled into the routine of colonial rule and became part of the colonial establishment racialist assumptions which had been condemned in the formal debates in Spain tended to reappear. The key concept of the Indians in the thinking of the Spanish regulars was as children, either as the innocent children of God or as wards needing protection (in distinction to servants or slaves to be exploited). But there was another sense in which the Indian was regarded as a child and eventually this came to predominate so that, in the Philippines by the nineteenth century, the previous two senses were overlaid by the third. In this third sense, the Indians, as children, were irresponsible, feckless and emotionally, mentally and morally undeveloped.

The most influential support for this view of the Indian as an

31 Phelan, 'Conflicting Spanish Imperial Ideologies', 63.
32 Charles Gibson, 'Spanish Exploitation of Indians in Central Mexico', extract from The Aztecs under Spanish Rule (1964) in Hanke, Latin American Civilization, I, 176.
33 S. Poole, 'Latin America, Church and the Indian in', New Catholic Encyclopedia, VIII, 448; and see Phelan, Millennial Kingdom, 66-67.
infant inferior to civilised adults came from Las Casas' opponent in
the Valladolid debates of 1550-1551, the Aristotelian humanist scholar,
Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (1490-1573). Applying Aristotle's doctrine of
natural slavery to peoples, Sepúlveda based his case for a just war
against the Indians on his thesis that they were innately inferior to
the Spaniards:

The man rules over the woman, the adult over the child, the
father over his children. That is to say, the most powerful
and most perfect rule over the weakest and more imperfect.
This same relationship exists among men, there being some who
are by nature masters, and others who by nature are slaves...
It will always be just and in accordance with natural law that
such people submit to the rule of the more cultured and humane
princes and nations .... And if the latter reject such rule,
it can be imposed upon them by force of arms. Such a war
will be just according to natural law.... War against these
barbarians can be justified not only on the basis of their
paganism but even more so because of their abominable licentious-
ness, their prodigious sacrifice of human victims, the extreme
harm that they inflicted on innocent persons, their horrible
banquets of human flesh, and the impious cult of their idols.34

Sepúlveda, although his works were removed from circulation or banned in
the decades after the Valladolid debate, appealed to nationalist and
imperialist sentiments which suited the material goals of those Spaniards
who travelled to the colonies to seek personal fortune or power. 35

The Town Council of Mexico, representing the largest and wealthiest city
of the empire, voted him gifts and recorded their approval of his
theories, encouraging him to continue his advocacy of Spanish domination

34 Quoted in Phelan, 'Conflicting Spanish Imperial Ideologies', 47-51.

35 It was not until the end of the eighteenth century that his Opera
appeared in print and the book that was the immediate cause of the
Valladolid dispute was not published until 1892; Hanke, Struggle
for Justice, 129.
of the peoples of the colonies. Although unofficial, the position adopted by Sepúlveda was most congenial to those Spaniards who, as officials and colonists, settled in the colonies and adopted an attitude of racial superiority to the natives they controlled. His thesis that Spaniards were superior to Indians intellectually, culturally and morally was reflected in the colonial mentality which emerged in the Philippines as in Spanish America by the second generation of Spanish rule.

Assumptions less harshly expressed but still based on the idea that the peoples of the colonies were innately inferior to Spaniards actually received official recognition when colonial policy was finally regulated by the Laws of the Indies published in 1681. In this basic code, the Indians were presented as minors, rather than fully responsible adults, to be protected by the secular and ecclesiastical authorities. The implication was clear that they lacked the intellectual and moral capacity to order their own lives. Racial distinctions which were benevolent in intention carried the other message that relations between Spaniards and Indians were those between superiors and inferiors. Though in qualified form, the unequal colonial relationship was officially sanctioned.

Spanish attitudes to the colonised peoples of America and the Philippines differed from the growing intolerance of Muslims and Jews evident in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries but there was probably some transference of discriminatory assumptions fostered during the final century of the reconquest to the colonial situation. The

36 Ibid.

37 Phelan,'Conflicting Spanish Imperial Ideologies', 63.
The concept of limpieza de sangre was peculiarly Spanish and preoccupied Spanish thinkers from the fifteenth century onwards as they debated the status and rights of conversos or New Christians. The question at issue was whether the descendants of Jewish or Muslim converts could be accorded full rights in church and state with Spanish Old Christians. One by one, the religious orders themselves succumbed to political suspicions and economic jealousies affecting relations between Old and New Christians, and adopted discriminatory statutes against Catholics of 'impure' descent. The founding of the Spanish Inquisition in 1480 provided the principal vehicle for the spread of limpieza statutes within cathedral chapters, monastic communities, the universities, and religious courts. While limpieza statutes reflected the political and religious concerns of the reconquista in Spain and had only an indirect influence on policies adopted in the New World they officially encouraged a hostility to miscegenation between Spaniards and Jews or Muslims which could be transferred into a prejudice against the children of sexual relations between Spaniards and Indians in the colonies. Limpieza statutes were attacked in Spain from as early as 1449 and they had only a brief and limited application in the Philippines, at a time when, during

38 The Franciscans adopted a statute of limpieza de sangre excluding all Christians of Jewish descent from the Order in 1525 and the Dominicans followed soon after. These measures were confirmed by the definitive statement adopted by the Cathedral Chapter of Toledo in 1547 at the instance of the Archbishop, Juan Martínez Siliceo. In 1555 and 1556, first the Pope and then Philip II recognised such distinctions within the Spanish Church. The Jesuits stood out longest, accepting a modified form of the limpieza statute in 1608. See Henry Kamen, The Spanish Inquisition (London, 1965), 129-30. See also Magnus Mörner, Race Mixture in the History of Latin America (Boston, 1967), 13. European candidates for the Philippine Province of the Society of Jesus in the seventeenth century were required to prove their limpieza de sangre; de la Costa, Jesuits, 236-37.
the reign of Philip IV (1623-1665), the long process of dismantling them had begun in Spain. Nevertheless, limpieza statutes reflected an aspect of sixteenth century Spanish prejudice which provided part of the general mental context within which colonial policies were made. When, influenced by later eighteenth and nineteenth century racial theories, the Spanish regulars in the Philippines denounced the leaders of the revolution as depraved mestizos, this new and more virulent modern form of racism had these older discriminatory assumptions as a precedent.

In the Philippines, for the whole of the Spanish period, the Spanish regulars generally discouraged too much contact between the Filipinos under their charge and private Spaniards, partly to protect the Filipinos from the abuses of Spanish adventurers and colonists, and partly to keep them pure in the faith quarantined from irreligious and corrupt ideas. Colonial society was conceived as dualistic, divided between the Spanish stratum of peninsulares, criollos and legitimate, fully Hispanicised mestizos and the mass of the Indians; a division formulated in the early concept of the two republics, the República de Españoles and the República de Indios. In the Philippines the religious orders

---

39 Regulations adopted for the collegiates of the Seminary of San Felipe de Austria in 1641 forbade acceptance of candidates for the priesthood with 'a fourth part of Filipino blood'; Blair and Robertson, XLV, 175. Restrictions on the ordination of Indians and mestizos in the Philippines will be discussed in the following chapter. Attacks on the limpieza statutes in Spain began with Alonso de Cartagena's Defensorium Unitatis Christianae of 1449-1450, and continued throughout the sixteenth century; Kamen, op. cit., 129.

40 'The Friar Memorial of 1898', op. cit., 245.

41 Mörner, op. cit., 45-52.
managed to maintain this policy until the nineteenth century when
easier communication between the islands and Spain and an influx of
Spanish colonists, adding to the rapid rise of a Spanish-Chinese mestizo
population made the policy untenable. As in the Americas marriages
between Spaniards and Indians were recognised by church and state but
were not encouraged. Marriage regulations drawn up by the crown in the
late eighteenth century decreed that 'information on the purity of blood
should not include the Indian race among bad and deficient races'.
In practice, however, the children of mixed marriages faced official as
well as social discrimination. The concept of the two republics was
not racist in intention and, as the New Laws set out, the Indians were
free vassals and subjects of the crown as much as the Spaniards. Never­
theless, the Indians were collectively regarded as the base of the social
pyramid equivalent to 'miserable rustics' in Spain. Their rights and
restrictions on their actual independence were counterbalanced. The
emergence of a wealthy and educated mestizo class in the Philippines
confused the original concept of a dual society but by drawing up elaborate
categories of racial mixtures and by generally assuming the mestizo group
to be an accretion rather than an integral part of Filipino society, the
friars attempted to preserve the two cultures theory and thus justify
their special role as guardians and teachers of indio society. The fiction

42 Hörner concludes that the official policy of separating the Spaniards
and the Indians, worked out in the 16th century and legislated in
the Laws of the Indies was largely ineffective in Spanish America
by the middle of the 18th century; ibid., 47.

43 Ibid., 44.

44 Ibid., 41.
of a colony ethnically divided on the lines of the first decades of missionary work remained a necessary presupposition for the orders' claim to be essential for the religious and social life of the Filipinos. This need to maintain the special relationship between the Spanish priest and his indio parishioner in order to justify both Spanish rule and the control of the Philippine Church by the orders is part of the explanation for the gradual intensification of racial distinctions in the colony at a time when such distinctions were being challenged and discarded in Spain. The more stringent and discriminatory measures taken against mestizo aspirants to the priesthood in the nineteenth century were motivated largely by the fear that a mestizo clergy, like mestizo lawyers, doctors, merchants, and intellectuals would challenge the 'most enviable peace and felt respect to authority' prevailing among a simple indio population which, without the intrigues of an elite, would obey Spanish authority without question, 'by conscience, by education, by tradition, by social habit, passively and by custom'.

The sixteenth century legacy was complex. Rather than one, official and orthodox view of the colonial relationship between Spaniard and Indian, the legacy was ambivalent and even contradictory. Rival factions within the Spanish colonial elite could draw on one or another of the various theories of empire debated during the sixteenth century to support rationalisations congenial to their particular material or political interests. The crown did enunciate a legal code for the proper relations between colonist and colonised and theologians in the Dominican

45'The Friar Memorial of 1898', op. cit., 252-53.
tradition did achieve a certain success in establishing a benign view of the purpose of Spain's sovereignty but the sixteenth century 'model' was complex enough for advocates of contradictory views of colonialism to find within it support for their arguments without conscious hypocrisy. Nevertheless, however ambiguous, the sixteenth century legacy was recognised by later generations of churchmen as a real and profound influence on their understanding of the colonial church and of their role in the colonies. In time, it assumed an authority which limited the range of options open to the Spanish religious in their response to changing conditions. The conservatism which was to become the strongest feature of Spanish-Philippine Catholicism was already apparent within a few decades of the conquest, corresponding to a growing rigidity and authoritarianism in Spanish culture remarked by historians of the late sixteenth century. The creative energies of the intellectual revival of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries had settled into formalism and institutionalised conformity which placed fidelity to sources and the inherited patterns of thought they contained above originality and innovation. Thus, proponents of the new science were opposed by 'conservative scholastics [who] endlessly repeated the doctrines and methods of the medieval schoolmen'. The writings of Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas were treated as received truth by their discipines and their denial as equivalent to heresy. The Protestant Reformation encouraged religious conservatism in Spain and gave further impetus to a Thomist revival which stressed the need for exact and authoritative statements of faith which then became absolutely binding.

46 Lynch, op. cit., 248

47 Weisheipl, op. cit., 132.
These developments in Spanish Catholic thought were confirmed by the Council of Trent in which Spanish theologians played such a prominent role. The Council, in response to the Protestant challenge and divisions within the Catholic world, was concerned to define and assert Catholic tradition and authority. Spanish theologians stressed those aspects of the Counter-Reformation which enjoined uncompromising opposition to Protestantism and heresy, adherence to precise and orthodox doctrine, dependence on tradition as much as scripture as the basis of religious authority, and special recognition to Thomist philosophy with its rationalist and logical methodology. 48

The conservative, traditionalist, and legalist qualities which marked the Spanish Church by the time of the establishment of the Philippine mission did not result in religious or ideological uniformity among the religious orders despite the systematic definition of doctrine achieved by the Council of Trent and the efforts of the Inquisition to enforce theological purity in Spain. Differences in important matters of theological emphasis continued to divide the various schools which found support with the theologians of particular orders. Conflict between the old and the new learning tended to be reinforced by political rivalries and conflicts, for instance between the universities, and these rivalries were extended to the colonies. 49 The Society of Jesus, with its supra-national orientation and its direct relationship with the papacy suffered internal tensions between its internationalist commitment and the

48 Kidd, op. cit., 103-10. The Spaniards also displayed their regalist and nationalist bias in stressing the spiritual authority of the crown and the dependence of the episcopate on royal as well as papal authority.

49 Lynch, op. cit., 249.
nationalism and regalism of many of its Spanish members. These tensions contributed to the eventual decision by the Bourbon, Charles III, to expel the Society from Spain and the Spanish empire.\textsuperscript{50} There were also serious tensions between the Jesuits and the Dominicans, and between Dominicans and Augustinians.\textsuperscript{51} It was a Spanish Dominican who spent eleven years in the Philippine mission, Father Juan Baptista Morales, who visited China in 1633 and a decade later began the bitter Chinese Rites controversy by complaining to the Propaganda against the laxity of the Jesuits in tolerating Chinese 'idolatry'. The uncompromising Dominican position in China had been anticipated by the Franciscans when, in 1581, a party of Fathers left Manila for China and proceeded to energetically denounce Chinese idolatry leading to their arrest and expulsion from the empire.\textsuperscript{52}

The sixteenth century religious legacy was, then, a complex and contradictory one in which rival traditions coexisted uneasily in an enforced orthodoxy under the discipline of a hierarchical and authoritarian

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 255-56.

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 249; and Weisheipl, op. cit., 132. As late as 1897 the Provincial of the Dominicans in the Philippines felt it necessary to make vehement denials to the Minister for the Colonies against 'Masonic slanders' that there was serious discord between the Jesuits and the four other orders. Propagandists and Katipuneros had spread rumours that the Jesuits intrigued in Manila, Madrid and Rome against the friars. Anonymous broadsheets in the 1880s had praised the Jesuits and condemned the friars in an attempt to sow divisions between the religious. The masons revived stories that the Jesuits wanted to take over all higher education in the islands; Bartolomé Alvarez del Manzano, O.P., Circular, Manila, 24 August, 1897, 73-75. Ilustrado witnesses before the Taft Commission repeated these allegations; see 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', 141; 167; 177; 184; 187; 192; 194; 209; 261; 266; and see Schumacher, The Propaganda Movement, 276-77. For details of the actual dispute between the Jesuit College of Manila and the Dominican University of Santo Tomas in the 1640s see de la Costa, Jesuits, 408-409.

\textsuperscript{52} Columba Cary-Elwes, O.S.B., China and the Cross, A survey of Missionary History (New York, 1957), 84-85; 109; 147ff.
ecclesiastical system. Internal disputes between the orders and between the orders and the bishops or the secular clergy tended to be coloured by ideological and theological differences. Within Spanish Catholicism, Scholastic, Aristotelian, secular and Christian humanist, and scientific rationalist theories of man and society all found their proponents. More benevolent universalist ideas about all men's predisposition towards goodness competed with the militant, intolerant values of the reconquista tradition. Mystical and apocalyptical visions of a new paradise inhabited by equals in the sight of God contrasted with hierarchical and authoritarian models of the cosmos where perfection was enforced by discipline and human relations were vertical rather than egalitarian.

The first generations of Spanish missionaries in the Philippines were prepared to tolerate and even praise many indigenous mores and practices which did not obviously conflict with the basic precepts of Spanish Christian morality, whatever their avowed aim of completely supplanting paganism with the new faith. The friars were close and interested observers of indigenous customs and recorded details of native life in their histories, building up composite descriptions of the cultures of the major regions of the islands within a few decades of the arrival of the first Augustinians with Legazpi. Existing Tagalog customs were given legal recognition in Spanish courts as early as 1599 although practices such as bride-service and bride-price which were regarded by Spanish jurists and religious alike with suspicion did not receive

53 Ricard, op. cit., 242-54.

54 Phelan, Hispanization, 64.
It was assumed that the Indians retained their natural rights and that their cultures and social organisations conformed sufficiently to natural law to merit support and not merely toleration from the Spanish administration. The participants in the Synod of Manila in 1582 recognised the validity of existing political and social divisions and respected the freedom of the local peoples to continue their social life much as they had before Spanish 'pacification'.

The Spanish religious started with two assumptions, however, which made this tolerance less than complete. The religious life of the Filipinos it was assumed was grounded in paganism and therefore under the power of the devil. The Spaniards' task was to destroy this paganism in order to liberate the Filipinos from their enslavement to the devil and thus lead them to salvation. Secondly, Spanish observers, religious and secular, gave much attention to the system of debt peonage based on usury, a system of social division which caused serious disquiet among Spanish priests and officials. Yet, even on the latter issue, the Spanish government and the religious orders tolerated slaveholding among the Filipinos on the principle that native customs of long standing which were not contrary to the natural law should not be suppressed outright. Spaniards, however, were not justified in enslaving Filipinos.

55 Ibid.

56 De la Costa, Jesuits, 22ff; J. Gayo Aragón, O.P., 'The Controversy over Justification of Spanish Rule in the Philippines', op. cit., 11. 'Pacification' replaced the term 'conquest' by royal order in 1573.

57 Phelan, Hispanization, 25.

58 De la Costa, Jesuits, 355. The Jesuits did not attempt to abolish debt slavery in their missions but attempted to discourage it by offering interest free loans; ibid., 157-58.
The question of what could and could not be tolerated in existing indigenous religious beliefs and practices was a more difficult one because it raised the issues of heresy, idolatry, blasphemy and satanism. Despite their ignorance of the gospel before the arrival of the missionaries and the presence of certain barbarous customs, including alleged sexual licence, the natives were not regarded by the Spanish clergy as entirely possessed by the devil.\textsuperscript{59} On the contrary, it was assumed that the rapidity of the spiritual conquest of the islands had been prepared by the prevenient workings of divine grace. Thus, Bishop Salazar in his first pastoral letter saw the readiness of the natives to accept Christianity despite the abuses committed against them as evidence of the operation of grace working not through miracles or good example but simply through the word of God.\textsuperscript{60} Alonso Sanchez, the Jesuit who played such an important role in the Synod as its adviser, in a personal memorandum presented to Philip II in December, 1587, described the Filipinos as peaceable once subjugated:

They are of a happy disposition, candid, loyal, simple, and sociable. They love to speak our language, even if they can only manage a few words. They have a lively intelligence and easily learn Christian doctrine and how to read and write in our alphabet; most of them read and write in their own.\textsuperscript{61}

Another Jesuit, Pedro Chirino, writing some years later also recorded the willingness of the Filipinos to respond to the light of the gospel once exposed to it as evidence that despite their idolatry they deserved

\textsuperscript{59} For Spanish attitudes to Filipino sexual customs see Chirino, op. cit., 319-22 (who attributes instances of polygamy to the 'execrable' influence of the Muslims); Morga, 277; and Phelan, Hispanization, 64.

\textsuperscript{60} De la Costa, Jesuits, 22.

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 89.
pity and not condemnation as 'those who blind in their darkness love and esteem the light yet know not how to open their eyes to it'. Chirino, in common with his contemporaries, saw many good values in native culture. The Tagalog language, he believed, possessed each of the principal virtues of Hebrew, Greek, Latin and Spanish being subtle, refined, elegant and courteous. Like their language, the Filipinos were also cultured, affectionate and graceful.\textsuperscript{62} The Synod of 1582 recognised the worth of Tagalog culture as well as the practical limitations of mission work when it adopted a resolution requiring the missionaries to preach the gospel in the vernacular instead of making the natives first learn Spanish, a policy which also applied to the local languages of the other linguistic regions of the islands.\textsuperscript{63}

The resolution of the Synod of 1582 was all the more significant understood in the context of the linguistic controversy which had pre-occupied the crown and the religious orders from the middle of the sixteenth century. The initial policy of the friars in Mexico was to preach the faith in the local language, a decision they regarded as essential to the effective evangelisation of the Indians.\textsuperscript{64} When Philip II succeeded Charles V he introduced a new policy which declared that to

\textsuperscript{62} Pedro Chirino, S.J., The Philippines in 1600 (Manila, 1969), 296; 274-79. He also argued that the inhabitants of Cebú held an image of the Holy Child in reverence partly because of its novelty and its associations with Magellan's expedition, but also because 'the Lord Himself inspired [reverence] in them'; 235. Echoing Salazar, Sánchez and Chirino, the layman de Morga observed that it was the 'good understanding' of the natives which enabled them to respond well to the faith and recognise the errors of heathenism.

\textsuperscript{63} A.M. Molina, The Philippines Through the Centuries (Manila, 1960), 85; Quinton M. Garcia, 'By the Sword ... or by the Cross?', op. cit., 26.

\textsuperscript{64} Ricard, op. cit., 46.
be Christianised the Indians had also to be Hispanicised and the minimum essential for this was the instruction of the natives in the Spanish language. A royal cedula of 1550 ordered the friars to teach Spanish so that the Indians could acquire 'our Castilian social polity and our good customs'. The linguistic controversy was also a fundamental philosophical conflict: was it necessary for the Indians to become Europeans in their culture for them to be Christians? Most of the friars argued that it was not necessary to speak Spanish to be understood by God and supported Christian universalism against the Spanish imperialism of the crown. In any case, the physical problems of teaching a new language to the Indians, they claimed, were too great for the new policy to succeed. In the Philippines, royal policy was to support the missionaries in their compilation of grammars and catechisms in the local languages and to instruct the faithful in them. This had the important consequence of deflecting the impact of Hispanic culture making the acculturation process indirect and less destructive. It also encouraged the absorption of new values and ideas into an existing structure of values and ideas preserved in pre-Hispanic languages, thus confirming the process by which Spanish Catholicism was 'Philippinized' by its converts. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the crown attempted belatedly to promote the teaching of Spanish in an effort to Hispanicise as well as Christianise the Filipinos, reflecting a growing conviction that the local languages were not capable of transmitting the

65 Ibid., 87.
66 Ibid., 88.
67 Phelan, Hispanization, Chapter VI.
mysteries of the Catholic creed and that idolatries and superstitions would persist until the natives abandoned the vocabulary of their pagan past. Nevertheless, in the Philippines in contrast to much of Spanish America, where larger criollo and mestizo populations eventually confirmed the popularity of Spanish, most Filipinos remained monolingual retaining the language and therefore much of the culture of the pre-Hispanic past.

The missionaries were not entirely comfortable, however, with the vernacular as the language of Catholic dogma. The problem was how to translate notions into the local languages which could not be expressed by indigenous concepts. The danger of adapting existing words to new ideas such as the Trinity, Holy Ghost, Redemption, Sin, Grace and so on was that the Christian faith would be polluted by the pagan connotations contained in the native terms. The result was a compromise. To discourage converts from confusing Christian with pagan religious beliefs the key concepts of Christianity were not translated into the vernacular. In the Doctrina of 1593 the Spanish terms for God, Trinity, Holy Ghost, Virgin Mary, Pope, grace, sin, cross, hell, church, Sunday and the names of the sacraments were retained. Sometimes the Latin term was used and Latin forms of the major prayers and the oraciones (sacred formulae containing petitions to the saints, etc.) became part of folk religious

68 Ibid., 131
69 Ibid., 158.
70 Ricard, op. cit., 55; Phelan, Hispanization, 58.
71 Phelan, Hispanization, 58 and n.6, 185. See also Ricard, op. cit., 55-57.
culture even in cults outside Catholic orthodoxy.  

The attitude of the first generation of missionaries in the Philippines was one of enthusiasm and dedication and the period between 1565 and 1609, when the Dutch war imposed new strains on the colony, was, in Phelan's view, the 'golden age' of the missionary enterprise.

The writings of the first missionaries reflect an optimism in the capacity of the Indians to respond to the gospel and to adapt their good customs to Christian civilisation. The evangelisation of the islands was understood by the Spanish religious as a means of protecting the rights and dignity of the Filipinos against imperialist and colonialist abuses as well as the more primary task of bringing them salvation. Despite an ambivalence regarding the paganism and satanism of indigenous religious beliefs, the missionaries showed themselves adaptable and tolerant in their policies and willing to respect a great deal of existing custom and values. In this they revealed the influence of the debates in Spain and the experience of the missions in New Spain in the decades leading up to the colonisation of the Philippines. Already, in the sixteenth century, the Philippine missionaries based their conception of their role on the assumption that the peoples of the islands, however given up to idolatry, were not totally in error and in sin for their cultures revealed an inspiration toward goodness and a predisposition towards the light of the

---

72 See Prospero R. Covar, 'General Characterization of Contemporary Religious Movements in the Philippines', Asian Studies, XIII, No. 2, August, 1975, 79-91 for examples of these oraciones in twentieth century cults. The Latin has been orally transmitted through the centuries losing its sense but retaining a magical potency. For a scathing comment on these Latin incantations see Pardo de Tavera, 'Legacy of Ignorantism', op. cit., 17.

73 Phelan, Hispanization, 70.
gospel. Thus, in a period when rival and more hostile theories of Indian culture and character found supporters in Spain and the Americas the Filipinos were fortunate to be evangelised by proponents of the benign tradition. But, while the Spanish regulars consciously incorporated much of existing custom and belief into the new religion they also vigorously destroyed every obvious manifestation of pagan practices, assuming that what was 'pagan' could be detached from those elements in the indigenous cultures which conformed to natural law and Christian morality. In practice, such a separation was only possible at the superficial level of overt ritual and religious symbolism. If the early missionaries were naive in their resolution of this dilemma by being content with the substitution of Christian rituals and symbols for pagan while ignoring the survival of pre-Christian values and ideas, this at least averted a destructive collision between the two cultures.

It has been argued that, in the seventeenth century, later generations of missionaries, coming to an established mission and being required to consolidate rather than establish the faith, suffered a lowering of morale, a process apparent among the Augustinians even as early as the 1590s. The zeal of the first generation gave way to the routine of regular parish work in the areas of conversion and was replaced sometimes by apathy and discouragement or complacency. At the same time, the religious renaissance in Spain which had made the evangelisation of the

---

74 For a discussion of principal missionary attitudes towards pagan civilisations and religions see Ricard, op. cit., 284-85. In the Philippines the missionaries took what they could from pagan customs and brought it into the Christian plan, a policy which became more favoured in other Catholic missions much later.

75 Phelan, Hispanization, 70.
New World possible and had generated the enthusiasm and dedication of the first missionaries had settled into a conservatism which was to distinguish Spanish Catholicism from the late sixteenth century onwards. Lastly, the demands of an established mission church and the limitations and constrictions of colonial rule on religious initiatives and independence meant that the vigour of the early period inevitably declined. The structures of the colonial church were tightly bound to the interests of Spanish rule and the claims of the Patronato; the values and thought of the religious orders as well, while claiming formal continuity with the sixteenth century past, more and more conformed to the imperialist and authoritarian mould of Spanish colonial rule.

The sixteenth century religious inheritance provided one of the main supports of continuity in the Philippine orders' perception of their task, with the qualifications that the original tradition was itself complex and contradictory and that the experience of colonial rule and changes in Spain and the empire gradually transformed Spanish Catholic thought although the formal theological and legal uniformity of doctrine and social philosophy was maintained. There were other basic continuities in the friar position, however, possibly even more fundamental than the sixteenth century inheritance. The most essential element in the friars' perception of their role was the import of their ordination as priests and the vows they made as religious. It was their priestly and religious character which provided the essential definition of their individual and corporate personality. As Catholic missionaries, the friars acknowledged one primary goal which gave direction to their efforts and provided them with what was in their terms an unassailable justification for their presence in the islands and their deepening involvement in colonial rule. It was their task to bring souls into the Kingdom of God.
and to save them from damnation by preaching the faith and administering the sacraments, particularly the essential sacrament of baptism. It was the strength and weakness of the Spanish missionaries in the Philippines that they saw their evangelical work in straightforward and practical terms however sublime the spiritual goal. The work of extending the Kingdom of God could be achieved by means which were specific, direct, and unambiguous. Once the indio had accepted baptism he was a full member of the church open to the workings of grace and able to avail himself of the other sacraments to ensure his salvation. The essential act of salvation had been performed. The missionaries did not preach that the act of baptism automatically and mechanically transformed the convert into a true believer and there were divisions within the orders and between them on the degree of instruction and preparation necessary for the convert to properly assent to the sacrament, but it was still believed that the act of baptism could be accompanied by miraculous consequences such as the cure of illness.  

The convert was required to make a sincere act of repentance and to understand the basic teachings of the Christian faith but the missionaries generally assumed this could be achieved by instruction in only an essential minimum of dogmatic Catholic teaching.

Throughout the Spanish period this teaching followed a set form. The first Philippine catechism, the Tagalog Doctrina adopted by the Synod of Manila in 1593, included the Pater Noster, the Ave Maria, the

---

Credo, the Salve Maria, the fourteen articles of the Faith, the seven sacraments, the seven capital sins, the fourteen works of mercy, the Ten Commandments, the five commandments of the Church and the act of general confession. The catechism proper consisted of thirty-three questions and answers. Converts, both adults and children, were required to learn much of this by heart and instruction tended to be oral and communal rather than individual. The 1593 Doctrina was superceded by Philippine adaptations of the later Dottrina Cristiana compiled by the Jesuit, Robert Cardinal Bellarmine, in 1597, and these became the standard works for instruction in the faith. In the seventeenth century the organisation and supervision of catechismal instruction was shared increasingly with fiscales who acted as lay assistants to the clergy and were responsible for maintaining the faithful in their religious duties. The Spanish religious were never entirely satisfied with the extent of their converts' understanding of the Christian faith and it was assumed, even after three centuries of mission work, that the Indian if left to himself was always on the verge, as Archbishop Nozaleda expressed it, of 'hieing back to the woods' and returning to paganism. Nevertheless, the missionary was psychologically sustained by the conviction that with baptism he had performed his essential evangelical duty by

77 De la Costa, Jesuits, 141; Phelan, Hispanization, 57; Ricard, op.cit., 83-108.

78 Phelan, ibid., 57-58. The standardisation and use of catechisms was encouraged by the Council of Trent. A Catechismus Romanus, issued in 1566, provided the basic model for all catechisms up to the 20th century; 'Thomism', New Catholic Encyclopedia, XIV, 134.

79 Testimony in 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', 100. For details of 17th century doubts on the depth of evangelisation see Phelan, Hispanization, 59.
bringing the convert into the church and into direct communion with Christ. By this act he felt that years of training and sacrifice and isolation from Spain were made worthwhile and justified his labour beyond question. At the same time the missionary was fulfilling his own vocation and working for his personal salvation while labouring for new souls. Even if the peoples with whom he worked rejected his message or failed to adopt Christian behaviour as he defined it, he was vindicated in the sight of God. Whatever the apparent failures of his mission, God's plan for the world would inevitably triumph and by preaching the gospel and administering the sacraments the missionary played his part in the overall design. Achievement could be measured, as it was, in tables setting out statistics of baptisms, confirmations, confessions and marriages. The danger was that the missionary could be content to limit his mission to an external, superficial routine.

The Spanish missionary was also sustained by his essential role in the liturgical and ritual life of the local church. The celebration of the Eucharist was the focus of his sacramental and liturgical functions and involved him directly in the communal life of his parishioners. Popular Philippine Catholicism, like that in Spain, included rich and diverse rituals and pageantry linking communal life to the annual ritual pattern of the church year. In addition to the great religious occasions of Christmas and Easter, when liturgy and folk Catholic rituals combined to

80 The definition of the efficacy of the sacraments by the Council of Trent furthered the emphasis on practical expressions of supernatural processes. See Kidd, op. cit., 67-68; and Lamb, op. cit., 526-27.

81 Phelan, op. cit., 71.
pay homage to the Holy Family and to observe the Crucifixion and Resurrection, the priest participated in the celebration of the feast day of the community's patron saint and in other special days of observance in the church year. To this annual pattern was added the weekly cycle of the Sunday Mass and the daily ritual, such as the public singing of the Rosary, popular in many communities. The Jesuits, for instance, encouraged the people in their missions to come together to sing the catechism and popular prayers as a daily, communal ritual:

The custom arose in the villages of the mission of people gathering in the late afternoons around the wooden cross erected by the missionaries in each village and singing not only the set words of the catechism but hymns and cadenced prayers of their own composition based on what they had heard in church. The melodies used must have been those of the awit, employed in love songs and lullabies, simple tunes to which each one fitted his or her own verses as the spirit moved.82

Priests were sometimes involved in popular mission revivals such as those conducted by the Jesuit Sanvitores in a number of Tagalog parishes where dramatic sermons, processions and public acts of contrition recalled the folk Catholicism of the Middle Ages.83

The attitude of the orders to the religious culture of the islands at the time of colonisation was theoretically straightforward but in practice considerable accommodation between the old and the new religions was possible. According to the militant tradition discussed in the previous chapter, the missionaries saw themselves as soldiers of Christ

82 De la Costa, Jesuits, 157.
83 Ibid., 470-71.
"waging with spiritual weapons a war to overthrow the devil's tyranny" in the pagan world. The evangelisation of the Philippines was a 'spiritual conquest' by which the entirely new Christian religion would supplant the existing paganism of the indios. The conquest was given practical expression in the enthusiastic destruction of pagan idols. Nevertheless, while waging war on the 'false heathen religions, idolatries and superstitions' of the Indians, the Spanish missionaries actually tolerated much of the existing religious culture. Where the existing practice was offensive to Spanish Catholic standards, the friars attempted to replace it with a Christian practice. Elements of the pre-Hispanic religion which were not seen as clearly blasphemous or idolatrous were tacitly incorporated into the new faith, partly because the Spanish clergy could not exercise sufficient control over the process of Christianisation to attack the entire existing system of beliefs and partly because the missionaries conceded some value to native culture.

84 Phelan, ibid., 53. Phelan follows Ricard here who argued that in Mexico the missionaries insisted on presenting Christianity as something entirely new 'which meant an absolute and complete rupture with the whole past'; op. cit., 35.

85 Chirino, op. cit., 296. The Jesuit annual letter of 1610 gives another example of the missionaries' belief that the devil gained control of the natives, in this case in Bohol, by the cult of ancestor spirit worship; de la Costa, Jesuits, 313.

86 Phelan, op. cit., 79; de la Costa, ibid., 158; Ricard, op. cit., 37.

87 Chirino unconsciously illustrates the transference of pagan to folk Catholic practices when he writes of how the devil in Taytay kept control of a pagan priest by assuming a new identity as 'an angel of light', and of how a man possessed by demons was at peace only while wearing an Agnus Dei relic (which he probably regarded as an antinganting); op. cit., 376-79.
Because of their experience of folk Catholicism in Spain, the Spanish missionaries were able to accept aspects of Filipino popular religious culture after conversion which were far different in spirit from the scholasticism and intellectualism of the theological seminaries. In Spain in the sixteenth century, despite the watchfulness of the Inquisition, popular Catholicism was rich and undisciplined and attracted the kind of criticisms later made against Philippine folk Catholicism. Popular rituals and devotions eased the transition from paganism to Christianity. In the earlier period of evangelisation, as John Leddy Phelan has noted, the suppression of outward pagan rituals did not mean the eradication of the beliefs they expressed and, under a sometimes superficial Christianity, preconquest beliefs and practices survived. Gradually, however, the syncretic mixture of pagan and Christian beliefs gave way to a folk Catholicism which was both Christian and genuinely indigenous, tolerated if not entirely controlled by the clergy. In areas further from continuous Spanish contact this process was incomplete and in the nineteenth century folk religious movements were still appearing, even in Central Luzon, which deviated far enough from acceptable folk Catholicism to be condemned as reversions to paganism. While the line was difficult to draw between folk Catholic beliefs and superstition, in the Philippines as in Spain, and while the missionaries were suspicious

88 See Henry Charles Lea, A History of the Inquisition of Spain, IV (New York, 1966), 502-504, for examples of Spanish folk Catholicism in this period and contemporary criticism.

89 Phelan, Hispanization, 79-80.

90 For examples, the Cofradía de San José of 1841 and the Guardias de Honor in the 1890s; Sturtevant, Popular Uprisings, 96ff.
throughout the Spanish period that the Indians were always liable to
degenerate into 'idolatry and fetishism', the clergy actually used
popular religious culture even in some of its more extravagant forms
to maintain mass involvement in the Philippine Church.  

Actually, the degree of acculturation varied with the region and
the attitude of local peoples to the missionary. The evidence of nine­
teenth century folk religious movements such as the Cofradía de San José
and the Guardias de Honor suggests that the Filipino populations of those
provinces most affected by constant contact with Spanish clergy were
profoundly affected by central Christian ideas such as that of the Holy
Family and the Passion. Yet, even movements which began as officially
sanctioned lay fraternities could move into direct opposition to the
Spanish clergy and the religious orthodoxy they represented. The
religious revolts discussed by David Sturtevant show a progression from
the seventeenth to the nineteenth century from largely nativistic move­
ments led by babailanes (mediums) or catalonans (mediums) of the outlawed
paganism to the Guardias of the 1870s onwards which began as sodalities
under the direction of the Dominicans and then quickly acquired non-
Christian rites and beliefs. Popular religious culture in the Philippines
under Spain covered the spectrum from orthodox folk Catholicism expressed
in church festivals and liturgy, devotions to the Virgin and the saints,
pilgrimages, penance and other practices, through syncretic and semi-pagan

See Pardo de Tavera's attack on the orders' encouragement of folk
Catholicism in his 'The Legacy of Ignorantism', 14ff.

See Chapter III.

David R. Sturtevant, Popular Uprisings, 97-99.
religious cults to revitalist and nativist movements which borrowed perhaps a few important concepts and images from Christianity but had a dynamic and a world-view essentially pre-Christian in origin.

This complex religious culture, as Reynaldo Ileto has demonstrated, was important in determining popular perceptions of the revolution of 1896, at least in the Tagalog regions, and it will be examined more fully in the following chapter. It should be pointed out here, however, that the world-view of the Spanish missionary was also affected by the religious culture of the Filipino laity. Its more blatantly non-Christian manifestations confirmed his fears of Indian idolatry and kept alive the demonology which remained part of the thinking of the Spanish clergy in their response to the Philippines from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. It was also inevitable that the 'unofficial' values and beliefs of his parishioners should limit and partly define the way the priest carried out his mission. As in Mexico, the religious influence of the priest was reinterpreted in terms of the customs and expectations of the indigenous culture. The church and even more such lay organisations as the cofradías adjusted to the needs and values of the Indian and in the process the religious culture of the missionary himself could be influenced. 94

What is obvious is that the popular rituals and devotions of Spanish-Philippine Catholicism, especially those devoted to the Virgin Mary and to the Saints, formed an important part of the religious culture of the friars as well as their converts. The Spanish clergy and the Filipino laity shared an enthusiasm for such devotions as the annual

94 See Francis Brooks, op. cit., 38.
pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady of Peace and Happy Journeys at Antipolo. The parish church was the centre of popular traditions as well as the formal rituals of the church and the parish priest participated in popular folk rituals although his interpretation of them may have differed from that of his parishioners. The religion brought to the Philippines by the orders was dogmatic and highly articulated and marked by a concern for orthodoxy and exact teaching but it also carried with it substrata of myths, popular beliefs and rituals and a complex cultural legacy of Medieval Christianity and folk Spanish traditions. Spanish Christianity shared a basic orientation with existing indigenous religious beliefs in the islands in that both religious traditions assumed that the visible world was governed by an invisible, supernatural order which intervened in human affairs through intermediaries whose intercession could be benevolent or malign. Belief in the magical intervention of spirits, in miracles and in supernatural explanations for natural phenomena expressed in folk cults in areas only superficially Hispanicised found expression in folk Catholic practices tolerated and sometimes encouraged where the clergy had greater influence over the religious life of the people.

As priests, the Spanish missionaries found psychological reassurance in the claims of the Roman Catholic Church to be the only true church, divinely founded by Christ, uniquely possessed of spiritual authority

95 De la Costa, Jesuits, 531. For parallel popular devotions in Spanish America see Haring, op. cit., 184; Bolton, op. cit., 56-57; and Ricard, 187-93.

96 See Phelan, Hispanization, 79 et passim.
through the apostolic succession exercised by the pope as successor to Peter, the shepherd under Christ of all the faithful. The clergy, as the inheritors of the apostolic ministry, were the chosen agents of God to maintain the true doctrine of the faith, celebrate the sacraments and advance the cause of the Church Militant. They shared in the authority of Christ. The missionary was a man set apart from others possessing authority as a minister of a church distinct from the state and superior to it. The characteristic conception of the church held by the Spanish missionaries was that derived from the medieval model of 'Unam Sanctam' where the church was seen as an autonomous and sovereign society, with rights superior to that of the state and teaching an evangelical law greater though not necessarily opposed to natural or civil law. The church ultimately could only be judged by God, not by man or human government, and its priests in that they exercised its divine authority were similarly beyond the final judgement of the temporal authorities. Despite the growing regalism and nationalism implicit in the Spanish church's support of the Patronato, the clergy retained a full sense of that superior authority claimed by Boniface VIII on behalf of the medieval church: both the temporal and the spiritual orders were in the power of Peter and his successors, the temporal power to be administered on behalf of the church 'by kings and captains but at the will and by the permission of the priest'. Disobedience towards the hierarchy

97 I have used Bishop Alcocer's Pastoral Letter 'About the Catholic Unity' (Manila, 1902) as the source for this brief summary of Catholic teaching on the authority and powers of the priesthood.

was equivalent to disobedience against God.\textsuperscript{99} We have already stressed how the \textit{reconquista} experience exaggerated militant and exclusive elements in the Spanish Catholic tradition, picturing the relations between believers and non-believers in terms of a crusade or a war between the armies of Christ and those of the devil. This intolerant strain in Catholic thought remained, although tempered by contrary universalist and humanitarian values and it provided the Spanish missionaries in the Philippines with an aggressive confidence that was reflected in their battles with hostile officials, Muslim raiders, and Dutch and English invaders. It was a militant tradition which found expression in the eventual struggle with reform and revolution and in the condemnations of the \textit{Iglesia Filipina Independiente} and American Protestantism.

It may be useful in summarising the sixteenth century legacy to divide the various perceptions of the priest's authority and function according to Victor Turner's theory of structural and anti-structural oppositions in social institutions.\textsuperscript{100} The Spanish missionary defined his role according to a set of structural notions about the cosmos, the proper ordering of human society and the nature of man. Drawing on medieval models of the cosmos which conceived of heaven, earth and hell as divided into hierarchies, he understood authority as travelling downwards from God through Jesus Christ to the choirs of angels and archangels to man, from pope to bishops to priests to laity, with hell divided into its own hierarchies ruled by the Prince of Darkness.

\textsuperscript{99} See Alcocer, op. cit., 7; 18; 22; 51.

\textsuperscript{100} Victor Turner, \textit{The Ritual Process} (Harmondsworth, 1969).
The emphasis in human affairs was on the spiritual and temporal authority of the church whose members were obliged to 'submit to [its] ecclesiastical authorities and laws', accepting their place in a hierarchical unity where relations were between superior and inferiors. The tendency was for the clergy to emphasise their dominium or potestas (authority to command) rather than their ministerium (duty to serve).

The authority of the priest, defined in mystical and supernatural terms as different from and superior to that of the layman was also conceived as being a temporal authority. The church was conceived as largely the ecclesiastical institution made up of the clergy with the laity somehow 'below' their priests. This hierarchical and authoritarian understanding of the relations between clergy and laity was complemented by the exclusive definition of the church as

\[
\text{The terrestrial Kingdom of Jesus Christ ... No one can enter His Heavenly Kingdom without having been His subject in this world. The Holy Father is the head of the Church and the Kings and Emperor owe him obedience.}\]

This ecclesiocentric view of the church ultimately derived from the justification of hierarchical authority made in the church of the second century and furthered by the monarchical organisation of the church during the medieval period, but in the Spanish Catholic tradition it assumed a

101 Alcocer, op. cit., 5-8.

102 I have borrowed these terms from Yves Congar's discussion of Catholic thought on authority in his Power and Poverty in the Church, trans. Jennifer Nicholson (London, 1964).

103 Fray Bernardino Sahagun, Platicus, Book I (the first sermons preached in Mexico in the early sixteenth century); Ricard, op. cit., 87.
The clergy in Spain in common with the other clergies of Europe invested the institution and its structures with religious significance as divinely ordained. Their charismatic authority was reinforced by their role as custodians of this sacred and eternal institution. In the theocratic Spanish tradition this identification of the institutional church as a perfect society hierarchically organised according to the divine plan became confused with social structures outside the church itself. The Spanish regulars of the revolutionary period saw themselves as fighting for the survival of the church when actually they were also defending the institutions of Spanish colonialism.

In a colonial situation the ecclesiastical and hierarchical definition of the church was further exaggerated for reasons that have already been suggested. The perception of the indio as a child dependent upon his Spanish 'father' was reinforced by the ecclesiastical assumption that as a layman he was dependent upon the priest. The dominant-dependent relationship inherent in colonial rule confirmed the gulf between Spaniard and Filipino in both senses. Yet there was a basic dilemma for the Spanish missionary in this unequal relationship with his flock, not simply as both a servant of God and a servant of empire, but as a fellow member of a universal community, a belief that was at the centre of

In the second century church salvation came to be associated with the special saving powers of the clergy who passed their spiritual authority on to their successors, creating a priestly 'caste' distinct from the laity. The hierarchy of pope and monarchical bishops was defended as early as 110 A.D. by Bishop Ignatius of Antioch as a 'likeness to the heavenly hierarchy of God, Christ and the Apostles'; Hans Conzelmann, *History of Primitive Christianity* (London, 1973), 26-27.
Catholic teaching and which had found articulate spokesmen in the Spanish religious who defended the Indian in the sixteenth century debates. The emphasis on dominium, hierarchy and authority conflicted with the call for agape, or selfless love, expressed through humble service, a call made explicit in the vows and rules of the missionary orders and repeated in the church's liturgy and scripture. The mission was essentially a mission of love rather than law or conquest. Despite their preoccupation with authority the Spanish regulars in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were not unmindful of the universal character of their own religion, a universality based on the premise that all men are created equal in the image of God, endowed with a common origin and a common end. It was in the service of this ideal that the religious went to the Philippines in the first place. Catholic equalitarianism and universalism, however, were essentially otherworldly. All men were created equal in the sight of God but certainly not in the sight of their fellow men. 105

As the debates in Spain revealed, there were leading theologians in the sixteenth century prepared to argue that Indians and Spaniards should be regarded as equals in this world as well as in the next, but, as Phelan concludes, the idea that inequalities of wealth, status, and intelligence were 'natural' and part of the divine plan became a characteristic feature of the colonial mentality. In the Middle Ages such inequalities were assumed to exist between individuals; in the Philippines as in the rest of the empire from the seventeenth century onwards they were increasingly applied to whole races, and 'few Spanish religious in the Philippines could discard this colonialist notion that subject peoples were congenitally inferior'. 106 Their subjection tended to be interpreted

105 Phelan, Hispanization, 87.
106 Ibid., 88
as proof of their imperfect and sinful nature or else explained away as part of the nature of things in a world not yet ready for the Second Coming. 107

Nevertheless, the 'anti-structural' and 'liminal' elements in Spanish Catholicism in the Philippines remained potent as a kind of counter-tradition to the dominant emphasis on hierarchical authority, obedience, the sanctity of institutions and structures and the superiority of priest and Spaniard to layman and indio. But while the counter-tradition could find expression in individual acts of charity, in liturgy, and in concern for the general welfare of the colonised, the authoritarian mentality suited the process of consolidation and institutionalisation of the church from the seventeenth century onwards. 108

The structures of the colonial church dominated the missionaries who supposedly controlled them. With each generation of religious the weight of the ecclesiastical inheritance and the patterns of assumptions and values embodied in it became more difficult to move.

It is not possible, within the scope of this study, to trace in full detail the intellectual and political movements which, in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, significantly modified the complex of values and ideas which the religious orders brought with them to the Philippines in the first century of the mission. It is possible to divide the long period of Spanish rule in the islands in terms of its

107 Ibid. Phelan traces these rationalisations from the Middle Ages through Dante's justification of modern imperialism to Sepulveda.

108 See Peter Berger's suggestion that the growth of legalist and authoritarian patterns of thought in churches is a consequence of their consolidation as institutions; 'The Sociological Study of Sectarianism', Social Research, XXI, No. 4, 1954, 467-85; and A Sociology of Religion (London, 1973), 92-93.
religious history in the following way: the first period of evangelisation from 1565 to 1609, including the establishment of the five major orders and the Synod of Manila; the period of consolidation and missionary expansion between 1609 and the mid-eighteenth century; the period of attempted secularisation and the regalist policies of the Bourbons from the 1750's into the early nineteenth century; and the period from 1826 to the end of the Spanish period when the secularisation policy was reversed and the religious orders recovered almost complete control of the Philippine Church. It is the last period which is of particular relevance to the religious issues raised by the revolution but, although change in the nineteenth century had a more obviously dramatic impact on the attitudes and thinking of the orders, it was a cumulative process begun much earlier. We have looked in detail at the sixteenth century world-view of the orders because much of it survived into the nineteenth century and the continuity of basic assumptions and values is clear. But by testing late nineteenth century Spanish Catholic thinking in the Philippines with that of the first period of evangelisation, the shifts in emphasis and concern also become clear.

Because the regular clergy were almost all Spaniards in the Philippines it is the intellectual and political movements in Spanish religious life, affected in turn by developments in the rest of European Catholicism, which determined, in combination with the colonial experience

109 The situation in the Philippines after 1750 contrasts with that in the Spanish American colonies where the regalist policies of the crown largely succeeded in removing the regulars from most of the Indian parishes and where the secular clergies emerged as a much stronger influence within the colonial churches; Tibesar, op. cit., 454.
itself, the gradual modification of the friar world-view. In the
seventeenth century, Phelan suggests, change in the Philippine mission
and in the attitudes held by the regulars was a consequence more of the
routine of missionary work and a general decline in zeal rather than in
any significant rethinking of the theological and philosophical bases
of the missionary enterprise.\footnote{Phelan, \textit{Hispanization}, 70-71}
In the Philippines, as in Spanish America, the influence of the \textit{Patronato Real} confirmed the decline of
the original enthusiasm for building a new Christian world on new
principles; the friar became a colonist bound to Spanish rule at the
same time as his role changed from a religious pioneer to a pastor.\footnote{Tibesar, op. cit., 454-55.}\footnote{M. Gongora, 'Latin America, Church and Enlightenment in', \textit{New Catholic Encyclopedia}, VIII, 440.}

In the eighteenth century, however, the orders were confronted in Spain
with the challenge of the Enlightenment and the rationalist, egalitarian,
liberal, republican, democratic and revolutionary movements which it
encouraged. One response was for an influential minority of the Spanish
clergy to adapt the principles of the Enlightenment to the church. In
Spain and the colonies, it was this educated elite which first encouraged
interest in the new philosophical and scientific ideas.\footnote{In particular, the Jesuits in the years immediately before their
expulsion from the Spanish territories introduced seventeenth century
secular philosophical systems, Newtonian physics and the rules of historical
criticism into their schools and colleges. In the colonies they intro-
duced new curricula derived from reformed courses of study adopted in

In particular, the Jesuits in the years immediately before their
expulsion from the Spanish territories introduced seventeenth century
secular philosophical systems, Newtonian physics and the rules of historical
criticism into their schools and colleges. In the colonies they intro-
duced new curricula derived from reformed courses of study adopted in
Spain, adding Spanish to Latin, eclectic philosophy in addition and in competition with traditional Scholastic Aristotelianism, modern physics and mathematics, Spanish law and modern international law to Roman and natural law, and new emphases on biblical studies, church history and positive theology in ecclesiastical studies. In the Philippines, as early as 1690, Antonio Jaramillo, a former rector of the College of Manila, was advocating changes to the curriculum in the college, petitioning the Jesuit general to modernise the Ratio Studiorum to make it more practical and relevant to Philippine conditions, dealing with matters such as trade and the duties of colonial officials as well as with experience in moral science. The Jesuits recruited members in the early eighteenth century from Germany, France and Italy as well as Spain for their Philippine province, bringing with them the new ideas gaining circulation outside Spain and introducing the techniques and attitudes of contemporary science. On their return to the Philippines in 1859 the Jesuits resumed their educational work, taking over the Escuela Municipal de Manila which became known as the Ateneo Municipal in 1865. The second general of the restored Society had already revised the Ratio Studiorum in 1832 to bring it up to date with modern needs, and the renewed educational work of the Jesuits in the Philippines

113 Ibid.

114 De la Costa, Jesuits, 506. The traditional subjects were arts, grammar, and theology. The Ratio studiorum Societatis Iesu was promulgated by Aquaviva in 1599; ibid., 198; 563-66. The core of the arts course was Aristotelian philosophy as interpreted by Thomas Aquinas. Instruction was in Latin.

115 Ibid., 552-58.

116 Hollis, op. cit., 191.
reflected this reform. In the 1890s, the arts graduates of the Ateneo, taking courses in the revised curriculum of 1894, were offered religion, history, Spanish, music, drawing, physical education, agriculture, ethics, law, natural science, commerce, industry as well as the more traditional subjects of poetry, rhetoric and philosophy.\footnote{117}

As the eighteenth century progressed, the divisions between those members of the colonial clergy who attempted to apply the new ideas of the Philosophes to established Spanish Catholic forms, and those who opposed them as dangerous and heretical, widened. The colonial clergy were seriously split on almost every aspect of the Enlightenment with a progressive minority responsive to developments in philosophy, science, economics and politics, a larger minority opposed to these developments and loyal to traditional scholasticism, and a majority passively accepting the status quo.\footnote{118} The contest between traditional and new thought, in the Philippines as in Spain and Spanish America, was complicated by the contemporary eighteenth century contest between regalists and the defenders of the church's independence. Regalist supporters of the absolute claims of the Bourbon monarchy tended to borrow those elements in Enlightenment thought which neutralised the influence of canon lawyers arguing the case for the spiritual autonomy of the Spanish Church.\footnote{119}


\footnote{119} Carr, Spain, 76.
In the colonies, regalist bishops appealed to the crown in their campaign to assert episcopal authority over the religious orders, endorsing the royal policy of secularising the parishes of the overseas churches and thus contributing to an effort to alter the basic composition of the colonial clergy. In the Philippines, this effort failed but for more than half a century (1774-1826), the crown and its allies among the bishops were agents of change challenging the position of the religious orders and the vision of the Philippine Church they supported. The battle lines in the intellectual and theological struggles of the second half of the eighteenth century were confused by the fact that regalist bishops could be as hostile to the clerical supporters of the 'Catholic Enlightenment' as the members of the religious orders who most determinedly resisted ecclesiastical reform. After 1790, however, the intellectual struggles within Spain and the empire of the eighteenth century were submerged so far as the religious orders and the upper hierarchy were concerned by the fundamental threat to the integrity of the church posed by the French Revolution.

Central to the world-view within which the regulars condemned the Philippine Revolution was the belief that they and the Catholic truth they defended were the victims of a secret conspiracy ultimately directed by the devil. In this they were by no means unique. Conspiracy theories had proliferated among the European clergy in the eighteenth century in response to the challenges of the Philosophes and movements supporting egalitarian,

rationalist, republican and democratic goals. Long before the French Revolution confirmed the worst fears of those churchmen who believed in the threat of a vast, underground plot to overthrow the church and the social order it endorsed, the papacy had condemned secret societies as a danger to true religion. Above all, freemasonry was denounced as irreligious and depraved and in their attacks against a Masonic conspiracy the Spanish regulars in the Philippines in 1896 could look back to papal condemnations of the Craft as early as the bull *In eminenti* of Clement XII in which all members of the society were excommunicated and the power to absolve them reserved to the pope. Masonry was feared in the eighteenth century because it was secret (and thus threatened the sacrament of confession), because it was thought to be anti-religious, and because of its egalitarian and rationalist philosophy. The French Revolution fed 'the demonology of counter-revolution', as J.M. Roberts calls it, popularising conspiracy theories of a diabolical plot uniting Masons, Philosophes, Protestants, revolutionaries, liberals, democrats, and later, socialists and communists, in a campaign to subvert church and state. The French Revolution itself was explained, in these terms, as a Masonic conspiracy. The Abbé Barreul influenced Catholic thought throughout the nineteenth century with his explanation of the Revolution as an impious conspiracy to 'annihilate the religion of Jesus Christ' planned by Voltaire, d'Alembert, de Volney, and others.


122 Ibid., 135ff. The Illuminati in Germany, who infiltrated Masonry in order to use its organisation for political subversion, gave substance to these fears.
Diderot and Frederick of Prussia, and implemented through their agents, the Masons, Protestants, Jews and Illuminists. After the execution of Louis XVI, Pope Pius VI, in a secret consistory, condemned the 'Calvinists and perverted Philosophes' who had conspired to destroy the monarchy and named Voltaire as the author of the movement in ideas which led to the execution. Barreul popularised Pius VI's denunciation of the 'false slogans of "Liberty" and "Equality"' and religious toleration. The declared enemies of monarchy were also intent on destroying the Catholic religion; a thesis which the programme of dechristianisation after 1793 encouraged. With the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in France in 1814, the league between throne and altar was renewed and the papacy, in the same year, issued a formal prohibition of the Carbonari, by then active in Italy, and linked the revolutionary society with Masonry which was again condemned. In 1821, the bull Ecclesium a Jesu Christo, excommunicated members of the Carbonari but it managed to stage a substantial rising in the papal states in 1831. The papacy accused societies such as the Carbonari of being, if not formally masonic,

123 Ibid., 160ff; 183-84. This was the thesis of the Abbé Lefranc in his work published in 1791, but the most influential thinker in this tradition was the Jesuit, Augustin de Barruel, particularly in his five volume Mémoires pour servir a l'histoire du jacobinisme (1797). See Roberts, 203-13; and Austin Gough; 'The Catholic Church and the French Revolution,', Ph.D. thesis, Adelaide University, 1970, 76-79.


125 Roberts, op. cit., 320.

126 Ibid., 337.
then offshoots of a basically masonic movement to destroy religion. The bull *Ecclesiam a Jesu Christo* gave notice that the church believed political secret societies to be the nineteenth century inheritors of those eighteenth century conspirators responsible for the French Revolution. Four years later, *Quo Graviora* condemned the sects as a whole and stressed that all democratic, republican, masonic and other 'subversive' movements were organically linked. This thesis was again affirmed in two more bulls, *Traditi* (24 May, 1829), and *Qui Pluribus* (9 November, 1846). 127

In Spain, the Church also faced a radical challenge after 1790 as the impact of the French Revolution reached Spanish intellectuals, and again the Spanish Church responded with a conspiratorial explanation of the subsequent political crises which profoundly affected the attitudes of the Spanish religious orders for the rest of the century. 128 Clerical conservatives used the radical threat from popular movements and the demands for reform from intellectuals influenced by the Enlightenment to justify a general attack on liberty of thought through a revived Inquisition. 129 Between 1780 and 1820, the Holy Office heard some 5,000 cases and the denunciations upon which it acted are revealing for the new mentality of fear affecting the Spanish hierarchy in the period of the European revolutions. As Lea points out, the enemy is no longer

127 Ibid., 347.


129 Carr, op. cit., 76-77.
so much outside the church as within it:

    Judaism and Islam and Protestantism no more claim its attention. The Church is no longer threatened by enemies from without; what it has to dread is revolt among its own children. Three fifths of the denunciations are for "propositions" largely among the cultured classes, including a fair proportion of ecclesiastics.

The precise errors contained in these 'propositions' are unspecified but Lea believes they often referred to Jansenist and other movements within the Spanish Church critical of the claims of the Church Militant and the absolutism of the monarchy. To be more accurate, by the end of the eighteenth century, the Spanish bishops and regular clergy were convinced that the enemies of the church had infiltrated the lower clergy and the laity so that they faced a double threat from within and without. Radicals and reformers in Spain in the critical period between 1790 and the promulgation of a Liberal constitution in 1812 were seen by Catholic traditionalists as heretics and traitors because of their sympathy with the French and with anticlerical, rationalist and liberal ideas. The liberals of Cadiz refrained from a frontal attack on the Spanish Church but the claims of the clerical right, the position adopted in the nineteenth century by the friars in the Philippines, were incompatible with the minimum demands of the liberal state even when it assumed a monarchical form. The liberals hoped for the collapse of the Inquisition and the monasteries and, from the debates of 1813, nineteenth

130 Lea, op. cit., 391. See also Greenleaf, 'The Mexican Inquisition and the Enlightenment', op. cit., 167. Questioning of divine monarchy was equated from the 1790s with questioning of papal authority, although earlier in the century regalists and canonists saw these authorities in tension.

131 Carr, Spain, 75.
century Spanish history became largely a contest between Catholic traditionalists and their liberal and radical opponents who charged the Inquisition (and by implication the Church) with enslaving the Spanish mind and denying progress. The hierarchy's response in a pastoral letter of December, 1812, to the challenge of the liberals condemned the Cortes' attack on the discipline, doctrine, privileges, and property of the Spanish Church. 132 From this period, liberalism and Spanish Catholicism were politically and ideologically opposed. The Spanish Church with the other Roman Catholic Churches became inseparably identified with political reaction and the absolutist counter-revolution.

In Spain, too, this struggle was perceived by the orders as a war with a vast, Masonic conspiracy against religion. The contribution of Masonry to the Revolution of 1820 fed the myth of its occult strength and clerical conservatives presented liberalism and later radical movements as manifestations of a permanent Masonic conspiracy. 133 In the aftermath of the 1820 revolution, the religious orders were confirmed in their horror of reform by the execution and murder of monks, a bishop and fourteen priests in 1823 for their counter-revolutionary sympathies. 134 Regulars died again in 1835 during another cycle of revolution in what had become not only a contest between conservative and liberal politicians and intellectuals but a recurrent pattern of mass violence against the orders. In the following year the Liberal government of Mendizábal

132 Ibid., 115-117
133 Ibid., 127; and see Roberts, op. cit., 331-32.
134 Ibid., 143.
decreed the dissolution of all religious houses in Spain and the seizure of property belonging to the orders. The only exceptions were those missionary colleges which prepared missionaries for work in the Philippines. One consequence of these measures was to force many regulars to go to the Philippines to preserve their religious identity. The moderate liberals showed, notably in the Concordat worked out with the Papacy in 1851 that they would continue to recognise the Roman Catholic Church as the official church of Spain to the extent of paying emoluments to the secular clergy from the treasury but liberal recognition of the Catholic unity of Spain stopped short of support for the regular clergy. The orders were not compensated for their losses of property or granted state support; indeed, their very existence was the central issue in dispute between church and state in Spain for much of the nineteenth century. It was only by a tortured interpretation of Article 29 of the Concordat that the bishops were able to re-establish the regular orders in their diocese, a move which was bitterly opposed by anti-clerical liberals for whom the orders were not merely anachronisms but, as teaching orders, 'a source of "poison" in a liberal state'. The September Revolution of 1868 widened the rift between church and state in Spain even further: for leading Republicans the Revolution was a religious revolution and it was in the debate on the religious clauses of the constitution of the following year which revealed fully the chasm between conservative and republican Spain. The Republicans were philosophically committed to freedom of religion and this was enjoined in the 1869 constitution. Some

135 Schumacher, Burgos, 11.

136 Carr, Spain, 235.
Republican delegates denied the authority and truth of dogmatic religion and one denied God Himself, stating that 'the dead ideas are faith, heaven, God: the new science, the earth, man'. The Spanish Church absolutely refused to admit the claims of the 'neutral' state, denouncing the Constitution as disinheriting Catholicism and attacking the unity of belief which was necessary for the survival of Spanish society. The periodic confrontations between church and liberal and republican states between 1820 and 1869 pushed the defenders of the Spanish Church, and in particular the regular orders, into an alliance with the political right. The authoritarian, hierarchical and intolerant characteristics of Spanish Catholicism were thus exaggerated, distorted and given an unmistakeable political orientation with consequences for the Philippines as well as for Spain. In the event, the Spanish Government decided that Spanish liberalism was not for export to the colonies but the impact of the struggles of 1868-1869 on the attitudes of the Spanish regulars in the Philippines was profound, more so because Philippine critics of the orders, including Father José Burgos, participated in the debate in the Spanish press on whether the friars should be withdrawn from the islands.

At the same time as liberal and republican attacks on the orders in Spain confirmed their absolute opposition to anything but the most conservative and absolutist ideas, parallel developments in Rome provided

137 Ibid., 345. Catholicism was still acknowledged as the state religion but other religions were tolerated. As well as separation of church and state, the Constitution of 1869 provided for liberty of press, speech, assembly and worship; Schumacher, Burgos, 24.

138 For details, see Schumacher, Burgos, 26-27.
them with what seemed a complete vindication of their position. Four years before the Revolution of 1868 Pope Pius IX released the Syllabus of Errors, issued with the Encyclical, Quanta cura, on 8 December, 1864.

In Spain in 1868 and in the Philippines in 1896 the regular clergy used this most famous contemporary denunciation of those liberal and revolutionary movements undermining their own existence to claim that the attacks of their enemies were ultimately directed against the church, Catholic truth, and God Himself. Reacting to the attacks on the papacy from Mazzini and the Piedmontese, the Syllabus proscribed and condemned 'the chief errors and false doctrines of our most unhappy age'. It was arranged in ten sections under which eighty theses were stated and condemned, including pantheism, naturalism and absolute rationalism, moderate rationalism, indifferentism and religious latitudinarianism, socialism, communism, secret societies, Bible societies, clerical-liberal societies, errors about the church and its rights, errors on the state and its relation to the church, errors on natural and Christian ethics, errors on Christian matrimony, errors on the temporal power of the pope, and errors of modern liberalism. By no great effort the Spanish religious could identify in the Philippines of 1896 the Katipunan with the proscribed Carbonari, Mabini with Mazzini, and the reform and revolutionary movements of the 1880s and 1890s as manifestations of the same international

---

139 Pope Pius IX, Quanta cura, 8 December, 1864, issued together with 'A Syllabus containing the most important errors of our time which have been condemned by Our Holy Father Pius IX in allocutions, at consistories, in encyclical and other apostolic letters'. The political background to the Syllabus is discussed in E.E. Hales, Pio Nono, A Study in European Politics and Religion in the Nineteenth Century (London, 1954), 137ff; 255ff. See also J.B. Bury, The Papacy in the Nineteenth Century (London, 1930), 161-62, for a particularly hostile view of the Syllabus.
Masonic conspiracy denounced by the Holy See. The Syllabus condemned Masonry; Masonry was at work in the Philippines. Rationalism, pantheism, naturalism and the principles of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution were all condemned; these very movements and ideas were threatening the religious unity of the colony and endangering the simple faith of the indio. Thesis 80, the proposition that the Roman Pontiff 'can and should harmonise himself with progress, with liberalism, and with recent civilisation' was condemned: were the friars to accommodate themselves to these things in the Philippines? Thesis 77, that 'in our age it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be regarded as the sole religion of the State to the exclusion of all others' was condemned: how could Filipinos who claimed to be Catholics advocate religious toleration?

The superiors of the religious orders in the Memorial of 1898 affirmed their commitment to the literal understanding of the Syllabus of 1864. Their enemies knew that

our banner is none other than the Syllabus of the great pontiff, Pius IX, which has so often been confirmed by Leo XIII, in which all rebellion against legitimate authority is so vigorously condemned. They know that, as lovers of the only true liberty - Christian liberty - we would rather die than consent, in whatever pertains to us, to the least lack of purity of the infallible Catholic teachings, of the holiness of Christian customs, and of the most complete loyalty due to the Spanish nation.

The friars interpreted the Syllabus as justifying not only their

140 'Friar Memorial of 1898', op. cit., 237-38. See also the Circular by Alvarez del Manzano of 1897, op. cit., 5-6, where the Dominican Provincial presents the orders as the defenders of the Syllabus under the flag of religion and patriotism against irreligion, secret societies, and the false theories and practices of modern democracies.
condemnation of secret societies and false modern theories of reform but also their identification of the religious integrity of the Philippine Church with the perpetuation of Spanish rule. As they understood it, the Syllabus was to be applied literally. Its unqualified condemnations of the intellectual and political movements of the nineteenth century were eternally valid and immediately applicable. Explanations that Pius IX had written in terms of 'absolute and eternal principles', in ideal abstractions relevant to the 'perfect society' which at a given time and place might be inexpedient or even unjust to enforce were ignored.\textsuperscript{141}

Between 1864 and 1898, in the Philippines unlike France, Germany, Italy and the United States, there was no debate among the Spanish clergy over the possible interpretations of the Syllabus. Spanish regulars were not attracted by those progressive and reform movements within the church eventually condemned by Leo XIII in 1899, and by Pius X in 1903, 1904 and 1907.\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{141} Bishop Dupanloup of Orleans, with Pius IX's permission, made this point in the pamphlet, 'The September Convention and the Encyclical of December 8'; see Hales, op. cit., 261. Pius IX, shortly before his death was reported to have said that 'I can see that everything has changed; my system and their policies have had their day, but I am too old to change my course; that will be the task of my successor'; Alec R. Vidler, The Church in an Age of Revolution (Harmondsworth, 1965), 153.

\textsuperscript{142} Leo XIII's Apostolic Letter, Testem benevolentiae, 22 January, 1899, on Americanism condemned concessions and adaptations to contemporary secular thought. His Encyclical to the French clergy, Depuis le jour, 8 September, 1899, repeated this condemnation. On 4 October, 1904, Pius X denounced the errors of rationalism and mistaken science and emphasised unquestioning clerical obedience in the encyclical E supremi apostolatus. The emphasis on discipline, obedience and hostility to modern thought was repeated in two encyclicals in February and March, 1904. The 'compendium of modern heresies' known from 1904 as 'modernism' was finally condemned by Pius X in the Encyclical, De modernistarum doctrinis (September, 1907), better known as Pascendi dominici gregis. See Michele Ranchetti, The Catholic Modernists, A Study of the Religious Reform Movement, 1864-1907 (London, 1969), 60-62; 124; 145 et passim; Alec R. Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists (Cambridge, 1970), 15-16; Carlo Falconi, The Popes in the Twentieth Century (Boston and Toronto, 1967), 32-38.
In the Memorial of 1898 the only oblique reference to the intellectual and theological movements then affecting European and American Catholicism is the remark that the Syllabus had been repeatedly confirmed by the present pope, Leo XIII. Leo XIII's cautious moves to achieve a measure of reconciliation with the modern world condemned by his predecessor, expressed in the positive social teachings of Rerum Novarum of 1891 and in his compromises with the Third French Republic, had encouraged progressive members of the clergy in Europe to hope for a reversal of the thinking so apparent in the Syllabus. In fact, the Spanish regulars were correct in claiming Leo as a defender of the Syllabus. In his Encyclical Libertas of 1888, he repeated the earlier condemnation of liberalism as the work of Lucifer, warning the clergy that 'in no way whatsoever is it permitted to ask for, advocate, or grant the unrestricted freedom of thought, press, education, or religion, for if such rights were natural it would then be possible to reject submission to God'. Earlier, in the Encyclical Aeterni Patris of 1879 he specifically reaffirmed the doctrines of the encyclical and Syllabus of 1864. Leo XIII, fully as much as Pius IX, endorsed the traditional teaching that authority was from God and that every person was obliged to obey the constituted civil and ecclesiastical authorities. In the Encyclical Immortale Dei, of 1885, he reemphasized the divine origin of the ruling powers which he described as 'invested with a sacredness more

143 Some commentators on Leo XIII exaggerated his reformist interests to present him as a liberal preceded and followed by illiberal and reactionary popes; cf. the biographical notes of S. Minocchi in Ranchetti, op. cit., 80.

than human'. Obedience to the civil and ecclesiastical superiors was 'submission to the will of God'. Leo XIII as the great theoretician of the juridical conception of the church believed the definition of the church as a divinely ordained structure with authority descending from its Divine head downwards was immutable and beyond question.

Given this understanding of authority it was not surprising that Leo XIII unconditionally reaffirmed the pronouncements of his eighteenth and nineteenth century predecessors, ignoring older justifications for legitimate resistance to tyrannical or heretical rulers, when he castigated revolutionary resistance to constituted authority however great the provocation:

And if at any time it happen that the power of the state is rashly and tyrannically wielded by Princes, the teaching of the Catholic Church does not allow an insurrection on private authority against them, lest public order be only the more disturbed, and lest society take greater hurt therefrom. And when affairs come to such a pass that there is no other hope of safety, she teaches that relief may be hastened by the merits of Christian patience and earnest prayers to God.

In opposing the Philippine Church to the revolution the friars thus had the full endorsement of solemn pronouncements by the Holy See to support them. In any case, of course, they denied that Spanish rule was tyrannical or unjust.

Nor were the friars wrong during Leo's pontificate in claiming that the church still taught that it was surrounded by an international conspiracy of atheists, freemasons, Jews, Protestants, and others working 'to overthrow the whole religious order of the world which Christian

---

145 Lewy, op. cit., 552.
146 Falconi, op. cit., xii-xiii
147 Encyclical, Quod Apostolici Muneris, 28 December, 1878, quoted in Lewy, ibid., 43.
teaching has produced, and the substitution of a new state of things ... based on the principles of pure Naturalism'. For Leo XIII as for Pius IX, the enemies of the church were 'under the direct inspiration of the devil'. The condemnation of masonry and its agents in this encyclical was enthusiastically praised by Spanish religious in the Philippines of the revolutionary period, just as Pius IX's previous bull, Apostolicae Sedis, excommunicating Masons, was endorsed by the Provincial Council of Manila in 1907.

The conspiratorial view of world history held by the Spanish regular clergy on the eve of the Philippine Revolution derived then from a century of papal pronouncements as well as from their bitter experiences in Spain. The growing preoccupation with secret plots and daemonic enemies expressed an anxiety with some foundation in fact in so far as the orders were committed to colonial rule whatever its abuses in the Philippines and to an increasingly embattled conservative and even reactionary political position in Spain. Nevertheless, by assuming a conspiratorial and even metaphysical explanation for the hostility against them, the orders felt no need to seriously consider the merit of the actual, concrete demands for reform made by the Propagandists of the 1880s and 1890s. Given the colonial situation which bound the church and the dogmatic conservatism in international Catholicism of the period it was possibly beyond the capacity of the orders


149 [Pablo Pastells, S.J.], La Masonización de Filipinas, Rizal y su Obra (Barcelona, 1897), 20. Acta et decreta Concilii Provincialis Manilani I in urbe Manila celebrati anno Domini MDCCCVII (Rome, 1910), 186. See also the later Apostolic Letter, 'The Evils of the Time and their Remedies', 1902, text in Australasian Catholic Record, 2nd quarter, 1901, 376ff.
to compromise with such demands but their paranoia led them to misjudge the nature of the threat they faced. 150

Thus, they were not so much concerned to engage in debate with the reformers so much as to expose the hidden motives behind the programmes put forward by liberal Spaniards and their Filipino counterparts. The reform movement as much as the revolution was the expression of filibusterism, of separatism, envy, hatred of sect. Inspired by 'false modern liberties condemned by the church', by 'politico-religious erros ... from Europe', by revolutionary and evil doctrines 'condemned a hundred times by the church', the orders' critics were seen as either the dupes or the cunning agents of an international conspiracy to destroy religion. 151 The spokesmen for the five orders who drew up the Memorial of 1898 stated bluntly that

No one is unaware that the chief of all those partial phases and factors of the social disorganisation of the archipelago has been masonry. The Asociación Hispano-Filipina of Madrid was masonic. Those who encouraged the Filipinos in their campaign against the clergy and against the peninsulars here resident were masons in almost their totality. Those who authorised the installation of lodges in the archipelago were masons. Those who founded the Katipunan, a society so mortally masonic, that even in its terrible suggestive pact of blood it has done naught but imitate the masonic carbonarios, were masons. 152

The Memorial echoed many other arguments advanced by members of the orders

150 However, the orders as the Augustinian friar, Eladio Zamora, observed, were fully aware of the practical threat to their corporate interests posed by the reform and revolutionary movements. The end of Spanish rule, they realised, 'would also be the ruin of the orders in the islands'. Las corporaciones religiosas en Filipinas (Valladolid, 1901), 427.

151 'Friar Memorial of 1898', op. cit., 236-37; 240; 253-55.

152 Ibid., 255-56.
that Spain's problems in the Philippines were ultimately due to a vast, secret conspiracy. An earlier pamphlet, *Sobre la Masonería en las Islas Filipinas* began by declaring that 'it was fully proven that masonry had been the principal factor in the undoing of these islands' through its 'advanced and irreligious ideas' and its secret organisation. \(^{153}\)

The Memorial also echoed conservative Roman Catholic explanations of the French Revolution (as a conspiracy operating through antireligious and destructive ideas) when its authors blamed the Philippine Revolution not on political, economic and social movements but on introduced ideas disseminated by Spanish masons: it was 'the introduction of those [revolutionary] doctrines and tendencies [that were] beyond all doubt the culprits of the insurrection'. \(^{154}\) In the regulars' view, the Spanish domination of the Philippines rested on the moral and spiritual unity and obedience to authority taught by religion. The Spanish clergy instilled 'obedience and submission to all constituted authority'. The Filipinos were 'educated in the doctrine that it is never legal to disobey authority under pretext of abuses, even if some are true'. Catholic ethics encouraged patience and submission. \(^{155}\) Thus, an attack on the prestige of the religious or against the religious foundations of the colonial system were the most dangerous possible threats to continued Spanish rule and to the maintenance of Catholic truth.

---

153 Reproduced as Document 3 in Rodriguez, op. cit., II, 178-80; and extensively quoted in Pastells, op. cit., 11-12

154 'Friar Memorial of 1898', 254.

155 Ibid., 231; 253-54.
For the regulars the temporal order was interpenetrated by the spiritual order and from this assumption ideas such as those which were used against the orders in Spain from 1820 were almost conceived as having an existence of their own, able to take control of men's minds through such instruments as masonry and secret societies, irreligious books, and other propaganda. The Cavite uprising in 1872, the demands for the expulsion of the friars in 1888, the reform movement and the Revolution of 1896 were part of the larger pattern: a masonic conspiracy by which the periodic cycle of revolution and 'republican anarchism' was carried from Spain to the Philippines. The Liga Filipina was not an association expressing the aspirations of a rising class in Filipino society but a tool of 'universal Masonry'. The Liga attracted the support of the comfortable and ilustrado class, while the Katipunan, the mass instrument of 'masonic-filibusterism', organised peasants and humble people directed by caciques and members of the principalía in the local areas.

The petitions for freedom of thought, freedom of the press, freedom of association and of religion, the demand for the secularisation of the

---

156 The Filipino revolt was presented by the friars as a repetition of the 'violent and shameful attacks against them of 1834-40'; 'Friar Memorial', 233. In the peninsula, the masons and their supporters had 'rejuvenated their war against us' by attacking them through the Katipunan in the Philippines; ibid., 234-35. Again, the Philippine Revolution was a re-enactment of the masonic-liberal Revolution of 1868 in Spain; Pastells, op. cit., 8.

157 Pastells, ibid., 8.

158 Ibid., 10.

159 Ibid., 25; 42.
educational system, for the disamortisation of the orders and their expulsion, were thus perceived by the regulars as weapons with which to attack first the friars, then the religion they defended, next Spanish colonial authority, and ultimately, God's plan for humanity.¹⁶⁰

Ideas of 'erroneous liberty and forbidden independence' were used by the enemies of the church to win popular support for their actual campaign to further the designs of the devil.¹⁶¹ Their enemies were even prepared to accuse the orders themselves of creating masonic lodges in the islands in order to foment subversion which they could then use to convince the colonial government to destroy their Filipino critics.¹⁶²

The regulars also believed that colonial rule and their own hold over the mass of the people was in the material and social interests of the Filipinos, thus rejecting the reformist claim that a redefinition of colonial policy would benefit the people. Father Bartolomé Alvarez del Manzano, Provincial of the Dominican Order, put forward the regulars' conception of the colony as an innocent paradise before the injection of foreign radical ideas in a Circular to the Minister for the Colonies in August, 1897. Before the introduction of 'perfectly exotic liberties' the islands had been 'the most perfect model of a country ruled for the sake of moral excellence' under a rule that was firm, efficient, humane and civilised. The September Revolution in Spain had let loose 'irreligion, false theories and practices of modern democracy and the

¹⁶⁰ 'Friar Memorial of 1898', 240.
¹⁶¹ Ibid., 256; and see Zamora, op. cit., 432; Pastells, op. cit., 20.
¹⁶² Zamora, ibid., 434-35.
errors and passions of secret societies'. Under the benign direction of the religious orders the colony had enjoyed the immense benefits of unity of religion, political unity and unity of doctrine. The authors of the Friar Memorial repeated this argument in the following year. The orders had devoted themselves to the 'legitimate and holy progress of Spain' while forging a moral bond between the colony and the Mother Country, a bond that had been the only force necessary to bind the Filipinos to Spain:

Not only do we preach the gospel here; not only do we carry the Christian and civilized life to the barbarous and fetish-encumbered inhabitants of these islands; not only did we obtain the incorporation of the archipelago into the Spanish crown, working in harmony with the official entities and preserved it, as is well known, in a peaceful and happy condition for the space of three centuries; but also, in all time, even now when we are wronged so deeply by some ingrate Filipinos, whom we pity, have we been the constant defenders of the Indians, enduring for that reason innumerable loathings and all kinds of persecution on the part of many peninsulars, who did not understand the devotion and patriotism of our conduct. The orders believed themselves persecuted not because there was any justice in the charges against them, which they vigorously denied, but because they were the main support of colonial rule, being very Catholic, very Spanish, effective defenders of good and sane doctrine, and 'never showing weakness toward the enemies of God and the fatherland'.

The conspiracy thesis with its emphasis on masonry and the secret societies which masonry was accused of spawning remained central to the

163 Circular, Manila, 24 August, 1897, passim.
164 'Friar Memorial of 1898'. 244.
165 Ibid., 236.
Spanish regulars' understanding of the revolution and later determined their reaction to the challenges of Protestantism, secular education and separation of church and state under the American regime. The schism of 1902 was similarly seen as a further development of the original masonic plot. Thus, Archbishop Nozaleda, in his denunciation of the Americans in 1898, called them heretics and unbelievers come to destroy the Catholic faith. With more discretion but in the same vein, Bishop Alcocer warned the faithful in 1902 that

With the change of political domination there has entered into this country a new people with new ideas, new customs and new aspirations, and new religious sects. With the recent transformation the labor of proselytism, ambition for rulership, thirst for novelties, desire for false liberties and rivalries against the lovers of truth and justice have powerfully developed. Side by side with ignorance and audacity are increasing immorality, superstition, impiety, secret societies, apostacy and scandals, and malevolence against venerated institutions of the Church: all tokens of a conjunction against Catholicism.‘Vile and servile instruments of secret and cunning agents' were active spreading heresy and schism on behalf of 'foreign freemasonry'. The creation of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente in 1902 was similarly seen as a masonic plot with Protestant and liberal support. It is more

A translation of this controversial Pastoral Letter of 8 May, 1898, can be found in Achutegui and Bernad, Religious Revolution, I, 81-82.

Martín García Alcocer, Pastoral Letter About the Catholic Unity (Manila, 1902), 1.

Salvador Pons y Torres, 'La Iglesia Filipina Independiente', in Rodriguez, II, 57. Achutegui and Bernad have accepted contemporary friar claims that masonry was a factor in the revolution which 'cannot be overestimated'; Religious Revolution in the Philippines, I, 154. They argue that with American rule, masons high in the new administration promoted its influence. Its 'vast strength ... was used to further the Aglipayan movement'; ibid., 252-53; 428. In 1918, Aglipay himself became a mason.
likely that masonry, as Marcelo del Pilar claimed, was a means of propaganda and education rather than an organisation working towards revolutionary action. Another prominent mason during the reform and revolutionary periods, Mariano Ponce, was cynical about the motives of leading foreign and Filipino masons and denied that masonry played any important part in the revolutionary effort. Its basic purpose and contribution was an educative one, preparing Filipinos to accept ideas of brotherhood, progress and rejection of the friars. Masonry contributed a source of symbols and ritual to the Katipunan as well as ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity to ilustrado nationalists but nationalists and revolutionaries supported reform or revolution not because they were masons. Rather they became masons to further their programmes which reflected new aspirations and social and economic changes within the Philippines, not merely imported ideas from outside. John Schumacher, after reviewing the importance of the lodges in Spain and in the colony during the 1880s and 1890s, concluded that their role had been exaggerated and misinterpreted by friends and enemies.

169 Quoted in Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 161.

170 Mariano Ponce to Ferdinand Blumentritt, Hongkong, 18 August, 1897; Ponce to Miguel Morayta, Hongkong, 11 February, 1898; in Cartas sobre la revolución, 1897-1900 (Manila, 1932), 23; 107. He describes a founder of Filipino masonry [Pedro Serrano Laktaw?] as 'sly and immoral' and concerned only with exploiting the country. Filipino masons, like their Spanish counterparts, engaged in constant faction fighting: see Schumacher, ibid., 161.

171 Ibid., 154.
The citadel mentality which determined the unqualified hostility of the orders to reform was the first great difference between the mentality of the Philippine Church of 1600 and that of 1896. The explicit racism which marked the regulars' attitudes to Filipinos in 1896, and particularly to mestizo Filipinos, is the other. As the French theologian, Yves Congar has pointed out, the thesis that human beings are divided by innate differences of race into those of superior and inferior capacity is incompatible with the fundamental tenets of the Christian faith regarding the unity and the dignity of human nature and also with Christian spirituality. The logical conclusion of racism is 'the practical denial of God and of His Kingdom', denying the common origin of mankind expressed in Genesis and its common end according to the Christian view of human history. We have seen that the universality of the church and the unity of all mankind were stressed by the most influential theologians of Spain in the sixteenth century, whatever the actual abuses committed by Spaniards in the New World. The Holy See also made clear its unqualified commitment to the essential equality of all men in the sight of God when, in 1537 and 1538, Pope Paul III, concerned at the situation in Mexico, published two bulls in which the Christian position was clearly stated. The Indians, though still not received into the church, were men capable of faith and of salvation and were not to be reduced to slavery or deprived of their rights.


173 *Pastorale officium*, 29 May, 1538; quoted in Congar, ibid., 36.
The enemy of the human race [Satan] has suggested to some of his followers the idea of spreading through the world the opinion that the inhabitants of the West Indies and the southern continents, of whose existence we have but recently learnt, should be treated like animals that have not reason, and be employed solely for our profit and our service, on the pretext that they have no part in the Catholic faith and are incapable of adopting it. ....

We regard the Indians as true men, being not only capable of adopting the Christian faith but desirous of doing so. Therefore, in the desire of remedying the ill which has been caused, We decide and declare ... that the aforesaid Indians, and all other peoples which may, in future, become known to Christendom, shall not be deprived of their freedom and their goods ... even if they be not Christians; but that, on the contrary, they shall be left in the enjoyment of their freedom and their property.

The Indians and other peoples which may yet be discovered in the future shall be converted only by the Word of God and by the example of the good and holy life.  

It was this pronouncement which served as the basis for the resolutions adopted by the Synod of Manila of 1581-1586, and underlay the favourable response of the first generations of missionaries to the peoples of the islands.

Up to the sixteenth century, the divisions perceived by Europeans between themselves and others were primarily religious and cultural. Christendom was the largest unit claiming their common loyalty and the non-Christians outside Christendom were thus set apart. Yet Christianity as an evangelical religion was to be extended to the non-believer and this very evangelism contradicted any assumption that the world was intended to be divided.  

In Spain, the limpieza statutes

174 Sublimis Deus, 2 June, 1537, quoted in Congar, ibid., 36-37.
176 The idea of a Chosen People was not racist. For a discussion of allegations that the Bible was racist see Congar, op. cit., 28-32.
and the growing discrimination against Jews and Muslims on the eve of colonial expansion were religious rather than racist policies. Moros were thought of not as 'Arabs' but as 'infidels'. Nevertheless, persecution of culturally and ethnically identifiable groups on religious grounds carried with it the seeds of racist ideology, and the experience of colonial domination in the sixteenth century encouraged the growth of a new attitude to non-Europeans based on supposed innate differences between peoples. We have already examined examples of this new attitude in the arguments of Sepúlveda. The Spaniards, ruling American civilisations which succumbed rapidly to European diseases and European aggression, were also the first Europeans to establish effective colonial rule with the result that Western imperial theory originated in sixteenth century Spain. Colonialism encouraged racist dogma as a rationalisation for the exploitation of one group by another and as an ideological explanation for the dominant-dependent relationship inevitable in the colonies. The Spaniards, not surprisingly, were most vulnerable to racist ideas as the empire settled into the routine of colonial rule.

The concept of race, however, remained implicit rather than explicit until the latter part of the eighteenth and especially the nineteenth centuries when the development of such sciences as physical anthropology, biology and zoology gave an intellectual justification for

177 Congar, ibid., 33-34. The violence committed against Jews, the Crusades against Islam, the struggle against the Turks, etc. were also religious rather than racist in their ideology. See also Curtin, op. cit., xiii-xiv.

178 Curtin, ibid., xiv.

179 Congar, op. cit., 35-36.
the emergence of more aggressive forms of imperialism expressing the economic transformation of industrialised Europe and the competition between rival European nation-states. The association of slavery with a dark skin in the colonies influenced European thought most markedly in the eighteenth century but the implicit assumption that negroes were 'naturally' slaves appeared even earlier in Spanish America. In the eighteenth century, however, implicit racialism began to acquire an explicit ideological form as differences in culture and appearance between colonisers and colonised were attributed to race using the analogy of the hierarchy of species in the Great Chain of Being. The orthodox view of mankind in the eighteenth century was monogenist, arguing that there was originally only one species of man which subsequently underwent various changes and divisions under the influence of environment and history. But this view was increasingly attacked in the nineteenth century by polygenist theorists whose argument that the different races sprung from different origins provided a rationale both for slavery and imperialism. Even before Darwin's Origin of the Species of 1858 brought new and international prestige to biological science, full-blown racist theories of history and society had gained considerable support

180 Curtin, op. cit., xvi.

181 Ibid., xv.

182 N.A. Barnicot, 'From Darwin to Mendel', in Man, Race and Darwin, Papers read at a Joint Conference of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland and the Institute of Race Relations (London, 1960), 25; and see Donald G. McRae, 'Race and Sociology in History and Theory', ibid., 78-79.

in the first half of the nineteenth century. After 1858, Darwin's theories were adapted by Social Darwinists to explain conflict between peoples and nations and their concepts gave a pseudo-scientific respectability to European imperial theory between the 1870s and 1920s which was based on racist assumptions with evolutionary overtones. The assumption was that non-Western cultures were far inferior to Western culture; that non-Western peoples were racially different from Europeans; and therefore cultural inferiority was hereditary. To this was added the theory that miscegenation weakened the culture of the 'pure' races through infertility and debilitation. Arthur de Gobineau's *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines* (1854) was the most influential statement of this view, although Darwin himself suspected that the disabilities of 'half-breeds' were social rather than physical. Nineteenth century Spaniards were especially sensitive to theories of the grave effects of miscegenation. In the newly independent nations of Spanish America, race mixture was a preoccupation of political as well as scientific theorists.

At the time of the Philippine Revolution, then, racist theories of


185 Barnicot, op. cit., 27-28; and Philip Mason, Introduction, ibid., 4. For a biography of Gobineau see Michael D. Biddiss, *Father of Racist Ideology* (London, 1970). Significantly, Gobineau, as a French aristocrat, expressed the political pessimism of the conservative right during the period of the 1848 Revolution and his racial theories reflected this attitude. See MacRae, ibid., 80-81.

186 Mörner, op. cit., 140-41. Racial theories were popularised by Domingo Faustino Sarmiento in his *Conflictos y armonías de las razas en América* (1883).
the innate differences between peoples and of the dubious effects of miscegenation seemed part of contemporary scientific knowledge. Anthropometrics, for instance, was considered a special discipline and had an already long pedigree going back to the work of craniologists such as the American Samuel Morton.\(^{187}\) It is clear from an examination of the literature produced by the Spanish religious orders in the islands between 1896 and 1907 that, consciously or unconsciously, they too had been influenced by such theories despite the evident contradiction between the gospel and the racial view of mankind and notwithstanding the contemporary condemnations made by Leo XIII of 'pseudo-science'.

The problem of accommodating an *indio* and *mestizo* clergy into a colonial church bound to a colonial system premised on Spanish superiority was the central test for the Spanish bishops and regulars in holding to the original optimism and benevolence toward the Filipinos endorsed in the 1580s. This problem will be discussed in the following chapter and the debate over the racial character of the *mestizo* and the *indio* which it provoked will be examined in more detail. In this chapter, we will confine the analysis of the racial assumptions of the regulars to the nineteenth century. T.H. Pardo Tavera remarked that, although the law recognised no differences between the various races in the islands, nevertheless, from the beginning of the nineteenth century the Spaniards claimed superiority over the Filipinos, and so taught their children. On the other hand the Filipinos did not participate in the government of their own country ... The townspeople were obliged to remove their hats when a Spaniard passed, and this was especially the case if he occupied some official position; if the Spaniard happened to be a priest, in addition to the removal of the hat the native was obliged to kiss his hand. No Indian was allowed to

\(^{187}\) Barnicot, op. cit., 25.
sit at the same table as a Spaniard, even though the Spaniard was a guest in the Indian's house. The Spaniards addressed the Filipinos by the pronoun "thou", and although many of the Spaniards married pure blood native women, the wives were always looked down upon in society as belonging to an inferior class. From the beginning of the nineteenth century the laws abolished all race distinctions, but the distinction could not be abolished from the actual customs which obtained, and the racial friction or ill-feeling increased in proportion to the increased education of the Filipino people.  ...  188

The behaviour Pardo de Tavera found so objectionable would have had a different significance in earlier centuries but in the nineteenth Spanish attitudes in the colony had shifted towards an increasingly overt racial justification for colonial rule, and the petty abuses of colonial dominance acquired a new meaning. The presence of an educated and wealthy Filipino elite was another factor which made even the older, paternal assumptions of authority by Spaniards no longer tolerable.

Pardo de Tavera accused the friars of being as racist as lay Spaniards. Their favourite weapon for chastising the Indians was the whip. 189 The orders' response was that they were the only effective and sincere guardians of the people but the reasons they advanced in support of this argument in 1896 were not the same as those used in the time of the first Synod of Manila. Father Zamora identified as one of the three basic foundations of Spanish rule in the islands the 'superiority of race expressive of Spanish nobility', the others being religion and the prestige of the orders. When he used the term 'raza' it was in a

188 T.H. Pardo de Tavera, 'History', in Census of the Philippine Islands (Washington, 1905), I, 337-38; subsequently published as Reseña histórica de Filipinas (Manila, 1906), 32.

189 Ibid. For the friars' reply see Sobre una "Reseña histórica de Filipinas (Manila, 1906), Chapter VI, 37-39.
sense unknown to the missionaries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Zamora published his views after the regulars had suffered harsh treatment and imprisonment at the hands of the revolutionaries and his bitter tone is understandable. A Dominican, Ulpiano Herrero, expressed similar feelings in his account of the imprisonment of the friars. The natives were 'ungrateful', capable only of 'mimicking' the externals of Spanish civilisation but missing its substance. The paternal care of three centuries had been betrayed by 'Malayan perfidy'. Speculations concerning Malayan treachery were taken to further extremes by secular writers such as José María del Castillo y Jiménez but Spanish regulars spoke in the same accents of fear and anger. For Castillo, the Filipinos were a 'savage people' who 'lacked self control'. Despite the generosity of the 'noble and confiding Spaniard' this 'ferocious and bloodthirsty people' wished to return to the barbarous customs of the past. The Chinese mestizos were singled out as particularly cunning and dangerous. Masonry had encouraged the ambitions of these 'half-breeds' who, having the advantage of a greater 'cerebral diameter', were superior in intelligence but inferior in feeling to the Indians. The mestizo preached liberty but practised slavery; he taught the Indian to follow him like a dog, teaching him to curse the Spaniards and kiss the

190 Eladio Zamora, O.S.A., Las Corporaciones religiosas en Filipinas (Valladolid, 1901), 431.

191 Ulpiano Herrero y Sampedro, Nuestra prisión en poder de los revolucionarios filipinos (Manila, 1900), 39.

192 José Ma. del Castillo y Jiménez, El Katipunan o el filibusterismo en Filipinas (Madrid, 1897), 6-10. He added that after three centuries of 'the enlivening warmth of Spanish rule, the indios repaid all the care taken for their well-being and spiritual salvation with barbarity and race hatred'; ibid., 67.
criminal hand of his own executioner. 193

Supplementing the conspiracy thesis by a curious reversal of Spanish racial prejudice, the Spanish religious advanced a racial explanation for the violence of the revolution and for the attacks against them. Racial prejudice was projected onto the revolutionaries. If, especially in Manila and the surrounding provinces, the ancient respect for the Spaniard had been undermined,

Is it strange that race instincts should have asserted themselves strongly, and, considering that they have a distinct language, and distinct lands and climate, that they should have discussed and have attempted to raise a wall of separation between Spaniards and Malays? 194

The secret society of the Katipunan, established by the masonic federation, the Gran Oriente Español, and raging like a plague through the islands, had 'race hatred' as one of the first articles of its programme. 195

The Indians were easy victims of its propaganda:

The thought of what may happen to this beautiful country at any moment terrifies us, for we do not know to what point sectarian fanaticism may go, exploiting the suggestibility of this race and their weak brain by the deeds that they are heralding .... 196

The Memorial of 1898 repeated earlier arguments that the Filipino was innately vulnerable to the manipulation of secret societies such as the Katipunan. A pamphlet on masonry published in late 1896 or early 1897 claimed that the character of the natives was favourable to the mystery and symbolism of masonry and could be easily accustomed to its ridiculous
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194 'The Friar Memorial of 1898', 256.
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signs, oaths, passwords, initiations and shadowy mysteries. The Jesuit writer, Pablo Pastells, also echoed this view of the revolution as both masonic plot and the expression of a race hatred (odio de razas) aroused in the Filipinos. The Dominican Provincial put forward the same argument in 1897: hostility to the friars was really hatred of all Spaniards, the rebel Indians exalting a love of race and true blood.

The racial explanation of the violence of the revolution amplified existing perceptions of the Filipinos as inferior men whose credulous and suggestible nature made them vulnerable to good or evil example. This was brought out in the testimony given by Spanish religious leaders before the Taft Commission. Archbishop Nozaleda believed that the Malayan race had 'no proper individuality' and 'an absolute want of character':

if they live in good surroundings they will be good, and if they live in bad surroundings they will be bad .... They can not grasp an idea and by their own mental effort determine whether it is proper or improper .... They have just sufficient of the logical faculty to be rational beings [but] they have not the sufficient mental capacity to digest any abstract question.

The Archbishop of Manila expressed the general opinion of the Spanish clergy. The apologies published by the orders between 1896 and 1902 pictured the Filipinos at the time of the conquest in terms of the most

197 'Sobre La Masonería en las islas Filipinas', Document 3, in Rodriguez, op. cit., II, 179; see also Pastells, op. cit., 11-12. See also Francisco Foradada, La Soberanía de España en Filipinas (Barcelona, 1897), 277.
198Pastells, ibid., 43.
199Alvarez del Manzano, op. cit., 38.
200Testimony, 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', 98.
unflattering, minority tradition championed by Sepúlveda three centuries before. The Filipinos were:

Barely clothed and more often naked, revelling by day and night in drunkenness, given to the practice of infanticide, holding virginity as a dishonour, having among them people who practised defloration as a profession, ignorant of the value and uses of money, making use of men, women, and children to pay debts, in continual warfare with one another, enslaving their prisoners, practising wholesale murder of slaves on the death of a chief or important person-age, adoring and sacrificing to rocks, trees, crocodiles and idols of wood, lacking religion, but having in its stead most bestial and absurd superstitions, without temples, monuments, or even literature, although they possessed a written language. The only human ideas they possessed were adopted from the Chinese, Japanese and Borneo Mohamedans whom they imitated after the manner of apes.201

The fear that the indios would revert to paganism of the early period had become a fear of the Indian nature itself.202 This theme was made explicit in a curious work produced by the orders in 1900 and intended for readers in the United States as well as for Americans in the Philippines. The inaccurate English of this document reveals rather than conceals the thinking behind the orders' insistence that the people of the islands were incapable of self-direction. They were a 'people but of yesterday' still yearning for their pagan past:

Inexpresible to say, is the eagerness that the Indian feels for the lonely life in the woods, where his action of behaviour cannot be censured by the Authorities, nor

201 W. Brecknock-Watson, op. cit., 9. See also [W.E. Retana], Los frailes filipinas por un Español que ha residido en aquel país (Madrid, 1898), 22-23.

202 Jaime Bulatao, S.J., discusses this fear of 'the dark side of the aswang and the pagan gods, the superstitious law of the grandmother, the value system of the old, familiar barangays' in 'A Social-Psychological View of the Philippine Church' in J.B. Braganza, The Encounter (Manila, 1965), 203.
controlled his wicked instincts, in which he may enjoy
at his own pleasure .... They know pretty well the
Christian catechism yet they have no remorse in prac­
tising at the same time some ancient uses, which are
but the leavings of paganism.203

The authors of The Civilizers of the Philippines conclude that the
orders were justified in retaining their unique power over the indios
for their own good. Only they could 'instruct and bring up this babyish
people' for when religion and its ministers held authority the Filipino
people were the happiest in the world. Left to themselves, however,
they were an easy prey to corruption:

All what is said shows how easy [it] is to impose on the
Indians, profiting of his religious fanaticism and of his
innate tendency to whatever holds a wonderful or fantastical
character, even if it were in its most coarse and ridiculous
form. Thence, the great need of watching the people's
religious beliefs, lest they might be misled, being, as it
were, so well fitted to anything .... Being now and maybe
ever, the Filipino people unable to govern itself, there
are but two ways or forms of restoring the lost peace. The
first is to give back to religion its own due place to reign
again over the people's minds, moralising them and inducing
[them to] rely and trust their new dominators [the United
States]; and the second way is to oppose strength in front of
the fanaticism of a people, who will go straight on, to its
total ruin, before yielding to circumstances.204

This attempt to convince the Americans that it was in their interests
to support the Spanish regular clergy and return them to their former
influence was remarkable for its misreading of American attitudes but
not for its arguments in the context of Spanish-Catholic thought in the
islands. Printed at the Dominican press at the University of Santo Tomas
with the approbation of the Archbishop it reveals the ambivalence and

203 The Civilizers of the Philippines; Ten Statements concerning
the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippine Islands (Manila,
1900), 64.

204 Ibid., 67-68.
conflict within the Spanish clergy's attitudes towards the Filipinos. They are childish and docile yet conceal dark passions and frightening remnants of paganism. They are fickle and malleable yet will fight to the death for their cause. They are incapable of deep religious feeling yet are a profoundly Catholic people. They are barely capable of rational thought yet are children of God and equal members of His Kingdom.

The contradictions in the friar world-view are most evident in the pastoral letter published in 1902 by the last remaining Spanish bishop in the islands. In this statement on the Catholic unity, Bishop Alcocer begins with a summary of the evil forces threatening the church. In his explanation of why the 'new heresiarchs' had attracted the support of the 'rabble' by promising the bait of 'alluring and impossible liberties', 'undefined progress' and 'an equality and perfect levelling of the social classes', he distinguished between the supporters of the Katipunan and 'another people' closer to the obedient indios of Spanish Catholic tradition:

there is another people, very numerous and very sympathetic, formed of the multitude of the laboring classes who suffer in silence their misfortunes; who know, although not thoroughly, their rights and duties; who know more or less completely, the Christian catechism; who love peace and order; who obey as well as they can the laws and commandments of their superiors ... who recognise their right place in society and their humble condition, and who are disposed to comply with all their religious and civil obligations.

These people were oppressed by the rich and powerful but they knew that by the wise disposition of divine providence, and by the sad condition of human affairs, there was ever in the world, is now, and always will be, a notable and natural difference between the poor and the rich, between ruler and subject, between the guilty and the innocent, between the prudent and fools, between the strong and the weak, between the great and the small. Each one should conform
to his lot; willingly or by force the loving designs of
God over peoples must be completed. 205

The paradox of the friar position is contained in that last sentence.
The Indian could not be forced to accept the faith although the church
was entitled to preach the gospel free from violent opposition. Yet,
if the Indian was childish and innately credulous, easily dominated by
the enemies of religion, how could his conscience be respected?

At the same time that the Indian was expected to accept oppression
and exploitation as part of the human condition while remaining obedient
to his natural superiors, he was also a full member of the church which,
from the beginning refuted 'all national frontiers, all colors of races,
all privileges of classes, all differences of languages, all the
mysteries of descent and lineage, all the stains of class and all the
enquiries of blood':

For God and His Church we all form one only family,
we are all His children, all brethren, and therefore
in the Church there is no other fundamental law than
this beautiful law: to love God who is our father,
and our neighbor as our brother.
Before democracies were born and the words "liberty,
equality, and fraternity" came into sociological use,
the Church of God was a society whose whole soul was
in the defense of these rights, in the proper meaning
of the said words. In the Church no-one is born with
a right to rule: there are no prelacies or positions
held by inheritance or testament. All the jurisdictional
charges from the Papacy to the priorate of La Trappe are
filled by election, opposition, or concourse. The canon
law is the most democratic law, and in it are given no
papers of citizenship, nobility or estate .... All receive
the same baptism, recite the same creed, hope for the same
heaven; and even here in this world there exists no hall,
no theatre, no congress, no official feast in which there
predominates the beautiful disorder, the holy equity, the
popular confusion so much as in the temples and forms of
worship of the Church. 206

205 Alcocer, op. cit., 41-43.
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The paradox was that while preaching such perfect equality and claiming to practise it within the church, the Spanish clergy endorsed a hierarchical, authoritarian and quietistic model of church and society which accepted and legitimised divisions of wealth, education, class, privilege and even race. They attempted to reconcile their role as 'soldiers defending religion and the fatherland' with their pastoral duty towards the Filipinos by arguing that the superimposition of Spanish colonial rule on native society was divinely ordained and without contradictions. In their Memorial of 1898 they even went so far as to specifically reject the more scrupulous tradition which had softened the paradox between the two roles of colonist and priest in the sixteenth century. They protected the natives, they wrote, 'without the pious boastings and exaggerations of Las Casas'.

The church's universality itself was used as an argument against Filipino aspirations for national independence. Father Zamora endorsed the view of two Augustinians in 1850 that Spanish authority had been 'naturalised in these islands' and that Spaniards were not foreigners. Thus, the rights of nations recognised in the juridical tradition of Vitoria and Las Casas were set aside as irrelevant in the 1800s.

The revolution provided another argument for authoritarian rule. It was made to justify a new 'crusade', blessed by the religious orders, in support of Spanish authority. Foradada argued that those who resisted Spanish authority resisted what was ordained by God. Patriotism did not justify rebellion against Spain, much less did 'wild modern theories' on the emancipation of subject peoples. Independence would mean the return

207 'The Friar Memorial of 1898', 239.
208 Zamora, op. cit., 430.
to slavery and barbarism. Racial differences did not give countenance to rebellion. The revolution proved that the Indian needed paternal but strict discipline if he were to be saved from exploitation and ruin in this world and damnation in the next. The remedy for violent revolt was a return to the 'Cross and the Sword' in defence of the union of altar and throne as the only means by which peace and felicity could be returned to the Philippines. State power could be used to enforce the rights of religion because the Roman Pontiffs delegated their temporal authority to kings and princes who could be obliged to defend the faith by force of arms if necessary.

The followers of Christ are frequently inspired to war against infidels, certainly not to oblige them to believe through coercion (for when they are made captives they are left the freedom to believe or not to believe) but in order to oblige them not to impede the teaching of the Christian faith.209

209 Foradada, op. cit., 17-18 et passim. Foradada's opinions do not coincide with Jesuit tradition which acknowledged the right to resist against unjust rule and traced royal authority to the consent of the people. Generally, the Jesuits endorsed the sixteenth century Thomist argument that the popes had ultimate moral and spiritual authority in religious questions but that the state had independence in secular matters. This view found its most famous expression in the Disputations (1581) of Robert Bellarmine. His thesis that the Pope had indirect power over temporal matters as spiritual head of the church became general after the Council of Trent. Foradada derived his arguments from an equally old minority opinion that the power of secular rulers came from the pope and not from the community itself as those following Bellarmine upheld. In the Bellarmine tradition, in secular matters the state could not demand unconditional obedience from its subjects. Sixteenth century Spanish Jesuits also stressed the voluntary, contractual nature of temporal rule. See the discussion of the thought of Juan de Mariana and Francisco Suarez in George H. Sabine, A History of Political Theory, 3rd ed. (London, 1963), 388-91; and also Charles Howard McIlwain, The Growth of Political Thought in the West (New York, 1932), 352-53.
The world-view of the Spanish religious during the revolutionary period differed in important respects from the system of values and beliefs given church approval early in the conquest, but the influence of reactionary, racist and conspiratorial theories on the thinking of the orders in the late nineteenth century in the Philippines derived only in part from their material and political interests in the colony. Added to the demoralising effects of long colonial rule, the orders were shaped in their attitudes also by nineteenth century developments in Catholic thought as well as by contemporary scientific theories about man's biological nature. When these influences are understood in the context of the violence and terror of mass revolution it is not surprising that the regulars advanced arguments between 1896 and 1907 which contradicted what they themselves at other moments indentified as the essential qualities of Christian love and universality. Perhaps more surprising and evidence of the international influence of racist and imperialist thought in the Catholic Church of the period, was the readiness with which bishops and priests from the United States adopted the most reactionary ideas of their Spanish counterparts in the islands. The Dominican, Ambrose Coleman, wrote in 1905 that the alleged 'laudable and natural revolt against the spiritual tyranny of Rome' in the Philippines was simply a phase of the revolt of the yellow against the white man, one of those self-assertive movements of the Asiatic races within recent years which, rightly directed, had led to the development of Japan, and, wrongly directed, to the excesses of the Boxer movement in China and the formation of the bloody Katipunan society in the Philippines in the early nineties.210

José Rizal had the 'Filipino vice of ingratitude abnormally developed'.
The Rizal cult, fostered by the Americans, encouraged 'that racial
antipathy which is growing more pronounced every day in the Philippines'.
American opinion against the friars had been formed by those 'slippery
and mendacious Filipinos' in contact with American residents in the
colony. The ordinary Filipino was 'timid'. Latin Freemasonry was
robbing a Catholic people of their faith by intimidation and violence.
Coleman's analysis was that of Bishop Rooker once he took up his appoint­
ment to the diocese of Jaro. The attacks by Filipino agitators, whether
revolutionaries or schismatics, were aimed at the Catholic Church and
against 'legitimate authority even though that authority might reside in
the hands of the white race'. At the bottom of opposition to Spanish
friars and American bishops

lay and still lies race hatred. These disturbers have
conceived the idea that the orient should be for the orientals, that the brown race must be free and independent
of all white domination. Their plan from the beginning
was to get rid not only of Spanish civil rule, but of all white supremacy in matters of either politics or religion.
The Katipunan 'put on the soutane of the priest and became the "Independent
Philippine Church"', enabling the campaign of race hatred to continue
under the cloak of religious toleration. The new church was the 'Church
of the Filipino in which white men are to have no part'.

Thus, the
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prejudices of the last generation of Spanish clergy in the islands became to a great extent those of the first generation of American clergy.
CHAPTER THREE
THE FILIPINO CLERGY AND REVOLUTION

The struggle between the Spanish regular clergy and the Filipino secular clergy which was such a significant part of the revolution of 1896-1898 and the first years of American rule grew out of a recurrent controversy which divided the Philippine Church for three centuries. This controversy concerned the many largely unsuccessful efforts during the Spanish period to establish a secular or diocesan clergy in the Philippines obedient to the bishop and not to a religious order, and predated by a century the creation of a Filipino clergy. Spanish bishops in the colony had repeatedly attempted to assert their episcopal authority over the religious corporations which had originally evangelised the archipelago and maintained the greater number of the parishes. Despite the occasional support of the Spanish monarchy and the Holy See, the bishops failed to remove the regulars' extraordinary exemptions from the usual local authority of the bishop in whose diocese they worked. Various Archbishops of Manila, from Bishop Domingo de Salazar in the late sixteenth century onwards, met persistent failure in their efforts to enforce their right to visit and oversee the religious houses in their territory.¹

The visitation and secularisation controversies of the seventeenth and

¹ Horacio de la Costa, S.J., 'Episcopal Jurisdiction in the Philippines during the Spanish regime', in Anderson (ed), op. cit., 44-64; Salvador P. Escoto, 'The Ecclesiastical Controversy of 1767-1776: A Catalyst of Philippine Nationalism', Journal of Asian History, X, No. 2, 1976, 97-133; Phelan, Hispanicization, 32-33. The first of these conflicts occurred in 1611-1612 when Archbishop Diego Vazquez de Mercado tried to impose episcopal visitation on the regular parish clergy. The controversy reappeared in 1622 during the administration of Archbishop Miguel García Serrano and again in the time of Archbishop Poblete (1654-56); Camacho (1697), and Sancho de Santa Justa y Rufina (1767-76).
eighteenth centuries were connected to the second major issue dividing the Philippine Church from the mid-eighteenth century on, the struggle between the regular and secular clergies for control of the parishes. Ordinarily, according to church law, the secular clergy should have replaced the regulars once the latter had succeeded in establishing a parish organisation but the religious orders were not prepared to give up the parishes they had worked so hard to establish in often remote and ungrateful conditions. The regulars argued that the Philippines was still an active mission; indeed, they were still arguing this as late as January, 1900, when the Vatican was considering reorganising the church to accommodate it to American rule.\(^2\) The preservation and purification of the faith required the continued presence of the disciplined and proficient missionary orders, supported by their organisation and trained to cope with a laity regarded as always on the edge of returning to paganism.\(^3\)

The visitation and secularisation controversies were not overtly racial in the seventeenth century although the peninsula prejudice against colonial-born Spaniards as well as mestizos and indios set the limits within which a Catholic clergy could develop in the Philippines. The close alliance between Spanish missionaries and the royal government

\(^2\) Indeed, by 1960, the clergy of the Philippine Church were still evenly divided into Filipino secular and largely missionary (foreign) religious clergies; by the mid-1960s 1,800 foreign Roman Catholic priests were serving in the Philippines. The Philippines: The Church in an Unfinished Society, reprinted from Pro Mundi Vita, No. 30, 34-35. See also Memorial to His Holiness Pope Pius XII on the Native Religious Clergy in the Republic of the Philippines, 21 November, 1957, where the authors complain that after four hundred years of Christianisation, the Philippine Church was still dominated by foreign clergy.

\(^3\) Phelan, op. cit., 34, and see Chapter II, 127-29.
under the provisions of the **Patronato** further inhibited the development of a large and self-sufficient diocesan clergy. In the Philippines, the **Patronato** excluded the supervision of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda Fide which, since its foundation in 1622, had accepted the responsibility to encourage the development of indigenous clergies in missions under its control. Philip II had partitioned the Philippines among the various Spanish religious orders in the sixteenth century and additional royal **cedulas** decreed that only the king and not the local bishop could transfer the **doctrinas** or mission parishes established by the regulars to secular priests. The effects of these privileges and exemptions were to reduce the secular clergy to the status of parish assistants to the friars.

The racial denigration which was eventually directed against the Filipino clergy by the Spanish religious was prefigured in suspicions felt towards colonial-born or **criollo** priests from early in the history of the Philippine Church. Provided they satisfied the **limpieza** statutes and were not out of favour with the Inquisition, the sons of Spaniards in the colonial service were eligible to enter the seminaries conducted by the Jesuits and the Dominicans in Manila. The Jesuit chronicler, Pedro Chirino, remarked in 1604 that the first seven Philippine-Spaniards were 'all very pious, humble and devout' but commentators who followed him recorded a recurrent suspicion that

---

4 In an instruction of the Propaganda Fide of 23 November, 1845, addressed to the Vicars Apostolic of Eastern Asia, it was recommended with special urgency that priests be ordained from the local populations and that the 'custom of lowering the native priests to the status of clerical assistants, a custom justly obnoxious to them, must be done away with and entirely abrogated'. Native priests were even to be appointed as bishops. Quoted in **Memorial to Pius XII**, op. cit., 8.
colonial-born Spaniards were inferior and dangerous. At first, the colony was administered from New Spain and the elaborate racial distinctions recognised there were transported to the Philippines. One Archbishop of Manila voiced the general prejudice against criollo Spaniards in 1680 when he protested against a royal order enjoining the development of an indigenous secular clergy in the islands. Even Spaniards born in the colony, he warned, were unsuitable as priests since they were reared by Indian women and suffered from defective training in their early years.

The Spanish secular clergy, whether criollo, Mexican, or from the Peninsula, were never very numerous in the islands and tended to be concentrated in Manila. They lacked the corporate discipline and the international influence and resources of the regular orders. Nor did they enjoy the revenues from the estates which the orders gradually acquired. At the same time, the regular clergy exercised an independent authority in their missions which was actually greater than that of the secular parish clergy. Beginning with the bull, Omnimoda, issued by Pope Adrian VI in 1522, the papacy granted special privileges to the orders permitting

5 Pedro Chirino, Relación de las Islas Filipinas, Spanish and English texts (Manila, 1969), 102, 342. The Jesuit seminary, the Colegio de Manila (later the Colegio de San Ignacio) admitted Philippine-Spaniards from its foundation in 1595; the Dominican Colegio de Nuestra Señora del Rosario (in 1611, the College, and in 1645, the University of Santo Tomas) followed a few years later. See Horacio de la Costa, The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581-1763 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1961), 134-35, 236-37; and Chapter II, 128.

6 The Spanish in Mexico distinguished sixteen major racial classifications; Charles C. Cumberland, Mexico, the Struggle for Modernity (London, Oxford, New York: 1968), 55. See also Magnus Mörner, Race Mixture in the History of Latin America, (Boston, 1967).

7 Blair and Robertson, XLV, 182-83.
them to carry out the sacramental and other duties of the parish clergy
without the express sanction of the local bishop, an independence of the
Ordinary which was confirmed in the bull Exponi nobis (1567) promulgated
by Pius V. Notwithstanding the provisions for episcopal authority set
out by the Council of Trent, the regular clergy in the Spanish empire
were confirmed in their obedience not to the bishop but to their own
religious superior. The regulars' exemption from episcopal visitation
and their right to act as parish clergy were theoretically revoked by
subsequent papal decisions, confirmed by the Spanish Bourbons, in the
eighteenth century but the orders managed to retain their original privileges
in the Philippines although their counterparts in Spanish America were
obliged to hand over most of the parishes to the secular clergy. Those
diocesan bishops who attempted to enforce their episcopal authority over
the regulars working in their dioceses found, as did the civil administra-
tion, that there was no practicable alternative to the friars. The
members of the religious orders resisted all efforts to curtail their
independence and, as Horacio de la Costa has pointed out, they confronted
their critics with a simple but effective formula: either they were left
alone in possession of their estates and parishes or they abandoned the
Philippine mission and left the church without priests.8

The secularisation and visitation controversies and the perpetual
warfare between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities were serious but

8 The text of Omnimoda is in Shiels, King and Church, 212-14.
For details of the privileges won by the orders see W. Eugene Shiels,
'The Legal Crisis in the Jesuit Missions of Hispanic America', Mid-
America: An Historical Review, XXI, 1939, 253-76, reprinted in
Greenleaf (ed), op. cit., 108-21; Ricard, op. cit., 245ff; Escoto,
art. cit., 98-99. See also Horacio de la Costa, 'The development
of the Native Clergy in the Philippines', in Anderson (ed), op. cit.;
80-81.
they were fought out within the Spanish community and did not bring into question the right of Spanish sovereignty itself. The ordination of native priests radically altered this situation. The old controversies continued to divide the secular from the regular clergies and the hierarchy from the civil administration but now these struggles acquired a dangerous racialist and eventually a nationalist character. The regular clergy were apparently well aware of this danger and they put off the training and ordination of indios and mestizos in the islands as long as possible.

The debate over the desirability or otherwise of an indigenous clergy predated the conquest of the Philippines. Pope Leo X had already indicated the policy of the Holy See toward the development of native clergies in the Spanish colonies of South America as early as 1518 when he authorised the ordination of 'East Indians and Negroes considered capable of serving God'. This was more than half a century before the first mission was established in the Philippines. Shortly after the arrival of the first Spanish religious, Pope Gregory XIII issued a similar directive, in 1576, in which he permitted the ordination of half-castes and dispensed from the ban of illegitimacy the sons of Spaniards living with native women, thus allowing them to enter the seminaries.

De la Costa, 'Development of the Native Clergy', 75-76. See also Stephen Neill, A History of Christian Missions, 175. Some early colonists welcomed this trend. In 1525 Rodrigo de Labornoz reported to the king that New Spain would greatly benefit from the immediate formation of a native clergy drawn from the local nobility. One native priest was worth fifty Europeans in bringing Indians to the faith; de la Costa, ibid., 73; and Neill, ibid., 174. The College of Tlatelolco, founded in 1536, was intended to form a cultured, Hispanicised elite among the laity and to provide a certain number of native priests.
This initially liberal policy was resisted by the Spanish hierarchy as it began to realise the political and ecclesiastical threat posed by a native clergy. In the period when the basic pattern of missionary activity in the Philippines was being defined, the synods and councils of the church in New Spain adopted a hostile attitude towards the ordination of Indians. The first Council of Mexico (1555) extended the limpia de sangre statues to Indians, mestizos, and mulattoes, who were now excluded, along with the descendants of Moors, and persons condemned by the Inquisition, from the priesthood. The third Council of Mexico (1585) reaffirmed this prohibition and forbade 'Mexicans who are descended in the first degree from Indians, or from Moors, or from parents one of whom is a Negro', from ordination except in extraordinary circumstances. Bishops sometimes ignored this direction and only excluded mestizo and Indian candidates for the priesthood. The second Council of Lima (1591) made this exclusive policy quite explicit when it ordered tersely that 'Indians are not to receive any of the orders of the church'.

The experience of Mexico and Peru in the latter part of the sixteenth century meant that when the orders came to the Philippines they brought with them strong prejudices against the training of a native clergy, and while in missions outside the Spanish empire the Holy See encouraged the formation of indigenous, secular clergies (although with little success), the Spanish crown and the Spanish clergy refused to train and ordain Indians

10 De la Costa, ibid., 74-75; Neill, op. cit., 175.

11 De la Costa, ibid. This decision was in accord with the instructions of Philip II to the Bishop of Lima in 1578 ordering that in no circumstances were mestizos to be ordained despite the recent dispensation of Gregory XIII granting them that right. See also Magnus Mörner, op. cit., 43-44.
Horacio de la Costa has identified three main factors behind this policy. The first was the cultural gulf between Spaniards and Filipinos which made the training of a Spanish Catholic native clergy impractical in the early period of evangelisation. The Philippines did not come to have a large criollo and mestizo population as did Mexico so that pressures to soften the policy on ordinations were weaker. Secondly, the structure of the Philippine Church was determined by the nature of the Patronato Real, including the privileges granted to the orders in the sixteenth century, and this left no place for a native clergy even when the mission was ready for it. Lastly, the conciliar and synodal legislation against native priests adopted in Spanish America was extended without modification to the Philippines. In time, the reasons for the prohibitions became part of received wisdom and resistance to sharing the pastoral work in the islands with native priests became entrenched.

The debate over the desirability of ordaining native priests began in the Philippines in 1677 when the Philippine hierarchy received a decree of the king in council which recommended that the ordination of Indians 'familiar with the language and belonging to the same race' would greatly assist the evangelisation of the islands, and that seminaries should accept Indian students in accordance with the provisions of the Council of Trent. Archbishop Felipé Pardo of Manila ignored this advice on the grounds that the natives had little inclination for theological and moral

12 De la Costa, ibid., 76-77.
13 Ibid. 77-78.
14 Ibid., 81.
studies and were unable to rise above their 'evil customs, their vices, and their preconceived ideas.... the sloth produced by the climate, and [their] effeminacy and levity of disposition'. The attorney-general of the colony, Diego Antonio de Viga sent a separate letter to the government in Madrid pointing out that a refusal to train a native clergy could cause disaffection among the people, that native priests would find it easier to work among their own community and that, if the number of priests was not increased the church would suffer from inadequate or non-existent administration. The ordination of Filipino priests would free some Spanish regulars for mission work in other Asian countries. Diego Antonio de Viga recommended the immediate establishment of a seminary for natives of promise. In the event, nothing was done, until, under the first Bourbon King of Spain, Philip V, a definite royal order for the foundation of a seminary in Manila was issued. In the same year, by coincidence, an Italian secular priest visiting Manila with the Papal Legate to Peking, collected funds for the erection of a seminary building which would house Asian candidates for the priesthood recruited from throughout Asia and Southeast Asia. Jealous of his prerogatives, Philip V had the building torn down.

The first native seminarians were admitted in the 1720s in several colleges in Manila but a seminary specifically for their training as ordered by the decree of 1677 was not built. Generally, after ordination these first native priests did not gain control of parishes but were confined to

15 Ibid., 81-82.

16 Manila, 26 June, 1680, in de la Costa, ibid., 84.

17 1 April, 1702, de la Costa, ibid., 84-85.
cathedral positions and chaplaincies in Manila. Even so, from this moment, the secularisation controversy acquired a dangerous racial character. Complaints from some members of the religious orders began immediately. In 1725 the Augustinian friar, Gaspar de San Agustín, warned that all kinds of abominations would follow from the acceptance of native priests into the church. In his view, ordination did not relieve the indio of the vices inherent in his race; if anything, with exaltation to so high an office, his natural arrogance, laziness, cupidity and vanity would increase. Most dangerous of all, if any insurrection or mutiny should arise how could the Spaniards prevent the 'cure from entering into the dance'? The native priests had their defenders. The Jesuit, Juan José Delgado, in answer to San Agustín, wrote of the native clergy that 'although they are indios, they can serve as an example to shame Europeans'. Racial prejudice against native priests was unjust because experience in India and Japan as well as the practice of the holy apostles proved the fitness of non-Europeans for ordination. 18

San Agustín's warnings and the general opposition of the friars (with the exception of the Dominicans) to the ordination of natives did not prevent their number gradually increasing. By the time of Archbishop Basilio Sancho de Santa Justa y Rufina secular clergy held only fifteen of the 121 parishes in the Archdiocese of Manila. The census of 1780 listed 345 priests in charge of parishes in the islands of whom 95 were

18 San Agustín's views are in included in the extracts of his Letter in Blair and Robertson, XL, 252ff., and see Delgado's Historia general (Manila, 1892) quoted in de la Costa, op. cit., 89–90.
seculars: 54 in the Archdiocese, 23 in Cebú, 6 in Nueva Segovia, and 12 in Nueva Cáceres.\(^{19}\) How many of these seculars were not Spaniards but mestizos or indios was not indicated. Archbishop Sancho, in his struggle with the orders to reduce their power and independence, established the first seminary for natives soon after his arrival in 1767. Native priests were installed in some of those parishes and missions vacated by the Jesuits following their expulsion from the islands and in 1773, more native priests were put in the place of those Augustinians expelled from their parishes in Pampanga. The orders accused the Archbishop of ordaining natives without scruples concerning their lack of qualifications. Subsequent scandals irreparably harmed the Filipino clergy's cause and the secularisation and Filipinization of the Philippine Church was delayed for more than a century. By hastily ordaining poorly trained and ill-prepared indios and mestizos, the Archbishop confirmed the racial prejudices of the religious orders and gave them a practical justification for their hold over the parish system.\(^ {20}\)

\(^{19}\) Escoto, op. cit., 101. See also Pedro V. Salgado, O.P., 'Contribution of the Secular Clergy', Boletín Eclesiastico de Filipinas, XXXIX, No. 435, January-February, 1965, 255-56. In 1735, Francisco San Agustin, O.F.M. calculated that there were 142 towns with 131,279 Christians in the care of secular priests while the regulars controlled 450 towns. De la Costa is mistaken when he states that in 1750 'native priests had charge of 142 parishes and missions out of a total of 569'; op. cit., 87. Not all seculars were natives and it would have been impossible for the new policy of ordaining natives to have had such dramatic results in so short a time.

\(^{20}\) Escoto, op. cit., 100-102; de la Costa, op. cit., 94-98. See the Memorial to King Carlos III, Manila, 1 October, 1768, reproduced in La Solidaridad, Madrid, 31 March, 1891; 15 April, 1891; 15 June, 1891; and 15 August, 1891; for the orders' view of the struggle and of the incompetence of the native clergy.
By the end of the eighteenth century the situation had developed where the Spanish religious could not be challenged in their control of the parishes as well as the other institutions of the church, while an indigenous secular clergy, treated with suspicion and contempt, was nevertheless still essential to the daily working of the parish system. The consequences of a deliberate policy of half-training and suppressing a large number of Filipino priests were apparent even to foreign visitors to the Philippines.  

An English naval officer observed in the 1820's that although the Indian clergy were given administrative responsibility in many large districts and towns,' they are as a body far from being worthy of such an important charge. The majority of them are ignorant to the last degree, proud, debauched, and indolent: in a word, they unite the vices of the priesthood to those of the Indian, and form a class of men who may almost be said to be distinguished by their vices only'. He thought that this condition was caused by their exclusion from the higher ecclesiastical situations, so depriving them of 'the most powerful stimulus to correct conduct':

With the very confined education they receive, and the impossible line drawn between them and the Spanish clergy, whom they are never allowed to approach, and who treat them with much contempt, [this is] sufficient to account, in great measure, for their apparent demerit....Their ordinary resort at Manila is the cockpit or the gaming table, where they show an avidity and keenness which are disgraceful to the last degree.

By men such as these, he added, 'nearly nine-tenths of all the clerical

---

21 Tomas de Comyn said of the 1000 or more native priests in the Philippines in 1810 that 'through their great ignorance, corrupt morals, and total want of decorum [they] universally incur the contempt of the flocks committed to their care'; they deserved to be deprived of the parishes they held and reduced to mere assistants: State of the Philippines in 1810, trans. William Walton (Manila, 1969), 109-14.
duties were performed'. A keen and deadly jealousy existed between the local clergy and the Spanish ecclesiastics, 'or rather a hatred on the one side and a contempt on the other':

The Indian clergy accuse these last of a neglect of their ecclesiastical duties, of vast accumulations of property in lands, &c., which, say they, 'belong to us the Indians'. The Spaniards in return treat them with silent contempt, continuing to enjoy the best benefices, and living at their ease in the convents.\(^{22}\)

The fact was that the religious orders were indispensable both for the Church and for the administration. By threatening to abandon the Philippine mission they were able to blackmail the diocesan bishops (when they were not members of the orders themselves) into permitting their special privileges to continue. By making themselves indispensable to the administration, they were able to persuade the Spanish government to adopt a repressive policy towards the indigenous clergy. There was one further argument available to the religious which could silence opposition to their authority when all else failed. The Spanish publicist, Francisco Cañamaque, expressed the root fear which negated all efforts to provide the Filipino clergy with better education and greater authority: they could not be trusted; they were enemies of Spain.\(^{23}\) The repeated accusation that the Filipino was incapable of assimilating any but the most rudimentary education disguised the ever-present fear first expressed by San Agustín but repeated throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, that if he should prove to be the equal of his teachers he might discover he no longer needed 'If he was competent, his competence

\(^{22}\) Anonymous, Remarks on the Philippine Islands, 1819 to 1822, "by an Englishman" (Calcutta, 1828), in Blair and Robertson, LI, 115-17.

\(^{23}\) Quoted in W.E. Retana, Frailes y Clerigos, Madrid, 1900 (first published 1891); and see Memorial to His Holiness Pope Pius XII (1957), 19.
proved that he was a rebel'. It was obvious to Spanish observers that the emergence of a self-confident, ambitious native clergy, possessing education and the charismatic authority of the priest in a Roman Catholic society, posed an extremely dangerous threat to Spanish rule as much as to the privileges and authority of the Spanish clergy. The ordination of Filipinos to the priesthood was potentially more subversive of Spanish assumptions of authority than the granting of commissions to Filipinos in the military. Confrontation between Spanish friar and Filipino secular brought into question the very source of Spanish authority: the authority to preach the Gospel and celebrate the sacraments, bringing the unconverted into the Kingdom of God. A self-sufficient indigenous clergy put in question the justification for a continued Spanish presence. Only if the local clergy were degraded and relegated to minor positions could the Spanish state as well as the Spanish hierarchy theoretically support their hold on the colony. It was at this deeper level that the apparently reasonable demand of the Filipino clergy to take a greater share in the government of the church aroused fundamental fears. Any questioning of Spanish domination of the church ultimately involved the king who as patron of the church ultimately controlled it. The identification of church and colonial administration was embedded in the law, in barrio, local, provincial and colonial government.

24 De la Costa, op. cit., 100.

25 The Spanish penal code expressly forbade any questioning of Catholic dogma; Section 226 stated that those who did so were to be imprisoned. Bernardita G. Panganiban, 'The Role of the Roman Catholic Church in Philippine Politics', Master of Arts thesis, University of the Philippines, 1956, 23. For an extended discussion of the formal status of the church under Spain see Jorge R. Coquia, Legal Status of the Church in the Philippines (Washington, 1950).
From 1810 Spain was particularly sensitive to the danger of an ambitious indigenous priesthood. Local priests had taken a leading part in the wars of independence in the American colonies. The process of reversing those gains the Filipino clergy had managed to make in the previous century was well under way even before the warning of events in Mexico and Peru. In 1804, Governor Aguilar authorised the appointment of Spanish regulars to the vacant parishes of Santa Rosa, Imus, and Las Pinas, excluding Filipino secular priests from them for the remainder of Spanish rule. In 1826, a royal cedula finally ended the token commitment of the Spanish government to the secularisation of the Church in the Philippines and ordered the return to the regulars of the parishes which had been taken from them since Archbishop Sancho de Santa Justa's time. The royal cedula of 1774 which had officially decreed the replacement of regular clergy by secular clergy in the parishes was finally abandoned. What was worse, the 1826 decree ordered that all the parishes which had been turned over to the secular clergy since 1774 and earlier, should be restored to the religious clergy as they became vacant through the death or retirement of the incumbent Filipino priest.

The lower clergy generally supported the revolution in Mexico in 1810, angered by the monopolizing of the highest ecclesiastical positions by Gachupines. Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, and the mestizo priest, José María Morelos y Pavon, were leaders in the revolt. Charles C. Cumberland, *Mexico, The Struggle for Modernity* (London, 1968), 117 ff; Mecham, op. cit., 50-66. Salgado, op. cit., 257, believed the wars of independence in Latin America prompted the Spanish Government to support the Spanish clergy from 1826 onwards.


The decree of 8 July, 1826 was the first of a number which dispossessed the Filipino clergy of many of the parishes they had taken over since the 1770s. A royal cedula of 20 June, 1848, transferred parishes held by native priests in Negros to the Recollects. A royal order of 9 March, 1849 removed them from seven parishes in Cavité province; the parishes of Bacoor, Cavite Viejo, and Silang going to the Recollects, and Santa Cruz, San Francisco de Malabon, Naic and Indan to the Dominicans. The hostility these two royal orders aroused was brought to a crisis when the secular clergy learned of a third, that of 10 September, 1861. An earlier decree of 30 July, 1859 had arranged for the Jesuit Fathers who had recently returned to the islands to assume responsibility for the parishes in Mindanao administered by the Recollects. The 10 September decree indemnified the Recollects by granting them parishes in the Archdiocese of Manila which had been administered by native priests. Archbishop Meliton Martínez complained that the royal order was issued while the Archbishopric was vacant and he wrote to the Regent he would have renounced the archbishopric to which he had just been appointed if he had known he was expected to accept responsibility for such a policy. The dispossession of the Filipino clergy was the more resented because it was seen as a deliberate attack on them. As the Archbishop pointed out, it would have been much more logical for the Recollects to have been

29 Letter of Archbishop Gregorio Melitón Martínez to the Regent, Manila, 31 December, 1870, document 8 in Schumacher, Burgos, 195; and also in Austin Craig and Conrado Benitez, Philippine Progress Prior to 1898 (Manila, 1916), 121 ff. See also William Howard Taft, 'The Church and Our Government in the Philippines', address before Faculty and Students of University of Notre Dame, 5 October, 1904 (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1904), 15-16. Archbishop Meliton Martínez did not arrive in Manila until 27 May, 1862; his predecessor died on 18 April, 1861. The 10 September decree was later amplified to cover the parishes of Manila.
assigned new parishes in the Diocese of Cebú which was more in need of parish clergy than the Archdiocese.

The evident decision by the Spanish Government to support the regular clergy and suppress the Filipino seculars coincided with an intensification of interest among the religious orders in the Philippine mission. In this period, the orders established missionary colleges in the peninsula specifically to recruit priests for the Philippines, replacing the old system of calling for volunteers from various provinces in Spain. In 1836, the hostile Liberal government of Mendizábal had ordered the dissolution of all religious houses in Spain with the exception of the missionary seminaries training priests for the Philippines. This led to an increase in the number of friars willing to go to the Philippines and an increasing pressure on well-established parishes. At the same time, from 1832, Filipinos were not permitted to become members of the religious orders.

The exclusion of Filipinos from the religious orders, their gradual and humiliating removal from some parishes and abrupt dispossession from others, the abuse printed against them in books and pamphlets by Spanish writers including their fellow Spanish priests led to a strong movement within the secular clergy to assert their rightful position. Between 1826 and 1872 opinion among sections of the laity as well as the clergy

30 Schumacher, Burgos, 11.

31 Taft, 'The Church and Our Government', art. cit., 16; Taylor Philippine Insurrection, I, 38. See also Chapter II, 168-69.
began to shift against the friars. The 1840-41 rising of Apolinario de la Cruz and his followers in the Cofradía de San José was a grave lesson that the dominance of the Spanish religious could be challenged by the laity. The friars were judged in the values of the Pasión as self-seeking and hypocritical. Apolinario de la Cruz was, as Richard L. Deats has called him, 'the first martyr' in the popular movement which grew throughout the nineteenth century and which eventually culminated in the revolution of 1896. The overreaction of the colonial administration to the Tayabas movement included the arrest of a number of prominent ilustrados in Manila alleged to be sympathetic to the rising.

There were other consequences: Apolinario de la Cruz had been refused entry into a religious order and instead became the leader of a religious brotherhood, the Cofradía de San José, the movement which led to an open confrontation with the Spanish authorities in Tayabas in 1840-41. As Ileto has pointed out, the Cofradía appealed to the deepest values of folk society, whereas the Spanish institutions controlled by the regular clergy were more remote; Ileto, op. cit., Chapter II.

Nationalism and Christianity in the Philippines (Dallas, Texas, 1967), 35. Deats assumes the Cofradía was a movement towards 'religious liberty'; LeRoy thought Apolinario was 'a sincere fanatic' who 'posed as a new Christ among the Filipinos'. It is interesting that he mentions the Pasión in the same paragraph but he dismisses the Cofradía and the Pasión as 'superstition'; Town and Country, 72. For the report of French Consul Fabre on the Tayabas massacre of 1841, see Horacio de la Costa, Readings in Philippine History (Manila, etc., 1965), Reading 2, 214. Contrast these external and superficial explanations of the Cofradía de San José with that of Ileto, op. cit., Chapter II.

Fabre thought the harsh measures taken by the administration clearly warned the colonial-born elite that they were regarded as subversives to be persecuted at will; ibid., Reading 3, 215. The execution of de la Cruz and his supporters led to a second revolt on 20 January, 1843, under the leadership of Sergeant Samaniego. The French Consul described this revolt as 'the first time that the word independence had been used in the Philippines'; Reading 4, 215.
The hierarchy and the administration responded to unrest with greater repression, singling out the Filipino clergy as the most subversive element in colonial society. They were confirmed in this attitude by the report in 1843 of Sinibaldo de Mas. De Mas warned that there was no other effective bond uniting the Philippines and Spain than the Catholic religion. Nothing was more dangerous in undermining Spanish authority than the ordination of native priests.

The leader of the Filipino clergy in their struggle to counter the campaign against them was a Spanish criollo, Father Pedro Peláez. Father Peláez was of such personal stature that he was chosen to assume the administration of the Archdiocese of Manila as vicar-capitular or ecclesiastical governor when the Archbishop of Manila, José Aranguren, died in 1862. In the propaganda struggle following the decree of 1849, the Filipino clergy collected money for lobbying in Madrid and for financing a series of articles in Spanish newspapers putting their case. The campaign was not successful but it set a precedent for further resistance when, in September, 1861, twenty-seven parishes held by secular priests in the Archdiocese were turned over to the Recollects.

35 Sinibaldo de Mas, 'Internal Political Condition of the Philippines, 1842; Report of the Condition of the Philippine Islands in 1842', vol. III, Madrid, January, 1843, in Blair and Robertson, LII, 45. De Mas himself favoured reform and eventual autonomy for the colony.

36 For a biographical note on Father Peláez, see Carlos Quirino, 'A Checklist of Documents on Conchurza from the Archdiocesan Archives of Manila', Philippine Studies, XXI, 1973, 23-26; Zude, I, 46, n.19; Schumacher, Burgos, 13. Peláez was born on 29 June, 1812, in Pagsanjan, Laguna. He obtained with highest honours, four degrees - Bachelor of Arts (1829), Bachelor of Sacred Theology (1833), Licentiate in Sacred Theology (1836), and Doctor of Sacred Theology (1844). He was a professor at the College of San Juan de Letran and the University of Santo Tomas where he taught José Burgos. See also Austin Craig, 'Peláez, Preacher of Patriotism', The Philippines Herald, 11 September, 1921.
decree unambiguously relegated Filipino priests to the role of permanent assistants to the friars.

Father Peláez sent a formal protest to Queen Isabel II but the alliance of royal officials and the representatives of the religious orders in Madrid again proved too strong. In 1862 the parish priest of Antipolo died. The parish of Antipolo, not far from Manila, was one of the richest in the islands, containing the shrine of Our Lady of Antipolo. Although the priest's stipend was not great, the offerings during the annual pilgrimage to Antipolo each May sustained the parish for the rest of the year. Antipolo had been administered by the Filipino secular clergy for many years and when its priest died, another secular priest, Father Francisco Campmas, was named by Father Peláez to succeed him. The Provincial of the Recollects protested the appointment, claiming that according to the decree of 1861, the parish should revert to the Recollect order. The Recollects put forward three names to the Governor-General from which he, acting as Vice-Royal Patron and overruling the administrator of the archdiocese, might appoint one to the parish. The Governor-General referred the dispute to Madrid and again the decision was unfavorable to the Filipino clergy. Archbishop Gregorio Melitón Martínez, who had by this time taken possession of the See, was obliged to install the Recollect Father Francisco Villa although he protested against the injustice of the appointment. At this critical moment in the

37 Exposición, 10 March, 1862.

38 Schumacher, Burgos, 17; Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, I, 39; Agoncillo and Alfonso, History of the Filipino People, 140. The Bishops of Cebú and Nueva Cáceres, although they were regulars, also supported the claim of the Filipino clergy to retain the parish. The Filipino clergy also lost the San Rafael parish in Bulacan because of the 1861 decree. The three bishops sent a formal protest to Madrid against the increase in power of the secular clergy but the governor—
struggle, Father Peláez was killed in the earthquake of 3 June, 1863. Leadership of the Filipino clergy passed to his former student and disciple, Father José Burgos.

Events in Spain provoked the next crisis in the religious struggle. The revolution of September, 1868, drove Queen Isabela from her throne and introduced a period of uncertainty and change into Spanish government. The revolution had strong liberal and anti-clerical elements and the arrival of a new governor-general in the Philippines therefore aroused the hopes of the Filipino clergy and their sympathisers that the friars would be recalled or at least removed from the parishes. Again they were disappointed: Spanish liberalism, apparently, was not exportable.

Governor-General Carlos de la Torre quickly became suspicious of Filipino liberals and priests, seeing them as a challenge to Spanish rule rather than as allies against the religious orders. In a letter to the Minister of Overseas of 4 January, 1870, de la Torre deplored the 'mad hopes' aroused by the September Revolution and gave the opinion that

> With very rare exceptions there is not a priest or lawyer born in this country with some education and influence who, both now and always, has not employed them in creating around his aspirations for independence .... the whole country points its finger at certain individuals of the clergy and certain lawyers, all mestizos and Philippine Spaniards. Without any doubt, these men, according to private information and confidences I have received, and from the indications emerging in the

general and the majority of members of his council born in Spain, voted against allowing the decree to be forwarded on from Manila. Archbishop Melitón Martínez and Bishop Francisco Gainza, O.P., of Cebú drew up a plan to reform the Philippine Church in 1863, intending to assert episcopal control over regular clergy acting as parish priests and to reapply the law of the cloister over regulars in religious houses and conventos. The reaction was so intense that the Archbishop found himself isolated and the object of attack in Spanish as well as Philippine newspapers.
confidential dossiers drawn up for this purpose, everything, I repeat, leads one to believe that these lawyers and priests are the only ones here who dream of the independence of the country.

The regular clergy, by contrast, were ardently on the side of authority. In a following letter he repeated that he was convinced that 'the native clergy is and always will be here a constant element of more or less open disturbance'. There was a reason for this in that the native clergy was deprived of the possibility of aspiring to positions in the church. De la Torre held a conference with the Ecclesiastical Governor of the Archdiocese (Melitón Martínez was in Rome attending the Vatican Council) and the Provincials of the Dominican, Augustinian, Recollect and Franciscan orders at which measures were adopted which, while providing for Filipino priests to be immediately assigned to vacant coadjutorships in the Archdiocese, placed the native clergy under the close surveillance of the friars; the fifth resolution advising that

The Reverend Fathers Provincial will adopt suitable measures to see to it that the parish priests treat the coadjutors from the native secular clergy with due consideration, oblige them to live in the conventos, watch over their conduct, and with the prudence and tact which the matter demands, will inform the authorities of whatever they believe proper, so that a suitable remedy may be applied.

The suspicion and hostility felt towards the Filipino clergy by the

39 Confidential Letter No. 167, from the Governor of the Philippines, Carlos María de la Torre, to the Overseas Minister, Manila, 4 January, 1870; document 5 in Schumacher, Burgos, 119-21. For the intelligence work of the colonial government under de la Torre, see John N. Schumacher and Nicholas P. Cushner, 'Documents Relating to Father José Burgos and the Cavite Mutiny of 1872', Philippine Studies, XVII, 1969, 457 ff.

representative of a government with no love for the friars clearly proved that colonial rule and expediency meant that whatever the philosophy or political character of the administration, the religious corporations, because they were made up of Peninsulares dedicated to maintaining Spanish rule, and because they were entrenched in the ecclesiastical administration and the civil bureaucracy, could always win the administration to their side. They were indispensable to colonial authority while the apparently reasonable demands of the Filipino clergy brought into question the fact of rule by force which lay behind the legalism and rhetoric of colonial policies.

In practice, the policies adopted by the colonial administration towards the Filipino clergy could hardly have been more inflammatory. The process of removing Filipino priests from parishes they regarded as rightfully theirs dragged on for fifty-five years. There was no sudden disestablishment of the seculars but a war of attrition which created a new crisis every time a parish became vacant. According to Tomas de Comyn, the native clergy administered almost half of the 500 or more parishes in the islands in 1810, the four Spanish orders controlling 293 pueblos. On de Comyn's calculations, over 200 parishes were administered by Filipino seculars early in the nineteenth century; by 1870 the seculars controlled only 181 out of 792 parishes and by 1898, members of the religious orders possessed all but 157 of the 967 parishes in the islands. The Filipino clergy had lost in absolute terms over fifty

41 Tomas de Comyn, op. cit., 112.

42 Agoncillo and Alfonso, op. cit., 141; and see Chapter 1. Sinibaldo de Mas reported that Filipino seculars controlled 198 parishes in 1842, Report, op. cit. II, 36-37.
parishes between 1810 and 1898 while the total number of parishes had
doubled and the population of the Philippines had increased three or
four times. The parishes they lost included some of the wealthiest
and most important. The situation in Batangas in the 1890's reflected
the generally inferior incomes of parishes retained by Filipino priests.
The Augustinian Fathers administered the parishes of Batangas, Bauan,
Taal and San Luis, Lipa, Tanauan, Lemery, San José, Ibaan, Cuenca, and
Talisay. The first four of these carried stipends of $1,200 a year;
Tanauan brought $900, Lemery and San José, $800; Ibaan, Cuenca and
Talisay, $600. The Recollect Fathers administered the parishes of
Balayan with its annex, Calatagan, worth $900 a year; Rosario, San Juan
de Bocboc, and Santo Tomas, worth $800 a year; and Taysan and Lobo, worth
$600 a year. The Filipino secular clergy administered only three
parishes, those of Tuy, Nasugbu and Lian, worth $800, $600, and $500 a
year. In addition, there were 33 Filipino coadjutors distributed as
assistants to the friars throughout the province. 43

Because the Filipino clergy could look back to a time when their
position was considerably better and because they were convinced of the
injustice of the policies adopted against them, the existing antagonism
between the regular and secular clergies acquired a bitter racial
character between 1849 and 1872. As Archbishop Melitón Martínez warned
in 1870, the suppression of the Filipino clergy threatened disastrous
consequences for Spanish rule. Since he had taken possession of the
Archdiocese, he had seen the Philippine Church repeatedly convulsed by

43 Manuel Sastron, Filipinas, Pequeños Estudios: Batangas y su
Provincia (Malabong, 1895), 309. Sastron was Civil Governor of
the Province.
the forcible transfer of parishes from the Filipino to the Spanish clergy. The antagonism this aroused had reached the point where 'what was formerly only hostility to the friars is changing into anti-Spanish sentiment'. It was an urgent necessity that the Filipino clergy should be offered some relief from their discontent and exasperation since, if the effervescence which I noticed in them on my return from the Vatican Council continues for any considerable length of time it will give an opportunity for the sentiments of the native clergy spreading among their parents, relatives, and the entire Filipino people, with whom they are in closer touch than the friars, and so the evil might take on grave proportions.

If Spain did not put out this 'little fire', it might by accident be fanned into a 'vast conflagration, in which perhaps the first to serve as food for the flames would be the very ones who occupy themselves in spreading their vain fears'.\textsuperscript{44} Little more than a year later, such an 'accident' occurred when the Governor-General took exactly opposite advice by trying and executing the leaders of the Filipino clergy, thus provoking a revulsion against Spanish rule which fundamentally altered the relationship between Spaniard and Filipino.

The resistance of the Tagalog and Pampangan clergies to the decrees of 1849 and 1861 encouraged them and their supporters to think of themselves not as mestizos or indios, Tagalogs or Pampangans, but as Filipinos. The word began to acquire the meaning it was to have under the Philippine Republic; previously it was used to describe Spaniards born or settled in the Philippines. The growth of an educated, Hispanicised elite - the ilustrados - and the commercial expansion of the economy of the islands provided the social and economic bases for the

\textsuperscript{44} Melitón Martínez, op. cit.
emergence of a sense of national identity among the elite but the
struggle between the Spanish regular and the Filipino secular clergies
gave the process of new self-definition an urgency and clarity it would
have lacked otherwise. The process was gradual and was by no means
complete even by the time of the Malolos Congress of 1898 but the
struggles begun in 1849 were an essential beginning for the nationalist
movement supported by the *ilustrado* Propagandists of the 1880s and 1890s.
Father Burgos had a decisive influence on this movement by broadening
the controversy over control of the parishes to include the basic problem
of the proper relationship between Spanish colonist and Filipino subject.

While still a seminarian, Burgos entered into the struggle to
assert the rights of the Filipino clergy when, in June, 1864, in defence
of the memory of Father Peláez, he published anonymously his most substan­
tial work, the *Manifiesto que a la noble nación española dirigen los leales filipinos*.\(^{45}\) The manifesto was also a defence of Archbishop Meliton

\(^{45}\) Translated as 'Manifesto which the loyal Filipinos address to the noble
Spanish nation in defence of their honour and loyalty gravely wounded
by the newspaper *La Verdad de Madrid*', document 3, in Schumacher,
*Burgos*, 59-115 (Spanish and English). The Manifesto is dated Manila,
24 June, 1864. José Apolonio Burgos was born in 1837 in Vigan, Ilocos
Sur 'the son of Spanish parents' (although Fidel Villaroel, *Father
José Burgos, University Student*, Manila, 1971, says his mother was a
*mestiza*): He was described as an 'español' in 1864 according to records
in the Manila Archdiocesan archives. He graduated with a bachelor's
degree in philosophy from the University of Santo Tomas in 1855. As a
student he led a demonstration against the irregular appointment of a
College official, for which he was suspended for six months. In 1861
he was ordained a deacon and received his licentiate in philosophy.
He put off his ordination for four years so as to complete his studies
for his doctorates in canon law and theology, and so was still not
ordained at the time of Peláez' death. Even before his ordination he
had been made a prebendary of the Manila Cathedral and in November, 1863,
the Archbishop awarded him a chaplaincy which carried a stipend of
2,601 pesos a year. In September, 1864, he sat for an examination for
appointment to several vacant curacies in the Archdiocese and was
awarded the position of second parish priest of Manila. A few days
after his ordination he assumed parish duties on 16 January, 1865. He
was given a seat in the choir of the Cathedral and a vote in the Cathedral
Martínez whose support of the Filipino clergy had earned him the hatred of the friar party. The manifesto was a reply to an article appearing in the Madrid newspaper, La Verdad, which accused Peláez and the Filipino clergy of encouraging rebellion. He set out to defend the preferential right which the secular clergy of the Philippines had to those parishes which were being taken from them and to answer 'the disgraceful and unworthy slanders' against the secular clergy made as part of a campaign to down-grade and abolish it. He wrote in defence of the secular clergy 'be they Philippine-born Spaniards or natives'. Burgos pointed out that until 1826, the Laws of the Indies and all other laws subsequent to them acknowledged the preferential right of the secular clergy to administer the parishes; canon law did not concede that right to the religious except where there was a lack of secular priests.

The manifesto is particularly concerned to refute the allegation that 'the Filipino by his nature, by his character, by the influence of the climate or the race, is not good for undertaking lofty offices'; that 'their intelligence is not equal to the lofty office of the pastor of souls'. Burgos traced these 'absurd and scandalous ideas' to the friars, Chapter in 1865, evidence that the Archbishop was interested in him. On 14 April, 1868, he was invested with the degree of Doctor in Sacred Theology and on 29 October, 1868, with a Licentiate in Canon Law; receiving his Doctorate in Canon Law in the following year. In 1866 he had been appointed synodal examiner and in 1868 he was promoted to acting promotor fiscal (ecclesiastical attorney general). Early in September, 1871, the Archbishop appointed him acting Magisterial Canon of the Chapter. In January, 1872, Manuel Regidor was acting on his behalf in an effort to have Burgos awarded the post in the Cathedral Chapter left vacant by the death of Father Villafranca. He was awarded the order of regular Commander of Isabella the Catholic on 5 August, 1871. Quirino, art. cit., 26-31; Leandro Tormo Sánz, 1872, Documents (Manila, 1974), passim; Schumacher, Burgos, 21; Schumacher and Cushner, art. cit., and Sol H. Gwekoh, Burgos, Gomes, Zamora, Secular Martyrs of Filipinism (Quezon City, 1974), 21 ff.
who made use of the 'infamous strategem of belittling the capacity and
aptitude of the Filipino secular clergy in order to make themselves
necessary in the country and to perpetuate themselves in the parishes'.
With education, all men born in the Philippines were capable of a stature
equal to that of the Peninsula Spaniard. All men belonged fundamen-
tally to the one family: recent scientific evidence had demonstrated
that there was 'no innate superiority of intelligence' between races;
only differences in education and circumstances. Quoting contemporary
authorities, he argued that only skin pigmentation differentiated the
Negroes from the European: the brain of both races, apart from some
superficial differences, was essentially the same organ, another proof of
the unity of the human species. Among 'pure Indios without any Spanish
blood' who had become great men was Miguel Lino de Espeleta who had risen
to be Bishop of Cebú and Acting Governor-General.

It is interesting that Burgos, a priest, chose to support his
argument for racial equality with scientific evidence drawn from German
anatomists and physiologists rather than with canonical and theological
precepts taken from church law and the Scriptures. The policy adopted by
the Spanish Government in 1826, as a reaction to the involvement of secular
priests in the independence movements of Latin America, was to hand back
the parishes to the regular orders in the Philippines, a policy which
reflected the mentality of what historians have called 'the ominous decade'.

Domingo Abella has argued that Espeleta was of 'full-blooded Spanish
parentage' and was a criollo and that there were no 'Filipino' bishops
during the Spanish regime; Eighteenth Century Documents on Bishop
Miguel Lino de Espeleta of Cebú, reprinted from The Philippine
(1823-1833) of unrelieved clerical reaction in the Peninsula. But whereas liberal governments alternated with conservative ones in Spain and influential sections of the bourgeoisie adopted increasingly anti-clerical ideas, the reactionary religious policies introduced into the Philippines became increasingly oppressive throughout the rest of the century, despite the replacement of royalist governors-general with Republic governors in 1868, as noted earlier.

Burgos, in protesting this trend in the colony to exclude criollos, mestizos and indios on racial grounds, had available to him the universalist and egalitarian Catholic traditions articulated by Las Casas and Mendieta in the sixteenth century. Moreover, these writers appealed to Christian beliefs and teachings which should have been the most powerful arguments with which to counter the racial theories countenanced by some contemporary scientists and increasingly accepted by some of the regular clergy. Burgos was acutely aware of the contradiction of increasing racialism in the Philippines in 'an era characterised by the rule of fraternity, of equality before the law, of progress in all the branches of knowledge'. Yet he chose not to assert the unity of mankind

47 Raymond Carr, Spain, 1808-1939, 146. The work of the Spanish progressives begun in 1812 and proclaimed in the 'Arreglo del Clero' by the last Cortes del Trienio in 1823 was destroyed in that year by the defenders of the 'altar and throne' position allied to the Fernando Restoration. Under Fernando VII the Inquisition was reinstated, the ultramontane, royalist wing of the clergy resumed control of the church, and characteristic theories blaming the devil and freemasonry dominated Spanish Catholic thought; provoking more intense anti-clerical persecutions in the civil war of 1840. José Manuel Cuenca, Estudios sobre la iglesia española del XIX (Madrid, 1973), 20; 63ff. See Chapter I and II.

by quoting the New Testament that God had made 'of one blood all nations of men' but rather appealed to the Benthamite tradition of pointing to the physiological unity of all mankind. Man was perfectible through scientific education. Burgos' arguments from contemporary science neatly countered the alternative 'scientific' theories whose influence has been detected in friar thought in the Philippines in the latter part of the nineteenth century (see Chapter II). For Burgos, science and reason reaffirmed the universality and equality of all men taught in the gospels.

It is also apparent that for Burgos, as for the ilustrados of the emerging Filipino commercial and professional elite, the discovery of a distinct Filipino identity was to be found in emulating the material and moral progress and prosperity of 'European civilisation'. Burgos is quite specific in his advocacy of secular progress and the primacy of reason. Spain had freed herself from 'the legacy of superstitious generations who had falsified the holy institutions of their inspired founders'. He meant by this more than his rejection of the excesses of the Inquisition or the pervasive fact of racial discrimination in the church. He approved the confiscation of some church property and the disestablishment of the regular clergy in the Peninsula. Burgos was the Philippine equivalent of the progressive leaders of the Peninsular 'lower clergy', the diocesan priests who had encouraged Economic and Patriotic societies in late eighteenth century Spain and who, as Wellington remarked, organised local

49 For an introduction to the contemporary European debate on racial differences, see Christine Bolt, Victorian Attitudes to Race (London, 1971), and see Chapter II, 184 ff.

50 Manifiesto, op. cit., 107.

51 Schumacher, ibid., 104, n. 35.
resistance to the Napoleonic invasion. The Spanish secular clergy was almost as estranged from the regular clergy as was the Filipino secular clergy. The diocesan parish clergy in Spain in the rural areas and particularly in the Basque country and Catalonia tended to side with the peasantry in the war over control of the land. In the urban centres, the better educated of the lower clergy gave support to moderate liberal programmes for reform in contrast to members of the religious orders whose political position increasingly moved to the conservative right in the nineteenth century. It was the regular clergy who suffered the full attack of anti-clerical governments and urban mobs. In July, 1835, when the religious houses and conventos were burned in Madrid and Barcelona, the cathedrals and parish churches belonging to the secular

52 Contrast Burgos' stress on the empirical and rationalist values of contemporary biologists and scientists such as Claude Bernad with the inspiration of another nationalist, reformist priest, the Abbé Gregoire, whose political ideas arose from a radical reading of the gospels interpreted as an egalitarian call to brotherly love and social justice; see Hans Maur, Revolution and Church: The Early History of Christian Democracy, 1789-1901 (Notre Dame, Ind., 1969); M.G. Hutt, 'The Cures and the Third Estate: The Ideas of Reform in the Pamphlets of the French Lower Clergy in the Period 1787-1789', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, VIII, 1957, 84ff; and Norman Ravitch, 'Liberalism, Catholicism, and the Abbé Gregoire', Church History, XXXVI, 1967, 422ff. The 'revolt of the cures' in France drew its ideas from the French theologian Edmond Richer (1560-1631) who preached the independent divine authority of the lower clergy as the successors of the seventy-two early followers of Jesus; Lewy, op. cit., 350.

53 Carr, Spain, 46-47.

54 In 1823 the monks of Mora del Ebro were shot for their counter-revolutionary activities and a bishop and fourteen priests massacred by a militia column; Carr, ibid., 143. For details of later attacks see Joan Connelly Ullman, The Tragic Week, A Study of Anticlericalism in Spain, 1875-1912 (Cambridge, Mass., 1969).
clergy were untouched. The disentailing measures of the same year abolished all religious orders except those engaged in educational, charitable or missionary work. In 1851, when Spain signed the Concordat with the Holy See, the Liberals agreed that the state would support the secular clergy and recognise Catholic unity as the religious-ethical basis of the nation. It was the regulars who were disestablished and uncompensated. The anti-clericals singled them out as 'an intolerable anachronism' and a 'source of poison in a liberal state', judgements that were echoed by a later generation of intellectuals in the Philippines. For much of the nineteenth century, the Franciscan, Dominican, Recollect and Augustinian orders were confined to working in the Philippines.

Burgos was not unusual then, in arguing as a diocesan priest that the friars had abused their position and that they deserved the curtailment of their privileges. His enthusiasm for science and progress and some liberal values linked him to the next generation of nationalist intellectuals in the Philippines, although men like Marcelo del Pilar and Graciano López Jaena were to accept ideas which for Burgos would have been unacceptable as irreligious. Yet even in Burgos' thought there was an inherent contradiction. In the church of his day although his ideas were not heretical they were extremely unpopular and the Spanish regulars who eventually denounced him as a traitor placed him with the masons, filibusters and other agents of the conspiracy against religion and the church. The Augustinian, Eladio Zamora, recalled 1872 and the trial of

55 Ullman, ibid., 29.

56 Carr, op. cit., 234-35.
Burgos, Gomes and Zamora as evidence of treachery and disloyalty to God of many of the Filipino clergy. The mestizo and indio clergy were as envious, ambitious and subversive as the lawyers and doctors and other ilustrados who formed the educated stratum of Filipino society. Certainly, the tensions and contradictions between commitment to reform and moderate liberal values and the demands of a conservative, authoritarian church became intolerable for the Filipino priests who followed Burgos. In the 1880s and 1890s the lines between champions of Catholic monarchy and Spanish colonialism and the proponents of 'democracy and free thought', reform, and equality between Spaniards and Filipinos, were clearly drawn. The progressive Filipino priest was left in no-man's land between these two positions.

By the 1880s, the spiritual authority of the church and not just the misconduct of the religious orders was brought into question by ilustrado intellectuals. Atheistic and deistic currents of thought found support in the Liberal, Republican, Masonic, and Anarchist clubs of the Spanish cities where Filipinos like López Jaena, Del Pilar and Rizal acquired their ideas. Progress and reason were coming to be understood as antithetical to faith and revelation. The regular orders never tired of condemning these 'modern heresies', supported by the Holy See and the Syllabus of Errors. If Burgos was not liable to the charge of heresy he was open to the accusation of dangerous political radicalism in the view of his Spanish regular critics. Yet Burgos was a priest loyal to the authority of the church and to the Spanish hierarchy while a patriot loyal to the interests and aspirations of the country of his birth. If,

57 Zamora, op. cit., 468-70.
as de la Costa has argued, he was able to integrate these two loyalties in his thought and action without ambiguity, that resolution of contrary demands became much more difficult in the years after his execution.\textsuperscript{58}

The revolution made the conflict inescapable.

While Burgos preached the equality of all men he did not go so far as to argue, as did Rizal later in his notes on Morga's historia, that the Filipinos had possessed their own fully developed genius \textsuperscript{misprints} before the conquest and that this had been obscured by 'brutalisation'. For Burgos, civilisation was European. Although he deliberately chose to identify himself as Filipino he shared the prejudice of the ilustrado elite that reason and high culture were Western. He always denied that he hoped for separation from the 'protection and high culture' of Spain. The regular clergy had erected a scarecrow of rebellion with which to frighten the government into ignoring the legitimate appeals of the secular clergy for justice. There was nothing further from the thoughts of the Filipino clergy than independence:

\begin{center}
for we know and understand very well that away from the Spanish name ... we will be nothing and perhaps worse than nothing. For we are not ignorant that once emancipated from the magnanimous and generous Spanish nation, this country would be handed over to the most complete anarchy or would be a slave to the harsh rule of a foreigner.\textsuperscript{59}
\end{center}

Such protestations were probably more than prudent rhetoric. He identified the emerging idea of a Filipino identity with Spanish culture.

Moreover, he shared the fear of his class against the 'chaos' of mass revolution. Federico de Lerena, publisher of El Eco Filipino in

\textsuperscript{58} Foreword to Schumacher, Burgos, xi.

\textsuperscript{59} Manifiesto, ibid., 59.
Madrid, and supporter of Burgos in the controversies of 1864-1871, deplored the 'infamous and accursed Cavite rebellion' because it led to the persecution of his friends among the ilustrado class and because the 'desperate' and 'insane' supporters of such a rebellion committed a 'horrid crime' against the proper good order of society:

For all: peace, and liberal reforms for the Philippines; honor and benefit for Spain.

Peace and liberal reforms were the opposite of revolution.  

The campaign led by Peláez and then Burgos challenged Spanish assumptions of racial superiority and colonial authority which were fundamental. As priests, they symbolised and, indeed, embodied the paradox at the centre of the ethnical and religious justification of Spanish rule. They were witnesses to the Christian mission with which Spain justified her right to conquer and control the Philippines yet their abilities questioned the need for Spaniards to continue to control the church and, ultimately, the colony. Their humiliation and oppression, in turn, brought into doubt the good intentions of the Spanish administration, and the deliberate policy of suppressing them reversed the basic argument for a Spanish presence. The struggle over control of the parishes exposed the racialist and absolutist origins of colonial power, but the dilemma of the Filipino clergy, at least before 1872, was that they could not conceive of an indigenous culture which could be called civilised but which rejected Spanish civilisation. Apparently the enemies of Spain were those priests who responded best to her civilising

60 Federico de Lerena to his Mother and Brothers, n.d. (1872), and letter to José Basa, n.d. (1872), documents 487 and 288 in Sanz, 27-30.
and Christianising mission.  

Burgos' thought as expressed in his writings is interesting for what it says and does not say about the aspirations of the ilustrado elite and their brothers in the Filipino clergy between 1864 and 1872, but his most important effect on the future course of Philippine history was through his death. As Archbishop Melitón Martínez had prophetically warned, the persecution of the native clergy was a disastrous policy.

On 20 January, 1872, the garrison at the Cavite arsenal rose in revolt against their Spanish officers. The reasons for the rising and its extent are not clear. The official Spanish version described it as a wide rebellion whose purpose was to put to death all Spaniards and proclaim a provisional government under Father Burgos.  

Sergeant Octavo testified that Francisco Saldua had informed him, when planning the Cavite rising, that Fathers Burgos, Mariano Gomez, Jacinto Zamora, and Guevara, were directing the revolution, that the object of the rebellion was to kill all Spaniards and to proclaim the independence of the country with a provisional government under the presidency of Father Burgos, that Burgos had collected money in Manila for the rising, and that four Filipino lawyers would then set up a permanent government after the provisional government of the priests had fulfilled its purpose,  

61 Leon Ma. Guerrero has recognised this paradox in his The First Filipino (Manila, 1963), 13.

62 See 'Testimony of the Trial of Sergeant Bonifacio Octavo', Documents 523, 524, 525, in Banz, op. cit., 73-90; Letter of Governor-General Rafael Izquierdo to Admiral Juan Bautista Topete, Manila, February, 1872, document 495, ibid., 42-49; Confidential Letter No. 816 from the Governor of the Philippines, Rafael Izquierdo, to the Overseas Minister, Manila, 12 October, 1872, document 10, in Schumacher, Burgos, 249-59.
the new government to be ruled by a king. Izquierdo and the military tribunal were 'convinced ... of the justice of their judgement' despite the fact that the evidence which convicted the three priests was based on hearsay. John N. Schumacher has quoted a contemporary Jesuit report which indicates that the arrest of the priests was rushed through on the evening of January 21, while the fighting was still going on in Cavité. A second Jesuit report stated 'scarcely anyone doubts that there were some innocent men among them'. Izquierdo wrote to Archbishop Melitón Martínez on 15 February, 1872, forwarding a testimony of the sentence of death rendered on that day of Burgos, Zamora, and Gomez 'in order that, as set down by the sentence itself, your Excellency proceed with the unfrocking of the said secular priests'. The Archbishop refused, replying that before he could do so he would need to study the entire proceedings of the trial (which had been held in secret), and adding that it would be a 'consternating spectacle' for the 'religious Filipino people' to witness priests being sent to the gallows. By refusing to defrock them and by pleading for their pardon, the Archbishop put in doubt the judgement against them in the eyes of the Philippine community. The origins and significance of

63 'Testimony', op. cit., 77, 85. Governor Izquierdo believed the four lawyers to be Regidor, Pardo, Serra and Sanchez. Izquierdo to Overseas Minister, in Schumacher, op. cit., 251.

64 Ibid., 30.

65 'Communication of the Superior Civil Governor of the Philippines to the Archbishop of Manila sending sentence against Burgos, Gomez and Zamora', Manila, 15 February, 1872, document 466, Sanz, 92-93.

66 'Letter of the Archbishop of Manila to the Governor of the Philippines', 15 February, 1872, document 527 (c), Sanz, 93-94.
the 1872 rising remain controversial. A recent view of the 'true
instigators of the Cavite revolt' is that they were not the native
priests whom Izquierdo executed 'but the Freemasons whom he did not
dare to execute fearing to provoke an international conflict and whom he
sent to Cadiz and Ceuta instead'. A contemporary opinion which,
whether justified or not, gained wide acceptance among Filipino opponents
of the friars was that

in 1872, the heads of the monastic orders in the
Philippines, seeing their supremacy attacked and
their powers questioned, suborned a mutiny among
the native troops in Cavite in order that they might
denounce it in advance, thus proving that they and
they alone, by their source of information and their
control over the people, were capable of holding the
islands in subjection, and in order to entangle in the
meshes of the resulting legal processes the native
priests who had been conspicuous in their opposition
to them, procuring their murder by process of law.

Whatever the degree of their complicity, if any, in the rising of 1872,
the public garrotting of Fathers Burgos, Gomez and Zamora, transformed
a struggle within the church into a popular cause. When the three
priests were garrotted before a crowd of 40,000 at the Luneta on 17
February, 1872, their executions were perceived as a martyrdom at the
hands of the Peninsula Spaniards and, specifically, the friars.
Father Burgos' last words: 'Is there no longer any justice in this land?'
haunted Spanish rule until its collapse in 1898.

67 Sanz, op. cit. 11.
68 Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, I, 43.
See the contemporary account of the Frenchman, Edmund Plauchut in the
Revue des deux mondes (1877), English translation by Dalmacio Martin,
Historial Bulletin, December, 1960. See also LeRoy, 'The Philippines,
1860-1898...', in Blair and Robertson, LII, 170. The friars were
alleged to have paid 'much gold' to secure the executions: Letter from
the Secretary of War (Washington, 1901), 80.
69 Leon Ma. Guerrero, op. cit.
The executions of 1872 marked a fundamental shift in the responses of both the educated elite and the Filipino masses to Spanish rule. By 1872, colonial society had divided into two cultures: that of a small, Hispanicised elite which looked to the liberal, rationalist and nationalist values of contemporary urban Spain for articulation of its aspirations; and that of the great majority of the people who still lived within the world of Christian and pre-Hispanic values and beliefs. The executions had a profound effect on the nationalist movement among the elite, while they provided the Filipino masses with a powerful symbol of martyrdom and suffering. Historians have tended to concentrate on the way 1872 was interpreted by the ilustrado nationalists who supported the campaign for reforms in the 1880s and 1890s. For them, the executions marked 'a turning point in the history of Filipino nationalism', a 'catalyst' and the 'beginning of a new era'. José Rizal claimed that 'without 1872 there would not now be a Plaridel [del Pilar], a Jaena, a Sancianco, nor would the brave and generous Filipino colonies exist in Europe';

Without 1872 Rizal would now be a Jesuit and instead of writing *Noli me tangere*, would have written the contrary. At the sight of those injustices and cruelties, though still a child, my imagination awoke, and I swore to dedicate myself to avenge one day so many victims.

---


71 Schumacher, *Burgos*, 1; Agoncillo and Alfonso, op. cit., 160.

Rizal dedicated his second novel to the patriot martyrs as 'victims of the evil I am trying to fight'. And in an article in *La Solidaridad* he warned that in the struggle between the friars who wanted 'ignorance and darkness' and the Filipinos demanding reforms, the enemies of progress might simulate 'another revolt like that of Cavite and then, because of it, cut off the heads of many educated persons'. If this happened then 'from the blood spilled, fresher and more shoots will sprout'. His own execution in 1896 had just such an effect.

Apolinario Mabini called the three priests 'martyrs to justice'. Their deaths aroused 'not fear but hatred of the friars and the regime that supported them'. Mabini was sensitive to the way 1872 was perceived by those 'outside the influence of liberal, rationalist thought current among the elite. In the attitudes of the common people, 1872 worked a 'miracle':

> It made the Filipinos realise their condition for the first time. Conscious of pain and thus conscious of life, they asked themselves what kind of a life they lived ... The curtain of ignorance, woven diligently for centuries, was rent at last: fiat lux, let there be light, the dawn of a new day was dawning.

Mabini, although an ilustrado, was responsive to the religious imagery of the masses and intuitively understood the depth of their emotional response to the executions, but he interpreted that response in terms of his own conception of the proper goals for the movement towards

---


He assumed that the injustice of the sentence helped destroy the 'superstition' which had 'blinded' the Filipino people to their deception by the friars, and yet, the very force of the executions on the popular imagination was because they were interpreted in the terms of a 'superstitious' world-view which Mabini could not accept. He was perceptive enough to realise that the widespread revulsion and awe produced by the public garrotting was because

These were Christian priests, and they died like Christ, slandered by the friar-scribes, because they had sought to take away from the friars the administration of the parishes, the seat of their own power and influence over the masses, and the principal source of their wealth.\(^\text{76}\)

But he distinguished between authentic and superstitious religious belief and his own commitment was to a rationalist humanism distinct from the values of the Pasion even though he could share in the manifestations of the folk tradition.

The paradox of the revolution which had its origins in 1872 was that, whereas the 'dawn of a new day' meant the creation of a sovereign nation-state for the ilustrados who assumed leadership of the struggle, for the peasants and poor townsmen who joined the Katipunan from 1892 or the religio-political movements which accompanied the revolution, the 'dawn' signalled the restoration on earth of the original paradise, a rediscovery of the Lost Eden in which all men would acknowledge one

\(^{75}\) Agoncillo has commented, 'Mabini showed at least that he wanted to wipe off the guilt complex which in the early period of the Revolution haunted him because he lacked the necessary insight to understand fully the peculiar workings of the mass-mind', Malolos, 643-44.

\(^{76}\) Mabini, op. cit.
another in ideal brotherhood and equality. The martyrdom of Fathers Burgos, Gomez and Zamora was a sign that the world had entered the last phase of chaos before the overthrow of false and deceptive beliefs imposed by the Spaniards. The three priests became saints in the folk-Catholic religion of the Katipunero and the member of the Colorum. Their names were invoked as a password by the Katipunan during the revolution of 1896. In 1896 'it was as if the heroes Burgos, Zamora, and Gomez ... came alive'. Burgos appears with Rizal in the prayers and hymns of the sects which sprang up during and after the revolution. One such hymn recalled that

the sufferings of Burgos and the sufferings of Rizal Occurred here in the Tagalog region; Burgos was hanged, Rizal was shot, They accepted their lot with nary a protest.

The Aglipayan Church also claimed the three priests as its saints. Gregorio Aglipay claimed in August, 1899, that their blood had united the Filipino clergy and people in the one struggle for justice. On a

77 See Ileto, Chapter IV, 'The "Lost Eden" of the Malolos Republic, (1898-1900)', 139-42; and Anthony Day,'The "Lost Eden" in Filipino Consciousness', typescript, 11 April, 1970.

78 Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, I, 43.

79 Diego Moxica, Ang Bayan Kahapishapis (The Deeply Grieving Country), San Francisco de Malabon, September, 1899, quoted and translated in Ileto, op. cit., 155. Burgos was believed to have reappeared during the revolution just as Apolinario de la Cruz was thought to have returned in 1870. He was described in revolutionary songs as 'the Older Brother Burgos' with 'the Younger Brother Rizal'.

80 'Prayers and Hymns of the Bathalismo (Inang Mahiwaga) Inc.', in Marcelino Foronda, Cults Honoring Rizal (Manila, 1961), 64; also 'Mother Spain' (Inang Espania) in the 'Prayers of the "Iglesia Sagrada Filipina ng Sinco Vucales', ibid., 81
later occasion, he declared that the movement to found an independent church 'has its roots deep; it has been washed by the blood of martyrs'.

One of the first official ceremonies of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, on All Souls' Day, 2 November, 1902, was a solemn funeral service for the souls of Fathers Burgos, Gomez, and Zamora and for the priests executed in early 1897, Fathers Prieto, Diaz and Herrera. The three priests and José Rizal were added to the church's calendar of saints when, on 24 September, 1903, the four martyrs were formally canonised. Pictures of the four were distributed with cards for prayer books over the entire archipelago and novenas and leaflets were printed to encourage their veneration.

The executions of 1872 were significant, then, on many levels. They provoked a nationalist reaction among a section of the Hispanicised elite. They persuaded many uneducated Filipinos that the friars, and consequently the Spaniards, had no moral and spiritual claim to rule over them. The specific ramifications were most immediately felt within the church, however. The Archbishop of Manila had refused, with the Bishops

---

81 Gregorio Aglipay, Al Pueblo y Clero Filipino, 19 August, 1899, doc. 77 in Achútegui and Bernad, I, 213; 'Aglipay Writes of His Church', The Manila American, 10 January, 1904, 6. For other references to Burgos as the founder of the IFI see Rodriguez, Gregorio Aglipay, 122, n. 11.

82 Achútegui and Bernad, I, 203.

83 Clifford, op. cit., 388-89. Laubach observed that 'one may see pictures of these three heroes in thousands of Filipino homes. At the moment of their death they were reincarnated as the "Filipino Cause"'; op. cit., 97-98. The three priests appear with Rizal in altar paintings in the churches of the Rizalista sects. For a reproduction of this art see the article on the Iglesia Watawat ng Lahi, 'Rizal is not dead', Pace, 7 July, 1972, 48-49.
of Cebú and Nueva Segovia, to condone the executions or defrock the three priests, but the hierarchy did not escape the growing criticism of the Spanish clergy after 1872. When Father Pedro Payo, a Domínicán, succeeded Archbishop Melitón Martínez in 1876, the hostility towards the friars was extended to include all the bishops and so the source of ecclesiastical authority itself. 84 Father Payo became the special object of the anti-friar campaigns of the 1880s, and his return to Spain was demanded, along with the expulsion of the friars from the islands, in an exposition organised in March, 1888, by Doroteo Cortes, José Ramos, and Marcelo del Pilar. 85 From 1876, control of the episcopate enabled the religious orders to completely dominate the Philippine Church and to successfully resist the campaigns against them of 1887-1889 even though their Filipino critics had the support of two senior Spanish colonial officials, José Centeno and Benigno Quiroga, and an indecisive Governor-General who allowed the anti-friar party to canvass support for the proposed reduction of the orders' privileges and their expulsion from the islands. 86

84 Archbishop Melitón Martínez was the only secular priest to administer the see in the nineteenth century and, although a Peninsula Spaniard, to oppose the power of the religious orders and their hold on the parishes. From 1581 to 1898 there were 25 Archbishops of Manila, 16 of whom were members of religious orders. During the same period the other dioceses of the archipelago were administered by 75 bishops of whom 60 were friars. One other secular held office in the nineteenth century; Bishop Tomas Ladron de Guevara, of Nueva Cáceres, from 1842 to 1848. Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, I, 35; and Guía Oficial del Filipinas, 1898.

85 Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 96-113.

86 Ibid., 97-105. The presentation of a petition to the Civil Governor of Manila, Centeno, by a group of gobernadorcillos on 1 March, 1888, caused a hostile reaction partly because it included a demand that the Archbishop of Manila be expelled from the Philippines. For the friar view of the exposition of 1888 see [Pastells], La Masonización de Filipinas, 15-16; Alvarez del Manzano, Circular, 75.
They gained control of the church, however, at the cost of placing it as well as themselves in direct opposition to the rising discontent of the elite and the masses. The colonial administration lost all room to manoeuvre: either the whole complicated colonial system which united church and state was to be dismantled, a task beyond the capacity of the Spanish bureaucracy, or the administration had to accept its entanglement with the intransigent policies of the religious orders. When governments in Madrid attempted to institute reform by decree, through the Maura Reforms of 1893, for instance, and the plans to rationalise the Civil Code and introduce civil marriage, secular education, and the teaching of Spanish, these reforms were frustrated by the local authorities. No Governor-General, as Primo de Rivera admitted in 1897, could replace them. But by making themselves unassailable short of revolution and by identifying church and colonial administration they exposed to attack and hatred the church and religion they claimed to defend.

Between 1872 and 1896 the Filipino clergy were reduced to almost passive acquiescence by the threat of harassment and arrest, although they continued to be accused of being 'constant conspirators' against Spanish rule. The abuse which had been directed against them before 1872 intensified, if anything, thereafter. They were 'caricatures' of priests, lazy, stupid, greedy, but, above all, enemies of Spain. A Franciscan writer, whose attack against the Filipino clergy was the subject

---

87 Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 270; and see the support for these reforms expressed in various issues of La Solidaridad throughout 1889-1890.

88 Francisco Canamaque, Las islas Filipinas (Madrid, 1880), quoted in Horacio de la Costa, art. cit., 99-100. See the comment on such attacks by 'Padyph', article, 'The Friars in the Philippines', La Solidaridad, 15 September, 1889, 561.
of two articles in La Solidaridad in August and September, 1889, claimed that the native clergy lacked physical stamina and moral initiative; they were endowed with an indolence which nothing could change; their indifference and laziness were proverbial; they were sensual and spiteful and 'constant conspirators against Spanish rule, which they hate ... there was no revolt in which the native clergy had not taken part'.

The Filipino clergy were subject to government surveillance.

Not surprisingly, some Filipino priests responded to such oppression by contributing to the funds of the reform movement and supporting the ilustrado spokesmen for the campaign for reforms in their attacks on the friars. Occasional incidents showed that they had not been completely intimidated. The parish priest of Mariquina, Father José Zamora, was suspected of disseminating anti-friar literature and in March, 1889, his house was one of those searched for evidence. Another Filipino priest, Father Vicente García, published a defence of Rizal's Noli me tangere against the charges of blasphemy and heresy levelled against it by the Augustinian, Father José Rodríguez. The Filipino parish coadjutor of Malolos, Father Rafael Canlapan, belonged to the group of principales led by Marcelo H. del Pilar who attempted in 1888 to counteract the power

89 Memoria apologetica sobre la utilidad y servicios prestados á España por los Religiosos missioneros de Filipinas (Madrid, 1869), quoted and refuted by 'Padpyvh', art. cit., 559-60.


91 'An Attempt at Rebellion', and 'Letters from the Philippines', in La Solidaridad, 15 May, 1889, 229; 241.

92 Letter of 'V. Caraig' to Fr. José Rodriguez, La Solidaridad, 31 March, 1890, 219-27; and Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 89.
of the friar parish priest of Malolos, Father Felipé García, O.S.A. Canlapan was described, in a decree of 10 October, 1888, by the Civil Governor of Bulacan as a 'relative or intimate friend' of del Pilar, and that the coadjutor's house was used for meetings of the group opposed to the parish priest. Del Pilar's brother was a Filipino priest who had been exiled to the Marianas after the Cavite Mutiny.  

As a group, however, the Filipino clergy were reduced to impotence by the campaigns against them. They could rely on sympathetic support from relatives among the principalia but they could only assert themselves as individuals attached to groups of lawyers and professional men such as that led by del Pilar. The objectives of these groups were not necessarily those of the Filipino clergy. Their salaries as coadjutors were small and were sometimes withheld. There were even signs that they were to be denied the coadjutorships which Governor de la Torre had recommended should be made available to them in 1870. The Franciscans, for instance, introduced young Spaniards of their own order as coadjutors in some of their parishes.  

Suspected of sedition and rejected as innately inferior by the regular clergy, the Filipino priest was in an odd position: either he was ignorant, self-seeking, and lazy, or he was slyly treacherous, a cunning 'enemy of Spain'. A Spanish observer, quoted in Wenceslao E. Retana's Frailes y Clerigos, a work otherwise intended as a defence of the religious order, concluded that in the  

93 Father Toribio Hilario del Pilar 'coadjutor of Bigaa', Epifanio de los Santos, Marcelo H. del Pilar, Andrés Bonifacio, Emilio Jacinto (Manila, 1955), 11. For reports of Father Canlapan's activities, see the decree of Diaz Gomez, in Santos, 10, and Santos' account, 4; and the Confidential Report of Fr. Felipé García of 14 October, 1888, ibid. 15.  

94 La Solidaridad, 15 October, 1890, 689.
every time a native priest distinguishes himself by his learning or his activity, every time that he is seen to be successful in his profession, every time that he shines in one way or another, the same moral phenomenon is infallibly produced; public opinion marks him out as a rebel, and the malcontents seek him out and surround him, while those who are loyal to Spain withdraw more or less openly from his company .... It seems to me indisputable that as long as there are native lawyers and priests of some standing in any town or province of the archipelago, there shall rebellion and other troubles break out.  

Retana's own views were that the demands that the parishes of the Philippine Church be secularised were 'absurd'. Monasteries existed in Spain, so why not in the Philippines? To remove the Spanish regulars would be to destroy the foundations of colonial rule. The secular clergy were not competent to cope with the peculiar problems of parish work in the Philippines.

The principal victims of 1872, after the Filipino clergy, were the rising class of lawyers, doctors, and businessmen who had welcomed the 1868 Revolution in Spain and hoped its reforms and commitment to liberty of thought would be instituted in the Philippines. The ilustrado reformers wanted the colony to be granted the status of a province of Spain; the assimilationist argument being that in this way the rights of man proclaimed by the 'glorious revolution' could be extended to the Philippines. These hopes were utopian: Governor Izquierdo expressed

95 In W.E. Retana, Frailes y Clerigos (Madrid, 1891), 100; trans. by de la Costa, 'Development of the Native Clergy', 100.

96 [W.E. Retana], Los Frailes Filipinos por un Español que ha residido en aquel país (Madrid, 1898), 34-35; and Chapter XII, 'La secularización total de los curatos es un absurdo'.

97 'The September Revolution', and 'The Assimilation of the Philippines', La Solidaridad, 30 September, 1889, 579-83; 585-89.
the attitude of all Spanish colonial administrators, liberal or conservative, when he wrote in a confidential letter to the Overseas Minister in October, 1872 that whether or not democratic principles and liberty in all its manifestations were proper in Spain, 'here there ought not to be nor can there be any other policy than the conservative policy':

Freedom of instruction, of the press, the exercise of individual rights, everything in a word which in civilised Europe constitutes the life and progress of peoples, would only serve here to give arms to the enemies of Spain without profit for the country itself. For because of the backwardness in which it lies, it would not be able to appreciate such liberties nor make use of such rights.98

The same argument was to be used a quarter of a century later by the first American colonial administrators.

The Filipino reformers could not accept this basic fact of Spanish (and not just conservative) hostility to their aspirations because that would have been to admit the choice was either revolution (and the elite had a great deal to lose) or submission to large and petty humiliations and persecution which appeared unendurable. By the 1880s the ilustrados in favour of liberal reforms had recovered from the executions and deportations of 1872 and had organised themselves into an aggressive, international lobby, encouraged by individual Península Spaniards outside the colonial administration. Drawing on their status as members of the traditional principalía and defining the frustrations and ambitions of the rising section of that class, the ilustrado liberals represented different moral and intellectual interests to those

98 Izquierdo to the Overseas Minister, 12 October, 1872, document 10, in Schumacher, Burgos, 254-55.
of the Filipino clergy. Fathers Peláez and Burgos were able to acquire the new thought adopted by this group without apparent conflict with their values and beliefs as Roman Catholic priests, but there was a real opposition between the ideological and philosophical assumptions of clergy and secular, educated laity. Family ties and a shared nationalism partly disguised this difference. Lawyers like Joaquin Pardo de Tavera, and businessmen like Maximo Paterno, suffered with the Filipino clergy in 1872. Many *ilustrados* were close relatives or townmates of the Filipino clergy: Marcelo H. del Pilar's brother was among the priests exiled in 1872, and Father Mariano Sevilla was his close friend. The fact that the clergy suffered created a sense of obligation among the secular elite. Filipino priests continued to help the reform movement with contributions and personal involvement after 1872. Moreover, in their struggle against the friars it was obvious that the *ilustrados* should support the campaign to hand over the parishes to the secular clergy. Yet, the relationship between the two groups was an increasingly ambivalent one and reflected the fact that while common persecution brought them together, quite different responses to that persecution eventually drew them apart.

The priesthood itself was the first point of difference between the clergy and the secular nationalists. The Filipino priest shared in the declining prestige of the church among the educated minority in so far as the secular nationalists adopted the anti-clerical and anti-religious models of Spanish liberalism and Freemasonry. In attacking 'theocracy and conservatism', the *ilustrado* intellectual worshipped reason, progress and science, in forms uncompromisingly condemned in the Syllabus of Errors. The secular nationalists replaced the will of God with the will of the people, a will which they assumed to be formed according to reason and
natural law. In his poem, *Ang Kalayaan*, Marcelo H. del Pilar defined Liberty as the right of each man to follow his own will because

God has created man, endowed him with reason and conscience and with the life that He gave unto him, and also conceded him full liberty.  

The characteristic mode of liberal reformist thought was rationalist, individualist, and deist. Apart from the influence of such intellectual movements on Filipinos who mixed with sympathetic Spanish liberals, such a formulation of the nature of man, god, and society was appropriate to a class which wished to challenge the inherited patterns of thought and authority so as to make room for its political and economic as well as its cultural and social ambitions. Some Filipinos who studied in Spain, particularly those who lived in Barcelona as did the editors of *La Solidaridad* must have been aware of radical socialist and anarchist movements in the city's clubs but such ideologies were largely ignored by the sons of families with aspirations for the respectable and comfortable culture of the bourgeoisie. The most severe persecution did not persuade such individuals to adopt extremist political views.

The propagandists, like Fathers Peláez and Burgos, disclaimed any


100 The discussion of terrorism in Rizal's novels is interesting in this regard. The first Filipino ilustrado to have integrated European radical socialist thinking into his political philosophy appears to have been Isabelo de los Reyes who, after his return to the Philippines in October 1902, founded the *Unión Obrera Democrática*. 
intention of working for the separation of the Philippines from Spain. Unlike Fathers Pelaez and Burgos, they espoused radical and novel demands for the reorganisation of the colony and its assimilation as a province into metropolitan Spain. However 'meliorative and evolutionary' they claimed their programme to be, it required a considerable reorganisation of the colony's institutions and administration, and implied a new definition of coloniser and colonist discarding the assumptions which had shaped the colonial relationship for three hundred years. In so far as the Filipino clergy in their campaign between 1849 and 1872 merely attempted to hold on to parishes they already possessed and to assert rights which were sanctioned by the teachings of the Church (and by the Archbishop of Manila between 1862 and 1876), they could reasonably claim that they were conservatives rather than radicals, although, of course, any claims they put forward were regarded as subversive by the regular orders. The propagandists, by contrast, worked for a new Philippines fashioned on the principles of the September Revolution in Spain, and, ultimately, the ideas of the European Enlightenment and the French Revolution.

Those Filipino priests who accepted the goals and the outlook of the Propaganda Movement in the 1880s and 1890s did so by ignoring the explicit demands made by the Spanish hierarchy, supported by contemporary pronouncements from Rome, condemning the principles which the reformers believed essential. Given the doctrinal definition of clerical obedience and the obligation on priests to accept the authoritative teachings of the church on such matters, the implication of their support for the nationalist movement was to deny, deliberately or unknowingly, the absolute claims of the church as guardian of the Spanish Catholic moral order.
Until actual revolution presented the Filipino nationalists with the practical task of designing and operating an independent nation-state, it was possible for the irreducible differences between priest and liberal secularist to be disguised or denied. The Filipino priest could attempt to compartmentalise his obligation to obey ecclesiastical authority and his sympathy for the nationalist cause, and he could overlook the fact that his fellow workers in that cause looked elsewhere than to the church for their inspiration. The reformers helped to disguise the divisions between them and the secular clergy by publicly claiming that their attack was against the despotism of the friars and not against Catholicism or the priesthood. Nevertheless, the indifference and even hostility to the social and temporal claims of the church was implicit in the reform programme from the early 1880s: for the reformers it was irrelevant whether a Filipino was a Roman Catholic or not. 101

Indeed, the reformers were dedicated to destroying the values and beliefs of the Spanish Catholic world with a new order intended to replace religious 'obscurantism' and 'superstition' with Reason and Progress.

The rejection of the church and its explanation of authority and man's nature and purpose, led the secular reformers to reject the authenticity of the Filipino priest's vocation. _La Solidaridad_ published stories which showed the Filipino priest as the victim of the popular ignorance encouraged by the friars. In past times, one such story began:

> Among the better-off Philippine families who (had) gifted sons, it was almost a traditional custom for one of them to serve God by donning the habit of a cleric. The dream of our parents then was to see

their son become a curate, like an absolute king; they pinned their hopes on having someone in the house who could celebrate the mass and recite prayers for their sins. It was a signal honour to be able to say: 'My son is a priest; my son is a representative of God on earth'.

The weakness of parents, the influence of the friars, superstition and spiritual pride turned young men naturally 'belonging to a race of lovers' into 'common, cynical, ignoble' clerics imitating the vices and excesses of the friars. 102

The most influential propagandist of all, José Rizal, adopted a similar view towards the Filipino clergy in his writings. Rizal specifically rejected the hierarchical character of the church, the validity of its sacraments and its claim to infallibility. He regarded it as a human institution founded in 'the imagination of the multitude [and] in the attachment of women'. In his novels he questioned whether God spoke only through the mouth of the clergy; indeed, he suggested that they rarely acted or preached as true followers of 'a Just Man nailed on the cross of Calvary'. 103 The friars had paralysed the will and obscured the intellect of the Filipino. They had, through superstitious idolatry, bad example and despotism destroyed his original dignity and so lessened his human personality. 104 Rizal implies that the Filipino clergy, being closest to the friar, had succumbed most deeply to

102 'These Ideas will not come back', La Solidaridad, 30 September, 1890, 655-61.

103 Rizal to Father Pablo Pastells, S.J., in Epistolario Rizalino, IV 120, and see Eugene A. Hessel, The Religious Thought of José Rizal (Manila, 1961), 38; 131-49; 192 et passim.

104 'On the Indolence of the Filipinos, IV' La Solidaridad, 31 August 1890, 571-73; 'The Philippines a Century Hence', Ibid., 1 February 1890, 49; and Hessel, ibid., 88.
his evil influence. There appears in *El Filibusterismo* a Filipino priest, Father Florentino, who, although represented sympathetically, was virtuous despite his priesthood. He was 'distinguished from the ordinary run of native priests' in that he belonged to another era when

the best young men were not afraid to expose their human dignity to outrage by taking Holy Orders, when the native secular priests could look upon any friar as an equal, and when their calling, not yet defamed and degraded, attracted free men, not slaves, superior minds, not subservient wills.  

Father Florentino had entered the priesthood against his will. His virtues in the novel are intended to shine all the brighter in contrast to the assumed vices of the clergy. Rizal agreed with his friend Ferdinand Blumentritt that the friars were not humble and compassionate, but, unlike Blumentritt who was a Catholic, Rizal rejected the priesthood as inherently hypocritical and superstitious.  

More usually, the propagandists adopted a softer line with the clergy and the Catholic religion, at least in their public utterances. The basic ideological conflict with the Filipino clergy was rationalised in various ways. Filipino priests were alleged to have declined in ability and personal stature after 1872. The propagandists implied that a Father Peláez or a Father Burgos would have been entirely acceptable to the liberal nationalist of the 1880s and 1890s. This argument was repeated by the *ilustrado* witnesses before the Taft Commission: the

105 *El Filibusterismo* (1891), translated by León Ma. Guerrero (London and Hongkong, 1965), 17. It is possible that Father Florentino was modelled on Father Vicente García who defended Rizal's first novel in *La Solidaridad*, 31 March, 1890, 219-27; and see Schumacher, *Propaganda*, 89.

106 Ferdinand Blumentritt, 'Friars and Seculars', *La Solidaridad*, 30 November, 1890, 775.
moral and intellectual decline of the Filipino clergy was partly a result of the deliberate policy of the friars to reduce them to half-educated co-adjutors; partly to the fact that as their parishes were taken from them there was no incentive for talented men to enter the priesthood; and partly because of the alternative attractions of the professions in an expanding society. 107

The ambiguous relationship between the Filipino clergy and the reform movement, and the Filipino priest's own dilemma as a priest and a nationalist, reveal the fundamental problem of the nationalist movement: its attempt to create an alternative community binding Filipino to Filipino by psychological, moral and cultural ties in opposition to the Catholic and Hispanic bonds which had so far given the different language groups of the islands the experience of unity. There was, for the nationalist thinkers of the 1880s and 1890s, the dilemma of fashioning out of the synthesis of Spanish and pre-Hispanic culture of the past centuries a new synthesis which would provide a social order able to replace that of Spanish-Philippine Catholicism.

Given the nature of Catholicism in the colonial Philippines, religious questions were insoluble: reform was impossible in an 'ecclesiastical colony' however moderate it appeared by the standards of anti-clerical Liberalism and Republicanism in Spain. The programme of the propagandists required not the correction of abuses in the ecclesiastical or civil administration of the Philippines but the creation of a new

107 See Testimony of Felipe Calderón, Pedro Laktaw, and Florentino Torres, Senate Document No.190, 56th Congress, 2nd Session, 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses in the Philippine Islands, etc.', 142, 165, 188.
society, founded on indigenous values under indigenous control. Whether they realised it or not, the propagandists were separatists if their ideas were taken beyond the caution imposed by a heavy censorship and the Civil Guard.

The contributors to the first issue of La Solidaridad failed to recognise this when they set out the reformist philosophy:

Our programme aside from being harmless is very simple: to fight all reaction, to hinder all steps backward, to applaud and to accept all liberal ideas, and to defend progress; in brief to be propagandists above all of ideals of democracy so that these might reign over all nations here and beyond the seas.108

The application of ideals of democracy and liberalism to the Philippines was not held to be harmless by Spaniards in the colony.

The view held by the liberal reformers of what the Philippines should be, had no place for the theological and ethical claims of nineteenth century Roman Catholicism; certainly not in its Spanish-Philippine form. The protests against the despotism of the friars actually involved a rejection of the explanation of man and the cosmos put forward by the church and of the absolute authority it claimed to exercise over the spiritual and intellectual lives of the individual and society. Open rejection of the church was not politically expedient in the 1880s and 1890s but it is quite evident in the unofficial correspondence of the leading propagandists that this was the position Rizal, del Pilar and others had reached. Marcelo del Pilar, younger brother of one of the priests arrested in 1872 and friend of Father Burgos and of Father Mariano Sevilla, claimed in his articles in La Solidaridad

108 'Our Aims', La Solidaridad, 15 February, 1889, 1; see Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 122.
that his attack was directed against the four Spanish religious orders and not against the church or the Roman Catholic religion. The expulsion of the friars would be in the real interests of good government and that religion. Under del Pilar's editorship, almost every issue of La Solidaridad repeated attacks on the friars as theocratic despots, enemies of progress, obscurantists, profligates, tyrants, land-grabbers, and perverters of religion. In the second issue, a speech by Graciano López Jaena was reported in which López Jaena compared the Philippines of the 1880s to the Spain of the medieval Inquisition with its witch trials, superstitions, whips, and instruments of torture. The friar was the 'all-powerful creator of nothing', a teacher of 'fanaticism' and 'idiocy'. The religious orders did not recognise any country other than their convent, any government but that of their abbot, any law other than their own rule. They were parasites sucking on the blood of the Filipino people. Since it was not possible 'to unite light and darkness, day and night' it was not possible for monachism and

109 Marcelo H. del Pilar was born in 1850 in barrio Kupang, Bulacan. He studied at the College of San José and the University of Santo Tomas, during which time he joined a group of Filipinos which included Father Burgos. He was named during the hearings before the Military Tribunal in 1872 but escaped prosecution. His brother, however, Father Toribio del Pilar, was banished to the Marianas. His studies were again interrupted by a dispute with a friar parish priest over baptismal fees which led to his suspension from the University. During the trials of 1872 he was living in the house of Father Mariano Sevilla who was also sent to the Marianas. He received his licentiate in law in 1880. Two years later he helped found the first bilingual newspaper in the colony Diariong Tagalog which preached a 'moderate nationalism'. Between 1885 and 1888 he campaigned against the friar parish priests of Malolos, Bulacan, trying to transfer local power to the town's principalía. He was forced to flee to Spain to avoid arrest in 1888. Magno S. Catmaitan, Marcelo H. del Pilar, 1850-1896 (Quezon City, 1966); Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 94-96; Santos, op. cit., 1-5.
progress to live together. This speech implied that the religion
the friars preached was itself worthless: an obstacle to the progress
and development of the country, to the 'freedom of thought, freedom of
the press, and freedom of trade' found in English and Dutch colonies.

The anonymous articles, pamphlets and broadsheets produced in
Spain and the Philippines in the 1880s attacking the abuses of the
religious clergy made the rejection of Spanish Catholic teachings more
explicit. Many were written and circulated by Del Pilar and his
associates in Malolos and Manila. The parish priest of Malolos, Father
Felipe García, in a report to the provincial government on the activities
of the anti-friar faction, mentioned that he had seen such literature
which defamed the nuns of Sta. Clara and the religious. One pamphlet
demanded the expulsion of the Archbishop of Manila as well as the religious
orders. The Taylor collection includes parodies of the Catechism,
the Commandments, the Act of Contrition, and the Salve Maria. The

Speech at the Ateneo de Barcelona, 25 February, 1889, La Solidaridad,
28 February, 1889, 43-45. López Jaena was born in Jaro, Iloilo, in
1856 and studied at the Jaro seminary, later enrolling as a medical
student in Manila. He failed to gain admission to the University of
Santo Tomás and returned to Iloilo. In 1881, after clashing with
the provincial authorities he left for Spain, where he became
active in the Filipino community as one of the first propagandists.

Felipe García to the Commissioner Extraordinary of the General
For a discussion of the pamphlet, Viva España, Viva el Rey, Viva
el Ejército, Fuera los Frailes (1888) and others see Schumacher,
Propaganda Movement, 108, n. 33. Copies of the pamphlets are in the
Newberry Library, Chicago. The demand that the Archbishop be
expelled for 'being disobedient to civil authority' was repeated in
a petition of 1 March, 1888, when the gobernadorcillos of the
districts of Manila forwarded their demands for the expulsion of the
friars and the Archbishop through the Civil Governor of Manila to
the Governor General and the Queen Regent. The Civil Governor, José
Centeno, who was a friend of Del Pilar's and an anti-clerical was
obliged to resign during the reaction to the petition. The next
administration suppressed any criticism of the friars; Schumacher,
Propaganda Movement, 102-107.
booklets were well produced, obviously by literate and wealthy authors, with illustrated covers and realistic titles such as 'Holy Scriptures - Prayer Book and Missal'.

Del Pilar was a political realist who was willing to use whatever tactics he could to destroy the power of the religious orders in the islands and the authority of the church in general. Schumacher suggests that he used Freemasonry not as the source of an ideology or a philosophy but as a means of making contact with Spaniards and Filipinos sympathetic to the campaign to weaken the influence of the religious orders. The basic purpose of Philippine Masonry was 'an educative one, that of readying the minds of Filipinos to accept the anti-friar, nationalist, and progressist ideas that lay at the basis of the Propaganda campaign in general'. In Del Pilar's attitude towards Roman Catholicism as distinct from his attacks on the friars, Schumacher notes 'an apparent inconsistency' in his public position and his clandestine activities. He claimed he was acting in the interests of the church and that he wanted the friars to be replaced with secular priests. He was careful to exclude the Jesuits from his attacks. In private correspondence he expressed other views.

The title pages may have been copies from authentic missals. The 'Salve Santa Baria' (Hail Holy Centavo) makes a pun on Maria and mocks the friars for making a business out of religion. The Act of Contrition replaces 'Nuestro Señor' (Our Lord) with 'Mi Señor Fraile' (My Lord Friar) and says that the true God is 'not a mortal who fornicates and attacks me'. The Our Father implores the 'Padre' not to assassinate the supplicant. Taylor, Insurgent Records, file 467.3.

The title pages may have been copies from authentic missals. The 'Salve Santa Baria' (Hail Holy Centavo) makes a pun on Maria and mocks the friars for making a business out of religion. The Act of Contrition replaces 'Nuestro Señor' (Our Lord) with 'Mi Señor Fraile' (My Lord Friar) and says that the true God is 'not a mortal who fornicates and attacks me'. The Our Father implores the 'Padre' not to assassinate the supplicant. Taylor, Insurgent Records, file 467.3.

Propaganda Movement, 157-58 et passim.

Propaganda Movement 151. Del Pilar and Rizal both excluded the Jesuits from their attacks: Monastic Supremacy in the Philippines (Manila, 1950) 17; El Filubusterismo, Guerrero trans., 44; 103. The Provincial of the Dominicans in the Philippines, Father Bartolome Alvarez del Manzano denounced the efforts of the Filipino agitators to set the Jesuits apart from the friar orders. The Jesuits and Dominicans were close friends; only Protestants and Jansenists distinguished between clergy and clergy; Circular al Excmo. Sr.
In a letter to Rizal in which he set out his views on the long range goals of the nationalist campaign he wrote:

I understand clearly now what is needed among us is a weakening of the power of the Pope. Among us there is no prop to keep standing something which is being overthrown by everyone. Yet since those who have just awakened are frightened easily, we think it a good idea that they be frightened at the friar and not at us. In that way we will gradually bring them over to the point we are really aiming at. Moreover, as I see it, the seed the Pope sowed in our country is not very deep-rooted. It was not planted in the mind, but accepted because of the awe of the ignorant. Therefore, once the falsehoods they believe in are discredited a little, the faith of the Tagalogs will be discredited completely.115

José Rizal made his opposition to Roman Catholicism explicit in a letter to Ferdinand Blumentritt in 1890 when he denied that his first novel, Noli me tangere, was an attack merely against the friars:

I wanted to hit the friars, but since the friars use religion not only as a shield but also as a weapon, protection, citadel, fortress, armor, etc., I was therefore forced to attack their false and superstitious religion in order to combat the enemy who hid behind this religion ... Why should I not attack this religion with all my strength, if it is the prime cause of our sufferings and our tears? The responsibility lies on those who misuse its name. Christ did the same with the religion of His country, which the Pharisees had so misused.116

Rizal consistently worked to awaken Filipino national and cultural consciousness and to identify the source of that consciousness in a

Ministro de Ultramar, Manila, 24 August, 1897. The Jesuits signed the Friar Memorial of the following year.

115 Marcelo del Pilar to 'Pinakamamahal kong kaibigan', Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar (Manila, 1955), I, 72-73; quoted in Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 151-52, and see n.45.

116 Rizal to Blumentritt, 20 January, 1890, Epistolario Rizalino (Manila 1938), V, 523-24, quoted in Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 152-53; and in Majul, art. cit., 159-60.
pre-Hispanic past which owed nothing to Spain. He hoped that his annotated edition of Morga's *Sucesos de las islas filipinas* would 'awaken an awareness of our past, blotted till now from our memory, and rectify past calumnies and falsifications; if this is done ... we can all dedicate ourselves to the study of the future'.

His attacks on the friars were not only political or anti-clerical; he was concerned to deny their claim that they had brought civilisation and religious culture to the Philippines and that before the evangelisation of the islands the people lived as savages.

The nation-state which Rizal envisaged and which was prefigured in the Constitution of the *Liga Filipina* was premised on a definition of the Filipino identity which derived from new moral, economic and social values distinct from those of the existing Christian community and intended ultimately to replace them after an indefinite interregnum. Implicit in this programme was the assumption that the union of church and state under the Spaniards was the survival of 'medieval tutelage' and that Christianity itself had been overtaken by a progressive and scientific world. The Constitution of the *Liga* announced its first aim as 'to unite the whole archipelago into one compact, vigorous, and homogeneous body', rejecting the claim of the Spanish clergy that the

---

117 Editor's Introduction; in J.S. Cummins (ed), in Antonio de Morga *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, first pub. 1609 (Cambridge, 1971), 33. Rizal's edition was published in Paris in 1890. Cummins comments that Rizal's anti-clericalism in his notes, though understandable, was excessive.

118 Constitution of the *Liga* in Blair and Robertson, LII, 217-24; see also Majul, 'Rizal's Concept of a Filipino Nation', *art. cit.*, 35; *Propaganda Movement*, 250-51 et passim.
colony already possessed a unity as Christian people. As Cesar Adib Majul has commented, 'Filipinos were [no longer] meant to be identified as colonial subjects of the King of Spain .... Neither were the Filipinos to look at each other as Christian brothers or spiritual wards of the Pope of Rome'. The two means by which the ideal of unity advocated by the Liga was to be diffused among the principalía and ultimately the plebeyos were education and commercial expansion. At his trial, Rizal remembered the aim of the Liga as the establishment of unity among the various classes of the country 'with a view to developing commerce through the establishment of a kind of cooperative association.'

Economic expansion favoured the principalía class from which the ilustrado propagandists were drawn; the goal of economic growth also reflected the confidence of late nineteenth century liberals in the civilizing benefits of commerce and material progress. The economic aim was not seen as contradicting the social and moral ambitions of the Liga; economic growth was understood as the material condition for intellectual and national maturity.

The liberal nationalist intellectuals had a vision of a future Philippines which stressed material progress, enlightenment through modern education, and social institutions and customs in harmony with


120 In Horacio de la Costa (ed), *The Trial of Rizal*, W.E. Retana's transcriptions of the official Spanish documents, Spanish and English (Manila, 1961), 82.

121 This element in Rizal's thought is not integrated with his concern to rehabilitate the pre-Hispanic past. He could be accused of changing old Spanish gods for new.
reason and science. The nationalist inspiration for this vision, while containing elements of an indigenous cultural inheritance, was basically of European origin. Despite his attempts to recover the culture of the original Filipinos and to give it dignity as a foundation for a modern national culture, even Rizal accepted a definition of society which was alien to the great mass of his compatriots. His conception of the process by which the country would be transformed into a nation was elitist: by the end of the nineteenth century 'the spirit of the nation had been aroused and a common misfortune, a common debasement has united all the inhabitants of the islands' but the direction would come from

a numerous enlightened class which now exists within and without the islands, a class created and continually augmented by the stupidity of certain officials, which forces the inhabitants to leave the country to secure education abroad ... This class whose number is cumulatively increasing, is in constant communication with the rest of the islands, and if today it is only the brain of the country, in a few years it will form the whole nervous system.122

Rizal was aware of the danger of a privileged class inheriting the powers and the abuses of the Spaniards they replaced and he believed the only way to guard against 'the slaves of today becoming the tyrants of tomorrow' was by a period of preparation during which associations such as the Liga could develop a national community whose members shared basic aspirations and where education had made each member aware of his rights and obligations and where national sentiment prevailed over personal or class interest. However, Rizal, like Del Pilar and the other leaders

of the movement, did not preach a classless society: only when the level of the people's culture had risen to the point where they could appreciate and support the culture of the educated elite would independence be justified. The Manifesto he wrote during his trial in 1896 was consistent with his teachings over the previous ten years. He desired liberties for the Philippines but he laid down as a precondition that through education and hard work the people should acquire a civilisation worthy of such liberties:

In my writings I have urged study and the civic virtues, without which no redemption is possible. I have also written that reforms, if they are to bear fruit, must come from above, for reforms that come from below are upheavals both violent and transitory. 123

He condemned the 'ridiculous and barbarous uprising' of 1896 because it was a revolution from below inspired by aspirations and values very different to those he advocated.

The fact that Rizal, by his death, became the martyr of the revolution and the symbol of its aspirations has tended to obscure ideological and social divisions within the revolutionary movement which broke out into open conflict with Spanish rule in August, 1896. On the 7 July, 1892, Andrés Bonifacio, Deodato Arellano, Valentín Díaz and others founded a secret society, the Kataastaasan Kagalanggalang na Katipunan ng mga Anak ng Bayan (Highest and Most Respectable Society of the Sons of the People), in Manila. The Katipunan was founded in the conviction that the reformist, assimilationist programmes of the Liga Filipina and its intellectual supporters were inadequate to achieve the 'New Dawn' of a liberated and united people, 'children of the same race and brothers', free of the 'tyranny of Spain and from religious despotism'. 124


not preach overt class war, stressing in its Creed the unity of rich
and poor, educated and uneducated in the common struggle to free the
motherland. Nevertheless, the injunction to 'defend the oppressed;
fight the oppressor', and the mass base of the society meant that it
radically challenged not only Spanish colonialism but also injustices
and exploitation by one group of another within Filipino society itself.  

Intellectually and ideologically, the original leadership of the
Katipunan occupied an ambiguous position midway between the ilustrado
reformists of the Liga and the 'primitive radicalism' and millennarianism
of the poor townsman and peasants who formed the society's mass base.
Andrés Bonifacio was born of humble parents in Tondo, Manila, and grew
up in a world remote from that of ilustrados like Rizal. As a youth he
was obliged to earn money as a messenger and pedlar, later finding
employment as a clerk or store-man. His education was cut short by the
death of his parents when he was fourteen but he knew sufficient Spanish
to read in that language and his conception of an independent Philippines
was certainly influenced by such European works as Victor Hugo's Les
Miserables and a two-volume history of the French Revolution as well as by
copies of La Solidaridad and Rizal's novels, smuggled into the colony.  

Bonifacio acknowledged in particular the influence of Marcelo del Pilar
on his thought. Bonifacio was also a member of the Liga for a time as
well as a Mason belonging to the lodge Taliba.

---

125 A translation of the Katipunan Creed can be found in Kalaw, ibid.

126 Bonifacio was born on 30 November, 1863. His father, Santiago
Bonifacio, was a tailor. For a list of the books which influenced him see Epifanio de los Santos, op. cit., 'Andrés Bonifacio', 6; and
Zaide, Political and Cultural History, II, 152. See also Zaide, The
Philippine Revolution (Manila, 1968), 79-80.
Yet, Bonifacio, unlike Rizal or Del Pilar, thought in Tagalog and, in the judgement of nationalist historians 'had the instincts of the masses'. In Constantino's judgement, he was able to absorb liberal nationalist ideas from the *ilustrados* and transmit them to the mass following of the revolutionary movement while remaining close to the people's 'raw ideas'. From the *ilustrado* (and the modern nationalist) viewpoint, the ideology of the *Katipunan* was 'primitive' and 'inchoate', 'incapable of abstractions', instinctive and intuitively radical but requiring *ilustrado* intellectuals to give the people's desires more explicit form.

It is true that while Bonifacio was influenced by *ilustrado* ideas, other leaders of the *Katipunan* were even closer to the liberal reformist values and assumptions of the Hispanicised elite. Emilio Jacinto, despite his background of poverty, managed to finish an arts degree at San Juan de Letran and to study law for a time at the University of Santo Tomas. Jacinto wrote many of the important statements of the *Katipunan* and edited its newspaper, *Kalayaan*. Deodato Arellano, the first president of the *Katipunan*, was a brother-in-law of Del Pilar. The movement also included clerks in the colonial bureaucracy, some professional men, and members of the provincial *principalía*. After 1896, the centre

---


128 Ibid.

129 Ibid., 165-66; and see also Agoncillo, *The Revolt of the Masses*, 17, 48; and see Introduction, 31.

130 Agoncillo, *ibid.*, 43-46; Constantino, op. cit., 161-62. Constantino concludes that the original leadership of the *Katipunan* could be classified as lower to middle-middle class.
of the Revolution shifted to Cavite and its leadership, after Emilio Aguinaldo had replaced Bonifacio, moved closer to domination by the ilustrado elite of Manila and by the provincial elite of Cavite. The disbandment of the Katipunan in 1898 on the assumption of control by a formal revolutionary government indicated that the Westernised secular nationalists had assumed power.

Nevertheless, despite the influence of ilustrado concepts on the thinking of the Katipunan's original leadership and despite the eventual domination of the mass movement by the Cavite and Manila elites, the Katipunan was a genuinely mass movement which expressed demands and aspirations originating in the needs, values and beliefs of illiterate townsmen and peasants whose world-view derived from other sources than European liberal nationalist thought. What Reynaldo Ileto's study has shown is that this folk culture from which the mass of the revolutionaries derived their understanding of the revolution was complex and profound. In the Tagalog provinces, the Pasión tradition provided those who lived within it a complete and powerful explanation of man's nature and purpose, expressed in rituals and symbolism drawing on Christian and non-Christian religious beliefs. In the context of the values of the Pasión, the Revolution was not a political struggle directed towards the establishment of an independent nation-state constructed according to contemporary liberal ideas of rights and obligations, but a pilgrimage towards a New Eden in which the evil and injustice of the old life would be replaced by ideal equality, brotherhood, harmony and direct communion with God.

131 Constantino, ibid., 180-82; 184-95.

132 Ileto, op. cit., Introduction, and 102ff.
The rapid growth of the Katipunan and the extraordinary commitment of its ordinary members cannot be explained as simple credulity or blind obedience to a radical leadership. Initially, the ilustrado leaders of the reform movement condemned the Katipunan and, except where they could control it (as in Cavite), the local principalía remained hostile to a movement which threatened their privileged position. Prominent Filipinos, including Rizal, denounced it for its 'superstition' and 'barbarism' and even leading revolutionaries such as Antonio Luna initially condemned the society and were prepared to expose it. Nevertheless, the Katipunan spread quickly on the eve of the Revolution, particularly in the eight provinces of Central Luzon, but also to Panay in the Visayas and even as far as Mindanao. Estimates of its membership exceed 100,000 at the time of its discovery. In Cavite the leaders of the movement may have been the social and economic leaders of the province, being educated, wealthy or prominent office-holders, but in Manila, where the Revolution began, Bonifacio and Jacinto led a 'proletarian rabble' in the words of a recent study. The motives of large numbers of illiterate people are difficult for the historian to reconstruct but an explanation of the support for the Katipunan and for the Revolution in terms of elite manipulation would seem inadequate, especially if the long period of hard struggle led by the revived Katipunan between

133 Constantino, op. cit., 169. See also Cesar Adib Majul, 'Social Background of Revolution', *Asian Studies*, IX, No. 1, April, 1971, 17.


135 Achutegui and Bernad, ibid., 6.
1900 and 1910 is taken into account.\footnote{Ileto, op. cit., 198ff.}

The continuity of ideas and political aims between the more radical of the ilustrado Propagandists and the better educated of the Katipunan leaders is not in question but, as Ileto has observed, one of the serious obstacles to a full understanding of the revolutionary movement is the prevalent assumption that the Katipunan's motivation and aims can be explained in terms of adopted European ideas filtering down to the masses.

It is always emphasised that Bonifacio, though not an ilustrado was nevertheless well-read in Rizal's works and topics such as the French Revolution and the lives of the United States presidents. .... No-one has seriously asked why the revolutionary impulse had to start "from below". Nor have the Tagalog writings of Katipunan leaders, and other documents of the period, been viewed, beyond affirming their patriotic content, as the articulation of folk perceptions of change .... a discontinuity exists in our present understanding of the Revolution, between "folk traditions" and the liberal ideas of the nineteenth century that are said to have triggered aspirations for change.\footnote{Ileto, op. cit., 101.}

The articles in Kalayaan show obvious affinities with ilustrado writing, particularly that of Marcelo del Pilar, but once translated into Tagalog and explained in the context of an existing folk world-view, 'foreign' ideas acquired a new significance and were absorbed into an authentically indigenous framework of meaning. Thus, for instance, Ileto has analysed the different meanings of the key terms independencia and kalayaan, arguing that the Spanish term for independence was understood by Filipino intellectuals in its European sense while the Tagalog kalayaan evoked the values of the Pasion tradition.\footnote{Ibid., 99-100.} Interpreted in this tradition,
the Revolution was a pilgrimage from darkness to light, from suffering and dying to the world to freedom and transcendence. 'Political' ideas were integrated into a total, religious understanding of the goals of the struggle. The Katipunan, at the level of its mass following, derived its strength from the ideas and values of the 'poor and ignorant classes' who elsewhere supported the Colorums.¹³⁹

Even ilustrado contemporaries of Bonifacio who recognised the distinctive popular nature of the 1896 revolution misjudged it in terms of imported categories of thought. Florentino Torres described the revolution of 1896 as 'socialist', made by the 'plebeians or laboring people'.¹⁴⁰ Isabelo de los Reyes similarly characterised the revolt as one by the 'lower classes and ignorant people' with few ideas, although he acknowledged the intensity and religious 'fanaticism' with which the mass of the people could hold to such ideas.¹⁴¹ Educated Filipinos, like Spanish commentators such as Castillo y Jiménez, could not believe that ordinary Filipinos were capable of discovering for themselves the ideas set forth in the demands made by the 1896 revolutionaries. In the Spanish view, even the leaders of the Katipunan were too 'obscure and

¹³⁹ Ibid., 103.

¹⁴⁰ Torres, who became Attorney-General under the Americans, gave this opinion before the Taft Commission; Testimony in 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', 191.

¹⁴¹ See the translation of his Report on the Philippine Revolution of 1896–1897 (Madrid, 1899), quoted in Ileto, op. cit., 103. The strikes against foreign companies in 1898, condemned by the Aquinaldo government, demonstrated that though not 'socialist' in any ideological sense, popular radical movements during the revolution found practical expression in challenges to the wealth and power of companies, landlords, and local elites as well as to Spanish and American rule; see Ileto, ibid., 147-48.
uncultured' to be the real leaders of the revolution and it was assumed they were the dupes of powerful and educated individuals who used mass unrest to gain personal power. ¹⁴² That the masses were activated by a vision of radical change derived from indigenous traditions was dismissed by ilustrados and Spaniards, if they considered it at all, as fanaticism and superstition.

In the Pasion tradition, the Katipunan challenged the Spanish religious orders in the Philippines not primarily because they were landowners or foreign but because they were judged to have contributed to the enslavement of the Filipino people while pretending hypocritically to serve God.  In Katipunan literature, the friars are presented as the serpents in Paradise who seduce the Filipinos with enticing words hiding envy and moral confusion. Behind the promise of awakening the Filipinos to a better life, the friars blinded them with false beliefs while taking advantage of the sufferings of the people. The sun of reason revealed the 'claws of those of inhuman character who brought us death.'¹⁴³ In Emilio Jacinto's Manifesto printed in the first issue of Kalayaan, Liberty appears to a youth who is lost in darkness. At first he cannot recognise the figure because for three hundred years his people had adored false gods of religion and man, his fellow creatures. The friars taught love and compassion but practised tyranny and greed. Before their arrival the Filipinos had lived in light and freedom

But one day, which must be execrated and accursed, Slavery arrived saying she was Virtue and Justice,

¹⁴² Castillo y Jiménez, El Katipunan, 6-13; and see Pastells, op. cit., 112.

and promised Glory to all who would believe in her. Notwithstanding the fact that she came disguised with a mask of loveliness and goodness, and was smooth and affectionate in her behaviour, I recognised her. I knew that the happiness of the country was over, that she had pierced your unhappy people ... and your brothers believed in her and almost adored her ....

The friars were responsible for the martyrdoms of Burgos and Rizal. Ileto includes a translation of a poem attributed to Procopio Bonifacio, brother of Andrés, in which the 'humble martyrs' are presented as victims of the Spanish regulars:

On the shores of Manila bay/ at a place called Luneta by the Spaniards / was shot the pitiful pilipino, Martir of this Land. Our defender became involved in suffering / the eldest Burgos, / the youngest Rizal / sons without stain of guilt / were killed by the treacherous friars who had envy and fear.

Although the Katipunan identified the friars as a major enemy of the movement towards Kalayaan, and despite the rejection of Spanish Catholicism evident in the thinking of a number of the revolutionary leaders, the great majority of Katipuneros were moved by a profoundly religious vision of independence, as Ileto has argued. In contrast to the secularism and scepticism of the leaders of the ilustrado reform movement, they accepted a view of human society and of the revolution which was millennial, mystical and supernatural as well as political. In Cavité, the centre of the Revolution after Bonifacio and his followers in Manila suffered a series of military defeats,

Far from having the Masonic and anti-religious character which contemporary Spanish writers attributed to it, as

144 Emilio Jacinto, 'Kalayaan', in Kalayaan, March, 1896, trans. in Ileto, ibid., 112-14.

145 'Oh Mother Spain', in José P. Santos, Si Andres Bonifacio at ang himagsikan, 1935, 18; trans. by Ileto, ibid., 136.
well as later American and Filipino anti-Catholic historians, [the Revolution] was marked by a profoundly religious character. As General Artemio Ricarte, one of the leaders of the Magdiwang council put it in his memoirs, recounting the crowded churches of the time: "... In the Philippines during the insurrection the holy love of God was demonstrated more than in normal times". Eyewitness accounts relate the continual novenas, rosaries, and Masses held in the Cavité churches for the success of the Revolution, attended by principal government leaders, and even imposed by government decree. Decrees insisted on attendance at Sunday Mass, on the faithful observance of Christian morality so as to win God's blessing on the Filipino cause, and on daily public prayers for the Revolution.  

There were, of course, practical reasons why the leaders of the Revolution supported religious observance. For one thing, they needed the support of the Filipino clergy. Nor was it expedient to provoke deep religious divisions while fighting a war. Moreover, not all the leaders of the Revolution had accepted the anti-clericalism of the ilustrado reformers. Aguinaldo himself came from a religious family, his brother Crispulo being a close friend of the Spanish clergy and his mother a devout churchgoer.  

Aguinaldo had secretly warned the Recollect priest of Kawit in 1896 enabling him to escape to Manila when

146 John N. Schumacher, 'Church and State: the Philippine Experience to 1941', Manila, n.d. unpub. typescript, 5. Revolutionary civil and military authorities regularly ordered the celebration of solemn masses to mark important occasions; see the order by Brigadier-General Alejandro of 11 June, 1899, commanding civil and military officials to be present at a Mass in celebration of the anniversary of independence; Taylor, Insurgent Records, File 160.7. Similarly, Baldomero Aguinaldo ordered prayers and novenas in preparation for an enemy attack expected on 24 January; Doc. 34, Achúteguí and Bernad, Aguinaldo, 116-118.

147 Emilio Aguinaldo, Memoirs of the Revolution, trans. by Luz Colendrino-Bucu (Manila, 1967), 26. This caused a family crisis for Aguinaldo when he explained that he was a Mason and a katipunero. Aguinaldo also writes with respect and affection of Father Toribio Bunel, parish priest of Cavite el Viejo and friend of his father; ibid. 6. The Aguinaldo family prayed the mysteries of the Rosary every night; ibid. 10.
the revolt broke out. When four imprisoned friars (three priests and a lay brother) were tortured by a brother of Andrés Bonifacio and later executed on Andrés Bonifacio's orders this caused popular revulsion as well as condemnation by Aguinaldo.

Most of the leaders who gained control of the Revolution from 1897 remained orthodox Roman Catholics, distinguishing their hostility towards the friars from their proclaimed adherence to religion. The ordinary members of the Katipunan who responded to the Pasion tradition did not necessarily see a contradiction between rejecting 'Slavery disguised as Virtue and Justice' (the religion of the friars) and continuing to participate in Roman Catholic ritual. In the religious culture of the tao, the alternative to clerical abuses was not secularism and anti-clericalism, which were ilustrado responses, but an intensification of commitment to the 'anti-structural' values and beliefs permeating the folk Catholic tradition. Whether or not the religious life of the Katiupuneros or the followers of the Guardias de Honor or the Colorums moved outside the bounds of Christian orthodoxy was a judgement made from outside these


149 For an account of the executions see the 'Testimony of Telesforo Canseco', 28 February, 1897, doc. 99 in Achutegui and Bernad, Aguinaldo and the Revolution of 1896, 333-41. See also Aguinaldo's comments in his Memoirs, 119-20.

150 Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, II, 113. The issue was the problem of divided allegiance posed by Spanish bishops claiming spiritual authority over Filipinos engaged in a war of independence against Spain. The more conservative men who gathered around Aguinaldo continued to acknowledge the authority of the Archbishop but the more radical argument prevailed in the revolutionary councils.
movements. To their followers, the war against Spain was not a rejection of Spanish Christianity but, rather, a preparation for the fulfilment of God’s plan for the Filipinos.

In non-Tagalog areas, the influence of a tradition equivalent to that of the Pasión analysed by Ileto has not been studied by historians sufficiently to allow safe generalisations concerning the nature of mass support for the Revolution in northern Luzon, the Bicol region or the Visayas. However, the evidence that exists suggests that each region possessed its ‘Little Traditions’, peasant cultures influenced by pre-Christian and folk Christian values and ideas. Differences between regional traditions deserve close study but it is also evident from the spread of millennarian and radical folk movements in the 1896-1912 period that such movements could attract intense support from followers from more than one province or from more than one linguistic region. The Santa Iglesia of Felipé Salvador extended over Bulacan, Nueva Ecija, Tarlac, and Pampanga. Ilocano and Pampangan-speaking members held ‘a common mode of perceiving the world’ and shared basic beliefs and cultural symbols with similar movements in Tayabas. The Santa Iglesia was also called a Katipunan. Its origins went back at least to the 1880s to the movement led by the 'Holy King' Gavino. Its followers joined in the Katipunan revolt:

Constabulary officials were impressed by the magnitude of the Santa Iglesia’s support among the rural population and the ability of this organisation to cut across regional and linguistic barriers. It was noted that in a single group of raiders could be found men from Pampanga, Pangasinan, Bulacan, Tarlac, and Nueva Ecija – provinces comprising at

151 Ileto, op. cit., 259.
least three different linguistic groups.  

The Revolution of 1896 was perceived by followers of the folk religious movements which accompanied it as the apocalypse heralding the Day of Judgement and the Millennium. These movements varied in their beliefs and in their relations with both the Church and the revolutionary government. The Guardia de Honor began in 1872 as a religious sodality under the direction of the Dominicans and its devotion to the Blessed Virgin, public recitations of the Rosary, processions, images of the Virgin, pilgrimages to shrines and popular devotions were all well within the boundaries of Catholic orthodoxy. But within eight years of its foundation, the Guardia had begun to escape the control of the Spanish clergy, and its Filipino lay leaders had already introduced overtly pagan elements into its daily worship. In 1882, alarmed by this trend, the Spanish clergy withdrew recognition from the Ilocano chapter of the sodality. This decision encouraged the Guardia to move even further away from Catholic orthodoxy and its leader, Julian Baltasar, a powerful anítero [animist], as Apo Laqui [male deity, figuratively, and 'Mister Grandfather' literally] became the head of a folk cult based in Pangasinan province, but with chapters throughout central and northern Luzon. In 1886, Baltasar proclaimed the approach of Judgement Day which would cleanse the earth of the corrupt and introduce the millennium. Thousands of his Ilocano followers abandoned their villages and fled towards Santa Ana, a

---

152 Ibid., 260ff; 277–78. The rituals and beliefs of the Santa Iglesia closely resembled the Pasion tradition in the Tagalog provinces. See also Sturtevant, Popular Uprisings, 132–38.

153 Sturtevant, Popular Uprisings, 97–98.

154 Ibid., 98–99.
small island on the Agno River, proclaimed as the site for the elect
who were to survive the deluge. The subsequent intervention of the
Guardia Civil did not destroy the movement nor the failure of the expected
flood. Between 1886 and 1896 Baltasar and his wife (Apo Bae, or Female
Deity) were the central figures in a widespread movement and their home
in Urdaneta, Pangasinan, was the shrine for a constant stream of pilgrims,
who also visited the Dominican shrine to the Blessed Virgin in neighbour­
ing Manaoag. 155 In early 1898, Baltasar shifted the centre of the cult
to the remote sitio of Montiel which he renamed Cabaruan ('Renewal'),
the capital of a 'state within a state' until the execution of Baltasar's
successor, Antonio Valdes and other leaders by the Americans on 1 June,
1901.

The Guardia de Honor maintained an ambiguous and eventually hostile
relationship with the Katipunan in Pangasinan, resisting Katipunan
overtures to join it in a common revolutionary war against the Spaniards
but maintaining its own military units after 1896 and carrying out raids
on Spanish outposts and harassing haciendas owned by wealthy provincial
principales. The Guardia exhibited a hostility towards the elite
apparent in the original Katipunan but its leaders, notably Baltasar him­
self, were less influenced by the ilustrado world-view and were repelled
by the secularism (as well as the Tagalog character) of the Katipunan's
leadership. 156 By 1898, the three-cornered struggle between Spaniards,

155 Apo Bae died in November, 1896, and her spirit was then believed to
materialise near wells and fountains in Urdaneta investing them with
healing powers; Sturtevant, ibid., 101.

156 Ibid., 101. That there was a radical socio-economic element in
Guardia beliefs is evidenced by Valdes' description of his followers
as los agriviados (the oppressed).
Guardia de Honor and Katipunan in Pangasinan had become a direct conflict between the Guardias and the Revolutionary Government with the provincial elite making constant appeals to Aguinaldo for protection against the Agraviados. The same situation emerged in Tarlac, Nueva Ecija, and, by 1899, La Union, Ilocos Sur and Zambales. Valdes, in his war with the provincial elite and with the ilustrado leaders of the Republic, presented himself as the champion of Catholicism and ordered his followers to help Spanish friars to escape from imprisonment by the revolutionaries. His war bands staged raids on towns holding Spanish priests in order to free them.

Despite the affirmation of their Catholicism, the followers of the Guardia de Honor moved in a world which derived many of its beliefs from traditions outside orthodox Catholicism. The Spanish clergy were suspicious of the 'pseudo-religion' of the movement. The tens of thousands of peasants who made a pilgrimage to Cabaruan, depositing their food in a common store and accepting a communal pattern of labour and social life obeying theocratic rulers who identified themselves as manifestations of Jesus Christ, the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, were credulous fanatics in the Spanish view.

Ibid., 103-107. See also Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, II, 99-100. Taylor mistakenly assumes the Dominicans still controlled the Guardia in 1898-1899.

Sturtevant, ibid.

Valdes was accused, even by the friars who benefitted from his support, of superstition and deceit. Herrero concluded that God had used the 'pseudo-Guards of Honor' as a blind instrument to free the Spanish religious; Nuestra prisión, 639; and see Sturtevant, op. cit., 103, n.11.

Sturtevant, ibid., 111. For details of Guardia rituals and religious symbolism, see Taylor, Insurgent Records, files 168, 242, 298 and 790.
The Guardia de Honor and the Santa Iglesia shared much of their ritual and religious symbolism in common and members of the Guardia sometimes also belonged to the Santa Iglesia. Religious movements encouraged by the Revolution gained strength between 1902 and 1906 in the Visayas and northeastern Mindanao. In Negros, 'Pope Isio' was both an insurgent leader and the religious head of his followers. By December, 1901, his 1500 followers, men and women 'all of the most ignorant classes of the community', led by fifteen generals under Isio himself, occupied the mountains of southeastern Negros. The rituals of the Babailanes were modelled on those of Roman Catholicism but the supernatural powers attributed to the movement's leaders, the use of magical anting-antings, believed to be proof against bullets, the use of the Katipunan seal were all indications that the Babailanes had moved beyond the folk Catholicism tolerated by the clergy.

161 Ibid., 131-32.

162 Sturttevant mentions Pulajanes and Colorados (Reds), Cazadores (Hunters), Babailanes (Priests), Santos Ninos (Holy Children), Hermanos del Tercero Orden (Brothers of the Third Order) and Soldados Militantes de la Iglesia (Militant Soldiers of the Church), Ibid., 119. There were other underground cults such as the Dios-Dios, Cruz-Cruz, and Anting-Anting. The Babailanes in Negros, and the Pulajanes in Samar, with the Santa Iglesia, were the largest of these scores of movements. See also The Manila American, 9 February, 1905, 5, and The Manila Cablenews, 10 May, 1904, 1, for details of other movements in Mountain Province and Laguna.

163 See the unsympathetic and superficial account in Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, I, 413-16; and also Sturttevant, op. cit., 121-27. Isio (Dionisio Sigobela) became leader of peasant refugees in 1887 and created out of a band of raiders an army making war on the sugar hacenderos and Guardia Civil detachments. His struggle against the 'Negros Republic' set up by the wealthy elite had strong aspects of a class war as well as a religious crusade. For a recent overview of the religious symbolism of folk religious movements in the Philippines, see Prospero R. Covar, 'General Characterization of Contemporary Religious Movements in the Philippines', Asian Studies, XIII, No. 2, August, 1975, 79-92.
The Filipino clergy played a central and difficult role in the Revolution. The revolutionary leadership was aware of their importance in maintaining morale and support for the Republic. Some priests were involved in the actual formulation of policy at the highest level during the first phase of the Revolution in 1896-1897. Fathers Esteban del Rosario and Manuel P. Trias regularly participated in the meetings of the Magdiwang faction while Fathers Cornelio Ignacio and Eulalio Almeyda worked closely with the Magdalo group. Other priests attended meetings on political or military strategy. Another Filipino priest, Father Pedro Dandan, one of those exiled to the Marianas Islands for alleged complicity in the 1872 Mutiny, joined the revolutionaries in Cavite in January, 1897, and became an important influence on its leaders as well as on the Filipino clergy's response to the Revolution. Dandan was largely responsible for winning over the secular clergy to the struggle. He acted as an adviser to Aguinaldo and chaplain to Emiliano Riego de Dios, Minister of Commerce in the Magdalo Government, living with the revolutionaries in their mountain retreat after Aguinaldo had retired to Biak-na-bato. Dandan was authorised to create a Departmental Government of Central Luzon covering all the revolutionary provinces except Cavite and Batangas, being elected President. In March, 1897, the Filipino clergy

164 Schumacher, 'Church and State', art. cit., 6. Father Trias was an uncle of General Mariano Trias, vice-President of the Revolutionary Government after the uniting of the two factions.

165 Ibid., and see Achutegui and Bernad, Aguinaldo and the Revolution of 1896, 503.

166 Ibid., and Agoncillo and Alfonso, History of the Filipino People, 218. Father Dandan died in the mountains in late 1897.
met soon after a united revolutionary government had been created under the presidency of Aguinaldo, to elect an 'Ecclesiastical President', Father Cornelio Ignacio, to represent their interests.  

The Filipino clergy had strong and emotional reasons for sympathising with the revolutionary movement. As successors to Fathers Burgos, Gomez and Zamora and the bitter secularisation struggle they were susceptible to the political campaign against the friars mounted by the Katipunan and the Revolutionary Government. Their pastoral duties and their family ties kept them in close contact with the leadership and the mass following of the revolutionary movement. They were among the first victims of the Spanish reaction to the discovery of the Katipunan on 19 August, 1896, by Father Mariano Gil, the Augustinian parish priest of Tondo. Some Filipino priests were almost certainly involved with the Katipunan but the Spanish authorities acted indiscriminately in arresting and torturing priests in La Union and Albay and Camarines Norte. In San Fernando, La Union, three Filipino priests, Fathers Adriano Garces, Mariano Gaerlan, and Mariano Dacanay, were arrested after being called to Vigan by telegram by Bishop Hevia Campomanes. Their bodies were examined by the Augustinian Fathers of the Vigan seminary for marks of incisions left from the blood pact ritual of the Katipunan. They were accused of being Masons and revolutionaries but when they refused to confess they were tortured with whips and hot irons. Father Gaerlan testified later that Father Urbano Alvarez told him that the Spanish clergy were determined


168 Zaide, The Philippine Revolution, 107. There were earlier denunciations of the Katipunan but these were not sufficiently alarming until Father Gil uncovered documents and weapons in the printing shop of the Diario de Manila.
to eliminate the Filipino clergy once and for all. Father Garces also claimed that the Augustinian friar admitted that Bishop Hevia Campomanes 'thinks to exterminate the indigenous clergy because he is convinced that it is most false and treacherous'. Garces alleged that although he did not believe Hevia Campomanes was involved, the Augustinian Fathers were determined to punish the Filipino clergy for siding with the friars' opponents among the local principalia. 169

Other Filipino priests in the Diocese of Nueva Segovia were imprisoned in 1896 for alleged complicity in a conspiracy to overthrow Spanish rule in the Ilocos provinces. 170 News of the torture of the three priests provoked a rising in Bayambang, Pangasinan. 171 Fathers Dacanay, Gaerlan, and Garces were imprisoned in La Union from 21 September, 1896, to 6 December, 1896, when they were transferred to San Carlos Seminary in Intramuros and later to Bilibid Prison where they were kept with other political prisoners. They were not released until 3 April, 1897, and not cleared of the charges against them until 28 August. Father Garces was

169 Relatos of Father Gaerlan, Coadjutor of San Fernando, La Union; Father Garces, ex-Coadjutor of Baoan, La Union; and Father Dacanay, Coadjutor of Aringay, La Union, given in Bilibid Prison, Manila, 15 March, 1897; in Salvador Pons y Torres, Defensa del Clero Filipino (Manila, 1900). Ambrosio Mina, whose Relato also appears, wrote to Pons y Torres on 20 March, 1900, denying that he had authorised it or signed it, and that it was exaggerated and inexact. Nor had Father Apolonio Peña signed that attributed to him; in Rodriguez, op. cit., II, document 42, 228.

170 Father Cosmé Abaya, who had been prominent in the movement for the secularisation of the parishes, was arrested in 1896. During the period of the revolutionary government he was appointed Rector of the Vigan seminary by President Aguinaldo and in 1899 was made military chaplain with the rank of Captain; E. Arsenio Manuel, Dictionary of Philippine Biography, I (Quezon City, 1955), 6-7.

171 Agoncillo, Malolos, 10.
rearrested in September, 1900, on the order of General Jacob H. Smith, for alleged subversive activities against the United States. A few weeks later, on 13 October, Father Dacanay was arrested on a similar charge in Bacnotan, on the information of a townmate, and was put into prison by the American authorities 'without trial'. Dacanay was kept a political prisoner in the provincial gaol at Vigan until 29 September, 1901. Fathers Dacanay, Garces, and Gaerlan, not surprisingly, were active in the Paniqui Assembly of 23 October, 1899, when the Filipino clergy adopted a constitution which, in effect, declared them independent of the existing Spanish hierarchy although remaining loyal to the Holy See.

In the Bikol peninsula, three more Filipino priests were arrested in the weeks following the discovery of the Katipunan. After being tortured in Naga, Fathers Severino Diaz, Parish Priest of the Naga Cathedral, Inocencio Herrera, Choirmaster of the Naga Cathedral, and Gabriel Prieto, Parish Priest of Malinao, Albay, were transferred to Manila.

---

172 Laubach, op. cit., 133. See Father Garces' Impugnacion de la Censura Impuesta por el Ilmo. y Rmo. Obispo de Nueva Segovia, Fr. José Hevia Campomanes al Pbro. Sr. D. Adriano Garces (Manila, 1900) for an account of his imprisonment in 1896 and his disputes with the Bishop in early 1900. See also the letter from Father Fidel Larrinaga reprimanding Garces for disrespect towards his bishop, Manila, 8 January, 1901, in Rodriguez, op. cit., doc. 51, 285. Garces was removed from his parish of Dagupan in October, 1900.


174 For a discussion of the Council of Paniqui, see Achútegui and Bernad I, 190-14. The Constitution drawn up by the Assembly is included as document 31 in ibid., III, 112-17. Father Dacanay was selected to be Bishop of La Union in the Iglesia Filipina Independiente and Father Garces, Bishop of Pangasinan; The Manila American, 8 August, 1902, 10. They refused.
where they were tried with eight laymen by a military court on 29 December, 1896, the eve of Rizal's execution. Under torture they were forced to confess that they had conspired to receive a shipment of arms from Cavite with which they planned to massacre all the Spaniards in the Bikol region. The Bishop of Nueva Cáceres, the Augustinian friar, Father Arsenio Campo, believed the three priests to be innocent and appealed on their behalf but they were found guilty and shot on the Luneta on 4 January, 1897. 175

Their executions recalled the martyrs of 1872. Revulsion against the executions and against the torture of the clergy of Nueva Segovia helps explain the general support for the Revolution among the Filipino clergy. Their public and private encouragement of the revolutionary cause was an important factor in rallying popular enthusiasm behind Aguinaldo. Despite their ambiguous position as Filipinos dedicated to the patriotic struggle for independence and priests still bound to the spiritual authority of the Spanish bishops, in the period between the outbreak of the Revolution and the Treaty of Biak-na-bato they actively participated in actual government as well as giving moral support to the revolutionaries. 176

In the second phase of the Revolution, after Aguinaldo's return from Hongkong in May, 1898, the Filipino clergy lost influence with the Revolutionary Government as educated and wealthy *ilustrados* from Manila gained ascendancy over Aguinaldo and control of the policies of the Republic. The anti-clericalism and secularism of this sophisticated elite was


reflected in the growing tensions between clergy and the Republic, brought into the open by the debates on the proper relations between church and state held by the Malolos Congress in the latter part of 1898. 177

Indeed, the Filipino clergy as a group diverged in their sectional interests as well as in their ideological priorities from both the ilustrado anti-clericals and the local principales who emerged more often than not as their rivals in the pueblos. There is evidence that once the Filipino coadjutor assumed full control of the parish in the absence of the Spanish friar curate, he found himself facing similar conflicts with the local town elite, despite their common patriotism and loyalty to the Republic. The tensions between parish priest and local principalía it appeared were not entirely colonial and racial antagonisms but expressed tensions between the two poles of political and moral authority in local provincial life. In so far as the local Presidentes represented the civil authority of the Republic, this conflict was also the local expression of tensions between the Filipino clergy and a revolutionary government determined to bring the church fully under the control of the state and to break off the clergy's ties with Spanish bishops and fellow Spanish clergy.

In the pueblo, rivalries between the Filipino parish priest and the President and municipal officials had a practical basis in disputes over church property and income, the overlapping functions of the civil and

177 Taylor claims the ilustrados used but did not like Aguinaldo whom they regarded as ignorant; Luna believed he shared the superstitions of the people to the extent that his rationality was in question; Philippine Insurrection, II, 175-76.
religious functionaries, opposition by the clergy to the introduction of civil marriages, control of local cemeteries and of education, as well as personal clashes over precedence and status. The Filipino clergy displayed a lively consciousness of their rights as well as a concern for the interests of church and religion while Presidentes and the principalía from which they were drawn saw the Revolution as an opportunity to assert their full control over the political as well as the social and economic life of the provincial towns.

For its part, the revolutionary government did not at first perceive any need to require the Filipino clergy to formally renounce the episcopal authority of the Spanish bishops. In October, 1898, a number of Filipino priests reported to Aguinaldo that they had received appointments to parishes from the Archbishop of Manila and requested the revolutionary government's authorisation for them to assume their duties. This permission was granted. During this period, which lasted from the time of Aguinaldo's return in May until the orders concerning the Philippine Church issued by Aguinaldo on 20 October, 1898, the Filipino clergy were able to claim obedience to both the Spanish episcopate and the revolutionary authorities. With the expulsion of the friars from the parishes and their replacement by their Filipino coadjutors, the religious problem, in the eyes

178 Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, II, 111; Insurgent Records, file 1049. See also the petition from Father Escolastica Salamandan requesting the Archbishop to recognise his position as parish priest of Santa Cruz, Laguna, 6 December, 1898, file 208.5. In October, 1898, the people of Majayjay, Laguna, asked Aguinaldo to order the Filipino priest there to remain. In the order of 12 December granting their request, the Secretary of Justice praised the 'deep religious sentiments and patriotism' of the priest and his harmony with the civil authorities; Philippine Insurrection, 111.
of many Filipino priests, had been solved and it was only necessary for
the independent Philippine Republic to adopt a religious policy towards
its Filipino clergy similar to that adopted by Spain towards the Spanish
clergy before 1898. 179

Evidence of the uncomplicated enthusiasm of many Filipino priests
for church and revolution in this brief period can be found in a petition
from the residents of San Pedro Tunasan, Laguna, to Aguinaldo asking that,
notwithstanding the 20 October decree, the parish priest, Father M.
Victor Enrile, native of Baliwag, Bulacan, should stay in the town. Since
he arrived as their priest on 7 July, 1897,

We have never observed of him any behaviour whatsoever that
could be brought forward to criticise his attitude; on the
contrary, he has shown exceptional love for his fellow
Tagalogs and impeccable performance of his duties. [When
the town rose up in revolution on 31 May, 1898] as proof of
his love for Kalayaan and loyalty to the Revolutionary
Government, at twelve noon, when the flag of our Mother
Filipinas was raised, his first impulse was to face the local
presidencia of this town and declare that he was accepting
the overlordship of the Revolutionary Government and partici­
pating in it, dedicating all his life and labours to it; and
all these pledges have been fulfilled to this very day with the
fullest love. And, concerning his being a priest, no-one has
ever seen him use his status in any way contrary to reason, in
fact, he has used his position to show love for his fellow men
and compassion and caring for the poor. 180

Relations between the local civil officials and the Filipino parish priest
were not to remain so idyllic in some parishes. In May, 1899, fifteen
Filipino priests, led by Father Adriano Garces, addressed an angry letter
to the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the clergy of Pangasinan and

179 Ibid.
180 Petition to E. Aguinaldo by Residents of San Pedro Tunasan, Laguna
Province, PIR Reel 117-066 (Old Series Packages), 20 November, 1898;
translation by Reynaldo Ileto.
Tarlac against the public slapping of Father Eusebio David and his confinement by the chief of the pueblo of Urdaneta. They were wounded in their honour as priests and demanded immediate punishment for the official,

as by this our government will give evidence of its justice and its wisdom, since it cannot be denied that watching over and supporting the prestige of the clergy and justly punishing any affront which may lower it, such as the outrage described, will cause the clergy to preserve its moral influence necessary in these perilous times for the aid and support of our new-born Filipino nation, aid and support which the clergy has shown to be giving from the beginning of the revolution, working as it has with all its strength within its appropriate sphere of action and by continuing to labor to obtain our longed-for independence.181

An even graver incident took place in mid, 1899, when Father Mariano Villafuerte, parish priest of the Cathedral of Nueva Cáceres, was assassinated by Second Lieutenant Vicente Vasquez, acting as President of a military council of war, with the approval of the Divisional General, Vito Belarmino, in Albay.182

While such violent clashes between the local officials of the Revolution and the Filipino clergy were unusual and there could be cooperation between the two, there were serious material differences of interest between clergy and presidentes and municipal councils, and, as well, an ideological split between clergy and revolutionary government which appeared, even before the debate on the religious clause in the

181 Insurgent Records, 208.6; translation in Philippine Insurrection, IV, 523-24. The incident, concerning the priest's refusal to marry a local couple and the civil official's retaliation, took place in March, 1899.

182 Insurgent Records, 167.7. Unfortunately the document is incomplete and it is not clear what the priest had done.
Malolos Constitution, with Aguinaldo’s order of 20 October, 1898.

Soon after the establishment of a system of local government by the Revolutionary Government by its decree of 18 June, it turned its attention to the functions and responsibilities of the parochial clergy. Already, problems had arisen in some areas between the local religious and civil authorities. In the months between May, 1898, and the effective imposition of central control over provincial and local governments, the Revolutionary Government was aware that a number of Filipino priests suffered abuses at the hands of local leaders. A decree of 18 June made civil marriage compulsory and prohibited canonical marriages without a previous civil one, a measure in itself repugnant to a Roman Catholic clergy. But some local officials went further and attempted to stop canonical marriage altogether, motivated perhaps by an anti-clericalism strong among many members of the local *principalia* who had resented the authority of the friar, and also by the lure of full control of the income from marriage fees.\(^3\) The issue of civil marriage was to remain a contentious one between revolutionaries and clergy throughout 1898-1900.\(^4\)

---

183 Schumacher, *art. cit.*, 8; Majul, 'Anticlericalism during the Reform Movement and the Philippine Revolution', in Anderson (ed), *op. cit.*, 166.

184 Fr. Adriano Garces complained in October, 1899, that the *presidente local* of Tayug, Pangasinan, celebrated marriages and administered baptisms ignoring the protests of the parish priest against this 'satanical' abuse against the doctrines of the church; Letter to the Secretary of the Interior, Dagupán, 19 October, 1899, *Insurgent Records*, 160.1. Earlier, on 17 March, 1899, Fr. Pablo Singzon, acting ecclesiastical administrator of the Diocese, issued a circular letter warning the clergy against condoning irregular or civil marriages; 17 March, 1899, *ibid.*, 160.3. On 23 June, 1899, Aguinaldo issued a further order setting out the procedures and charges for civil marriage; *Varias disposiciones sobre el clero secular filipino*, *ibid.*, 167.1 (f).
The Revolutionary Government, though it contained anti-clericals and was later to appropriate parish income, realised the importance of the Filipino clergy in maintaining the loyalty of the masses to the Revolution. Disputes between priests and local presidentes could stir up unrest and threaten the stability of central revolutionary control. There were also, in the Revolutionary Government, those who felt a debt of gratitude to the Filipino clergy for their role in the nationalist movement and their sufferings in 1896. Others supported the Filipino clergy from religious principles. The important consideration, however, appears to have been the Government's anxiety to avoid internal divisions in the critical period when it was attempting to gain acceptance of its authority. Accordingly, Aguinaldo issued a decree on 26 July, 1898 which regulated relations between civil and religious authorities in the pueblos. In an introduction to the decree, when it was presented to the President for his signature, the Minister of the Interior stressed that the Government's main concern was to take all possible measures to secure internal order and to suppress any threat of discord. In order to achieve this, an important measure was to assist the clergy and to ensure that their prestige with large numbers of the people would further the Government's political ideals. The Government also owed the Filipino clergy some relief from their present miserable situation. They received no salaries; mass collections had fallen in such abnormal times; and the rents which the friars had used to supplement their incomes were not

185 Schumacher, art. cit., 8.
available to the secular clergy. 186

The 26 July decree ordered the local chiefs of the provinces to courteously instruct the clergy to preach unconditional submission by the people to the Revolutionary Government. They were to use the pulpit and the confessional to inculcate patriotism and obedience to Aguinaldo as the supreme authority in the islands. The clergy were to work for internal order, avoid factionalism, and to respect and help one another, 'ever mindful of the love and care with which they must treat their brothers'. In the second article of the decree they were encouraged to recover their proper parochial rights. Confiscation of church funds by local officials was forbidden and the civil authorities were commanded to respect the priest's office. The Revolutionary Government recognised the ancient stole fees as set out in the schedule of Bishop Sancho de Santa Justa y Rufina. These tariffs were to be translated into the local language and posted up on all church doors for the information of the faithful. This last instruction revealed the suspicion of the Government that the Filipino clergy were liable to the abuses ascribed to their friar predecessors. 187

Although the Government was concerned to define and protect the traditional rights of the secular clergy and to forbid their exploitation by some local officials the decree of 26 July made it clear that the

186 Text in Varias disposiciones sobre el clero secular filipino, 167.1 (a). When issued and circulated the decree did not contain this introduction, of course. See also Cesar Adib Majul, The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution (Quezon City, 1967), 148.

187 In Varias disposiciones, ibid.; and also included in various letters of instruction from provincial chiefs; files 208.9; 208.10.
Revolutionary Government expected the clergy to accept considerable civil control. Not only were they commanded to promote the authority of the Government but they were told to use the pulpit and even the confessional to do so. The implication that local officials had the authority to require them to actively support the Revolutionary Government was also clear. Superficially, the decree drew the Filipino clergy into a relationship with the Revolutionary Government which paralleled that occupied by the Spanish friars in the colonial government up to 1898. Certainly, the long experience of the Patronato Real must have eased the acceptance of state control for the Filipino clergy who had no experience of a separate church and state. But the Filipino clergy were in a weaker situation than the friars, not only because of their impoverished condition but also because the Revolutionary Government assumed a control over them that even the Spanish kings had stopped short of claiming. They were expected to act as officials of the state to an even greater degree than the friars. They continued to act as such even after the delegates to the Malolos Congress voted for the separation of church and state (although article 5 was subsequently suspended by article 100) and despite the qualms of some of Aguinaldo's advisers. As well as acting as propagandists for the state they were also required to collect funds for it. In the Government's view they were seen as entirely at the disposal of the provincial civil authorities.\(^{188}\)

The involvement of the provincial police and military officials as well as the municipal councils and local presidentes in ecclesiastical affairs deepened in the following months. On 8 August, the Secretary of

\(^{188}\) Taylor, *Philippine Insurrection*, I, 112; II, 480.
the Interior issued an order directing the Provincial Commander of the Cagayan Valley to assist Father Eusebio Natividad to convoke a regional assembly of the Filipino clergy. Presumably there were other regional assemblies ordered at the same time. They were intended as the first step towards the reorganisation of the Philippine Church under revolutionary control. In the province of Nueva Ecija in August, the Provincial Chief of Police and the Military Chief approved the election of Father Gonzalo Esquivel as Provisional Ecclesiastical Superior of the province, assisted by Fathers Mariano Llanera and Pablo Padilla. Henceforth, Father Esquivel was held solely responsible for relations between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities in the province. A later order of 1 September, 1898, invoked the 26 July decree to resolve all disputes in the province between civil officials and the parish clergy. Provincial governors were instructed to use utmost care to avoid conflicts with the Filipino clergy. A further order of 12 August had also referred to the 26 July decree as maintaining the 'status quo' in church-state relations in the province while warning against abuses in the charging of fees.

---

189 Text in Communication from the Provincial Commander in Tuguegarao to local officials, 5 April, 1899, Achútegui and Bernad, III, doc. 18, 81-82.

190 Insurgent Records, 160.8-160.9 (the files are continuous).

191 Order of the Provincial Chief of Morong, 1 September, 1898, ibid. See also Agoncillo, Malolos, 305.

192 Ibid. The order was written in response to a telegram of 11 August from the Secretary of the Interior.
The relationship between revolutionaries and clergy was not in fact that prevailing under Spanish rule despite the involvement of government and clergy in each others' affairs in both cases. The Revolutionary Government was much less inclined to recognise the spiritual independence of the clergy or to respect Catholic teaching on social questions. Leading spokesmen of the Filipino clergy were aware of the threat to their authority and independence. On 10 October, 1898, Father Mariano Sevilla wrote to Father Manuel Trias urging the clergy to contribute to a Catholic periodical able to oppose those 'more or less impious and positivist' papers produced in the Revolutionary Government's territory. A Catholic periodical was needed to defend 'our interests and those of the church'.

The growing anxiety of the Filipino clergy was confirmed on 20 October when President Aguinaldo issued a further decree. After warning the secular clergy against imitating the abuses committed by the friars, abuses which had been the principal cause of the Revolution, the decree strictly prohibited the clergy from selling candles and then raised an issue which was at the centre of the Filipino clergy's dilemma throughout the Revolution. The President ordered that no appointments to clerical positions made by Archbishop Nozaleda were to be recognised. Thus, the spiritual authority of the bishop over his diocesan clergy as laid down by ecclesiastical law was set aside by the Revolutionary Government,

193 Sevilla to Trias, Bulacan, 10 October, 1898, in Sevilla Papers, Insurgent Records, 619.

194 Order No. 47, Malolos, 20 October, 1898, in Varias disposiciones, op. cit.
a decision understandable given the war being fought between Spaniards and Filipinos and the participation of some Spanish clergy in military campaigns against the revolutionaries but something nevertheless which the Spanish kings had not attempted.

On the same day as the Revolutionary Government issued the order of 20 October forbidding the clergy to accept appointments from Archbishop Nozaleda, Aguinaldo appointed Father Gregorio Aglipay Military Vicar General or chief ecclesiastical superior of those under arms during the Revolution. Aglipay claimed that his authority encompassed 'all Filipinos'.

For this reason, I am likewise Superior of all Filipino priests who, as such, should all be appointed Military Chaplains for the duration of the war.\textsuperscript{195}

The intention of the Revolutionary Government clearly was to cut off the Filipino clergy from outside authority and to enforce direct revolutionary control over them as appointees of the state through the military chain of command.

In his first Manifesto to the Filipino Clergy on 21 October, Aglipay called on the Filipino clergy to nominate Deputy Military Vicars and to send in their own names so that the Revolutionary Government could appoint them Military Chaplains. Aglipay himself, as Military Vicar General, was not to be confirmed by election but held his position by virtue of Aguinaldo's appointment.\textsuperscript{196} Aglipay then addressed the crucial problem

\textsuperscript{195} Text of the appointment, Achútegui and Bernad, III, doc. 24, 92-93; and for Aglipay's comment on his powers see his Reply of 19 August, 1899 (drafted by Mabini) to his excommunication, ibid., doc. 77, 210-16.

\textsuperscript{196} Text of the Manifesto in Achútegui and Bernad, III, document 25, 94-96. Mabini again was the actual author. See also Achútegui and Bernad, I, 50-54, for their comments.
of spiritual jurisdiction held by the Spanish bishops. His solution was for the Pope simply to confirm as bishops those priests whom Aglipay and his Council should designate for the office. The appointment of Military Chaplains similarly were to be approved by the Holy See. The Council of priests from each province would call on the Revolutionary Government to remove any priest from his spiritual ministry if he failed to submit to these directions. On the 22 October, Aglipay felt the need to reassure 'the anxieties of timorous consciences' alarmed by the schismatic implications of the previous day's Manifesto. It was necessary to work with the Revolutionary Government, and to recognise the authority of the Spanish prelates would put the clergy in direct conflict with that Government. In that situation the Church would suffer and the legitimate aspirations of the Filipino people for independence be impeded.

An indication of the situation in which the decree of 20 October and Aglipay's Manifestos of 21 and 22 October placed some of the Filipino clergy can be gathered from a letter sent to the President by Father Lupo Carpio, on 1 November, 1898, in which he claimed that the clergy of Pampanga and Tarlac, while obedient to the civil authority and committed to peace and good order in the pueblos, were unable to accept the spirit of the decree with its assumption of spiritual authority over the clergy. Knowing the grave situation facing the country and fully aware of the delicacy and complexity of the matter, Father Carpio indicated the unease of the clergy at interference with their sacred obligations as ministers of the Catholic religion.

197 Achutegui and Bernad, I, 54; III, 96.

198 Text in Achutegui and Bernad, III, document 26, 97-100; and see ibid., I, 55-57, for their comments.
Their mission on earth was to be serene in the midst of tempests, and to comply with civil authority so far as it did not conflict with divine law. But the clergy were unable to alter or ignore without incurring the penalties of canon law their spiritual obligations. Priests were obliged by conscience to obey civil authority but an equally binding obligation of conscience was that to their spiritual superiors. The Philippines as a Catholic country was aware of the respect due to religion, and to its priests and bishops. This respect was due especially to bishops who exercised spiritual authority without distinction of nationality. The priests were naturales (natives, in the sense of citizens) of their bishops and subject to them. They were heretics and schismatics if they denied this obedience to their spiritual lords.  

In a covering letter of the same date to the Provincial Commander of Pampanga, Father Carpio repeated that the Vicar of Jesus Christ, the Pope, confirmed the obligation of all Catholics to obey their spiritual lords.  

In his reply, Aguinaldo repeated that the friars were the principal cause of the Revolution and that it would be impossible to combine Spanish and Filipino clergy in an independent Philippines. Under no circumstances were priests appointed by the Archbishop to be recognised unless they received authorisation for their appointments from the Revolutionary Government.
Perhaps in response to the anxious reaction of the clergy to state demands on the church, Aglipay issued a third manifesto on 28 October, 1898, probably composed by himself and not Mabini (who on the same day was complaining in a letter to Apacible about the obstinacy of the Filipino clergy in continuing to obey Nozaleda). Aglipay attempted to reassert the claims of the Philippine Church against the aggressive demands of the Revolutionary Government by stressing that the church was independent of the state and should not be subordinated to it:

To seek to bring the Church into subjection to the civil power in the prosecution of its own duties, is not only grave injustice but also grave rashness, as this would disturb the right order of things putting the natural ahead of the supernatural .... all initiatives in ecclesiastical matters must come not from the Philippine Government but from the clergy.

Nevertheless, the clergy were obliged to live in harmony with the state for the good of their ministry. Since the Holy See generally conceded rights and privileges to friendly governments, the Filipino clergy should seek such privileges for the Philippines.  

The Revolutionary Government also made conciliatory moves. The first two manifestos by Aglipay were apparently disapproved by the Government and the affairs of the clergy were transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Justice whose Secretary, Gregorio Araneta, was a devout Catholic. Ecclesiastical affairs were put under the immediate supervision of Father Manuel Roxas as Director of Worship.

202 Text in Achútegui and Bernad, III, doc. 27, 101-102; and for their comments and translation see ibid., I, 57-60.

203 Schumacher, art, cit., 9.
Meanwhile, Aguinaldo's Government had issued a further order offering some compensation for the acquiescence of the parish clergy in direct control by revolutionary officials. In order to protect the parish funds, local officials were commanded to take care that they went to the purposes for which they were properly intended. The provincial chiefs were to ensure that the clergy were left in control of such funds and that local presidentes did not appropriate them for other uses.204 The clergy were proffered further consolation by the Revolutionary Government in early November. On 2 November, acting on instructions from Washington that he was to attempt to secure the release of the friar prisoners being held by the revolutionaries, General Otis wrote to Aguinaldo arguing for their pardon. In his reply of the following day Aguinaldo argued that the religious corporations had been largely responsible for the revolution. Filipino priests who had tried to reform the false opinion of the Vatican regarding the true religious situation and who had tried to recover their legitimate rights according to canon law had been martyred and accused of being malcontents by the friars. It was not licit that Spanish clergy should predominate in the Philippines or foment a counter-revolution of religious fanatics or merceneries. When the Filipino clergy were named bishops and parish curates in their own country, then the friars could be released.205

---

204 Order No. 48, 26 October, 1898, in Varias disposiciones, op. cit. Published in El Heraldo de la Revolución 3 November, 1898.

205 Aguinaldo to Otis, Malolos, 3 November, 1899; text in Achútegui and Bernad, III, doc. 3, 35-37. See Insurgent Records, 162.6, for copies of Otis' letters of 2 and 10 November to Aguinaldo. See also Majul, Constitutional Ideas, 154.
between Aguinaldo and Otis was not primarily concerned, of course, with the good of the Filipino clergy. In a letter of 28 October, Mabini revealed that the Revolutionary Government was concerned that 'our priests still acknowledge the authority of Mozaleta'. He was 'trying to convince them little by little that they should ask earnestly the Roman Pontiff to appoint Filipino bishops in the Philippines [but] do not know whether I can finally convince them, they being obstinate'.

That this was a campaign to nationalise the church and make it subject to the needs of the state rather than altruistic concern for the Filipino clergy became evident during the debates on religion in November.

Father Manuel Roxas, on behalf of the Filipino clergy, responded warmly and diplomatically to Aguinaldo's letter of 3 November to Otis. He offered a thousand thanks to 'the Supreme Magistrate of the nation' on behalf of the Filipino clergy. The President had stepped forward as one of the few defenders of the native clergy. He had called the attention of the world to their situation, acting as defender of their rights and liberties as well as liberator of the country. The Filipino clergy could never forget his vindication of them. They had suffered, as had the martyrs of 1872, most recently with the deaths of Fathers Diaz, Herrera and Prieto in Camarines. But they were capable of being bishops, deans and parish clergy, and Aguinaldo was thanked for drawing the attention of the American people to their cause. At this point, Father Roxas alluded to the dilemma the Revolutionary Government had presented the clergy without actually mentioning the decree of 20 October. In closing, he

206 Mabini to Galicano Apacible, Malolos, 28 October, 1898, in The Letters of Apolinario Mabini (Manila, 1965), 70-71.
mentioned certain prejudices entertained in revolutionary circles against the Filipino clergy. It had been alleged that the clergy had had little effect and had been no help in the national cause. This was emphatically wrong. The sympathies of the Filipino clergy for independence were strong. But their situation was difficult given that their ecclesiastical superiors were Spanish bishops. They were in danger of losing their licences to administer the sacraments and perform their priestly functions. With all the vehemence of their hearts they proclaimed their sincere adhesion to the Filipino cause and unconditionally placed themselves at the President's orders in so far as they accorded with their holy ministry. They solemnly protested their dedication to the liberty of the Philippines.207

Actually, Aguinaldo's letter to Otis of 3 November and a subsequent letter of 18 November, were drafted by Mabini whose opinion of the Filipino clergy was as low as Father Roxas feared. He was later to say that with few exceptions 'it must be declared that the parish priest, whether friar or secular, only thinks of his parishioners when it is time to collect the parochial fees':

All have slept on their laurels trusting in the Catholicism of the Filipino people and have seldom troubled themselves to carry words of love and sympathy to the afflicted or unfortunate, or to go about their districts reviving faith and confidence in the Divine goodness. True fathers of the poor were very rare among them and many trust to the lash as an unanswerable argument with which to expound the excellencies of the Catholic religion.208

207 Manuel Roxas to Emilio Aguinaldo, Manila, 15 November, 1898, Insurgent Records, 208.8

If Mabini was sceptical concerning the commitment of the Filipino clergy to their parishioners he was equally sceptical of their trustworthiness as supporters of the Revolution. He described the 'internal problems' the Government experienced with the Filipino clergy as 'ugly'. He was responsible for warnings made against the clergy that they would be considered 'enemies of the country' if they continued to listen to their Spanish bishops.  

The threat behind the Revolutionary Government's policy towards the Filipino clergy became blatant in incidents such as that involving Father Anastacio Cruz, Vicario foráneo of Batangas, who protested to President Aguinaldo that he had not authorised a telegram issued over his name which warned the clergy of the province not to oppose the 'canonisation' of couples married according to civil law and threatened those of them who obeyed the order of the Archbishop with action against them as spies. Father Cruz claimed that he had always tried to inspire respect for authority as his priestly office demanded, and that he had suffered 'as a priest and citizen' during the period of Spanish domination, being confined to a seminary for four months by the Archbishop, having his house watched by the Guardia Civil, and exhausting his health caring for the forces of the Revolution. His patriotism, then, was beyond question but as a priest he had always upheld the sanctity of marriage, in accordance with canon law. The government, in its decrees of 26 July and 1 September had recognised canonical marriage and boasted of its Catholicism. There-

209 Apolinaro Mabini to 'Kanoy and Ikakis', Rosales, 25 July, 1899, addition dated 13 September, Letters of Apolinaro Mabini, 204.
fore, the telegram issued in his name was false. 210

The Archbishop’s order referred to in the telegram which so angered Father Cruz, was possibly that requiring all Filipino priests to report to him in Manila. In Pampanga he invested Father Lucas Leyco with faculties empowering him to revoke licences or ecclesiastical grants and to remove curates from their positions. In a note on this order, Felipe Buencamino, who involved himself, as Minister for Foreign Affairs and possibly for reasons of private ambition, in the problem of the Filipino clergy and the Spanish bishops, remarked that it had created agitation amongst the Filipino clergy. Those Filipino priests who insisted ‘goatlike’ on their parish rights had caused trouble with the local presidentes. More serious, he believed, was the presence of Filipino priests likely to be moved by the Archbishop’s command, ‘those who might [listen] chickenheartedly to the voice of this Señor’. Such priests could bring the Revolution into disrepute with their parishioners. 211 The demands of President and Archbishop made the Filipino priest’s dilemma inescapable.

The anguished state of conscience which Aglipay himself claimed several times to have suffered afflicted the Filipino clergy more acutely

210 Anastacio C. Cruz and Fr. José Villanueva, communication including text of the telegram, forwarded to the President through the Provincial authorities and also enclosing four questions and replies signed by Father Cruz and Jacinto Buenaventura, Batangas, 4 November, 1898; Insurgent Records, 165.8.

211 Felipe Buencamino, Notes, Insurgent Records, 440.10. Nozaleda became the ecclesiastical superior of the clergy of Nueva Segovia on the imprisonment of their bishop by the revolutionaries, and his jurisdiction thus covered most of Luzon. For a comment on Buencamino’s ambition to be Ambassador in Rome and Mabini’s doubts about his sincerity, see Mabini’s letter to ’Kanoy' and 'Ikkis', 13 September, 1899, op. cit., 204.
later in November when it became apparent that a strong faction at the Malolos Congress favoured the separation of church and state, the disestablishment of the Roman Catholic church, and liberty of belief.  

The delegates to the constitutional congress turned their attention to the religious question on 28 October but it immediately became obvious that opinion was deeply divided on the draft articles drawn up by Felipe Calderon and debate was deferred until the 22 November. Calderon, friend of Father Mariano Sevilla and grandson of a friar, accepted the traditional unity of church and state and drafted the original articles in Title III on religion as follows:

The nation shall protect the cult and ministers of the Roman Catholic Apostolic religion, which is the religion of the State, and shall not use its revenues for the expenses of any other cult. (Article 5)

Any other cult may be practised privately, provided that it is not contrary to morals and good customs, and does not subvert the security of the nation. (Article 6)

The enjoyment and discharge of the duties and official functions in the Republic, as well as the acquisition and exercise of civil and political rights, shall be independent of the religion of the Filipinos. (Article 7)

Delegate Tomas G. del Rosario led the attack against the provision and put forward an alternative which read: 'the State recognises the freedom and equality of all cults, as well as the separation of Church and State'.  

Mabini warned Aguinaldo during the subsequent debate which lasted from 22 to 29 November that if he took the side of one group or the other.

212 Achútegui and Bernad, I, 235-36.

213 Ibid., I, 61.

214 Text in Agoncillo, Malolos, 298, and Majul, Political and Constitutional Ideas, 137; Spanish texts in Achútegui and Bernad, III, doc. 101, 271.

215 Agoncillo, ibid.
other he would alienate the other and that 'if you accept one religion [i.e. the union of church and state] you will lose the people on whom you can count more during critical times'.

Delegate del Rosario argued that ministers of religion protected by the state tended to begin as martyrs and end as tyrants; it was 'indecorous' for the clergy to be tied to the state and belittling to the Church; papal interference in temporal affairs followed union of church and state; the decadence of Spain resulted from such a union; and three hundred and fifty years of experiment in such a system had failed. Calderon in reply evoked the priest-martyrs Pelaez, Burgos, Gomez, Zamora, Díaz and Mendoza who had shed their blood or given their talents to the Filipino cause. Religion was the one effective bond uniting all Filipinos otherwise divided by language and custom. Finally, separation of church and state could provoke the Vatican to nominate foreign bishops and to take away the offices of the Filipino clergy.

The first vote on 29 November resulted in a tie and on the second ballot del Rosario's amendment was accepted by one vote, and the three original articles of Title III were replaced by the statement that 'The State recognises the freedom and equality of all cults, as well as the separation of the Church and State'.

The Filipino clergy protested against the move to separate church and state while the debate was continuing. Under the leadership of Father Sevilla a number of them actively lobbied delegates in an effort to retain Calderon's proposals. Sevilla presented a memorial to the Congress.

---


217 For the debate see Agoncillo, ibid., 299-303; Majul, op. cit., 138-42; and Felipe Calderon, Mis memorias sobre la revolución filipina (Manila, 1907), 71ff.
attacking the constitutional draft put forward by Mabini advocating separation of church and state.\textsuperscript{218} Aglipay had already condemned separation of church and state before the debates but he was absent from Malolos while they were taking place although his vote would have been decisive in the first round. On 10 December, the Filipino clergy addressed a protest to President Aguinaldo against the proposed separation of church and state, expressing their anguish at the religious divisions and destruction of ancient institutions this would cause and warning of the danger this could cause to the unity of the Republic faced as it was by formidable enemies. In the same petition, the clergy took the opportunity to repeat their opposition to the introduction of civil marriages which had been approved in a bad moment for the country.\textsuperscript{219}

In January, 1899, the Filipino clergy again petitioned the Government asking Aguinaldo to use his influence to establish freedom of one religion only, that of the Catholic Church. Father Garces also wrote to Congress arguing that

\begin{quote}
Neither society nor good government can exist without morality, order and authority, that is, without law, and therefore without religion; for this is the basis of all three, as it is the life of the nation and the organ of the government. Civil society is conceived ... as a moral person, and as such is obliged to have a religion .... To permit the liberty of all religions is to concede liberty to both error and impiety.\textsuperscript{220}
\end{quote}

Acting on Mabini's advice, President Aguinaldo won the support of Congress for a third amendment to the article on religion which temporarily

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{218} Schumacher, \textit{art. cit.}, 10. For the text of Mabini's proposals see Majul, \textit{op. cit.}, 145.
\item \textsuperscript{219} Unsigned memorial to President Aguinaldo, Malolos, 10 December, 1898, Sevilla Papers, \textit{Insurgent Records}, 619.
\item \textsuperscript{220} Quoted in Majul, \textit{op. cit.}, 143.
\end{itemize}
suspended the separation of church and state until the meeting of a con-
stitutional assembly presumably when the security of the Republic had
been assured. Mabini, though ideologically committed to a secular state
separate from the church, believed in January, 1899, that 'in these
difficult times it would not be convenient to establish openly the separa-
tion of the Church and the State, as it would give the supporters of the
religion of the State cause to leave the Government'.\(^{221}\) Article 100,
which suspended Article 5, also provided that 'in the meantime, the
municipalities of those places which may require the spiritual offices of
a Filipino priest shall provide for his maintenance'.\(^{222}\) Ironically,
given the transparent expediency of the suspension of the separation of
church and state, the Filipino clergy were made to appear as if Article 100
was a victory which could be made permanent if only the Pope would recognise
Filipino control of the Philippine Church. In a draft letter to Leo XIII
in Buencamino's hand, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs assumed the voice of
the secular clergy and, after arguing that the Philippines was now an
independent nation of eight million Catholics and that the friars had
'abandoned' their parishes, urged the recognition of Filipino parish priests
and the appointment of Filipino Vicars and Bishops. It was no longer
possible for the Spanish bishops to exercise their spiritual authority and

\(^{221}\) 'Memorandum on the Constitution' (n.d. but circa 10 January, 1899),
*Letters*, 90. In a list of proposed amendments to the Constitution,
sent to Aguinaldo on 14 January, Mabini recommended that 'Article 5,
Title 3 (on religious liberty), will not take effect until our
independence is recognised'; ibid., 92.

\(^{222}\) Majul, op. cit., 144. In a tenth amendment to the Constitution made
by Aguinaldo in his New Year's message of 1 January, 1900, he also
proposed the expulsion of the friars, the confiscation of their
property and a limit on all religious bodies owning more than 50,000
pesos worth of property; Achútegui and Bernad, I, 63–64.
the people as well as the revolutionaries would not let them return. The religious life of the people had been threatened by the new constitution separating church and state but that proposal had been suspended 'for now' by Article 100. The clergy had 'no small satisfaction in having been able to save for the time the faith of these eight million Christians' but the threat was implied that without recognition from Rome they would not be able to hold off the secularisation of the country.223

In 1899 and 1900, the Republic put increasing pressure on the Filipino clergy. In October, 1899, Mabini drafted a memorandum to be signed by the Filipino clergy affirming their loyalty to Aglipay despite his excommunication and refusing to recognise the authority of any bishops, the Filipino clergy assuming their duties until the Pope appointed new bishops.224 In March, 1900, Aguinaldo issued a strong decree which commanded that the supreme ecclesiastical authority in the Philippines was the Military Vicar General, Gregorio Aglipay; that priests who held office without Aglipay's approval even if they were Filipinos would be punished; that the parishes were to be in the hands of Filipino priests although Jesuits and Protestant ministers would be protected; that the friars were to be expelled; and that the Apostolic Delegate was to be received as the Pope's representative but not as an American prelate.225 On 20 November, 1900 Aguinaldo repeated his decree of March, 1900, and added the further modifications:

223 Draft of a Letter, 'Beatisimo Padre Santo', Cabautuan, 18 June, 1899, Buencamino Papers, Insurgent Records, 418.8

224 Text in ibid., III, doc. 30, 107-11.

225 Text in Achútegui and Bernad, III, doc. 32, 118-20; comments in vol. I, 236-37.
1st. All parochial priests will give their secret adhesion to the Filipino authorities of their several stations, and their appointments will be privately approved by them; if this is not obtained they will be arrested as enemies.

2nd. A nomination will not be approved if it is of an enemy of the Revolution, or a person who is in favour of the usurping priests, or of a person who does not pay the contribution of war of his class.

3rd. Monsignor Chapelle is declared a prelate of the enemy from the moment he hoisted the American flag upon his palace, and hence not only he but all those who accept parish priests, governors and prelates who are not Filipinos will be treated as enemies.

At the same time that the Republic was tightening its political demands on the clergy under pressure from the Americans, it took back the financial concessions it had made in 1898. On the allegation that parish funds were still finding their way to the Archbishop, an order of 24 June, 1899 by Aguinaldo ordered parish funds to be placed on loan to the state through Father Aglipay or his Secretary. Between September and October it was further ordered that church funds and church property should revert to the use of the state. The emotional and complicated question of the Spanish religious prisoners also continued to be a divisive issue between Republic and church (see Chapter IV).


227 Varias disposiciones, op. cit., Order No. 54, Tarlac, 24 June, 1899. An earlier order, of 5 June, ruled that the clergy were to receive those fees in the Bishop Sancho schedule marked for indios and not the higher charges for mestizo and Spanish laymen, because the government objected to the implied racial discrimination; ibid.

228 Insurgent Records, 163.1; 163.2; 163.4
An examination of the role of the Filipino clergy and their relation with the revolutionary leadership between May 1898 and the end of 1899 shows that the simplistic and usually hostile judgements made by Spanish observers were inadequate in that they missed the acute dilemma in which the Filipino clergy were placed by the Revolution. Thus, Archbishop Nozaleda told the Taft Commission in 1900 that the Filipino clergy were merely used by the Katipuneros who wanted 'nothing but native priests because they can manage them and make them their instruments, and they know that they could not manage white priests and therefore they are trying to make the people hate white priests'.

Neither the motives of the revolutionary leadership nor the reaction of the Filipino clergy were as straightforward or crude as Nozaleda assumed. The Superiors of the Franciscan and Augustinian Religious Orders agreed with Brigadier-General R.P. Hughes in claiming that the native clergy were 'exciting and helping the revolution', constituting 'the soul of the insurgents'.

The Bishop of Jaro claimed that the clergy in his diocese were 'moving heaven and earth to keep me from going back' because they were having a great time running the diocese as they wished.

The ilustrado witness, Florentino Torres presented a different view:

---

229 Testimony in 'Lands Held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', op. cit., 108.

230 Juan Villegas and José Lobo testimony, ibid., 70; 78; and Hughes testimony, ibid., 177.

231 Andres Ferrero, ibid., 119.
The Filipino priests are natives of the country, and have more or less the same aspiration, sound or mistaken, as the generality of its inhabitants, and they are bound to them by ties of relationship, sympathy, and many other moral and social reasons, and it is not at all strange that some of them should support the cause of the revolutionists. The strange and surprising thing is that these should be only a few, a very few, and that the greater part, the large majority, have either wholly abstained from politics, keeping aloof from the revolutionists, or have accepted and adhered to American law and sovereignty, at the great personal risk of those residing in distant pueblos, and this in spite of the total and studied abandonment which the archbishop and bishops gathered in this capital left them.\textsuperscript{232}

Torres not only was unaware of the dilemma faced by the Filipino clergy in 1898-1899, he was also apparently unaware of the growing commitment of some priests to the revived Katipunan in 1900.\textsuperscript{233} The Filipino clergy remained largely hostile to American rule; either openly or secretly, a considerable number of them joining the revolutionaries when war broke out between the Republic and the Americans, as chaplains and advisers but even in some cases (such as that of Aglipay) as actual military commanders.\textsuperscript{234} At the same time, the representatives of the Filipino clergy, notably Father Mariano Sevilla, made efforts to gain American support for the right of the native clergy to administer the parishes. In a circular letter of December, 1900, Sevilla set out the way the Filipino clergy should present their case to the new American

\textsuperscript{232} Testimony of Florentino Torres, ibid., 190.

\textsuperscript{233} In November, 1899, Aguinaldo formally declared a policy of guerilla warfare against the Americans. A dual government was set up through many provinces. At the same time, the Katipunan was revived, Aguinaldo ordering its formal reorganisation on 15 August, 1900. Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, II, 277; 314-15. See also Chapter V, 393.

\textsuperscript{234} Schumacher, \textit{art. cit.}, 12
administration. The Civil Commission, sitting in Manila, should receive answers to the 'political campaigns and calumnies' of the enemies of the Filipino clergy against them. A printed petition to the American Civil Commission, to be signed by the Filipino clergy, maintained that as priests, the Filipino clergy accepted their duty to 'abstain absolutely from all interference in political questions', acknowledging and respecting the authority of the United States and promoting fidelity and submission to the new government.

For many priests, particularly those working in parishes at a distance from central American control, submission 'without mental reserve of any kind' was impossible, and the authority of the government of President Aguinaldo continued to be obeyed as legitimate and binding. Even after the capture of Aguinaldo in March, 1901, the involvement of some priests in the revolutionary struggle did not end. However, with the institution of American rule, a new, critical phase began in the history of the Philippine Church. The Holy See was able to take a direct part in the affairs of the Philippine Church for the first time in its long history.

235 Quiapo, December, 1900, in Sevilla Papers, Insurgent Records, 619.

236 Printed Petition, 'To the Honorable Civil Commission of the United States in the Philippines', [December?], 1900, ibid.
CHAPTER FOUR

CHAPELLE AND THE CRISIS OF 1900

The Vatican's response to the crisis which faced the Philippine Church in 1899 was to send an Apostolic Delegate to the islands. On the second day of the new year, Monsignor Placide Louis Chapelle, Archbishop of New Orleans and Apostolic Delegate to Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, came ashore at Manila.1 His arrival aroused intense hope and anxiety among those Spaniards, Americans and Filipinos concerned with the future of the church and the resolution of the colony's religious problems. He was the first direct representative of the Holy See to be sent to the islands in their long Catholic history. The Spanish clergy looked to him to vindicate their long struggle to keep control of the Philippine

---

1 Placide Louis Chapelle was born in Runes, France, on 28 August, 1842. In 1859 he emigrated to the United States and entered St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. He was ordained by Archbishop Spalding in 1865. In 1869 he accompanied Spalding to Rome and served as the Archbishop's theological adviser at the Vatican Council. His subsequent appointment to St. Matthew's Church, Washington, D.C., gave him the opportunity to widen his diplomatic contacts. From 1891 he served as Coadjutor and then as Bishop of Santa Fe, New Mexico. In March, 1898, he was installed as Archbishop of New Orleans. Leo XIII appointed him Apostolic Delegate to Cuba and Puerto Rico in October of the same year, and in August 1899 as Envoy Extraordinary to the Philippines. Two months later he was appointed full Apostolic Delegate to the Philippines where he arrived on 2 January, 1900. He served there until April, 1901, when, because of conflicts with Governor William Howard Taft, he was recalled, although keeping his title of Apostolic Delegate until November, 1902. He died on 9 August, 1905, in New Orleans, during a yellow fever epidemic. Francisco J. Tschans, Dictionary of American Biography, IV (1930), 11-12; H.C. Bezou, New Catholic Encyclopedia, III (1967), 453; Sister Mary Dorita Clifford, 'Aglipayism as a Political Movement', Ph.D., St. Louis University, Missouri, 1960, 264, n.4.
Church and to resist change; the Americans hoped he would impose a settlement of the religious divisions which threatened new outbreaks of violence in areas already pacified; and the Filipino clergy hoped he would recognise their aspirations and allow them a full role in their own church. The supporters of the Filipino clergy were prepared to welcome him with 'warm enthusiasm' as their protector against the friars and against the American military administration (which regarded them as 'absolutely our most dangerous enemies' and 'secret enemies of the Government').

His manner of arrival was unfortunate but it accurately prefigured his policies: he accepted the offer of the Military Governor's personal launch to take him ashore from the Sherman where he was met by a welcoming committee of American army officers and Spanish bishops and religious.

It was cried from the housetops that the new American prelate, come to reinstate the friars, was brought ashore in the government launch, given a reception in the old governor's palace with the friar archbishop and the other friars by his side, and otherwise shown official courtesies which to Americans were merely ordinary social amenities, but to Filipinos were magnified into matters of great importance.

In fact, the Filipinos recognised immediately that Chapelle had not

---

2 J. F. Bell, Brigadier General, Commanding, 'Instructions to all Station Commanders', 9 December, 1901, Batangas, in Senate Document No. 331, part 2, 57th Congress, 1st Session (Washington, 1902), 1610. Isabelo de los Reyes and Felix de Leon, claimed in a Memorial to Leo XIII of 29 June, 1901, that Chapelle had been received with affection by the Filipino people until he showed himself in sympathy with the friars, after which he was attacked and ridiculed by the Filipino press; in Achútegui and Bernad, I, op. cit., 159-160.
come to speak to them but to ally with their opponents. His formal and elaborate appearance, although not unusual for a papal ambassador of the time, suggested worldliness and arrogance to some observers. A Filipino priest who joined the Aglipayan Church wrote later that the Delegate came wearing a priest from Pampanga wrote later that the Delegate came wearing a great, lined mantle, in a long and low royal coach drawn by four horses. The Filipino clergy when passing before him were forced to kneel as though they were passing before the Holy Sacrament itself.3

The Apostolic Delegate's arrival provoked an intensification of the war of abuse between friar apologists and friar critics. At first the anti-friar pamphlets which appeared appealed to the Delegate to break the hold of the friar 'leeches in human form' on the Filipino people. There was widespread alarm that under American protection the Spanish regular clergy would try to return to their parishes and claim the right to resume their control of the life of local communities. The principalía as a group had no desire to share power once more with friar curates and probably sympathised with the Filipino clergy, contributing to the anti-friar literature

3 'Un Clerigo Pampango', in Propaganda Católico-Filipina [an Aglipayan publication], No. 1 (Manila, ca. 1903), 11. He also wrote that the 'friar periodical', Libertas, carried eulogies praising Chapelle to the heavens.
which appeared throughout 1900. There were already fears that the Apostolic Delegate was sympathetic to the friars as news of his interviews in the American press before his departure filtered into the Philippines. The Manila press picked up some of the Apostolic Delegate's statements made in the United States supporting the Spanish regular clergy and their claim to the parishes and agricultural estates seized during the revolution. By February and March, 1900, the abuse began to turn against him personally. Very soon the expectations aroused by his arrival were disappointed in all but one case: the Spanish bishops and friars found him entirely sympathetic to their cause. The disillusionment of every other group with an interest in the future of the Philippine Church arose partly from the initial widespread misunderstanding of the Delegate's purpose in coming to the islands.

The proposal that an apostolic delegate should come to the Philippines had been discussed at least a year earlier. During the few months when the Philippine Republic was able to take diplomatic initiatives, it considered the need for a direct representative of

---

4 For examples of this literature, see Severo Dusa, Circular entitled Rumor, 22nd January, 1900, protesting against the rumour that the friars would return to the parishes. The friars are pictured as leeches and 'devils in human form', thieves, the cause of 'a thousand secret funerals' and the 'ba! ba! ba! fathers of mestizos'; in Taylor, Insurgent Records, 467,1. And see also 467.1b, 'A Circular attacking the Friars and advising killing them if they return'; and 'Filipinos Alerta', Dagupan, October, 1900, Taylor, 467,4(a).

5 Manila Times, 29 December, 1899, and 13 January, 1900; and see Clifford, op. cit., 267.
the Vatican to come to the islands to negotiate a settlement between itself and the Spanish hierarchy. The first direct appeal for a delegate from the Filipino side was made by Isabelo de los Reyes in Madrid. The committees of overseas Filipinos in Paris and Madrid appointed de los Reyes to call on the Papal Nuncio to Spain, Nava di Bontife, and put the case of the Aguinaldo Government. De los Reyes was granted at least one interview with the Nuncio in early January, 1899. He claimed that the Philippine Republic wanted the Pope to send an apostolic delegate who could report directly on the religious needs of the Filipino people. He warned that it was the firm intention of the Aguinaldo Government not to release the several hundred Spanish friars held by its revolutionary forces unless the Pope agreed to religious reforms which would transfer powers formerly exercised by the friars to the Filipino secular clergy.

Although the Nuncio rebuked de los Reyes for trying to impose conditions upon 'the highest authority on earth' he apparently saw some merit in the idea of sending a delegate to the Philippines.

In a letter written some two weeks after the interview he suggested

---

6 For biographical information on de los Reyes, see Juan M. Ruiz, The Three Pillars of the Philippine Independent Church (Manila, 1950), 1-6; and Achutegui and Bernad, op. cit., I, 165-80.

7 The Nuncio included a report of the interview in a letter to Cardinal Rampolla, Vatican Secretary of State, Madrid, 22 January, 1899; English translation in Achutegui and Bernad, ibid., I, 176, and the Italian original in the same authors' The Religious Coup d'État, 1898-1901, III, document 7, 49-51.
that Cardinal Rampolla should inform the Archbishop of Manila that the Holy See was planning to send one of the bishops of the Far East – perhaps the Vicar Apostolic of Hongkong who had appealed to Cardinal Gibbons on behalf of the friar prisoners the previous year – as Apostolic Delegate to the islands. The Cardinal Secretary of State in turn wrote to Archbishop Nozaleda in Manila suggesting that if the Archbishop believed a delegate was necessary, the Pope would send one willingly, but only on condition that the religious prisoners would first be released. Those Filipinos who expected the Delegate to be an impartial investigator of their claims thus misunderstood the intention of the Holy See to send him at the request of the Spanish hierarchy and as their colleague.

8 Mariano Rampolla del Tindaro, Secretary of State from 1 June, 1887, until 20 July, 1903. He was Leo XIII's closest adviser and actually controlled Vatican policy in the Pope's last years. J. M. Mayeur has observed that 'it would be extremely difficult to differentiate the respective roles of Pope and secretary in the conduct of pontifical diplomacy during these sixteen years. Their views were identical'; New Catholic Encyclopedia, XII (Washington, 1967), 75-76.


10 The mistaken expectations of supporters of the Filipino clergy are indicated in a printed pamphlet by 'I.M.', 'Motivos de la Aversión del Filipino al Fraile', February, 1900, in which the author wrote: 'The arrival in this archipelago of Mons. Chapelle [is] to plan the inauguration of a new clergy, or to reform the existing one'; in Taylor, Insurgent Records, 467.10.
Cardinal Rampolla's instinct, which reflected the contemporary authoritarianism of the Vatican, was to trust the Spanish Archbishop of Manila as the church's highest authority in the Philippines. There was no idea of 'reforming' the Philippine Church. The Cardinal Secretary of State if aware of them rejected as irreligious the attacks being made against the 'bloodthirsty' Archbishop. The major concern of Cardinal Rampolla was the fate of the religious prisoners. He also wanted good relations with Spain and the United States. Moreover, there was no reason why a nineteenth century Italian Cardinal should be sympathetic to a revolution after the experience of the Church in Italy with revolutionary nationalists. More profoundly, the Cardinal shared the prevailing juridical and theocratic Roman Catholic view of spiritual and temporal authority, an outlook which had found concrete expression in the 'policy of temporal aggrandizement' pursued by Rampolla and Leo XIII. The Papacy was as implacably hostile to revolutions from below which challenged 'legitimate authority' as the Spanish hierarchy.

11 John Foreman makes the charge that the Archbishop had urged Governor-General Ramon Blanco to suppress revolt 'by fire and sword and wholesale executions'; The Philippine Islands, op.cit., 512. Nozaleda's reply to his critics is contained in his Defensa Obligada contra acusaciones gratuitas (Madrid, 1904).

12 Carlo Falconi, The Popes in the Twentieth Century, From Pius X to John XXIII (Boston, Toronto, 1967), 8, and see Chapter II.
Cardinal Rampolla's letter to Archbishop Nozaleda of 13 March, 1899, was written after an appeal on behalf of the Spanish religious prisoners to the Holy See from the Queen Regent of Spain, transmitted to Rampolla by the Apostolic Nuncio in Madrid. Rampolla had also received from the Nuncio an account of a visit from Isabelo de los Reyes and extracts from a letter sent to the Nuncio by the new bishop of Jaro, Andrés Ferrero, O.R.S.A. Bishop Ferrero blamed Freemasonry for having inspired the antireligious, rebellious spirit in the islands. On 8 February, 1899, the Nuncio also addressed a letter to Rampolla suggesting that the Filipino clergy could be asked to intercede on behalf of the Spanish friar prisoners. Rampolla expressed to the Archbishop of Manila the Holy See's concern over the fate of the Spanish bishop and religious held as hostages by the revolutionary forces. He took up the Nuncio's suggestion and recommended that Nozaleda should appeal to the Filipino clergy to negotiate with the revolutionaries for the release of the religious. The 'powerful help of the native clergy' might influence the revolutionary leaders 'because it is easier for them to have access to the chiefs of the Filipino forces'. The Cardinal thought that the native clergy would cooperate with the hierarchy's efforts to free the friars so as to be thought worthy of 'the award of civilisation'.

13 Rampolla to Nozaleda, Rome, 13 March, 1899; text in Achútegui and Bernad, III, doc. 10, 60-61. For the appeal of the Queen Regent, the report of the interview with de los Reyes, and Bishop Ferrero's letter, and the Nuncio's letters, see docs. 6, 7, 8, and 9, 45-59.
the Filipino clergy in the Revolution but apparently was unaware of or underestimated the extent of control exercised over the Filipino clergy by the Aguinaldo government. As we have seen, in 1898 and early 1899, the revolutionary leadership moved to bring the secular clergy under direct and close government control, requiring them to perform administrative and propaganda functions for the state and ordering them to obey Gregorio Aglipay as the supreme ecclesiastical authority in the Philippines, not their Spanish bishops. \(^{14}\)

Nevertheless, on the issue of the Spanish religious prisoners the Filipino clergy demonstrated a willingness to dispute the policy adopted by the Republic to use the friars as hostages in its negotiations with the Vatican and the Americans. The Cardinal's suggestion had some result, not because the Filipino clergy merely obeyed a direction from Nozalea, but because, whatever their differences with the Spanish regulars, they could not condone abuses against the inviolable character of the priesthood. On 14 September, 1899, the Filipino clergy addressed an Exposición to the President of the Republic and to the President of the Philippine Congress, Ambrosio Rianzares Bautista, in compliance with the request of Pope Leo XIII, transmitted through Cardinal Rampolla to Archbishop Nozalea. They requested the release of the Spanish prisoners, and in particular of the Spanish religious. The Republic would win the benedictions of Heaven if it pardoned past injuries and would earn the respect of the

\(^{14}\) See Chapter III, 293-311.
civilised world for the Filipino nation. The Filipino clergy and
the friars were all priests united in one Lord. Jesus Christ
Himself had warned: 'do not lay hands on my anointed ones'.
The Exposición, signed by forty-four Filipino priests in the
name of the seven hundred Filipino clergy in the islands,
was delivered to the Philippine Congress in Tarlac on 22 September
by Father Eusebio Natividad, Vicar foraneo of Tarlac. It was
accompanied by a letter of Father Mariano Sevilla of 14 September,
repeating that the Holy Father 'vividly desired that the indigenous
clergy should exert all their influence with the authorities of the
country for the liberty of the Spanish prisoners, especially the
religious'.

Rampolla sent his letter to the Archbishop of Manila in March,
1899, and in the same month, long before the letter could reach
Manila, the revolutionary press took up the question of the need for
a direct representative of the Pope to come to the Philippines. La
Independencia reproduced a letter by Ferdinand Blumentritt in which
he urged that the Philippine Republic should demand as one of the
conditions for the release of the friars the appointment of
an Apostolic Delegate to ask for their freedom in the name of

15 Exposición que los Señores Clerigos de Manila en nombre de todos
los de Filipinas, presentaron al Sr. Presidente del Gobierno
revolucionario y al Congreso, September, 1899; trans. by Pons y
Torres of the original Tagalog, Insurgent Records, 467.13, and
Sevilla Papers, 619. An anonymous note in Spanish with Sevilla's
letter praises the Exposición as a 'glory of the Filipino clergy'
published before the world and particularly in Rome in an Italian
translation. Achutegui and Bernad give another Exposición to the President of the
Spanish text in vol. III, doc. 14, 69-71. The Tagalog original is
in Insurgent Records, 162.8.

16 Ibid., 619. Sevilla opposed the return of the friars to the
parishes. Fr. Vicente Ramirez who signed the petition joined the
IFI in 1902; Achútegui and Bernad, I, 341-42.
In effect, such an official appeal from Rome would accord the Republic implicit recognition. In May, the newspaper published an account of the bargaining between a Filipino delegation sent to Rome by Aguinaldo to negotiate with Cardinal Rampolla for the release of the friar prisoners.\(^{18}\)

Nozaleda finally received Rampolla's letter in August. He forwarded it to President Aguinaldo with the advice that if 'some political interest' prompted Aguinaldo to bargain using the friar prisoners then he were better advised to release them and so win the moral approval of the entire world.\(^{19}\) Mabini, in a draft reply made up for Aguinaldo, assured Nozaleda that 'the clergy and Catholic

\(^{17}\) Blumentritt advised the Filipino revolutionaries also to demand that all bulls and pontifical decrees conferring special privileges on the religious orders against the general laws of the church be withdrawn; that the rights of the [Filipino] secular clergy be respected; that the friars be forbidden to discharge parish, cathedral, episcopal or diocesan duties all of which should be transferred to Filipino priests; and that rules be fixed for the election of bishops; *La Independencia*, 27 March, 1899.

\(^{18}\) Rampolla was reported to have offered one thousand duros (five thousand pesetas) for each friar released and five thousand for the release of Bishop Hevia Campomanes. For their part, the Filipino delegation demanded five thousand duros for each friar, ten thousand for an ex-provincial or vicario, and one hundred thousand duros for the bishop; *La Independencia*, 6 May, 1899. In July a sum of $7,000,000 was mentioned in negotiations with the Spanish Government; Taylor, II, 248 and exhibit 668.

people of the Philippines are possessed of the most unswerving adherence to the Holy See' but the Spanish religious prisoners were retained in the highest spirit of justice and in the sacred interests of the Catholic religion in the Philippines. He pointed out that when Pope Alexander VI had granted authority to the Catholic kings of Spain to extend the Gospel to the Oriental Indies, he did not authorise them to sell the peoples who thus became Christian to 'infidel nations' such as the United States. More significantly, he warned the Vatican that 'before looking after a few religious priests, [it] should interest itself in the fate of eight million Filipino Catholics, now in the jaws of slavery thanks to that sale'.

As for the plan to send a delegate to the islands, Mabini believed that

the Filipino clergy and the Filipino people will receive with pleasure, deference, and respect the nuncio or Apostolic Delegate of His Holiness, whose presence is truly needed so that the Vatican can understand in all its sad reality the state of Catholicism in the Philippines. But, on the other hand, they are firmly resolved not to recognise any foreign bishop as head of any diocese of the Philippines.

In Spain the Pope would not dare appoint bishops who were not Spaniards; nor would the Philippine Government allow such a practice in the Philippines. The thinking of the Aguinaldo Government was further expressed in the draft of a reply to the Holy See. This letter,

---

Draft of Mabini's answer to Nozaleda, Tarlac, undated; in Letters, ibid., 215-16; Achútegui and Bernad, ibid., document 12; also Veloso, ibid.
addressed to Leo XIII, pointed out that the friars in the Philippines had helped caused by their civil and social abuses the outbreak of the revolution. They were so resented for their conduct and their race hatred that it would not have been surprising if at the outbreak of the revolt they had been totally exterminated. They had been saved by the natural human kindness of the Filipino people. It was not true, as the European press appeared to have claimed that the friars were badly treated or that their lives were in danger. 21

The Republic was caught up in a struggle for survival and its leaders could not afford to be disinterested in their approach to the question of the friar prisoners or to the larger problem of the position of the church in a revolutionary Philippines. Mabini was aware of the broader context within which the argument over the friars took place, but the pressures of war, quite apart from his personal anti-clericalism and distaste for the 'superstition' preached by the Spanish clergy, meant that political and practical objectives overruled the need for fundamental religious changes. In pursuing immediate political advantage it is possible that the Aguinaldo Government sacrificed the chance to negotiate a resolution of the struggle between the Spanish and Filipino clergies. It was just possible in late 1898 that if Aguinaldo had offered to release the friars on condition that they withdraw permanently from the

Philippines his government could have permanently altered the future history of the Philippine Church. Certainly, the Vatican appeared more anxious over the fate of the Spanish clergy than over that of the Filipino clergy and laity who, after all, made up the Philippine Church. Rampolla had written to Nozaleda that what 'grieves most [the Holy Father's] heart as the common Father of all the faithful is the very sad fate of so many religious priests who were made prisoners by the Filipinos...'.

It is just conceivable that the Vatican would have permitted all Spanish priests, including the bishops, to leave the Philippines in mid-1899 if the Filipino leaders had simply required them not to return to the islands, although, as de los Reyes recognised, the Vatican would be loathe to deal with 'an insurgent government probably suspected of being irreligious for having decreed the separation of church and state'.

Ironically, the Aguinaldo Government was preparing at that very moment to set free all Spanish prisoners who were not in the regular army, including those in the church. The Vatican Nuncio at Madrid and the

22 Rampolla to Nozaleda, op.cit.

23 Isabelo de los Reyes, 'Letter to the Filipino Clergy', 29 March, 1900, quoted by Achútegui and Bernad, I, op.cit., 178. A report in May, 1898, indicated that the Spanish regular clergy were willing to withdraw then; New York Times, 31 May, 1898.

24 Decree of President Aguinaldo, Malolos, 23 June, 1899, in Taylor, Insurgent Records, folder 171.5, English translation, folder 385.2. Release of the Spanish clergy had also been considered in late 1898 but the outbreak of the Philippine-American War interrupted the decree and led to a reversal of policy.
Cardinal Secretary of State were convinced on the advice they had received from the religious orders in the Philippines and Archbishop Ireland in the United States that the Filipino insurgents were 'semi-savages'. The revolutionaries, in the event, gained no advantage from their use of the friar prisoners as an attempt to blackmail Spain and the Holy See into granting them recognition. Rather, the prisoners were used by Spain and the United States to prove that the Aguinaldo Government was uncivilised and not worthy of formal negotiation.

The attempts of Mabini and Aglipay to draw the Filipino clergy into a national church committed to the Republic raised the insoluble problem of reconciling disobedience to the Spanish hierarchy with obedience to the Pope. A sympathetic apostolic delegate was the one faint hope of resolving this dilemma if he could be persuaded to gain Vatican approval for the appointment of Filipino bishops. The Filipino priests who met at Paniqui on 23 October, 1899, were careful to leave open the possibility of such a delegate being recognised by the national church. Clause Two of Canon VI of the Paniqui Constitution laid down that the Council 'will only recognise foreign bishops with the rank of Monsignor or Apostolic Legate of His Holiness'. Loyalty to the Holy See was repeatedly and

25 'Archbishop Ireland's View', New York Times, 20 December, 1898, 3. Ireland said Aguinaldo was 'semi-barbarous' and 'ambitious' and was hostile to the clergy because they upheld the ruling power in the interests of law and order.

26 In Achútegui and Bernad, I, op.cit., 112-13; III, op.cit., document 31, 112-17.
explicitly affirmed.

The Council of Paniqui marked the culmination of the attempt to found a national church under Filipino direction yet loyal to and recognised by Rome. Aglipay was fully aware that the Holy See would reject the resolutions of the Paniqui Council unless events tipped the balance of influence decisively in favour of the Republic. For this reason he counselled patience. If a delegation were sent to the Holy Father at the present time it would invite rejection:

For the present, with the rainbow of peace still invisible and our independence withheld, it is impossible in every way for us to have any understanding with the Holy See .... The Commission is bound to fail and undoubtedly His Holiness would tell its members: 'My sons, I do not know you'. We should wait for a more propitious occasion, or a day not far distant that will mark the triumph of our ideals.  

Unfortunately, the fate of the Philippine church was already being decided in that same week in Washington and the decision took no account of the aspirations of the Filipino clergy or the demands of the embattled Philippine Republic.

Although the Filipino clergy did not know, the Vatican had already appointed Placide Louis Chapelle as Envoy Extraordinary to the Philippines. Two months later just as the Paniqui Conference was in preparation he was made full Apostolic Delegate. A few days

Opening address by Aglipay to the Council at Paniqui, 23 October, 1899, in Teodoro M. Kalaw, The Philippine Revolution (Kawilian, Mandaluyong, Rizal, 1969), 209-10. See also Achutegui and Bernad, I, 11, and Clifford, op.cit.
before the opening of the Paniqui Conference, Chapelle was at the White House conferring with President McKinley. On the very day that Aglipay was making his speech to the Filipino priests assembled to draw up resolutions for an independent church, the Apostolic Delegate was making a statement to the American press defending the Spanish friars in the Philippines and unreservedly endorsing American intervention in the Philippines. 28

At first sight, Chapelle's appointment appeared reasonable and even enlightened on the part of the Vatican. Chapelle had a reputation in the United States as belonging to the progressive, 'liberal' wing of the American hierarchy. He had supported Archbishop Ireland and Cardinal Gibbons in the 'War of 1897': the struggle between the liberal, Irish-American, east-coast hierarchy and the conservative German-American faction. 29 Moreover, Chapelle's varied career suggested that he would appreciate the broader issues at stake in the Philippines. He was an international figure, both as a Frenchman who had spent most of his life in the United States and as a professional Vatican diplomat. He helped found the Catholic University of America and later resisted the


29 For details of this struggle and the eventual papal condemnation of 'Americanism', see Colman J. Harry, O.S.B., *The Catholic Church and German Americans* (Milwaukee, 1952).
efforts of a conservative administration to restrict the University's teaching programmes. His episcopal work as coadjutor and Bishop of Santa Fe, New Mexico, and his period as secretary to the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions brought him into contact with the problems of minority and disadvantaged groups. As the Vatican's representative at the Paris Peace Conference Chapelle made a 'good impression' on the American Peace Commissioners, one of whom wrote that Chapelle was 'obviously conciliatory and naturally disposed, as far as possible, to aid the authorities in bringing the Cuban priests to a knowledge and acceptance of American ways'. He persuaded the Americans to include in Clause VIII a specific guarantee of church property rights and thus laid the foundation for American reparations, sale of the friar lands, and the court decision of 1906 which returned property held by the Aglipayans to the Roman Catholic Church. From the viewpoint of Washington in October 1899, Chapelle must have appeared a reasonable, flexible man of the world, sympathetic to American rule in the islands and willing to 'normalise' the church according to American principles. Nozaleda had cooperated with the United States to Washington's satisfaction 'but is is felt that the presence of a Delegate in this country

30 Barry, ibid., 194ff.

31 Whitelaw Reid from his diary, quoted by Oscar L. Evangelista, 'Religious Problems in the Philippines and the American Catholic Church, 1898-1907', Asian Studies, VI, No.3, December, 1968, 249.

32 Majul, Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution, 134, n.109; and see Laubach, op. cit., 130-31.
(the Philippines), authorized to act for the Vatican, will permit more direct co-operation on the questions which are constantly arising'. The American Government expected that Chapelle's appointment would 'permit a reorganization of the Church system of the islands, based on changed conditions'.

From the viewpoint of the Cardinal Secretary of State, the appropriate action in the Philippines was to reimpose and intensify conventional church structures, keeping these in the hands of foreign bishops. Oscar L. Evangelista has suggested that in the Vatican's eyes, the Catholic Church in the Philippines (that is, the ecclesiastical structures dominated by the Spanish clergy) would be better off, in any case, under an American administration than under an independent Philippine Republic. By its presence as a stabilising force, the United States would assure the safety of the friars who remained in the islands while ensuring property and other civil rights of the religious orders and the church.

The Vatican's apparent preference for the United States, even though it was for the preservation of stability rather than the democratic values associated with the American way of life, indicates Rome's indifference to the idea of a native church in the Philippines. The Vatican's position would be less threatened by a secular America than by an independent Philippines with a national church.

From the viewpoint of the Cardinal Secretary of State, the appropriate action in the Philippines was to reimpose and intensify conventional church structures, keeping these in the hands of foreign bishops. Oscar L. Evangelista has suggested that in the Vatican's eyes, the Catholic Church in the Philippines (that is, the ecclesiastical structures dominated by the Spanish clergy) would be better off, in any case, under an American administration than under an independent Philippine Republic. By its presence as a stabilising force, the United States would assure the safety of the friars who remained in the islands while ensuring property and other civil rights of the religious orders and the church.

The Vatican's apparent preference for the United States, even though it was for the preservation of stability rather than the democratic values associated with the American way of life, indicates Rome's indifference to the idea of a native church in the Philippines. The Vatican's position would be less threatened by a secular America than by an independent Philippines with a national church.


34 Oscar L. Evangelista, 'Religious Problems in the Philippines and the American Catholic Church, 1898-1907', Asian Studies, VI, No. 3, December, 1968, 250. For an example of the oversimplified reports appearing at the time in the American press, see 'Pope will accept U.S. Control of R.C.Church [in Philippines]' editorial, New York Times, 10 October, 1898.
In fact, the Vatican's thinking in the last years of Leo XIII was still formed in the ultramontane assumptions which had found expression in the Syllabus of Errors and the first Vatican Council. The Vatican was at that moment condemning 'Americanism' in the American Church. The Vatican did not accept the American view of church and state. Nevertheless, while Evangelista appears to underestimate the conflict, and, indeed, the incompatibility of the philosophies held by the Vatican and the American Government, conflict which quickly appeared once the Catholic hierarchy and American administration in the Philippines came to bargain over specific issues, his general point that Rome preferred the United States to Aguinaldo's government is undoubtedly true.

So anxious was the Holy See to come to an accommodation with the United States that, in 1898-1900, it almost sounded as if it approved of the American secular state. Archbishop Ireland claimed that the Vatican refused to intervene directly in the Philippines as 'a concession and as an expression of goodwill' towards the United States. Chapelle's appointment was presented as a compliment to

---


36 Statement in Times Herald, 2 October, 1900, quoted in Evangelista, ibid., 250-51; and see H. H. van Meter, The Truth about the Philippines (Chicago, 1900), 404-405.
the American hierarchy (the next Apostolic Delegate, Monsignor Guidi, was the professional Italian Vatican diplomat who could have been expected in 1900). It even seemed that the Vatican was prepared for the United States to assume some control over the temporal affairs of the Philippine Church as a reward for its protection. Behind the rhetoric of diplomatic exchanges, however, both sides held views which were irreconcilable. Just as the Vatican Secretary of State misread the willingness of Americans to be drawn into church affairs, so Presidents McKinley and Roosevelt misunderstood Vatican concessions as a willingness to make basic compromises. By 1901, the Taft Mission in Rome began to discover the gulf between American and Vatican views of the Philippine Church; in 1903-1904 the American authorities were even more disappointed when 'safe' bishops in the United States became intransigent absolutists in the colony.

In 1900, however, it looked as if a modus vivendi were possible. Rampolla, Archbishop Ireland claimed, turned down petitions received on at least three separate occasions asking for direct relations between Rome and the leaders of the Philippine insurrection, 'out of consideration for the American Government'. Archbishop Keane later in 1900 gave an authorised interview when he assured the people of America that the Holy Father had accepted the

37 In contrast to Chapelle, Guidi was described as 'a man of tact and good disposition toward the Filipinos' (LeRoy, Town and Country, 91-92)

38 Times Herald, op. cit.
transfer of sovereignty from Spain to the United States and had expressed 'no sympathy for the insurgents'. The Philippine Church had been encouraged to support the lawful government. 39

Chapelle at first did little to disabuse American confidence in the Vatican's policies for the Philippines. His public statements were fervently American. Press statements released by him soon after his appointment included unreserved support for American intervention in the islands. At the same time he explicitly and uncompromisingly identified himself with the Spanish hierarchy and regular clergy. When he talked of the 'church' it was apparent that it was the Spanish clergy he meant. A few days after his meeting with President McKinley he replied to a speech made by General Funston to students of Stanford University in which the General claimed that the church dominated the islands and that Congress would drive out the friars and confiscate every inch of church property. General Funston thought that if this were done the revolution would disappear within the week. Chapelle denied that the inhabitants of Luzon were completely under the domination of the church: how could they be when, for the past eighteen months 'more than 350 [Spanish] priests have been undergoing unheard of torture in insurgent dungeons'? 40 Chapelle was a little out of date: Cardinal Rampolla had already

39 Ireland and Keane quoted in the Literary Digest, XXI, 27 October, 1900, 499. See also Clifford, op. cit., 250-51.

conceded seven months earlier that 'prisoners were not being treated with so much severity as they had been at the beginning'.

Chapelle argued that the insurgents represented 'only one tribe out of the eighty-five tribes peopling the archipelago' and that their sentiments were not shared by 'the great body of the natives'. The 'natives' owed what civilisation they possessed to the friars:

> whatever the natives are or have they owe to the friars. By them they were lifted out of savagery and brought under the blessed and refining influence of Christianity. By them they were educated, not only in the schools, but in the fields and the workshops, were taught by them the very industries which are now the source of their prosperity.

If anyone doubted the moral improvement the friars had worked, they had only to compare 'the Christian native with his southern neighbour of the same blood - the fanatical Moro'. The echoes in Chapelle's statements of the propaganda produced by friar apologists in Manila and Madrid are unmistakable.

On the question of the friar estates, Chapelle rejected out of hand the doubts cast on the legality of the titles held by the religious orders:

---


42 On the particular point of this claim that the Filipinos owed their material civilisation to the friars see the identical argument in the Circular of 1897, op. cit., 59, which Chapelle had probably read.
you might as well talk of confiscating the estates of the Vanderbilts, the Astors, and other millionaires, whose estates have in the course of years grown so wonderfully... The estates of the religious orders have been acquired in the usual way, by purchase, and in the course of nearly four centuries have naturally grown large; but, if even unbiased Protestant witnesses are to be credited, large as they are all are used for the betterment and uplifting of the natives.

His view on the racial character of the peoples of the islands were unflattering. He quoted with approval the comments of a former British Consul who believed the 'natives are, with some rare exceptions, in need of tutelage, without which they would fall back to the customs of their ancestors, a tutelage that no-one can exercise better than the friars'. Despite his assurances that he would personally investigate all charges made against members of the religious orders and the validity of the titles to church property, he revealed in his 23 October statement how deeply he was committed to the Spanish clergy's view of the religious problems dividing the Philippines.

Perhaps it is not surprising that a nineteenth century Archbishop should regard Filipino aspirations as spurious (although the Propaganda Fide had been teaching the rights of the local church to be administered by its own clergy since the seventeenth century), but what is surprising is that Archbishop Chapelle assumed that he could reconcile his enthusiasm for American imperialism and American principles regulating church and state with his commitment to the Spanish hierarchy in the Philippines. He appears to have assumed that he could simply 'reorganise church affairs on American lines, and place [the church] in a position similar to the one she holds in the United
This was not what the friars wanted: indeed, the position of the church in America was regarded by them as unnatural and a consequence of American Protestant and secular heresies. Once in the Philippines and exposed to the claims of a church in an overwhelmingly Catholic country, Chapelle remembered his ultramontane theology and almost immediately began to make similar claims, claims which in the United States would have been unthinkable. Whether Chapelle was naive or devious in his initial support for the American principle of separation of church and state is difficult to decide; the confusion in his loyalties to America and the Universal Church, however, eventually made him the object of angry criticism from the American military authorities, from Governor Taft, and even from Archbishop Ireland who, back in the United States, could not understand how his protégé could alienate so disastrously the American authorities.

I have quoted the statement in the New York Times of 24 October, 1899, at some length because it indicates the assumptions behind the Apostolic Delegate's approach to the religious question in the

43 Interview in Chicago Inter Ocean Daily, 4 March, 1901.

44 Otis was critical of Chapelle's attempt to persuade him to safeguard the return of the friars to their parishes; see Report of Major General Otis, op. cit., 1900, and LeRoy, The Americans in the Philippines, II, 299-300. See also Clifford, op. cit., 281, for details of Archbishop Ireland's disenchantment with Chapelle. Even Father McKinnon turned against him; McKinnon to Ireland, 10 January, 1901, ibid.
Philippines very clearly. The Manila press picked up this and other interviews and commented unfavourably on Chapelle's insistence that 'friar property was church property and would remain church property'. Nevertheless, one historian who has written on this question of Chapelle's attitudes and sympathies has tried to shift the blame for the controversy which preceded his arrival to Army Chaplain Father William D. McKinnon:

Archbishop Chapelle had scrupulously avoided making any such commitments [to the friars or to the colonial policy of the United States] but every public utterance of Father McKinnon was regarded as having his approval.

In fact, in late October Chapelle had put forward pro-imperialist views which were identical with and were possibly borrowed from the Chaplain. On October 25 with Father McKinnon he visited the State and War Departments and had interviews with Secretaries Hay and Root. Later the same day he told the press that he was going to the Philippines 'with an earnest desire to assist both church and state'. He strongly attacked the critics of American intervention in the

45 Manila Times, 29 December, 1899.

46 Mary Dorita Clifford, op. cit., 266. In Chapelle's alleged interview with El Progreso shortly after his arrival in Manila, he is said to have expressly endorsed Father McKinnon's four lectures on the Philippines and the other evidence suggests that at this stage, before their quarrel in Manila, Chapelle and McKinnon were agreed in supporting the friars. Indeed it was McKinnon who later decided they should be withdrawn - Clifford, 280ff.
islands: 47

"The anti-imperialists", declared the Archbishop, "who are saying that America should retire from the Philippines, are devoid of a conception of the meaning of the words National hero. To retire under fire is base, un-American, and absolutely out of the question". He believed that our large Pacific coast made it necessary for us to have strategic positions on the Pacific. Moreover, the islands were valuable, commercially, and, above all, the key to the China trade. "I favour their retention", he said, "and their retention forever if that shall prove to be the best course as indicated by future events".

These sentiments were echoed four days later by Father McKinnon when he delivered an illustrated lecture in which he argued that more patriotism and less criticism was needed of the American involvement in the Philippines. McKinnon expanded Chapelle's comments on the 'natives'. 'The Filipino's wants being few', he said, 'he is naturally indolent'. Repeating Chapelle's statement of the 23 October he claimed that

Whatever the natives are or have ... they owe to them [the friars]. Every industry or source of revenue the natives have was introduced into the islands by the same much-abused monks.

The great mass of the population was not in sympathy with the insurrection:

The tagalogs, one tribe out of eighty-five, form the backbone of the insurgent army. They are reinforced by the bandits and half-breed mestizos.

47 New York Times, 26 October, 1899, 5.
In the accents of such friar works as *El Katipunan* he warned that all the insurgents belong to the sanguinary Katipunan society, a society formed after the pattern of the Lodge of Action of the Red Lodge of Masonry in Spain, a lodge composed of determined revolutionaries ready to use the dagger and prepared to wade through a sea of blood to accomplish their designs, just like the Mazzini and Carbonari of Italy.

McKinnon, as a member of the United States Army, was also responsive to the claims of Manifest Destiny and Kipling's exhortations to the Americans to take up the white man's burden:

What we need here in America is more patriotism and less criticism. This war would long since have ceased were it not for the criticism which has reached the camp of Aguinaldo and his followers, and revived their drooping spirits and encouraged them to persevere in their madness. The natives are not capable of self-government, nor does any large proportion of them wish it. Most of the tribes have sense enough to see how hopeless it would be for them to attempt it. They are quick to learn and good imitators, so we may hope that with our instructions and good example before them, after a couple of generations they may be capable of self-government.

President McKinley was evidently pleased with the pro-interventionist arguments advanced by Chapelle and McKinnon. A few days later McKinnon was promoted to the rank of Captain in the Army Chaplain Corps and assigned to accompany Chapelle to the Philippines as an adviser and unofficial liaison officer. The President was

---

48 McKinnon later admitted that he had his eye on a possible bishopric in the Philippines as a reward for his loyalty to the Republican administration; Clifford, op. cit., 281.
anxious to get a statement of support from the Apostolic Delegate and his aide as proof of Catholic support for the Government's policies in the Philippines as a weapon to use in the forthcoming elections. There must be some doubt, however, that McKinley would have promised in return to agree that the friars in the Philippines should return to their parishes and be regarded by the American authorities as 'elements of good order, and therefore American agents'. This understanding was alleged by the Dominicans in a statement released by them to the Spanish press, soon after Chapelle's arrival in Manila. The statement said that the Apostolic Delegate had assured the friars that President McKinley shared his view that they should remain in the islands and that they could work with the incoming American administration. \(^{49}\) We have already seen that Chapelle believed that the friars were the ideal tutors for the natives in the arts of civilisation; later, we will examine the minutes of a secret conference between Chapelle and the Spanish bishops in the Philippines in which he unreservedly supported the Spanish religious orders and their return to the parishes. But the American

\(^{49}\) *New York Times*, 'More Trouble About Friars', 18 January, 1900. See the report of the alleged interview with Chapelle in *El Progreso* of early January, 1900, reproduced in A. G. Robinson, *The Philippines: The War and the People* McClure and Philipps, 1901, 332; also in LeRoy, II, 197. 'The four public lectures given by Father McKinnon caused President McKinley to realise the necessity for the monastic orders to remain in the Philippines. I come to Manila with ample authority for everything. The friars of the Philippines have alarmed themselves without any reason. I know their importance and am openly predisposed in their favor. If the friars occupy the parishes they will be considered as elements of order and therefore as American agents'.
Government was well aware of the problems associated with the presence of the Spanish religious orders in the islands and McKinley could not have seriously offered to enter into an alliance with them.

Nevertheless, the idea that the friars could attach themselves to the incoming administration in a similar role to that which they performed under Spain received continued attention in their propaganda in 1900. The argument reduced to the need for an alliance between those of the white race in sustaining a civilising colonial effort in the Philippines. The friar was a European. He was a 'good American' because he was law-abiding and supported legitimate authority.50 Some months after Chapelle's arrival, the Taft Commission noted that it had been suggested that the friars, if returned to the parishes, would uphold American sovereignty and be 'efficient instruments in securing peace and good order' whereas the native clergy were active insurgent agents. The Commission concluded that the bitterness aroused against the American government among the people if the friars were permitted to return to their former parishes would far outweigh any advantage to be gained from using the friars as American agents.51

50 See, for instance, Anonymous, The Civilizers of the Philippines (Manila, 1900), 70; W. Brecknock-Watson, Vexata Quaestio or What Shall we do with the Friar? (Manila, 1901), 43.

The first misunderstanding of Chapelle's role was, then, that he could act as a 'double agent'. Chapelle came to the Philippines as a professional Vatican diplomat who understood his task as one of devising an accommodation between the Spanish hierarchy and the American administration while rescuing the existing ecclesiastical structure from Filipino revolutionaries and aggressive American secularism. He was even prepared to present himself as the representative not only of the Papacy but of the Government at Washington. While this doubled the suspicion felt against him by Filipinos hostile to the Americans as well as the friars, Chapelle believed it added to his influence as a man recognised in church and administration circles. His was a conventionally elitist response to the religious problems of the Philippines: the Spanish bishops and heads of religious orders and the American military officers at his public reception were precisely the men he saw as holding the authority to negotiate a religious settlement. Unfortunately, the situation in the Philippines demanded more than the secret conferences and public pomp of conventional diplomacy. By ignoring the aspirations of the Filipino clergy and the complexity and contradictions of the Filipino Catholics' position, Chapelle ensured that his mission would exaggerate the divisions between the two clergies rather than work for their reconciliation:

... he never gave any evidence of regarding conciliation as part of his mission. He allied himself from the first, and quite openly, with the Spanish religious orders; the Filipinos who opposed the friars and a resumption of friar rule he treated as enemies both of religion and order, and proposed for them the domination of force and authority, both civil and ecclesiastical....

The 'citadel mentality' of the Vatican and the Philippine hierarchy in the late nineteenth century has already been remarked; similarly, as a good Roman, Chapelle brought with him preconceptions of authority, hierarchy and ecclesiastical order which were entirely congenial to Archbishop Nozaleda and his fellow bishops.

It also should be recognised that both the Americans and the Filipinos overestimated Chapelle's freedom of action. The terms of his commission were set out in the later constitution for the Philippine church, Quae mari sinico, of September, 1902: so that ecclesiastical discipline might not suffer as the Americans assumed control, he was sent to the Philippines so that 'he might give to Us a report of affairs'. Chapelle had no brief to reform the

53 Le Roy, ibid.

54 Introduction to Constitución Apostólica de S. S. el Papa Leon XIII, para las islas Filipinas, 'Quae Mari Sinico', English/Spanish, Manila: Imprenta del Colegio de Santo Tomás, 1902. Alternative translation in Whittemore, Struggle for Freedom, 110: 'It was necessary to restore ecclesiastical discipline promptly. For this purpose we sent Placide Louis Chapelle, Bishop of New Orleans, as our delegate. He was to study the situation, take what immediate measures were necessary, and report to us. This he did to our great satisfaction.'
Philippine church or to rebuke the Spanish hierarchy. Isacio Rodriguez has been the only scholar since to point out that the expectation that the Delegate would approve a reformed Filipino Church was 'to dream of impossibilities'. The commission he held from the Pope did not carry special powers or the freedom to take personal initiatives on fundamental issues. He was limited to specific matters to be worked out with the Spanish bishops whose authority was not in question, so that he could report back to the Holy See. His mission was exploratory and informative. He was expected to cooperate with the Spanish hierarchy seeking them out as the legitimate leaders of the Philippine Church. The influence he may have had was to help persuade the Holy See to instruct the Sacred Congregation of the Council to issue a general decree on 12 July, 1900, which ordered all clergy under pain of suspension not to leave their proper place of residence in 'civil wars and political battles', nor to put off their clerical dress for political reasons or to engage in armed combat. Most importantly, Chapelle's advice and the recommendations of the Manila bishops' meeting in early 1900, can be seen in the crucial Vatican statement on the reorganisation of the Philippine Church, Quae mari sinico (discussed in the following Chapter).


56 The decree is found in the Appendix ad Concilium Provinciale Manilanum, I, Rome, 1910; published in Libertas, 11 September, 1900, from Civilité Cattolica of 4 August, 1900; and see Achutegui and Bernad, I, 128.
Granted the limitations of his commission, Chapelle must still bear a personal responsibility for the schism of 1902 and the perpetuation of racialist and authoritarian policies within the church. He was entirely uncritical, much less detached, in his attitude to the Spanish clergy and was clumsy enough, moreover, to make his prejudice obvious to everyone. He appears to have assumed throughout his stay in the Philippines that the real question was to be decided at the level of bishops and generals and that his robes and the prestige of his office were sufficient argument to keep the people in silent awe. For him, the opposition to the friars was 'an artificial propaganda fostered by the insurgents and priests, who are themselves leaders in the insurrection and are using it to obtain control of the Church in the islands.' Perhaps most seriously of all, he failed to recognise the nature of the religious problems confronting the church as an institution and the people who made up the church in the Philippines. The problems he was expected to solve were, as a perceptive American contemporary observed, problems 'for which any adjustment seems little short of impossible'. Chapelle was faced with the 'demand for a new order of things, not for a readjustment of an old system'.

57 Harold Martin, letter of 12 June, 1900, reproduced in Harper's History and quoted in LeRoy, Il, 297. There is a doubt as to the authenticity of this interview but on this point Chapelle's views during the Council of 8 January, 1900, agree. For Otis' preferential treatment of Chapelle, see John Marvin Dean, The Cross of Christ in Bolo-Land, Chicago, New York & Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1902, 49-50. Americans as well as Filipinos remarked Otis' welcoming gesture and there was even speculation that the General had converted to Catholicism. See also Clifford, op. cit., 268.

58 Robinson, op cit., 324.
the Philippine church required reforms that were beyond any one man, Chapelle did everything to exacerbate the divisions between Filipino and Spaniard and between bishop and laity. Nor did he perform that function set out in his instructions: as we shall discover from an examination of the minutes of a secret council he conducted with the Spanish bishops within a week of his arrival in the islands, Chapelle was content to act as a mouthpiece for friar propaganda. He may have endorsed opinions the Vatican was only too ready to hear, but his ignorance of the real condition of the Philippine church ensured that the eventual blueprint drawn up in Rome for its future character inevitably provoked a final split between the nationalist clergy and the conservative hierarchy.

The island press reported that the Delegate was required to return to Rome for a meeting with the Pope on 18 May, 1901, to explain his 'failure' in the Philippines. In October, he returned to the United States without returning to the Philippines, where he was subjected to further criticism which finally provoked him to an angry reply. He demanded evidence that he had failed in his mission and 'betrayed President McKinley and Cardinal Gibbons in the process' or that his commission had been cancelled by the Pope with disfavour. The Pope did praise Chapelle in the introduction to the Apostolic Constitution for the Philippines, Quae maris prinico, saying 'He

59 Manila American, 19 February, 1902, 4. For further details of Chapelle's activities in 1900-1901, see Ralph J. Mailliard, 'An Investigation of the Philippine Friars Land Case and related Church Problems', Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago, June, 1942, 177-92; and Salvatore Cortesi, 'The Vatican and the Philippines', The Independent, 20 February, 1902, 436.
certainly fulfilled to our satisfaction the office which had been en-
trusted to him; for which he has well-merited our honour and praise'.

If the Vatican was not simply being discreet with such praise (and its
tone suggests it was written as a response to criticism of Chapelle)
nevertheless it was quite clear in 1902 that the new Delegate had in-
structions to be more tactful with the Americans and to be cautious of
becoming too involved in the political battles of the Spanish regular
clergy. Archbishop Ireland, in a letter to Cardinal Gibbons in August,
1901, probably indicated the real opinion held in Rome of Chapelle when
he wrote:

I have had several letters from Cardinal Rampolla
about church matters in the Philippines - all lead-
ing up to a formal request through me to our government
to have some representative from Washington to go to
Rome to treat with the Vatican about property and other
questions ... From the general tone of Card. Rampolla's
letters, I can see that Abp. Chapelle does not count for
much. At any rate, the American Government will be much
displeased, as Mr. Root said to me, to see him return to
Manila.61

Six days after his arrival, Chapelle met in secret council with
the four Spanish bishops remaining in the islands to plan the future
of the Philippine church. Although the only other person present,

60 Constitución Apostólica de S.S. el Papa Leon XIII para las isles
Filipinas, in Latin, Spanish, English, Tagalog, Ilocano, and
Visayan (Manila, 1902), 2; also Achutegui and Bernad, doc.84, IV, 281-90.

61 John Ireland to Gibbons, St. Paul, Baltimore, 25 August, 1901; in
the Archives, Archdiocese of Baltimore; Ireland Papers, 98 Y9.

62 The original handwritten minutes of the council and a typewritten
copy are held by the University of Santo Tomás in the Santo Domingo
Archives, Manila, under the title, Acta Collationum, quas Episcopi
Philippinarum haberunt in Civitate de Manila praeside Rdomo. D.
Delegado P.L. Chapelle, Manila, January, 1900, tomo X in the
collection Historia Eclesiastica de Filipinas.
the Dominican secretary, was sworn to silence on the council's deliberations, the Dominicans could not contain their exultation at the Delegate's sympathy for their cause and a fairly accurate report of the council's approach reached the Spanish and eventually the American press. These reports were denied and although there were suspicions that resolutions favouring the friars had been taken at some such meeting, no firm evidence emerged. The minutes of the sessions of the Council have been preserved and they throw a clear light on the actual thinking of the Spanish hierarchy and the religious orders and on Chapelle's unqualified assent. The deliberations of the Council were of critical importance for the future direction of the church in the Philippines. A transcript of its discussions was sent to Cardinal Rampolla and confirmed him in his opposition to the Filipino clergy. Rampolla was to be the man responsible for negotiating the religious settlement between the Vatican and the United States two years later and through his influence, the arguments of the Manila

New York Times, 18 January, 1900. A. G. Robinson took up this hint but dismissed the council as a 'rumour', op. cit., 325-6; and see LeRoy, II, op. cit., 297-98; and see the exchange between Libertas and El Comercio, in the second week of January, 1900.

In their private history of the period, the Dominican Order included a brief account of the conference; Recorder, V, 222-23. This has been used by Father Pablo Fernandez, O.P., in an unpublished article used by the author. The minutes of the bishops' meeting which are examined here reveal the Apostolic Delegate's position clearly and end speculation such as that by Domingo Abella on Chapelle's reaction to the appeals made to him by the Filipino clergy in 1900; Bikol Annals (Manila, 1954), 199.
Council provided the assumptions for Leo XIII's constitution for the Philippine church, *Quae mari sinico*, a document which finally confirmed a section of the Filipino clergy in a religious schism which had been threatening since the outbreak of the revolution. In those few days in early January, 1900, the chance that the Vatican might respond to the real needs of the Filipino Christian community was lost.

Unaware that Chapelle and the friar-bishops were busily deciding all the important issues facing the Philippine church, the Filipino clergy and their supporters among the principalia (of towns in the Visayas as well as Luzon) were petitioning the Apostolic Delegate from the moment of his arrival for the expulsion of the friars from parish work in the islands. A petition by 'proprietors, merchants, lawyers, physicians, pharmacists and other leading citizens' of Santa Cruz, Manila, reached the Delegate soon after the first session of the Council. The signatories were alarmed by rumours that the religious orders were to resume control of the parishes and 'all the other ecclesiastical dignities which they enjoyed throughout the archipelago under the long Spanish regime'. The Delegate was warned that such reports had an intense effect on the Filipino people 'who unanimously protest against the pretension of such individuals, who, by their hateful behaviour, caused, to a great extent, the revolution which shook the Spanish yoke in these islands'. The petitioners described themselves as 'staunch Catholics, faithful sons of the Roman Church', but they earnestly desired to have all the parishes and other ecclesiastical dignities administered by the secular
clergy without the interference of the friars in any way:

The friars are foreigners here, and are everywhere rejected, even in Spain itself. The best policy of the American government, especially at the present juncture, would be not to admit the friars remaining here.65

The Santa Cruz petition was characteristic of others presented to Chapelle throughout his sixteen months in the islands and of those presented to his successor, Monsignor Giovanni Baptista Guidi.66 The agitation produced by reports that Chapelle had come to the islands as the 'joint agent of President McKinley and the Pope to reinstate the friars in their former power' was so intense that the military governor, Major General Eliwell S. Otis, found it necessary to publish a statement he made to a delegation of Filipinos protesting against the rumours of the friars returning to the parishes:

If the Church authorities assign friars to curacies who are obnoxious to the people, they will not be compelled to accept them. The individual liberty guaranteed by the American Constitution will not be denied the Filipinos, and the Government will not force

65 Petition to Mgr. P. L. Chapelle, 10 January, 1900, quoted in Albert G. Robinson, op. cit., 330-31; and see the report of a similar resolution in Cebu on 12 November, 1899, given by Robinson, ibid., 331.

66 For examples of these petitions, see Carta del Alcalde de Vigan, Don José Rivero al Padre Fidel Larrinaga ...., Vigan, 26 November, 1900; Exposición de los Miembros del Consejo Municipal del Ayuntamiento de Vigan al Excmo. Sr. Delegado Apostólico...., Vigan, 28 October, 1900, documents 46 and 78, in Rodriguez, I, op. cit., 230-31; 310-11.
upon them any ecclesiastical denomination contrary to their wishes.\textsuperscript{67}

Chapelle was later to describe Otis as 'of about the right mental calibre to command a one-company post in Arizona' and this clash was the first of many during the Delegate's period in the islands.\textsuperscript{68}

Also during these troubled first weeks, delegations of Filipino priests called on the Delegate to present their case. They had previously attempted to come to an understanding with Archbishop Nozaleda but the conversations broke down when Nozaleda refused to listen to demands that the Filipino secular clergy should keep control of the parishes.\textsuperscript{69} Now they appealed to Chapelle, hoping that rumours of his support for the friars were unfounded and also unaware that within days of his arrival he had agreed with the Spanish bishops that the friars should stay. A delegation of fifty-six Filipino clergymen called on Chapelle at his residence in Alix Street (Sampaloc) and presented the following considerations for the reorganisation of the Philippine church:

\textsuperscript{67} Quoted in New York Times, 'More Trouble About Friars', 18 January, 1900.

\textsuperscript{68} To Charles H. Blount, quoted in Blount, op. cit., 88.

\textsuperscript{69} Achutegui and Bernad, I, 157, and see Taylor, The Philippine Insurrection Against the United States, I, Exhibit 8, 'The Causes of the Dislike of the Filipinos for the Friars'.
1. The need for Filipino bishops as coadjutors with the rights of succession.

2. The difficulty and inadvisability of the friars returning to the parishes.

3. The personnel that should administer the parishes if Filipino priests are lacking should come from the Jesuits, Paulists [Vincentians], or other religious congregations [other than the friar orders].

4. The reorganisation of the parishes into smaller units to facilitate an orderly administration.

5. The ecclesiastical magistrates should be drawn from native clergymen as was the custom in other parts of the world.

6. The reorganisation of the seminaries which should be administered by the Jesuit Fathers.

Responding to this last point, Chapelle proposed that the seminaries be placed under the charge of four clergymen, one to be the rector and three others directors, without prejudice of engaging the services of foreign priests as professors: he did not reveal as fully to the delegation of Filipino priests as to the friar bishops in council, his conception of the reorganised seminaries. The Filipino priests added two further points:

7. The need of reorganising certain religious congregations for Filipinos/in the Philippines [the sources are contradictory here].

8. [The problem of] funds and ecclesiastical properties. 70

70 Abella, op. cit., 198-99. Fathers José M. Chanco and Mariano Sevilla presented a Memorial to the Apostolic Delegate on behalf of the Filipino clergy on 29 January, 1900; and also in January, 1900, fifty-six priests convoked by the Delegate advised that Filipino bishops should be appointed as coadjutors with rights of succession, that Filipino seculars should control the parishes and fill professorships in the seminaries; Achútegui and Bernad, IV, docs. 11 and 12, 42-49. A Committee of the Clergy offered further suggestions for reform on 21 February; ibid., doc. 13, 50-51. The Filipino clergy's recommendations
Domingo Abelia has commented that 'whether or not Msgr. Chapelle took these points into consideration in his recommendations to the Holy See, history will likely never know', but the minutes of the Council being held during the same time make it absolutely clear that on the crucial first three points put forward by the delegation of Filipino priests, the Delegate adopted the opposite position.

Petitions and representations were not the only means by which the opponents of the friars made their feelings known to the Delegate. Disturbed by his apparent sympathy for the Spanish regulars and excited by reports such as that of an alleged interview with the Delegate in El Progreso, crowds demonstrated before Chapelle on at least two occasions in January. Father Salvador Pons y Torres recorded the first of these 'anti-social manifestations offensive to truth, democracy and liberty' as taking place soon after the Delegate's arrival. At an evening reception during which the Archbishop of Manila and other high Spanish churchmen presented the Delegate to the

were that the Islands be divided into two bishoprics; that the Archbishop of Manila be raised to the rank of Cardinal; that each linguistic region be formed into a separate diocese; that the large parishes be subdivided. The Delegate made the following counter-proposals: the seminaries should be administered by secular priests rather than by the Jesuits; but teaching in them should be conducted by foreign, non-secular priests; proposals which possibly influenced Quae mari sinico in 1902.

71 The El Progreso interview is quoted by Robinson, op. cit., 332. All during January, 1900, reports appeared in the Manila Times and other journals of conferences between Chapelle and the friars in which Chapelle showed himself pro-friar. Chapelle denied these reports which were, of course, true. On 13 January, Father McKinnon was reported as the future Archbishop of Manila and this raised further anger: Clifford, n. 8, 267.
leaders of Manila society,

the liberals and Masons of Manila,
without considering the personal, democratic
rights of the people, secretly prepared a
common mob who, at a given signal, broke into
cries of 'Out with the Archbishop!', 'Down
with Nozaleda!', 'Out with the friars!' 72

On 23 January, Chapelle witnessed a demonstration of such
intensity that it must have dispelled any doubts he may have held
regarding the depth of anti-friar feeling in Manila. A reception had
been organised in his honour at Calzada 4, in San Miguel, not far
from the governor's palace and the guests included the Spanish Arch-
bishop and Bishop Hevia, the provincials of the religious orders, and
a number of high-ranking American officials including General Otis.

72 P. Salvador Pons y Torres, La Iglesia Filipina Independiente,
doc. 1 in Rodriguez, op. cit., II, 19. Pons gives the date
of this demonstration as 1 January, 1900, but the Delegate did
not arrive until the following day. It took place at a house
on calle de Malacanan. Pons was born in Pierola, Barcelona,
on 6 February, 1859, and was admitted to the Augustinian Order
at Valladolid in 1878. He arrived in the Philippines six years
later. In 1900 he was excastrated from his order and
thereafter produced pamphlets and books against the Spanish
Church and the religious corporations. He became closely
associated with the Aglipayan Church and so was one of only two
Spanish religious to support the independent church. In
March, 1909, he was reaccepted into the Roman Catholic Church
and in the following year was readmitted into his order. He
died in 1927. His La Iglesia Filipina Independiente, written
in these last years, was one of the articles he produced to
correct his earlier writings. As Achutegui and Bernad have
noted, the work is often inaccurate and lacking in perspective;
op. cit., I, Appendix E.
When Chapelle requested that the press should adopt some reserve in handling the delicate issues involved in the religious settlement being negotiated between the church and the new administration, shouts of *Afuera los frailes!* (Away with the Friars!) and 'Death to Nozaleda who protects the friars!' disrupted the reception. In the consternation which followed, Chapelle was reported to have fallen into his seat, his head in his hands. Nozaleda was stoned in his carriage on his way back to the Archbishop's Palace.\(^7\) 'Loyal Catholics' offered as a reparation for this 'act of savagery' a second solemn reception for the Delegate on 2 February in the safety of the episcopal palace in Intramuros. The Dominican chronicler believed, indeed, that the brutal events of 23 January possibly served to open the eyes of the recently-arrived Chapelle to the kind of enemies the friars faced and so was beneficial to the friar cause.\(^7\) The Spanish Bishops themselves attributed the disturbance to 'certain men, without doubt procured by money from Masonic sects' and supported by some of the Filipino clergy.

Other commentators interpreted the demonstrations of January, 1900, in a very different way. Albert Robinson, who showed some sympathy for the depth of feeling among Filipino opponents of the friars, rejected the efforts of 'the pro-friar element, evidently a

\(^7\) Achutegui and Bernad, 1, 156–57, and see Recoder, v.222, Fernandez, *art.cit.*, 1, Libertas, 24 January, 1900. Robinson also includes a report of this demonstration, op. cit., 332–33.

\(^7\) Recoder, v.222.
very limited body, and the friars themselves to discredit these protests by charging them to "non-Catholic sects and the diabolical spirit of Freemasonry". Robinson agreed with the Manila Times that there could be no doubt of the 'sincerity and deep significance' of the 23 January protest as

"no effervescence, but a great movement, deep-rooted and far-reaching, in fact, the voice of the Philippines people".\(^7\)

The Dominican writer was probably correct in assuming that ugly riots such as that of the 23 January would confirm the Apostolic Delegate in his commitment to what he saw as the forces of legitimate authority and order in the church - the Spanish bishops and the Spanish religious orders. But the agitation which followed him throughout his stay in the Philippines was a clear warning that the opposition to the friars was not the work of a few ambitious and evil men but a widespread reaction, particularly among the elite, and of acute importance to the future of the Roman Catholic Church in the islands.

Chapelle's response to this warning was to insist ever more strongly on obedience to orthodox authority and to make speeches. Pons y Torres reports one such address made by Chapelle to a commission of Catholics who, in the name of the city of Manila, expressed the general desire of the people that in time the high dignities of the Philippine Church should be conferred on Filipino priests.

\(^7\) Robinson, op. cit., 333
The speech is probably apocryphal but, as an expression of what the friars considered as the ideal argument to put forward before such critics, it has some value:

The Catholic church in the Islands has finished entering a terrible period of persecutions and struggles which it has never before suffered; her enemies are extraordinarily powerful and are tightly united in pursuing their ideal of ruin and destruction; they have come from all parts of the world to invade and destroy this flock of Jesus Christ, and are most skilful in the art of manipulating all kinds of weapons conducive to their ends. The church shall have to struggle against a great army of enemies, intus et foras, as Jesus Christ says ... it needs, then, wise, valiant, and most expert generals; the ship of Peter has experienced the battering of tempests; it needs pilots and captains accustomed to struggle against cyclones.... Do you sincerely believe that the Filipino priests alone, inexpert as they are, of whatever good understanding or even better purpose, would be able to solve [our] present and future conflicts, victoriously fighting against all the enemies of religion?

Before such clear and logical reasoning, Pons adds, the people's commissioners were persuaded to respect the Delegate's judgement, submitting to his view of the future programme to be adopted by the Pope towards the Philippine church. 76

Apocryphal or not, this speech summarises the attitudes which marked the thinking of the Spanish regular clergy before Chapelle's arrival and which were to continue, partly because of his acquiescence in them, throughout much of the American period. The sense of a world divided between darkness and light, good and evil, the church and

76 Pons in Rodriguez, op. cit., II, 30.
its enemies; the insistence on the acceptance of legitimate, hierarchical authority without complaint; the barely concealed distrust of the Filipino clergy were all characteristic of the prevailing bias of the Catholic hierarchy in 1900.

That the Spanish bishops blamed the Filipino clergy most bitterly for the collapse of the church during the revolution was made emphatically obvious when Chapelle held his first official meeting with the Spanish hierarchy. The first session of opened at ten o'clock on the morning of January 8 in the Archbishop's Palace in Intramuros. In attendance were the Apostolic Delegate, as president, Archbishop Nozaleda, Bishop Martín García Alcocer of Cebú, Bishop Hervía Campomanes of Nueva Segovia, Bishop Andres Ferrero, Bishop of Jaro, and as secretary, the Dominican friar, Father Tomás Lorente. Monsignor Arsenio del Campo, Bishop of Nueva Cáceres, had by this time returned to Spain. 77

After prayers and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, the Apostolic Delegate made two preliminary remarks which indicated the importance of their deliberations: all resolutions would be referred to the Holy See; and the agent for His Holiness would be His Eminence, Cardinal Rampolla, with whom all their dealings should be made directly. The Bishops then began a discussion of the issue which was to preoccupy

77 According to some reports, Bishop Campo left in disgust after the civil authorities and his fellow bishops refused to reprieve three of his Filipino diocesan priests, Fathers Severino Díaz, Inocencio Herrera, and Gabriel Prieto, sentenced to death for alleged rebellion; see Zaide, The Philippine Revolution, rev. ed. (Manila, 1968), 132.
them during their six meetings, the problem of the Filipino clergy and the need to provide parish priests in the provinces. Archbishop Nozaleda stressed that the need for a European clergy in the Philippines was 'absolute'. He supported this by pointing out that there were not enough native priests to cope adequately with the care of souls in the islands 'for how could the six hundred [Filipino] priests at present living here be sufficient when the number of Catholics exceeds six million?' The lack of priests was not the most important consideration, however, for Nozaleda made it clear that even if there were enough native priests 'they are altogether incapable of faithfully fulfilling their sacred ministry as they should'. The Archbishop explained this incapacity as a reflection of racial inferiority:

The unanimous consensus of previous writers and everyday experience reveal that the Filipino priest is subject to these grave defects: the greatest levity of spirits; an indomitable propensity for the vices of the flesh; a lack of intelligence by which he is impeded from obtaining for himself a suitable and complete education, or at least that in which a reasonably instructed priest ought to rejoice.

He stressed that the native clergy suffered from 'a total subordination to the temporal things in which [they] pass their time'. They were less concerned with their sacred dignity than with their private prosperity. They suffered from a 'clerical avarice' and this had provoked

---

78 This estimate is conservative even allowing for the Filipino priests who withdrew from their ministry because of the revolution.
factionalism and dissent among their parishioners. Not infrequently a Filipino cleric and those of his neighbours involved in his schemes ended up as the owners of all the wealth of their local community. Later in 1900, in his testimony to the Taft Commission, Archbishop Nozaleda explained more fully the reasons for his distrust for the Filipino clergy, indicating the racial assumptions with which he justified his refusal to trust them with authority. Like all Tagalogs, they were superficial, easily affected by pleasure, lacking the innate feeling which moved the European races, and lacking proper individuality. Although they had just sufficient logical faculty to be rational beings, they lacked character and moral discrimination. At best they could imitate mechanically the artistic and creative efforts of the white races. Their affection for their children was more that of an animal than human. They seemed to be without compassion and there was absolutely no sincerity in their friendship and they had no pity. While these inadequacies might not have been because of 'zoological' differences from the European, they were innate. Watched over by good rulers they could exhibit an enchanting simplicity and hospitality. The Filipino priest was morally weaker

79 The Spanish clergy were not the only critics of the Filipino clergy. Mabini also believed they were venal often and indifferent to the poor but he accused the friars of the same faults: 'making a few honorable exceptions, it must be declared that the parish priest, whether friar or secular, only thinks of his parishioners when it is time to collect the parish fees. All have slept on their laurels, trusting in the Catholicism of the Filipino people and have seldom troubled themselves to carry words of love and sympathy to the afflicted and unfortunate ...the true fathers of the poor are very rare and many trust to the lash'; interview in El Comercio, 1 February, 1900; and see his The Philippine Revolution, op.cit.,39.
and less respected than the Spanish friar and the Katipunan wanted a church of native priests because they knew they could manage them and make them their instruments. 80

Nozaleda warned the Bishops that there were special circumstances which now increased the danger of handing over the parishes to the indigenous clergy: with great sorrow they had all witnessed the erection of chapels and schools by the Protestants. What was to happen to the faith and to the church now that political peace was secured and many enemies had banded together to destroy them? The defence of the Catholic faith called for men endowed with great qualities of soul, but 'everything in the Filipino priest is the opposite of these qualities'. The poor spiritual state which reduced the Filipino priest to almost nothing in the sight of Europeans would cause our enemies to laugh at us.

The Archbishop expressed his hostility to the challenge of American Protestant and secular ideas in phrases reminiscent of the controversial pastoral letter of 1898 in which he had anathematised the Americans as a 'heterodox people' ruled by 'abject heretical passions'. With the disestablishment of the church the hierarchy needed good men to protect the faith:

The more the people are deceived by the Americans, the more prevalent will religious disputations

80 'Archbishop of Manila', testimony in 'Lands held for Ecclesiastical and Religious Uses... ', op.cit., 96-111. The other Spanish bishops gave similar testimony. The Bishop of Jaro thought that 'being Indians, [the native clergy] can take their habits off and get in with the other Indians unknown, whereas a Spaniard with a white face does not have the chance for evil doing'; ibid., 119.
become. The church has prepared great offensives against the Protestant ministers and for sustaining these offensives not only fortitude of soul but also solid instruction and full and complete knowledge of Apologetics will be required. And we ought to fear lest the faith of the people will be ruined on account of the ignorance and ineptitude of the Filipino priests.

At this point, the Apostolic Delegate asked Nozaleda whether there ought to be a Filipino clergy at all. Would it be expedient for there to be a Filipino clergy in the future? Nozaleda replied that there always had been a Filipino clergy and the reason for this was the shortage of European priests. The native clergy was a necessary evil. Bishop Martin Alcocer of Cebu also warned against proceeding inadvisedly in this matter of the future of the Filipino clergy:

I personally think the Filipino clergy are about to destroy themselves .... The life of a priest ought altogether to be consecrated to sacrifice and work, especially in these times; but now the Filipino cleric lacks self-denial and the desire to work. The donations usually made to the church have grown considerably less and the most niggardly parochial returns have been sent in. When the Filipino clergy, for whom money mulcted from the parishes is of such importance, learn this, most of them will flee from the embrace of the clerical life.

The Bishops of Nueva Segovia and Jaro agreed.

The delberations with a unanimous attack on the character and capacity of the Filipino clergy. As the proceeded throughout January, this became the recurrent theme. If the Filipino clergy had been able to overhear the Council their worst fears would have been confirmed. Without discussion, the men who were, according to the church doctrine, their spiritual fathers, rejected the
fundamental object of missionary activity as set out by the
Propaganda Fide: the establishment of a self-sufficient
church served by its own secular clergy. Chapelle had not
experienced the harsh treatment suffered by many friars over
the past eighteen months but he did not demur at an absolute
condemnation of the Filipino clergy. 81

The bishops proceeded to consider the second issue: 'whether
it is appropriate that religious orders should remain here to
administer parishes'. The bishops turned to this problem aware that
the Schurman Commission was at that moment publishing its report
with the recommendation that the friars' lands should be purchased
from them by the government and the friars deported. Chapelle was
receiving contrary recommendations. 82 It is clear, in any case, that
he had prejudged this issue from the statements he made before leaving
the United States. The question of the return to the parishes of
Spanish friars was regarded by the Filipino clergy and their supporters

81 He did witness, however, the plight of those friar prisoners who
were being released just as he arrived in the islands. The
testimony of Bishop Hevia Campomanes, who had suffered severely
and had only just been released in time for the Council, impressed
him particularly. Hevia Campomanes was described in December,
1899, 'as not having a square inch of whole skin on his body as a
result of the beatings he received'; Bureau of Insular Affairs
Files 2099.2, National Archives (Washington); and see his letters
to Pope Leo XIII of 15 March, 1900, describing his imprisonment,

82 See Clifford, op. cit., 271-72. Clifford's discussion of
Chapelle's motives presents him as more open-minded than he actually
was. Clifford also shifts the responsibility for the controversy
over the return of the friars to the parishes onto 'a recalcitrant
clergy headed by Father Mariano Sevilla and Father Manuel Rojas'.
in the elite as critical. The American military authorities feared a rising in the areas they controlled if the friars were to return.

The Spanish religious were only just being released after long months of imprisonment. Aguinaldo's forces still held much of Luzon. Apart from anything else, the return of the Spanish regular clergy to their parishes was physically impossible in early 1900 and, as Chapelle later recognised, could only be accomplished with American military protection. Yet, the bishops simply agreed that on this matter there was no need for discussion.

since the will of His Holiness our Lord the Pope concerning the permanence of religious institutes in the Philippines was made altogether clear to them by the most reverend lord Delegate.

This is a highly significant statement. The Vatican had decided, before Chapelle set foot in the islands, that the Spanish religious orders were to remain in the Philippines. Many hundreds of Spanish friars had left the islands in 1898 and a majority of those being released at the time of Chapelle's arrival also wanted to return to Spain. Chapelle later told the Taft Commission that the members of the orders had wanted to go elsewhere but he had detained them. The Provincial of the Recollect Order told the Commission that his priests were anxious to leave 'but the Pope at Rome has given his order and there is no recourse except to obey'.

Thus the representations by Aguinaldo and de los Reyes in 1899, and by delegations of

Filipino priests in 1900, the subsequent appeals by the Americans during 1901 and the controversy and speculation over whether the friars would stay in the Philippines were all too late. Leo XIII, or, rather, Cardinal Rampolla, had decided this matter in 1899 and possibly earlier. There is also the determination of the four Spanish friar bishops that this should be so. Bishop Hevia Campomanes had only just arrived in Manila a day before Chapelle after sixteen months of harsh imprisonment; Nozaleda, the Archbishop, had just endured the strain of a long siege. Spanish priests had been killed and others tortured and humiliated. The war was still going on. Yet the bishops agreed with Chapelle, that the Spanish religious orders should not withdraw from the islands and, indeed, that their presence should be confirmed.

The next debated the 'suitability of other religious congregations taking up parochial ministry in the Philippines'.

In the discussion on this point, the bishops returned to the question of the obstacles preventing Spanish religious from returning to their parishes.

They blamed the Filipino clergy for the hostility felt against the religious orders.

It can be asserted beyond a doubt that all the misfortunes which oppressed the poor religious, with a few exceptions which were engineered ... by certain laymen, were organised by [Filipino] clerics. They were not able to hide their ill-will. They burn with the desire of ridding themselves of the presence of the religious so that the whole field of the gospel might remain for themselves.

During the revolution, the Filipino clergy were persuaded that the
Holy See was about to yield to their demands and that not only the parishes but even the greater offices would come into their hands. But 'now since their vain desires and hopes have been shown to be false, and since the towers they built up are now levelled to the ground, their displeasure and ill-will shall be contained by no rule and they shall leave no stone unturned'. All the bishops agreed that during the revolution the dissolution of moral standards among the Filipino diocesan clergy had increased. With the restoration of peace, the Filipino priests were using every means to stir up the animosity of the people against the Spanish religious. They fomented 'impious and detestable propaganda' against the religious.

Archbishop Nozaleda was preoccupied above all with the future of the Filipino secular clergy. During the six sessions he continually returned to their role and future influence in the Philippine Church. He directed much of the bishops' deliberations to a condemnation of the Filipino clergy in a determined effort to discredit them completely with the Holy See so that they could not gain a stronger position in the reorganised church under the American administration. In the second session of the bishops he interrupted a discussion of the financial problems facing the Church to renew his attack on the native priesthood. He explained his misgivings on the capability of the church to guard its goods where the priest was a Filipino:

The natives of these islands are found to be extremely prone to interfere and entangle themselves in the smooth running of affairs. We believe the native clergy to be powerless to meet adequately the evils consequent upon [civil interference in church property rights] and we consider them to lack sufficient
depth of character to govern the people.

The other bishops agreed.

The bishops returned to the question of arranging for European and American priests to come to the islands to replace those Spanish friars who had left since 1898. Chapelle was possibly unaware of the bitterness such a policy would arouse; within a few days as rumours of his intentions spread through Manila, delegations of Filipino priests and others presented petitions to him protesting against foreign priests taking over the parishes. But the four Spanish bishops must have had a good idea of how controversial such a step would be. If so they were careful to keep silent: they assured the Delegate that 'they hoped cheerfully and with patient souls that they would soon see other European congregations sending their members to these islands....' Archbishop Nozaleda stressed that the missionaries of new congregations in the Philippines should have pre-determined regions assigned to them. The new congregations should be assigned to those areas where the animosity against the old orders was most virulent. The Delegate said that he would seek a definitive solution to this and the other questions of restoring parish work when he went to Rome where he would put their case directly. Nozaleda reminded him that on the question of the property and income of the religious congregations, the Holy See should provide that incomes pertaining to religious orders should not be tied up in other uses, however pious, which were not related to the spreading of religion in the Philippines. The seminaries and colleges educating missionaries for the islands came well within such a category.
As a result of popular hostility to the Spanish clergy, parish incomes and donations had declined and the Council next considered the difficulty of sustaining the parochial system in the future. The present emergency had added to the burdens of supporting a ministry which already suffered from long-standing problems. Some parishes were self-supporting but many others were incapable of meeting the most indispensable expenditures. Even where a religious congregation assisted with its wider resources incomes were often insufficient to meet necessary expenses. The Franciscan Order, in particular, was in difficulties because it possessed no properties and the tax or stipend its members received from the Spanish Government could no longer be expected. During the disruption of the past few years, the other religious congregations had also suffered from declining revenues. Money was needed to help finance those seminaries in Spain which trained priests for the Philippine ministry.

When Archbishop Nozaleda had made these points, the Apostolic Delegate reminded the bishops that the Philippine church could not expect much financial aid from the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in Rome, [Propaganda Fide] although some help might be forthcoming.

The bishops more closely examined the question of what special form of parochial ministry the present situation in the Philippines required. With considerable understatement, the Archbishop of Manila claimed that the form of parochial ministry previously in use in the islands was canonical 'although a little modified by right of royal patronage'. In fact, as the Filipino clergy and the few Spaniards sympathetic to them had demonstrated, the situation in the Philippines
during the nineteenth century was actually a reversal of avowed church
policy of secularising and indigenising local churches. The process
by which the regular clergy replaced Filipino priests in some parishes,
and the general attitude among the religious that the Filipino clergy
were better confined to mere coadjutorships, had resulted in a church
which collapsed once the Spanish regulars were forced out of the
parishes. With Spanish authority gone, it was apparent that there
could not be a return to the situation in 1896 even after the Revolution
had been suppressed. Nozaieda recognised that the relationship
between bishop and those of his parish clergy who were regulars
needed some clarification in the changed conditions of the islands.
With the Philippines still to be considered a 'mission field',
he and the other bishops resolved to ask the Holy See that the bull
Firmandis, issued by Benedict XIV, be restored to its original vigour
in the Philippines, and that the Constitution, Romanos Pontifices, of
Leo XIII be enforced throughout the islands.

The Apostolic Delegate then raised the delicate question of the
accusations of moral corruption made against the regular clergy.
Chapelle announced that his intention was to correct any abuses of this
kind. Archbishop Nozaieda conceded that 'it is plain that there have
been and indeed still are abuses among the regular clergy' and that 'it
is equally plain that superiors have been more lenient in correcting
the faults of their subjects than the dignity of religion or regular
discipline require'. The accusations against the regular clergy,
however, were exaggerated by sectarian enemies who tried to condemn

84 Nozaieda made this defence before the Taft Commission, op. cit.,
107-108; and see the evidence of the Superiors of the Dominican,
Franciscan, Recollect, and Augustinian orders, ibid., 56; 68; 77;
86.
all the religious and their sacred institutions from the faults of
the few. Nor were allegations of tyranny justified: nothing was
further from the truth than that parish priests belonging to the
regular orders were lacking in pastoral charity or a sense of humanity.
On the contrary, they were 'fathers for every age, watching over the
spiritual needs of the people and offering them whatever material
help they could and protecting them from harm'. As for the agricul-
tural estates administered by the friars; these lands were 'governed
less by strict law than by the law of charity':

The cultivators of the fields receive more from
their labour than the owner; and for this
reason everyone can marvel at the prosperity
and abundance of those who lived on the estates
of the regular clergy. This is not indeed the
case on the great estates of laymen, where the
residents are restricted by the harsh law of
mercenary gain so that they can scarcely get
the necessities of life.

Liars had tried to defame the religious orders as the sole proprietors
of land when in number and size and even in the benefits gained there-
from, the country estates owned by private individuals and agrarian
corporations far outweighed the regulars' country estates.85

The second session opened again with the invoca-
tion of the Holy Spirit and prayers for the protection of the Virgin
Mother of God. Before discussing the questions set down for this
session, the Apostolic Delegate raised the need for action against the

85 For details of the orders' defence of their administration of their
estates against the accusations of critics (who sometimes coveted
their properties), see Chapter II.
American military governor's dispositions concerning civil marriage and the requirement that consent of brothers to the marriage be obtained when the woman was not yet of age. Archbishop Nozaleda had brought to the attention of the Delegate the intention of the American authorities to introduce civil registration as legally sufficient. Chapelle pointed out that the bishops could best oppose this move by direct representation to the government in Washington. Appeals to Otis could be fruitless, for it was possible that the military governor might exceed his competence if he were to alter the new laws in favour of Catholic principles.

The bishops proceeded to discuss the matters formally set down for this session, beginning with the issue of the church's disputed title to the parochial cemeteries. The prelates unanimously agreed that all the cemeteries of the Philippines were the property of the church and that they had been constructed from the alms of the faithful. Only one exception could be found to this general rule: the cemetery built within the territory of Manila known as the 'de Paco' cemetery. This had been built at the beginning of the nineteenth century by the Municipality of Manila. Yet the Paco Cemetery, like all cemeteries in the Philippines, was consecrated to God and came under the power of the church in all matters connected with worship: only the material upkeep and the supervision of good hygiene were the responsibilities of the civil government.

This attitude of the bishops to the disputed ownership and control of the cemeteries was characteristic: it showed how little
they accepted a division between church and state in secular affairs notwithstanding the presence of a new administration which defined freedom of religion as a right exercised within a definition of church-state relations determined by the state. The bishops' observations on this question were illuminating in a further sense: they agreed that the original custom should be revived whereby only those who belonged to a particular parish while alive would have the right to be buried in its cemetery. Cemeteries were frequently desecrated to the extent that 'masons, heretics, Protestants, unbelievers, and others of the same kind' were buried in them even though the ecclesiastical authorities were reluctant and sometimes forbade this. On the question of the exhumation of bodies, Nozaleda recognised that Spanish and American laws disagreed on some points. When the Apostolic Delegate asked how conflicts in this matter might be avoided, Nozaleda replied that power should be given to the parish priest over all burials in the parish cemetery, that it be strictly forbidden that permission should be sought for non-Catholics to be buried in such cemeteries, that it be acknowledged that the parish priest had the right to refuse burial to anyone not a parishioner or thought unworthy of consecrated burial, that Catholic cemeteries be legally recognised as properties of the Roman Catholic Church, and that Paco Cemetery should remain under church jurisdiction. 86

86 The question of control of the cemeteries was presently a disputed matter between Filipino parish priests and the Presidentes and municipal councils of some pueblos. From mid-1898, the municipal authorities in some towns under revolutionary control claimed that the cemeteries were municipal property and that their income belonged to the town council. On 26 October, 1898, Aguinaldo directed that the parish priest was to be left in control of the local cemetery 'for the time being'; Order No. 48, Varias disposiciones, Insurgent Records, 167.1.
Anticipating the frequent clashes which were to take place between Roman Catholic and Aglipayan groups in 1902-1903, Archbishop Nozaleda next asked that the American authorities be persuaded to enact a law protecting public manifestations of Catholic worship outside the churches. The church needed an assurance that as the number of Protestants and others increased in Manila and elsewhere, church processions and festivals would be made freely and without interference.87

The bishops then turned their attention to the question of legal titles to churches, the funds and income of confraternities and other pious organisations, and the ownership of other church property. Archbishop Nozaleda stated that the Philippine Church had nothing to fear with regard to the legitimacy of ecclesiastical rights of possession in the islands. In fact, during Spanish rule, the respective rights and ownership of some institutions and funds of church and state overlapped and, in the case of the College of San José in particular, this was to cause complicated legal wrangling in the early American period. Nevertheless, the Archbishop of Manila had the Treaty of Paris and its recognition of church property rights according to Spanish law to support his argument that in the Philippines, no other individual or group enjoyed such a solid foundation in law as the church in its 'inalienable rights of possession' to 1

87 One instance of many such future clashes is given in The Manila American, 18 January, 1903; and on 20 January, 1903. The Aglipayans decorated a warehouse on Calle Lemery for the consecration of Aglipay as Obispo Maximo. Sunday, 19 January, was also the day of the Tondo Fiesta, with Archbishop Guidi leading the services in the Tondo Church and the Aglipayans holding their ceremonies in Calle Lemery. The rival processions, the Aglipayans led by 14 brass bands and the Roman Catholics by two, contended for the streets of Tondo.
property. The recent revolution had indeed destroyed many parochial archives and in many places the deeds of the right of possession had been destroyed. Nevertheless, the church had nothing to fear for it would be easy to prove what rightfully belonged to her. Chapelle then observed that titles of possession should be presented as quickly as possible so that he could pass them on to the American military governor, General Otis. He suggested that an inventory be made of all things belonging to the church, to its parishes, seminaries, hermitages, houses, cemeteries and other pious establishments. As well, an historical synopsis should be drawn up for those possessions which lacked titles of possession or right of possession, in which the name and year of foundation of the establishment should be included together with details of its financial support and administration. All those circumstances should be noted which were likely to win over even a prejudiced mind to the belief that the possessions in question had always belonged to the church and had been respected as such by public authority. Such information could be included in a document to be presented to the American administration concerning ecclesiastical property. On the question of ecclesiastical properties, the Apostolic Delegate suggested that all ecclesiastical properties and rights of possession should be registered in the name of one juridical person. On the matter of taxation, the Delegate believed that as schools and churches in the United States were exempted from public taxation, the same thing might easily follow for schools and churches in the Philippines. Nozaleda outlined the Spanish procedures in registering ecclesiastical properties in the name of an institution or juridical
person and further advised that the bishops should consult an American lawyer so that church titles would be fully secured under the new administration.

The bishops also discussed the need for 'arrangements for the maintenance of divine worship and ministers'. The Apostolic Delegate believed that it would be appropriate for those religious congregations who lacked the financial resources to maintain the necessary number of religious to appeal to their superiors general for help in the Philippines. Nozaleda replied that the Delegate's remarks should be understood to refer to the needs of missions, rather than the settled parishes which, he felt, were able to support their parish clergy. The Bishop of Jaro agreed that, notwithstanding the great harm done to the faith during the revolution, the parishes for the most part could support their own clergy. The Bishops of Cebú and Nueva Segovia also thought this possible. The Delegate asked if the religious orders were to alienate their estates whether this would be a great cause of poverty in the church in the Philippines? Nozaleda believed that this danger was not to be feared and, in the last resort, if such an alienation were thought to be a cause of poverty and harmful to the church in the Philippines, the Apostolic See had the authority to prohibit any such alienation. On this point, the bishops adjourned.

At its third session, the scheduled to discuss

the minutes give no dates for the second and third sessions which fell between the 8th and 19th of January.
further the problem of arranging financial maintenance for the parochial clergy, but first the Apostolic Delegate asked the bishops if it were true that the religious congregations were in the process of selling their estates. As subsequent evidence showed, this was in fact the case, but the Archbishop of Manila replied he had no certain information on such negotiations. Actually, the Dominican Order to which the Archbishop belonged, had transferred legal title to the eight largest of its estates to a joint stock company sixteen months before. The Order owned a majority of shares in the company formed to manage the estates but a French company based in Tonkin, with church backing, had purchased an interest in the company as well. An American corporation, through its agent in Manila, had also bought up 200,000 pesos worth of shares in the new company which, on 29 January, 1900, just a few days after Chapelle's enquiry, was incorporated as the Philippine Sugar Estates Company, Ltd. The public company created to safeguard the estates by taking them out of direct Dominican ownership was being registered at the very moment Nozaleda was claiming ignorance of any such transactions. The Order, as the major shareholder, had a debatable influence on the future control of their holdings but the transfer to a public company effectively removed the Order's properties from possible intervention by either the American administration or a hierarchy of future bishops possibly unsympathetic to the regulars. 89

89 The other landholding orders had also engaged in such transfers of legal title; see Chapter I, -. The bishops attempted to keep news of these sales secret but Robinson, op.cit., 328, noted that 'there seems firm ground for the current rumours of transfers of these titles to private holders who are aliens, English and others'.
Nozaleda conceded that 'since the Lord Delegate is the legitimate Vicar of the Holy See he has a perfect right to intervene in the matter [of the friar estates] and I think that there should be procured for him everything necessary for the proper and thorough information of the Holy See'. There were untruthful rumours circulating concerning the estates of the religious orders. A 'faithful investigation' of the landholdings of the three orders concerned was necessary for the information of the Holy See and to refute these rumours. On Chapelle's prompting them, the three other bishops agreed with Archbishop Nozaleda's remarks on this matter. If the Spanish friar bishops were deliberately keeping the Apostolic Delegate misinformed on the important question of the titles to the estates held by the religious orders, this reflected the determination of the orders, including the bishops who belonged to them, to protect their interests against the Americans and, if necessary, against intervention from within the church itself.

Chapelle proceeded to the matter of maintaining the parochial clergy and divine worship in an impoverished church. Altering his opinion expressed in the second session of the Council, Bishop Alcocer of Cebú said that since his diocese was poor and the income which he had received previously was already small, he feared that the diocese of Cebú might not be able to maintain worship and clergy.

The Apostolic Delegate then introduced a recommendation of fundamental significance for the Philippine church. He argued that 'it would be best for all if all things pertaining to the church of the Philippines were placed under the protection of the Sacred Congrega-
tion for the Propagation of the Faith'. Chapelle believed that if this were done 'many difficulties might be overcome, and not a few advantages won'. He had hinted earlier that the Propaganda Fide would provide some financial help for the Philippine ministry.

The Philippine Church, with the loss of its state financial support, the loss of the orders' land rents, and the disruption of the parishes, was in dire economic difficulties. Chapelle was also aware that the understandable desire of the Spanish religious, especially those just released from imprisonment, to leave the islands further threatened the very survival of the church.

Placing the Philippine Church under the Propaganda would provide an institutional replacement for the Spanish patronage of the church prevailing before 1898, and help regularise the position of the Spanish regular clergy he required to stay in the islands.

The bishops agreed that the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith should be the immediate superior of all the missions of the Philippines. Although such a change would mean the curtailment of the actual independence the orders had exercised under Spain the bishops, by defining the Philippines as an 'overseas mission', had administrative as well as financial advantages not otherwise possible. As Archbishop Nozaleda argued in the last session,

The old title of parish priest should be changed and the workers in the vineyard of the Lord should be considered simply as missionaries, since indeed it had been decided to ask the Holy See that the ecclesiastical territory of the Philippines be considered a mission territory. 90

If regular and secular clergy were to be considered as 'missionaries' the bishops hoped this would remove the opposition between friar and diocesan priest which had been such a disruptive theme of Philippine history and was still a major political as well as ecclesiastical problem in 1900. If all priests were missionaries, there could be no objection to regular priests performing similar parish functions to Filipino seculars; and, as the bishops were aware, in the critical years facing the Philippine Church, regular priests would be urgently needed to fill some parishes. The Spanish clergy would be in a position, as well, to supervise the adaptation of the church to American rule and to preserve foreign control of the church, a necessary measure in the bishops' view given their low opinion of the Filipino clergy. At the same time, as 'missionaries', the Filipino secular clergy were placed at the disposal of the bishops in a way not possible given the rights of the diocesan clergy to hold their parishes in security except in cases of grave offence. 'Missionaries' could be transferred at the bishop's direction. 91

Even so, by the decision to support the move for the Propaganda to assume responsibility for the Philippine Church, the Spanish bishops agreed to a change which, in the very long term, was to the advantage of the Filipino clergy. From its creation, the Propaganda had been committed to the ideal of creating from mission territories self-sufficient, indigenous churches, a policy opposed in the Philippines under Spain. The regular clergy, with the secular, would be accountable to Rome and regulated by more usual missionary practice, and not to their

91 Under canon law, secular parish priests were ordinarily irremovable; communication of John N. Schumacher.
orders in Spain. Church practice in the Philippines could be brought nearer to normal missionary policies accepted in the rest of the world.

This shift towards eventual but real reform in the organisation and ideology of the Philippine church was not apparent, of course, to those Filipino priests who, in 1900, were petitioning Chapelle for a filipinised hierarchy, and when the Vatican's blueprint for the Philippine church was promulgated in 1902, they ignored the signs of substantial change and interpreted the intent of the Holy See as favouring the foreign regular clergy at the expense of Filipino seculars.

The Apostolic Delegate understood that there were certain difficulties which could hinder the transfer of the Philippine mission to the Propaganda Fide and he advised that negotiations for the change should be put off until he could present the case personally in Rome. In the meantime, he asked the bishops what could be done to support the costs of present work in the parishes. The Archbishop of Manila suggested that a kind of tithe known as the 'Sanctorum' could be revived and that parish charters be reformed to include higher fees for the celebration of sacraments such as baptism, for those who could afford them. Another source of income could be an alms tax to be paid by parishioners who wished to take advantage of the 'exemption from abstinence recently obtained from Rome'. A new edition of the catechism would be prepared which would explain the responsibility of the faithful to support the expenses of the ministry. On this matter, the bishops adjourned the Council.

When the bishops met again on the 19th of January for their fourth session, they returned to the problem of finances
under the new conditions confronting the church. Archbishop Nozaleda proposed that some formula be devised for meeting the expenses of the bishop, since up to the present, episcopal finances had no legal basis in the Philippines. Chapelle outlined the practice in his own archdiocese of New Orleans where the parish clergy had the obligation of contributing from 3 to 9 per cent of all the parochial revenues to the upkeep of the bishop. In the Philippines, he believed, parish priests should receive a stipend. If the stipend could not be provided from parish funds, the priest should be subsidised; if parish revenues exceeded the stipend, the excess could be taxed at a rate of 9 per cent in favour of the bishop.

The Council also considered how to maintain revenues to the Obras Pías (Pious Works) fund. It was decided that the practice be introduced of charging the sponsors for each confirmation as was done in Mexico. Since this and other measures were new in the Philippines, the parish priests would need to be careful in explaining to the faithful the necessity and obligation for such payments. The bishops also agreed that in parishes of 2,000 faithful and less, 2 per cent of the parochial income would be set aside for the support of the bishop; and in larger parishes (the great majority), 9 per cent of all incomes.

92 The Obras Pías were partly secular and partly ecclesiastical; see LeRoy, II, 305, n.1; and Otis Report (Washington, 1900), 304-305. The question of whether the church should entirely control the fund antedated the arrival of the Apostolic Delegate. Archbishop Nozaleda in his Defensa obligada claimed that he had shrewdly begun to make representation before the military government as early as the fall of 1898 for the full assumption of the fund by the hierarchy.
The bishops next considered the question of the proper training of seminarians in the reorganised church. The Archbishop believed that the old form of instruction was far superior to the present form and, even if poverty did not force the matter, should be reintroduced. 'Thirty years ago', he believed, 'the clergy were outstanding for their instruction and education'. The Vincentian Fathers assumed direction of the diocesan seminaries (except that in Vigan) from 1862 onwards, and, in contrast to the clergy of the Augustinian, Recollect, Dominican and Franciscan orders, defended the ability and character of the Filipino clergy, which may partly explain the Archbishop's disenchantment with their efforts.

Chapelle believed that the running of seminaries could be entrusted to secular priests and an administration set up modelled on that used in the Spanish Seminary in Rome: that is, with a Rector, a Vice-Rector, and another priest acting as administrator, all three being under the immediate authority of the bishop. For classes, the students could be sent to the University of Manila (Santo Tomas) or, if suitable, they could be instructed in the seminary itself or in the Ateneo Municipal of the Jesuit Fathers. The Manila seminary should be considered as the central one for the archipelago, with other seminaries established for minor studies for the younger novices. The Bishop of Cebú warned against establishing minor seminaries which would prove superfluous after a short time, because he thought vocations will decline'; the Archbishop of Manila, however, held hopes that vocations would continue at the present rate.

Nozaleda said that it was the present responsibility of the Vincentians to administer the seminaries in Manila, Camarines, Cebú and Jaro.

For a defence of the Filipino clergy by the Vincentians, see Chapter XV, 'Los Padres Paules y el Clero Filipino', in *Los Padres Paules y las hijas de la Caridad en Filipinas: Breve Reseña Histórica de la labor realizada en estas islas por la doble familia de San Vicente de Paul (1862-1912)*, Manila, 1912.
and that of the Augustinians in Vigan. At Chapelle's request he then decreed that among the studies to be offered in the reorganised seminaries, the students be instructed to obtain as perfect a knowledge as possible of the English language. To achieve this it should be almost obligatory in the minor seminaries to speak in idiomatic English at certain times and places. The Archbishop of Manila thought, however, that on account of the present poverty of the church, it would be impossible or at least most difficult to support the cost of seminaries.

The fifth session took place on the 24 January, the day after a violent demonstration at a public reception given for the Apostolic Delegate. It was apparent from the bishops' discussion on the 24 January that they had been incensed by the outburst and blamed it on the Filipino clergy. The Dominican secretary noted:

It was well-known that the indigenous clergy, although not all of them, were in no way uninvolved in the plans and malevolent machinations of those who disturbed the reception. On account of this circumstance... the fifth session, which was held on the day following the reception, [was] completely concerned with the Filipino clergy.

Chapelle began the session by asking Archbishop Nozaleda his thoughts on the Filipino clergy. The Archbishop replied by declaring that

The principal cause of the long imprisonment of the religious has been the Filipino clergy. I speak on behalf of an examination of the facts. Not all the clergy are guilty, but generally speaking they have ill-feelings towards the religious.
By contrast, many Filipino lay people had treated the imprisoned friars with kindness:

There was one aspect of the imprisonment of the religious which was very consoling and that does great credit to the Filipino people. Many of the religious were weak from illness and could not have endured in any way the torments and privations of prison if there had not been men and women, but especially women, who without any fear of the danger involved, generously assisted them. The clergy, on the other hand, withdrew from the religious as though they were strangers to them, and the number of them who performed any work of charity towards them was very small.

Nozaleda said that he had sent out an archepiscopal order of a most imperative kind, ordering the clergy to assist the captives and to send him an account of the expenses entailed, but not one had obeyed his command. He believed the Filipino clergy were even more deeply committed to the revolution: they favoured in every way the Katipunan society which was Masonic.

I know for certain that there are some clerics who are members of that reprobate society and others who promote its causes.

The scurrilous periodical, Filipino Libre [Free Filipino], had been supported by Filipino clerics from beginning to end. Under their protection, another publication of the same low kind was produced called La Democracia, and there were Filipino clerics who had founded and supported the openly Masonic periodical called La Patria.

Chapelle then asked if the Filipino clergy should now return to their parishes and whether it would be sufficient for them merely to repent their previous conduct which had so little of humility and
charity about it. The Bishop of Cebú said that as zeal for religion did not motivate such priests but rather a burning desire for money, they could in no way be appeased now by having [their former?] parishes assigned to them. The other bishops agreed and asserted that the Filipino clergy had designs on all ecclesiastical offices, even those of the episcopate, and 'even if they got these there would still remain in their hearts room for ambition and the thirst for money'.

Chapelle proposed, and the bishops agreed, that the Filipino priests be obliged to sign a protestation against the insults inflicted upon ecclesiastical dignitaries and religious congregations during the previous day.

The Delegate then said that he believed it necessary for the good of the church in the Philippines that all clergy should be prepared to accept transfer at the will of the Archbishop. He stressed that the secular clergy must be persuaded not to involve themselves in political matters. Archbishop Nozaleda believed that a prohibition should be issued to this effect and that means ought to be laid down to prevent the Filipino priests winning over the support of Catholic laymen. It was decided to persuade the secular clergy to send a protest to General Otis against the prohibition on the use of the catechism in schools. It was also decided to send the more 'respectable' Filipino priests into those parishes which European priests were unable to minister. Finally, it was agreed that the bishops of the Philippine church should seek from the Holy See those faculties which bishops in the United States enjoyed.
Nozaleda next raised the question of ecclesiastical investigations. He thought the Philippines needed a reformed method of establishing proof of right in cases where scandal and unsatisfactory evidence made a decision difficult. His intention was to tighten the hold of the bishop over his parish clergy. After a short discussion on the need to circumscribe the powers of Cathedral chapters so that, as Nozaleda pointed out, the church could avoid 'the evils both spiritual and temporal' of a chapter of native priests gaining control, the session came to an end.

The sixth and final session of the bishops' meeting was held on the morning of 26 January. The Apostolic Delegate opened the discussion by returning to the question of the Filipino clergy: what should be done in order that from this time onwards the lives of the native clergy could be reformed? Nozaleda believed that the clerical life for the Filipino priest could be organised after the model of the 'House of God' which the Dominican Fathers had used in the mission in Tonkin, or after the model of the Fathers of the Overseas Missions who worked at the evangelisation of the people for six months and spent the other six months at home with leisure for their individual religious duties. The old title of parish priest should be changed and all priests in the Philippines, secular and regular, should be considered simply as missionaries.

Finally, the Apostolic Delegate asked if some religious might now return to their parishes. All the bishops believed this was presently impossible, with the exception of some areas in Nueva Vizcaya and Cagayan where the Bishop of Nueva Segovia believed the people were ready to accept regular clergy. On this point the series of secret meetings came to an end.
CHAPTER FIVE

QUAE MARI SINICO AND SCHISM

The new Apostolic Delegate, Monsignor Giovanni Battista Guidi, arrived on 17th November, 1902, bringing with him the Vatican's apostolic constitution for the Philippine Church, Quae mari Sinico. Guidi was aware of the hostility felt towards his predecessor and it was apparent from his first statements in the Philippines that he saw his task as one requiring great tact. In a circular letter he issued a few days after his arrival, he confessed that he had been overcome with fear at the 'grave and multiple difficulties' which had been confided to him, trusting that God would support him in his weakness and inadequacy. He hoped that both the secular and regular clergies would offer him their advice and help. He had come not to dictate but to serve the Church in a critical time. American observers found him a different man to Chapelle. James A. LeRoy thought him 'a man of tact and good disposition toward the Filipinos'.

Unfortunately, he arrived too late to save the Philippine Church.

---

1 First news of Guidi's appointment reached Manila in early August, 1902. He was born in 1832 in Rome. He served as Secretary to the Vatican Ambassador to Spain in the 1870s and assisted in the negotiations for the concordat signed between the Holy See and Portugal regarding the church in Portuguese territories in the East Indies. He also served in Monaco in 1887. On 18 May, 1894, he was consecrated Bishop of Nice. See Eco del Pontificato Gazzetta del Clero, XXVI, November, 1902, 1-2; Libertas, 7 August, 1902; The Manila American, 8 August, 1902, 10.

2 Juan Bautista Guidi, Carta Circular del Rmd. Sr Delegado Apostólico a los ... obispos ... Superiores de las Ordenes ... Sacerdotes de ambos Cleros, Manila, 22 November, 1902. The Circular is printed in Libertas of that date.

3 Philippine Life in Town and Country, 92.
from a schism which had been threatening from the time of Gregorio Aglipay's excommunication of 1899. The Philippine Independent Church already existed. The Apostolic Constitution which he brought with him made his good intentions irrelevant. News of its contents had persuaded a section of the Filipino clergy to make the final decision to leave the Roman Catholic Church even before Guidi promulgated it from Manila Cathedral. When it became obvious that Guidi could not satisfy the demands for the expulsion of the Spanish clergy and their exclusion from the parishes and for the appointment of Filipino priests as bishops, the clergies of Ilocos Sur and Iloilo also declared their separation from the Roman Catholic hierarchy although they refused to join the Aglipayan schism. Archbishop Nozaleda had left the islands on 25 September, 1900, but his place had been taken by the Franciscan, Martín García Alcocer, Bishop of Cebú, as Apostolic Administrator of Manila. Bishop Alcocer made his hostility to 'new ideas, new customs, and new aspirations' very plain in his Pastoral Letter of 1902: the hierarchy continued to condemn the demand for 'false liberties' and 'malevolence against venerated institutions of the Church'.

For those Filipino priests who had struggled through the past four years to continue the parish work of the church, subjected to the demands of the Philippine Republic as well as of their Spanish bishops in Manila, the injustice of the Pastoral Letter and the Apostolic Constitution was felt intensely. In the circumstances, Guidi's success in managing to at least re-establish

---

4 Martin García Alcocer, Pastoral Letter 'About the Catholic Unity', Manila, 1902. The Pastoral was issued towards the end of September; see also Libertas, 30 September, 1902.
communications between the Vatican and the Filipino clergy was remarkable. He had even succeeded in opening negotiations with Gregorio Aglipay when his sudden death on 27 June, 1904, destroyed the opportunity he had created.

The Apostolic Delegate's genuine humility and desire to reconcile the Filipino clergy to the Roman Catholic hierarchy appealed to the reluctance of even the most radical of the Filipino clergy to deny an ecclesiastical authority which they had accepted as coming from Christ. In August, 1899, in his reply to his excommunication by Archbishop Nozaleda, Aglipay was careful to affirm his loyalty to Rome. While denying the right of the Archbishop to judge him, he expressed confidence that the Pope 'as Vicar of Christ, who is God' would not deny the Filipino clergy justice once their sufferings had been explained to him. The Apostolic Constitution finally ended the hope that the Holy See would intervene to resolve the confrontation between the Spanish bishops and the Filipino clergy: thereafter, the Filipino priest faced the individual choice of submitting to the authority of superiors who had made their contempt for him quite obvious or taking the awesome step of leaving the Roman Catholic Church.

The open schism of 1902 confirmed a situation which was implicit as early as October, 1898, with the Revolutionary Government's assumption of authority over the Filipino clergy, and which was already acute by 1900 when the clergy were presented with bluntly conflicting demands on

---

5 Gregorio Aglipay, Al Pueblo y Clero Filipino (The 'Fourth Manifesto', drafted by Apolinario Mabini), 19 August, 1899; Doc. 77 in Achútegui and Bernad, op. cit., III, 210-16; and see Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, II, 118.
their loyalty to the Republic and their ecclesiastical superiors. Aguinaldo's order of 10 March, 1900, repeated in November, required all Filipino priests to give their secret adhesion to the Revolution, to help the guerilla war being waged against the United States, and to renounce Chapelle as an enemy of the Philippines. At the same time, the Holy See had intervened to endorse the claims of the Spanish bishops over the Filipino clergy. The Sacred Congregation issued a decree on 12 July, 1900, which was published in Manila on 11 September, which ordered the Filipino clergy to remain aloof from 'internal war' and to abstain from political struggles and to recognise 'legitimate ecclesiastical authority' Although the demands of their ecclesiastical superiors were unambiguous, those Filipino priests sympathetic to the Revolution could at least argue between 1898 and 1901 that it was in keeping with their priestly duties to obey legitimate civil authority and that the Aguinaldo Government was the legitimate authority in the Philippines. The revived Katipunan, as an organ of that legitimate government, could also command their obedience. But, with the capture of Aguinaldo by the Americans in March, 1901, and his proclamation of 19 April urging acceptance of American sovereignty the position of the Filipino priest became more difficult.

6 See Chapter III, and Achútegui and Bernad, I, 236-38.

7 'Decreto de la Sag. Cong. del Concilio', Libertas, 11 September, 1900. The decree applied to the clergy of all countries.

8 Aguinaldo decreed on 15 July, 1898, that the Katipunan had fulfilled its mission and on 1 August, 1898, Pascual Zamora formally disbanded it on order of the Revolutionary Government. It was revived by Aguinaldo on 15 August, 1900; Insurgent Records, 55.3; 206.2; and Philippine Insurrection, II, Exh. 1011; 1031. The society remained active unofficially in 1899-1900. For its operations in Laguna in this period see Insurgent Records, 706.8; 706.10; 712.6; and Order Book B59.
Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that even after 1901 clerical support for the guerilla war against the Americans continued and was frequently decisive in maintaining popular hostility to the new regime. It is useful to review the contribution of the Filipino clergy to the continued revolutionary struggle between 1900 and 1902 in order to place the schism of 1902 in its context. The revived Katipunan received active support from a number of Filipino priests who were sometimes leading figures in the 'second government' established by the revolutionaries in provinces under American control. Priests reported on American troop movements and on the activities of collaborators. They supplied the revolutionaries with financial help, food, and medicines as well as with military intelligence. Filipino priests were particularly significant in the Bikol region and on the island of Panay where they worked closely with the local leaders of the Revolution. The American military were acutely aware of the danger posed by parish clergy sympathetic to the Revolution. A Filipino priest in Taytay, Morong Province, was tried by court martial for belonging to 'the society of Dukuts' or assassins. The priest was accused of being the chief agent in a series of retaliatory executions against collaborators with the Americans. The local American commander found the priest to be 'the most

9 See General Miguel Malvar's appeal to a Filipino priest on 1 November, 1900, calling on him to help the Revolution, that being his duty; *Insurgent Records*, 692.2. On 30 August, 1900, the parish priest of Polo reported to the revolutionaries the number of police there; ibid., 201.78.

10 Schumacher, 'Church and State', art. cit., 12.

11 Schumacher, ibid., 12; and Taylor, *Philippine Insurrection*, II, 405, 480.
influential man in the community'. He was accused of ordering the burning alive of three American sympathisers, acting on behalf of the 'Philippine Government'. Some priests were subjected to torture by the American military to obtain information on guerilla activity. The ecclesiastical governor of Jaro died under torture after his disappearance at American hands. Apparently he was charged with sending church funds to support the guerilla forces, assistance which Aguinaldo demanded of the clergy in his orders of August-September, 1899. At a time when a number of revolutionary leaders were responding to the American policy of suppressing the insurrection by 'appointing the leaders to office and sending the followers to prison' (as Bishop Hendrick expressed it), Filipino priests continued to be the focus of local resistance.

The Filipino priest who supported the Revolution could draw on his religious authority to reinforce support for the struggle against the Americans. Religious ritual was used to inspire dedication to the Revolution and to place the war in the context of folk religious beliefs. Taylor cites an instance in General Malvar's district where a Filipino priest took the sacred image from the church and joined the guerillas with

---

12 Taylor, ibid., II, 322-24. See also Bishop Hevia Compamanes' evidence that four Filipino priests were being held by the Americans for complicity with the insurrectionary forces' in 1900; Testimony in 'Lands held for Ecclesiastical or Religious Uses', 130.

13 Schumacher, art. cit., 12-13; and see Insurgent Records, 167. Even earlier, on 1 January, 1899, Aguinaldo required the clergy to show their patriotism by providing funds for the Revolution; Achutegui and Bernad, III, doc. 50, 157-59. On 19 June, 1899, the Secretary of the Interior issued a directive ordering the confiscation of all church funds, ibid., doc. 67, 189-92.

14 Bishop Thomas Hendrick to President Roosevelt, 28 September, 1904; Roosevelt Papers.
it, bringing with him a large number of people under the protection of that particular saint. The revolutionaries manufactured holy images whose magical powers were directed to the revolutionary cause. In July, 1902, the provost-marshal of General Bell's brigade had acquired eleven of these images, all of which had been regularly used to obtain funds for the Revolution. Religious objects were blessed by the native clergy and used by revolutionary soldiers as talismans or anting-anting.

Even in Manila, Filipino priests were accused by the Americans of actively supporting the revolutionary cause. Fathers Mariano Sevilla and Manuel Roxas were included among those to be exiled to the Marianas with other opponents of American rule like Mabini and Ricarte and were apparently only saved by ecclesiastical intervention. The American press in Manila complained of 'the traitorous Filipino priests who have kept the insurrection alive'. General Bell, in an order to his station commanders of 9 December, warned:

Chief and most important among the class of disloyal persons are native priests. It may be considered as practically certain that every native priest in the provinces of Batangas and La Laguna is a secret enemy of the Government and is in active sympathy with the insurgents. These are absolutely our most dangerous enemies - more dangerous even than armed insurgents - because of their unequalled influence. They should be given no exemptions whatever on account of their calling ....

Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, II, 290.

Ibid. The Americans described these practices as fraud perpetrated against the superstitious.


The Manila American, 1 August, 1902, 7.

J.F. Bell, Brigadier General, Commanding, 'Instructions to all Station Commanders', 9 December, 1901, in Senate Document No. 331, part 2, 57th Congress, 1st session, 1902, 1610.
Governor Taft, reporting the surrender of some Filipino priests early in 1901, observed that the native priests had 'held out longest in favour of the insurgents and against the Americans' and that their surrender was of extreme importance.\textsuperscript{20} General Jacob Smith, ordering the institution of a policy of terror in Samar, declared that

\begin{quote}
By far the most important as well as the most dangerous [secret supporters of the guerillas] is the native priest ... However, the profession of priest will not prevent his arrest or proceedings against him. If the evidence is sufficient they will be tried by the proper court. If there is not sufficient evidence to convict, they will be arrested and confined as a military necessity, and held as prisoners of war until released by orders from these headquarters.\textsuperscript{21}
\end{quote}

Aglipay himself was active in northern Luzon as a revolutionary general from late 1899 until 30 April, 1901, when he finally surrendered.\textsuperscript{22} Although his critics dismiss the legends which were attached to him, Aglipay was apparently a charismatic figure with miraculous attributes, a folk hero in the indigenous traditions of Ilocos.

The Revolution and the Philippine-American War both radicalised many Filipino priests and brought to a crisis the inherent contradiction in their situation as patriots in a colonial church. Nationalist sentiment and a history of persecution as a group influenced many Filipino priests to support the independence struggle and to respond to the Republic's demand that they deny the authority of Spanish bishops. But

\textsuperscript{20} Quoted in Schumacher, art. cit., 13.

\textsuperscript{21} U.S. Army, Philippine Division, \textit{Annual Report of Major-General Adna Chaffee} (Manila, 1902), in Schumacher, ibid., 13. Bishop Hendrick recorded that some priests were subsequently subjected to the water torture.

\textsuperscript{22} Achútegui and Bernad, I, 115-42.
these larger factors were not enough to push a majority of the clergy into open schism. Most priests would not contemplate a final break with the Roman Catholic Church and when the choice was forced upon them turned their backs on the schismatic church. Others, for a time, continued to deny the authority of Spanish prelates and to threaten to disregard the claims of American bishops but this group continued to affirm loyalty to Rome. Only a minority of Filipino priests decided to leave the Roman Catholic Church in 1902. There were, of course, personal reasons why individuals made such a choice, but it is possible to discern some general factors which determined the most radical response to the crisis in the Philippine Church in 1902.

The pattern of adherence to the Iglesia Filipina Independiente which had emerged by 1903 suggests that regional factors were decisive in determining its support. The schism began as an Ilocano movement, led by the clergy of one province, Ilocos Norte. Aglipay, although a priest in the Archdiocese of Manila, was an Ilocano, as was the lay founder of the new church, Isabelo de los Reyes. As ecclesiastical governor of the Ilocos area (1898-1899) and as a guerilla leader, Aglipay established close personal ties with the clergy of the region. The initial impetus was very specifically localised; the neighbouring province of Ilocos Sur was much less affected by the Aglipayan movement and Vigan, the episcopal seat, despite the persecution of Filipino priests within its

The clergy of Nueva Segovia, Doeppers has pointed out, were the most deprived of ecclesiastical offices, holding only 6.7 per cent of all curacies in the Diocese, on his calculations, compared to 12 per cent for the Filipino clergy of the Archdiocese of Manila, 19.6 per cent for those of Jaro, 23.3 per cent for the clergy of Cebú, and 50.5 per cent for the clergy of Nueva Cáceres. The clergy of Nueva Cáceres actively supported the guerilla war and were sympathetic to the Revolution. Three of their number had been executed at the outbreak of Revolution, just as clergy of the Diocese of Nueva Segovia had suffered torture. But the priests of the Bikol region almost entirely rejected the Aglipayan movement, only one of their number, Father Vicente Ramirez, joining the independent church.

The new church spread rapidly in 1902-1903, aided by widespread indignation concerning the Holy See's failure to provide Filipino bishops and to withdraw the friars, but also depending often on the work of Ilocano-speaking sympathisers in central Luzon and Manila.

---

24 Achútegui and Bernad, I, 211. Doeppers points out that the Vigan seminary, which was the only one of the five diocesan seminaries not taken over by the Vincentians in the latter part of the nineteenth century, possibly had a lower standard of theological training and thus produced a clergy less sure of its commitment to the universal church; op.cit., 164.

25 Ibid., Table 1, 163, and 164.

26 Achútegui and Bernad, I, 229. Also the Bishop of Nueva Cáceres defended his clergy in 1896-1897.

27 Doeppers, art. cit., 164. He suggests that Ilocano migrants because of their 'uprootedness' may have been predisposed to the schism.
In those areas outside central and northern Luzon where the new church gained a strong hold, the patronage of the provincial elite often proved decisive, although this was not always the case. A club made up of labourers in the barrio of Zapatera, in Cebú, a community described as 'the focus of the Iglesia Filipina' in the island, sponsored an Aglipayan religious festival in May, 1904. In Misamis, the Filipino Governor and local officials in the province actively promoted the new church and the province became an Aglipayan stronghold. The northern coastal regions of Mindanao generally proved responsive to Aglipayan appeals. The American bishop, Thomas Hendrick, found in his diocese of Cebú, in 1904, that support for the Aglipayan schism corresponded with commitment to the revolutionary movement. Misamis was 'one of the most turbulent places, also strongly Aglipayano'. The 'quasi Bishop of the Aglipayanos' there had recently collected six thousand pesos for a war fund 'to free the people from the United States'. In Hendrick's view, 'the Aglipayan movement is not merely a religious, but an insurrectionary movement under the guise of religion':

As the American officials were told from the start, the active municipal authorities, Aglipayanos or others opposed to the Church throughout the Islands, though in every instance a minority, are the agitators and political schemers of the Islands; in almost every instance the prominent Aglipayanos leaders are those who are found in every movement against the Government since American occupation.

Those who supported the Roman Catholic Church were invariably 'conservative, quiet people who have taken no part in politics and who have quietly and

28 See the report of 15 May, 1904, in Achútegui and Bernad, IV, 224-225.
29 Doeppers, art. cit., 170-71; Achútegui and Bernad, I, 215.
peaceably accepted American sovereignty and attended to their business'.

Hendrick was pleading a special cause, American support for the Roman Catholic Church, but if his observations were correct it appears that in the Diocese of Cebú, unlike that of Neuva Cáceres, religious schism was adopted as a logical corollary of resistance to American rule. In fact, initial enthusiasm for the new church soon died down in Cebú. In Negros, the movement for an independent church gained support in 1903-1904 particularly from the ilustrado class. Secular priests in Negros were involved with the independent church as early as 1 October, 1902, when Father Lorenzo Paloma's name appeared with those of seven other new bishops of the IFI. Father Paloma had been parish priest of the prosperous southern town of Valladolid in Negros Occidental, and an assistant priest to the Recollect Fathers before 1898. There was support among the clergy of Negros for a Filipino hierarchy and the memory of the disestablishment of the Filipino secular clergy by the Recollects from 1849 must have encouraged nationalist sentiments.

30 Bishop Thomas Hendrick to President Theodore Roosevelt, Cebú, 28 October, 1904, in Roosevelt Papers.

31 See the Protesta del Clero de Cebú, in Libertas, 25 August, 1902, in a telegram to the Bishop of Cebú, protesting energetically against the pretensions of the schismatic Iglesia Filipina, and renewing unconditionally their adherence to the Roman Pontiff. For a general Protesta, of loyal Roman Catholic Filipino clergy see, Libertas, 22 October, 1902, denying the pretensions of Aglipay and his followers. Letter of 7 October, 1902, signed by Frs. José M. Chanco and Vicente Rosauro, and others.

32 María Fe Hernaez Romero, Negros Occidental Between Two Foreign Powers (1888-1909), (Iloilo, 1974), 220-25. Aglipay visited Negros Occidental in March, 1903. See also Achutegui and Bernad, I, 214, and Doeppers, art. cit., 171-72. See also the report of 15 May, 1904, on the IFI in Negros, Achutegui and Bernad, IV, doc. 69, 226-27. Doeppers suggests as a subsidiary factor, the consequences of different ecclesiastical policies adopted by the various orders in their regions, arguing that the
Of the seven hundred or so Filipino priests in the islands in 1902, perhaps fifty went over to the Aglipayan schism. In their analysis of the situation in each of the five ecclesiastical divisions of the Philippine Church, Achutegui and Bernad identified twenty-six secular priests from the Diocese of Nueva Segovia who joined the schism, three from the Archdiocese of Manila, one from Nueva Cáceres, two from Cebú, and four from Jaro. A number of other Filipino priests in Nueva Segovia and Jaro also temporarily broke away from their Spanish bishop; Monsignor Ferrero, in the case of Jaro, and from a proposed American bishop in the case of the Ilocano clergy involved in the Assembly of Bantay in July, 1903. About a third of the Jaro clergy, or some twenty-five priests, withdrew their obedience from the bishop and elected Father Nicolas Valencia as their ecclesiastical superior in his stead. About twenty priests were involved in the Ilocos protest. Neither the Jarornor Ilocos groups were schismatic in that they affirmed their union with the Holy See and refused to join the Aglipayans although they denied the authority of bishops appointed by Rome. Given the personal anguish this must have

Recollects were closely linked to the pattern of reaction against the Roman Catholic Church while the Franciscans and Jesuits generally did not provoke hostility; art. cit., 167-69.

Contemporary American writers reported that some 200 Filipino priests had joined the schism: Laubach, op. cit., 144; LeRoy, Town and Country, 93; James A. Robertson, 'The Aglipay Schism in the Philippine Islands', The Catholic Historical Review, IV, No. 3, 1918, 334. Aglipayan estimates included priests who were not formerly ordained Roman Catholic priests and were inflated for propaganda purposes in any case. Achutegui and Bernad identify 36 priests who joined the schism but add that if others who joined later are included the total is about 50; Religious Revolution, I, 231-32; and for details of the Jaro and Ilocos groups, ibid., 229-231.
involved, the decision by a minority of about one in seven of the Filipino clergy to either defy their bishop or break with the church entirely indicated the depth of feeling against the hierarchy of the Philippine Church in 1902-1903. Even the Dominican journal, Libertas, acknowledged the 'lamentable situation' of the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippines in early 1903, surrounded by 'all the infernal furies' attacking the faith of the Filipino clergy. Without direction, without prestigious leaders to guide them through the infinite difficulties which confronted them, the Filipino clergy were passing through 'a truly critical historic period'.

The momentum for an independent church grew out of the failure of the leaders of the Filipino clergy in 1900 to win recognition from Rome or from the Apostolic Delegate for their cause. The memorials to Pope Leo XIII composed by Father Manuel Roxas and Fathers José Chanco and Mariano Sevilla in April, 1900, failed to gain any tangible concessions from the Holy See as did the clergy's representations to Archbishop Chapelle. The friars remained in the islands and the encyclical of 1902

34 Libertas, 2 January, 1903.

35 Fathers Sevilla and Chanco composed a Memorial presented to Chapelle on 29 January, 1900, which stressed the need to keep the parishes out of the friars' hands. They reviewed the secularisation controversy, recalled the execution of Fathers Burgos, Gomez and Zamora, and recalled the Pope's encyclical 'Ad extremas Orientis oras' (which encouraged indigenous control of the Asian churches); text in Achútegui and Bernad, IV, doc. 11, 42-47. This Memorial was translated into Latin and addressed directly to Pope Leo XIII on 18 April, 1900. Father Roxas presented his Memorial to the Pope with a covering letter on 1 April, 1900, requesting the withdrawal of the friars from the islands; the appointment of Filipino bishops and parish priests; the assistance of foreign, non-Spanish, non-regular clergy; and the appointment of Filipino cardinals; ibid., doc. 17 and 18, 64-71.
confirmed the Apostolic Delegate's direction of 1900 that they were to resume parish work. No Filipino bishops were appointed in the critical period between 1900 and 1903, and it eventually became clear that American bishops were to take over the hierarchy from the departing Spaniards. The Filipino clergy actually sent representatives to Rome to plead their cause. In April, 1900, Fathers Chanco and Salustiano Araullo, attempted to personally present a Memorial to Pope Leo XIII but were unsuccessful. The clergy of Ilocos decided to send their own delegation to Rome and three priests were chosen for the mission: Fathers Pío Romero, Bartolomé Espiritu, and Rafael Estrada. Unlike the Chanco-Araullo mission, the Ilocano delegation never left the Philippines but the attempt was evidence of the agitation which continued in the Diocese of Nueva Segovia.

In 1902, with the failure of appeals to Rome unmistakable, the clergy of Nueva Segovia held two meetings, the first in January when several priests decided to secede from Rome and establish a Filipino church if the Vatican persisted in ignoring the rights of the Filipino clergy. They appointed Father Aglipay their representative to carry out their resolution. On 8 May, 1902, a second meeting took place, in the barrio of Kullabeng, in Badoc, when several priests and laymen resolved to declare their immediate independence from the Roman Catholic Church and to establish

36 Achútegui and Bernad, I, 162.

37 Proceedings of the Asamblea Magna, quoted in Achútegui and Bernad, I, 162. The instructions drawn up at this meeting were subsequently published in La Iglesia Filipina Independiente, in 1903, and carried the signatures of the clergy of Ilocos Norte and Abra.
an independent Filipino church. A radical faction, led by Fathers
Brillantes, Farolan and Bonoan went further and advocated reforms in
doctrine and religious practices, but a conservative group led by Father
Pío Romero opposed them, arguing that the church should follow the same
doctrines, dogmas and tenets of the Roman Catholic Church, except
obedience to the Pope, 'for the time being'. Aglipay asked for time to
contact all Filipino priests and leading laymen so that the movement
could count on unanimous support. The Assembly of Kullabeng thus moved
from the demand that the authority of the bishops should be denied to
the demand that the Filipino clergy and laity should declare themselves
independent of Roman authority. A section of the clergy were also inter­
ested in changing Roman doctrine, specifically to introduce a Unitarian
conception of God as 'One Person, One Essence, and One Spirit' as opposed
to the orthodox Trinitarian doctrine.

In the event it was not Father Aglipay and his supporters among the
Ilocos clergy who took the initiative in declaring a schism from Rome but
a group of laymen led by Isabelo de los Reyes, founder of the trade-union
organisation, the Unión Obrera Democrática, and Felipe Buencamino, a
prominent ilustrado who had acted as a judiciary official under Spain, a
Minister in the Philippine Republic, and was then head of the Tondo branch
of the Partido Federal, a party enthusiastically dedicated to American
sovereignty. A contemporary American priest described this group of
laymen as 'atheists, free-thinkers, and men placed high in the ranks of

38 Fonacier, Proceedings, 29; in Achutegui and Bernad, ibid., 163-64.
39 Ibid., 163.
Latin Freemasonry.  Certainly, they were incongruous leaders of a new church. De los Reyes at least had adopted the role of defender of the Filipino clergy for some time. Apart from his harsh treatment for attacking the friars he was a witness to the torture of a number of Filipino priests in 1896-1897 and he later wrote that this had left a permanent impression on his mind:

I saw with my own eyes how they shot, hanged and tortured many poor Filipino priests in 1896-97 despite their patent innocence. They had been imprisoned with me in the Manila jail with chains on their legs like criminals merely because of the satanic egoism of the friars.

It is difficult to clear away the prejudice obvious in Roman Catholic and American writing on de los Reyes. As a schismatic and a Socialist agitator he outraged Roman Catholics and Americans. Nor do the hagiographical accounts in Aglipayan sources present him credibly. Achútegui and Bernad describe him as impulsive and irresponsible, subject to fits of enthusiasm and the victim of a carácter exaltado. His large output of works on Filipino folklore, Ilocano history, religion, politics, ethnology, and so on, are dismissed by them as 'heterogeneous dabbling', 'superficial' and 'inaccurate'. The editors of the Manila American treated him with ridicule:

It is absurd to view men like de los Reyes and Poblete trying to enact the part of King Henry, the Iconoclast. Upon what meat hath these men fed that they have grown so great? Their records show that they have been

40 Ambrose Coleman, O.P., 'Do the Filipinos Really Hate the Friars', II, American Catholic Quarterly Review, vol. XXX, No. 120, October 1905, 681.

41 De los Reyes to James A. Robertson, Barcelona, 3 May, 1908, quoted in Achútegui and Bernad, I, 189.

42 Ibid., I, 165-80.
agitators for many years. One of them edited a sheet during the late insurrection, in which Mr. McKinley was abused and vituperated in terms of the lowest character. The other was a Spanish Mason and later a Katipunero. That such men could secure sufficient influence over their fellows to cause them to break away from the church that represents to their minds the only means of salvation is too ridiculous to entertain for a moment.

That Reyes and Poblete were anti-American and connected to the Katipunan actually would have enhanced their status in the eyes of revolutionary nationalists and of mass supporters of the Revolution inspired by an apocalyptic vision of independence. Ilustrado leaders of the new church in Manila were remote, in any case, from its new adherents in barrios spread from Ilocos Norte to northern Mindanao. More significantly for such followers, the Aglipayan Church appealed to patriotic and religious sentiments through its canonisation of Rizal and Fathers Burgos, Gomez and Zamora. The Spanish writer, Miguel de Unamuno, writing in May 1907, saw this millennial strain in Aglipayan support:

It seems to be an attempt to clothe Christian rationalism with Catholic symbols and ceremonies. Its future appears to me very doubtful. Thinkers do not found religions nor reform them. It is easier, I think, to build upon the base of Christian Catholic sentiment which Spain left there, and upon

---

43 Editorial, 'La Iglesia Filipina', The Manila American, 10 August, 1902, 4. The editorial argued that the attempt to found a Filipino Church did not deserve to be taken seriously because its founders, Isabelo de los Reyes and Pascual H. Poblete, were disreputable and because 'the education of more than three centuries has ground into the souls of the Filipinos that feeling that to die without the pale of the Roman Church is to go incontinently and inevitably to hell'. William Howard Taft echoed this view of de Los Reyes, calling him 'an agitator of irresponsible character'; Annual Report on the Islands, quoted in The Manila American, 9 January, 1903, 2-3.

44 Achutegui and Bernad, I, 240; and for the text of the Act of Canonization, 24 September, 1903, see ibid., IV, doc. 63, 212-13.
this base to build a religion in which the cult of the country, Filipinas, becomes itself a religion. People will then think that life is a pilgrimage from this to that other heavenly Filipinas in which Rizal is living and breathing in spirit.45

Indeed, veneration of Rizal, Burgos, Gomez, and Zamora, was not simply an extension of Roman Catholic veneration of the saints (condemned, incidentally, by the Aglipayan leadership), but appealed to a folk religious view of the world found, as we have seen, in the Pasión tradition in the Tagalog region, and in the Colorums, Guardias, and other popular cults of the period. Between 1910 and 1920, those areas of north-eastern Mindanao which had broken away and joined the Aglipayan schism also supported a revived Colorum movement with clear links with the beliefs and ritual of the Cofradías of the 19th century in Luzon.46

Although the evidence has yet to be assembled, it is probable that in the world of folk beliefs and values, the Aglipayan Church, whatever its rationalist teachings, was perceived by ordinary converts in terms deriving from older indigenous traditions.

The leadership of the new church, however, was distrustful of the egalitarian and apocalyptic elements in popular support for the Aglipayan movement. As in the revolution, the Hispanicised ilustrados and the wealthy, land-owning principales, exercised control over the movement against the Roman Catholic Church and defined it in terms of elite values and goals. De los Reyes perhaps was more open to popular radical aspira-

45 Epilogue to Retana's Vida y escritos del Dr. José Rizal (Madrid, 1907), 496-98, quoted in Achutegui and Bernad, I, 241.

46 Sturtevant, Popular Uprisings, 142-43.
tions than the others. He did not belong to the respectable haute bourgeoisie as did Felipe Buencamino and Pardo H. Tavera.

De los Reyes interviewed captured Katipunan members in 1897 (while he was in prison in Manila) and later commented that 'from whatever point the Katipunan is regarded it is obviously a terrible organisation, for the very reason that it is composed of people of the lower classes and ignorant people, for the lower class man has but few ideas, but for these few will rather die than give them up.' Later he added: '... the Katipunan was a plebeian organization... What the mass of the common people believe, becomes a religion, a fanaticism which works miracles'; Report on the Philippine Revolution of 1896-1897 (Madrid, 1899), English trans. BIA 2291-96; quoted in Ileto, op. cit., 103.

Isabelo de los Reyes y Florentino was born in Vigan, Ilocos Sur, 7 July, 1864 of a prominent Ilocano family. He studied first at Vigan Seminary and then moved to Manila in 1880 where he enrolled at the College of San Juan de Letran and later at the University of Santo Tomas. He graduated at the age of 22 as a notary but turned to journalism and published articles in most of the Manila papers. Between 1889 and 1896 he published and edited the bilingual periodical El Ilocano. He wrote a number of books in the same period including his Historia de Ilocos. He was arrested at the outbreak of the 1896 revolution for an alleged connection with the Katipunan. From prison he addressed his Sensacional memoria to Governor-General Primo de Rivera, violently denouncing the friars as the chief cause of the revolution. For this he was deported to Barcelona and the prison fortress of Montjuich. There he was influenced by anarchists and radical socialists, ideological currents noticeably absent from the influences on other Filipino ilustrados. He was arrested again after being pardoned, for alleged involvement in a Communist bomb attack. His prison reading this time was a New Testament given to him by the British and Foreign Bible Society. He adapted the egalitarian message of the Gospels to the radical thought he had absorbed earlier but his thought was rationalist and positivist, not mystical and apocalyptic. After his release he began a translation of the Bible into Ilocano for the Society. Between 1898 and 1901 he worked in Spain on behalf of the revolution, editing Filipinas ante Europa and El Defensor de Filipinas. He was fined 2000 pesos for libelling the papacy. On 15 October, 1901, he arrived back in Manila. Soon after, he founded the Unión Obrera. Despite his many activities he managed to have three wives (in succession) and twenty-eight children. He died, after being reconciled to the Roman Catholic Church, on 10 October, 1938.

Achútegui and Bernad, I, 165-90, et passim; Juan M. Ruiz, The Three Pillars of the Philippine Independent Church (Manila, 1950), 1-6; L. Ancheta, 'The Philippine Independent Church'.
of his polemical effort to refute the Church's authority, de los Reyes, in his book, *La Religión del Katipunan*, discussed the ancient religion of the Filipinos before the conquest and compared their view of a Supreme Being, Bathala, with the concepts of the deity in other world religions. Nevertheless, the message of this work was that 'science is the religion of the future' and that the worship of God must be purified. The ancient religion of the Filipinos was 'better than the excessively materialistic Catholicism that the friars have taught the Filipinos' but no religion was as useful in explaining the laws of the universe as Science.

The *Religión del Katipunan* foreshadowed the doctrines of the Philippine Independent Church and showed how those doctrines, while addressed to Filipinos, denied the validity of the inherited Filipino world-view of the masses. The *Doctrina y Reglas* of 1904 set out the theological approach of the new church as 'primarily' to reestablish the worship of one God by denying the Trinity of Persons and the divinity of Christ, by restoring the purity of His word, and 'liberating the conscience from all anti-scientific error, exaggeration, and scruple'. Auchútegui and Bernad have summarised the official doctrine of the *Iglesia Filipina Independiente* as rationalist, naturalist, 'anti-Christian', negative, syncretic, and self-contradictory. Certainly, the teachings that all religions were equal, that liberty of conscience was preferable to a collective commitment to revealed truth; that the 'dogmas and ancient traditions' of the Roman Church, including the teachings on the saints,

---

48 *Doctrina y Reglas Constitucionales de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente* (Manila, 1904), first published in de los Reyes' periodical, *La Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, 11 October, 1903, onwards. See also Aglipay's praise of science in Scott, op. cit., 5; Ruiz, op. cit., 18; and the Epistola III, 17 October, 1902.
miracles, and the Virgin Mary, were 'infantile' and 'absurd'; and that religious obligation consisted in using the intellect to unravel the 'exact and amazing laws' of Science were outside the world of the Pasión and the values of the folk revolutionaries of 1896. Just as the elite had reinterpreted the revolution from below in terms of independencia rather than Kalayaan and directed it towards establishing a Republican nation-state rather than creating a 'New Eden', so the mass movement away from the institutions of Spanish Roman Catholicism was explained in ilustrado terms as a rejection of Roman 'superstition' and 'obscurantism' in favour of science and progress. The religious revolution of 1902 was presented as part of the development of liberal national institutions appropriate for a rational society.

In this sense, the ilustrados who defined the church and created its institutions attempted to resolve the dilemma apparent in 1898 between the elite with its secular perception of the revolution and of Filipino society and the masses with a religious and apocalyptic vision. The reconciliation of two such incompatible traditions was beyond the Aglipayan leadership. As William Scott observed.

it was impossible that those millions who rallied behind the patriot priest [Aglipay] in the heat of the revolution could or did follow these flights into the rarefied atmosphere of the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom. Up until the present time, these multitudes have maintained that Pan-Latin piety which expresses itself in private prayers in public places. Even Don Isablo himself has left a reputation behind in his staunchly Romanist home town of Vigan for having spent pious hours on his knees in the Cathedral, free-thinker and modernist though he was.49

If the Aglipayan leadership was 'disgusted with a Church that tolerated an abjectly superstitious folk religion', as the official writings suggest, then it was as remote from the revolutionary masses as the Spanish regular orders were claimed to be. Isabelo de los Reyes, Jr., writing in 1950 as Supreme Bishop of Manila and Quezon City, claimed that while the leadership had become infected with Unitarian and rationalist ideas in the early stages of the movement, nevertheless 'the great mass of the people', while remaining 'profoundly loyal to their leader' [Aglipay], 'were not influenced by his theological deflection towards Unitarianism, but tenaciously retained their Trinitarian faith'. Bishop de los Reyes was concerned to justify the gradual readoption by the Iglesia Filipina Independiente of Catholic views of the Trinity and the divine inspiration of Scripture. Achútegui and Bernad put the responsibility for the 'sharp intrusion' of 'alien ideas' from European anti-Christian rationalism on Isabelo de los Reyes who presented the Aglipayan movement with a fait accompli by publishing the official books of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente without consulting the clergy. Despite the official


51 Reyes was negotiating recognition of the teachings of the IFI by the American Episcopalians who had consecrated Reyes and two other Aglipayan bishops in 1948, thus satisfying their desire to have valid apostolic succession in the eyes of the Anglican communion. He was also anxious to distinguish the IFI from the breakaway churches which had challenged the main body from 1928; see Achútegui and Bernad, I, 432ff. Unitarianism rejected the doctrines of the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ and questioned the divine inspiration of the Bible. Man was basically good and contained within himself all that was necessary for perfection; 'Unitarianism', in F.L. Cross, The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (Oxford, 1961), 1390-91.
teaching, they argued that

it is quite possible that very few of the former Catholic priests who formed the nucleus of the Philippine Independent Church's hierarchy and clergy, ever preached the new doctrine. The Mass, condemned in the official books, continued to be imitated by Aglipayan ministers. Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary and to the saints, rejected by the official books, continued to be practised. The divinity of Christ continued to be proclaimed. Prayers were said for the souls of the dead, and their bodies continued to be buried with ritual prayers similar to those of the Catholic Church. Indeed, the success of Aglipayanism in many regions among the populace was due largely to the fact that it was so similar to the Catholic Church, except that it was entirely Filipino, as against the "Roman" Church which was "Spanish". 52

The gulf between the Unitarian and rationalist attitudes of the leadership and the traditional doctrinal beliefs of former Roman Catholic clergy and the folk Catholic values and beliefs of the laity was not merely theoretical and theological. Leadership and masses differed profoundly on their response to the continued guerrilla war waged against the United States throughout the first decade of the century. The jurist, Cayetano Arellano, and the banker and lawyer, Felipe Buencamino, were examples of individuals who held high positions under the Spanish administration, the Philippine Republic, and the American administration. Their collaboration with three regimes reflected their interest in protecting their status and wealth in direct opposition to popular demands for redistribution of wealth and the overthrow of class distinction expressed through the revolution. 53 The national state set up by the Malolos Constitution was

52 Achútegui and Bernad, I, 434.

intended, in their view, not to prosecute the social revolution by consolidating the political revolution, but to suppress revolution from below. The Republic, by early 1899, had become an instrument for class rule, used by the upper principalia who had collaborated with Spain to retain their privileges and suppress the social and economic demands of the masses. Men like Pardo de Tavera, Arellano, Paterno, Buencamino, Araneta, Legarda and others, gained high positions in the Philippine Republic because they wanted to avert the 'possibility of a dark deluge'. The advantages they could win from controlling an independent state, and the threat of social revolution if they did not intervene, convinced the elite that it was worth the risk of supporting a revolution which they could not stop in any case. They were the first to betray the revolution when an alternative appeared; indeed, Agoncillo argues that the elite sabotaged the Republic from the moment they gained office 'through financial manipulations or through secret understandings with the Americans'. They were the first to accept offices under the incoming American administration. Key members of this elite were involved in the formation of the Partido Federal and the Aglipayan Church. Under the Presidency of T.H. Pardo de Tavera, a group of 'some 125 pro-American, upper-class Filipinos' worked out a platform for the Federal Party which stressed that 'public tranquility' was a more urgent priority than 'industrial rights and liberties' and that 'the recognition of the United States ... could introduce a liberal, democratic and representative government' in the Philippines. The Federal Party committed itself to

54 Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, II, 9; 138-39.

incorporation of the Philippines as a state of the United States at its 23 December, 1900, meeting. In April, 1901, the Party issued a manifesto calling for all Filipinos to recognise United States sovereignty. On 9 November, its members sent a petition to the United States asking for the Philippines to be constitutionally joined to America 'in such a way that the former may never be separated from the latter, nor the latter disunited from the former'. The supporters of the Federal Party preferred annexation by the United States to what Pardo de Tavera called the threat of 'democratic tyranny'. Federalists occupied all the posts created by the American administration.

Thus while Aglipay was still leading his armed force in actions against the United States Army, the men who were to finance and define the Aglipayan Church were advocating permanent annexation of the Philippines by the United States. Felipe Buencamino, President of the influential Tondo branch of the Federal Party, and described by Ruiz as 'one of the "Three Pillars" of the Philippine Independent Church', was busy informing the United States military in November, 1901, that all the Filipino priests in Batangas were secretly working against American rule. Under the Spanish, Buencamino had addressed a Memorial 'To Our Beloved Country,

---


Statement by Felipe Buencamino to Captain Dyar, 3rd Inf., that all padres in Batangas Province are against the United States', November 1901, Taylor, Insurgent Records, file 742.3.
Spain! protesting against libelous, anonymous demands for separation and claiming that 'the friars and the Spaniards all constitute for us the foundation of the civilised life ... without them would inevitably come upon us disorder and chaos'. After declaring his ardent support for American annexation he travelled to the United States in 1902 where he discovered, during an interview with Elihu Root, Secretary of State, the plan to join the colony to the United States permanently was futile, whereupon he became 'an ardent advocate of Independence'.

Buencamino, as President of the Tondo Committee of the Partido Federal, appears to have considered allying himself with the Protestant churches as a political move about the same time he was helping de los Reyes set up the Iglesia Filipina Independiente. The Reverend James B. Rodgers was invited to address mass meetings organised by the Federal Party in Tondo for several Sundays in succession in March, 1902. The delegation that called on Reverend Rodgers informed him that they had 'withdrawn from the Roman Church'. The first meeting took place at the 'Teatro Rizal' but the American missionary objected to his sermon being associated with political speeches.


59 Ruiz, op. cit., 8. Buencamino's mother-in-law, 'Dona Ninay', paid for the building of the IFI church at Tondo. Felipe Buencamino y Siojo was born on 23 August, 1848, in San Miguel de Mayumo, Bulacan. In 1886 and 1889 he graduated with degrees in arts and laws. He served as a Judge of First Instance under the Spaniards and later as a property registrar in Ilocos Sur. During the revolution he acted as Private Secretary to President Aguinaldo. He was accused of alleged complicity in the murder of General Luna. He died on 6 February, 1929, a "patriot of three epochs", according to Ruiz.
It was not an ideal Protestant service, and the passing of beer around the audience during the sermon, as well as other secular matters, showed the necessity of ensuring a more distinctly religious tone. Accordingly, Señor Buencamino, the head of the Federal Party in Tondo, arose at the end of the meeting to announce that on the following Sunday the gathering would be entirely in the hands of Pastor Rodgers, and would be non-political.60

The Reverend John Marvin Dean attended one meeting at the Teatro Rizal, which he described as 'a large wooden wigwam with a corrugated iron roof', with a decorative fence and 'a rude arch decorated with American flags':

Prominent Federalists and Protestant sympathizers were in seats of honor on the stage, and a little group of natives from Mr. Rodgers mission were assembled about Mrs. Rodgers and her portable organ at one edge of the stage, to act as a choir .... [Buencamino] requested the people "to respect the presence of God" by throwing away their cigars and removing their hats.61

The Federalists either did not appreciate Mrs. Rodgers' playing or they realised that it was not worth cultivating the Protestant missionaries because it gained them no advantage with the American administration. In either case, 'the Federal Party soon saw that an alliance with Protestantism was impracticable, and interfered with the political ends which they were striving to accomplish'. 62


61 Ibid.

62 Ibid.
These were the men who organised the meetings of July and August, 1902 which prompted de los Reyes to declare the Philippine Independent Church. They were also being denounced by the leaders of the continuing revolution and ordered shot.

Aglipay himself appears to have responded to the demand for an independent church separated from Rome with considerable personal anguish.

For accounts of these meetings see The Manila American, 25 July, 1902, 1; 4; 29 July, 1902, 1; 1 August, 1902, 7; 9 August, 1902, 1; 10 August, 1902, 4. Achutegui and Bernad describe the formal launching of 3 August, 1903, vol. I, 182-84.

Juan Cailles, Provincial Governor of Laguna, order to shoot all members of Federal Party, 28 February, 1901; Taylor, Insurgent Records, file 712.6; see also order book B59; file 718.3.

Gregorio Aglipay y Labayan, was born on 5 May, 1860, at Batac, a few miles south of Laoag, Ilocos Norte, of relatively poor but independent parents. His mother died the following year. He was arrested with his father at the age of sixteen for not having fulfilled the tobacco quota required by the state monopoly. In the same year he left for Manila. After two years' private tuition, he entered the College of San Juan de Letran, and from there he enrolled at the University of Santo Tomas where he was a contemporary of Rizal. In 1883 he returned to Vigan to enter the diocesan seminary. He later transferred to the seminary in Manila where he was ordained on 21 December, 1889. Between April, 1890, and December, 1898, he served in five parishes in the provinces of Cavite, Nueva Ecija, Bulacan, Laguna and Tarlac. He was not involved in the 1896 revolution but acted as an intermediary between Archbishop Nozaleza and the revolutionary government in 1898. Aguinaldo appointed him capellan castrense (military chaplain) in mid-1898 and vicario general castrense (military vicar general) in October, 1898. On 15 November 1898, the imprisoned Bishop of Nueva Segovia appointed him Ecclesiastical Governor of the diocese. His exercise of unlawful authority by appointing diocesan priests to high positions was used by Nozaleza to secure his excommunication, in May, 1899, but Aglipay claimed that this was a political move to adjust the policies of the hierarchy to the fact of American rule. He commanded a band of guerrillas from late 1899 until his surrender on 30 April, 1901. His formal consecration as 'Obispo Maximo' of the IFI was on 18 January, 1903. At the age of 79 he married Pilar Jamias. Aglipay died on 1 September, 1940. Achutegui and Bernad, I, passim; Ruiz, op. cit., 13ff; Bibiano E. Figueras, 'Four Noble Prelates of Ilocos', The Philippines Free Press, 19 February, 1949, 14-15; Biography in The Manila Cablenews, 10 January 1904, 6; Biography in The Manila Times, 25 December, 1902; Biography by Capt. Winfield S. Grove, in letter of Grove to Brig. Gen. Henry T. Allen, n.d., in Brent Papers.
As a priest trained in the Roman Catholic Church, the decision was more difficult for him than for de los Reyes or Buencamino. But there were other Roman Catholic priests, notably Father Pedro Brillantes, another Ilocano who was a 'close and warm' friend of Aglipay's, who declared their support for an independent church with less scruple. Father Brillantes supported Aglipay in his struggle with Archbishop Nozaleda in 1899; by 1902 he was advocating election of bishops by the Ilocos clergy and a unified demand that the new Apostolic Delegate should recommend the ratification of their consecration or face schism. \(^{66}\) Libertas, the Dominican newspaper, commented in July, 1902, that Brillantes showed an 'ambition for a bishop's hat'. He was one of the thirteen priests named by de los Reyes, in his speech published in El Grito del Pueblo (the Manila newspaper edited by Pascual Poblete), as bishops in an independent Filipino church. \(^{67}\) Brillantes was the first Aglipayan bishop to be consecrated, taking possession of his diocese of Ilocos Norte on 1 October, 1902. He wrote that 'I shall recognise the Pope if he recognises me' but of course this was impossible. \(^{68}\)

\(^{66}\) Brillantes has been described as Aglipay's 'right hand man' during 1898-1899. Bishop Hevia Campomanes appointed Brillantes vicar foraneo of Ilocos Norte on 20 August, 1898, when Brillantes was acting priest for the parish of Pasuquin. Isabelo de los Reyes described him as 'a model of loyalty' to Aglipay. He died three years after his consecration as Bishop of Ilocos Norte in the IFI, on 25 December, 1906. Achútegui and Bernad, III, doc. 23, 90; I, 194-95; Rodriguez, I, 197; Isabelo de los Reyes, Calendario, 1908, 2; Libertas, 10 July 1902; Rodriguez, II, doc. 67, 298-300.

\(^{67}\) El Grito del Pueblo, 8 August, 1902; and see The Manila American, 9 August, 1902, 1. Achútegui and Bernad doubt whether the 'sensational speech' was actually given; I, 182-83.

\(^{68}\) Letter of 20 October, 1902, quoted in Achútegui and Bernad, I, 194.
Father José Evangelista also accepted consecration as Bishop of Manila in December, 1902. 69

Generally, Aglipay has suffered from a bad press, which is not surprising considering his activities as a guerrilla leader and his leadership of a schismatic church which, except for the five or six years following its declaration, commanded only a small minority of support among a predominantly Roman Catholic population. 70 The contemporary American press ridiculed him as 'the Filipino Pope'. 71 The Cabelnews American described him as 'an ignorant, vulgar, illiterate peasant who has much force of character and considerable ability'. 72 The Episcopalians, who were considering in 1904 an alliance with the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, were just as harsh. In a Private Addendum to his 'Report on the Religious Conditions in the Philippine

69 Ibid. 206-207.

70 In 1918 only 13 per cent of the population, or 1,417,448 Filipinos, were Aglipayans; by 1940 they made up less than ten per cent, and by 1960, little more than five per cent. Achútegui and Bernad, I, 370; Achútegui, 'Religious Revolution in the Philippines; The Iglesia Filipina Independiente - IFI', typescript, Manila, 8 February, 1971, 15. Aglipayan estimates of the membership in 1903 ranged from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 although other sources put the figure at well below 2,000,000 at the height of the schism. When in 1906 the Supreme Court decided that churches taken over by the Aglipayans belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, many congregations returned to the Roman Catholic Church so that they could continue to worship in their local church.

71 See, for instance, the sarcastic poem, 'The Filipino Pope', The Manila American, 10 August, 1902, 4; and the allegations that Aglipay 'The Pope of the Wholly Filipino Independencia Church' had refused 100,000 pesos to recant; Cabelnews American, 1 October, 1905, 1; and the newspaper's flippant retraction, 'Padre Aglipay and that One Hundred Thousand', 3 October, 1905, 4.

72 1 October, 1905, 1.
Islands', the Episcopalian Bishop Charles H. Brent reported to the American House of Bishops that when he first met Aglipay in 1902, he had been warned against him 'as a dangerous man who would not scruple to use anyone who was friendly to him to further his own ambitious schemes'. Mr. Arthur W. Prautch, a local Methodist preacher and friend of Aglipay helped arrange a series of meetings between Brent and Aglipay in June, 1904. Brent felt that he 'had to be frank with him and say that up to that time "I had heard nothing but bad of him"'. Brent concluded after the meetings that Aglipay, like all Filipinos, was 'as fickle as the wind':

The character of the man is constantly assailed, though I have been unable to get at any specific charges beyond those quoted in this report. The Roman authorities, who are distressed and anxious over the success of his movement, are doing everything in their power to undermine his influence.... There is no doubt that he is a selfishly ambitious man, and like a good many Filipinos - and Americans for that matter - he confuses "independence" with "liberty". Having tasted of power, it would be no easy task for him to surrender any of his despotic prerogatives.73

Elsewhere Brent described Aglipay as 'unscrupulous and untrustworthy' and 'too slippery to do anything with'.74 The Rev. Mercer G. Johnston had

73 Charles H. Brent, 'Private Addendum to Report on Religious Conditions in the Philippine Islands'; Brent Papers, Manuscript Div., Library of Congress, Washington. The Report was published in The Missionary Review of the World, XVIII, January, 1905, 49-56, without the Addendum which was 'for bishops only'. The Addendum is quoted in Achútegui and Bernad, 'Brent, Herzog, Morayta, and Aglipay', Philippine Studies, VIII, 1960, 570-71. Two pages of pencilled notes of an interview with Aglipay of 13 June, 1904, also make interesting reading: Aglipay admitted he could not bring all his priests with him if the Episcopalian and Aglipayan Churches were to recognise the other. He was 'ready to go full length' but 'the people [were] probably not'; Brent Papers.

74 Brent to Bishop Hall, 16 March, 1903; Brent to Gen. Henry T. Allen, Boston, 12 October, 1904; in Brent Papers.
even stronger doubts:

I am afraid [Aglipay] is not that rara ava in these adventurous isles, a clean man. I am afraid he is the true son of the Scarlet Woman who, here at least, has rejected the Seventh Commandment of God that she might, for her own ends, keep her tradition of celibacy ... he has not only become an adept in the use of the fleshhook of the three teeth, but he has frequently lain with the women that assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. At any rate he seems to have his quiver full of "nephews".

Johnston warned Brent that he could not see Aglipay consecrated a bishop (in the Episcopalian Church) 'without making good my title of Protestant'.

Johnston blamed the faults he ascribed to Aglipay and the Aglipayan clergy to the corrupting effect of Romanism. 75

Despite widespread distrust among Spaniards and Americans of Aglipay's character and motives, he appears to have been a charismatic and even miraculous figure for the people of Ilocos. 76 It is important to distinguish between those speeches attributed to him but actually written by Apolinario Mabini or Isabelo de los Reyes and those where he spoke for himself. 77 In an article he wrote for the journal, the

---

75 Mercer G. Johnston to Brent, Manila, 30 June, 1904, in Brent Papers. Brent was also disturbed at the 'impurity' of the Roman Catholic and Aglipayan clergy in the Philippines. In his 'Report' he wrote that to counter the 'grave moral laxity' evident in the Philippine Church, to dam 'the filthy stream that trickled into the sanctuary', the hierarchy had to relax the rule of celibacy. Aglipay was prepared to release his clergy from the vow 'were it not that the mass of the natives are not yet in a state to receive it with equanimity'; art. cit., 54; 56. Allegations of Aglipay's supposed immorality appeared in the Roman Catholic press: see the description of Aglipay's carousing in Vigan in 1899 and extracts from alleged diaries of some Filipino nuns in W. Brecknock-Watson, 'Schismatic Comedy', Libertas, 29 December, 1902.

76 Achútegui and Bernad, I, 126-27.

77 His letter to the Filipino clergy of 15 August, 1899, for instance, reveals the influence of Mabini with its insistence on respect for individual right and the law; quoted in Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, II, 116-17. Lewis Bliss Whittemore claims that Aglipay's 'deepest intuitions' linked him to 'the clergy martyrs of the past'; Struggle for Freedom (Greenwich, Connecticut, 1961), 84.
Iglesia Filipina Independiente, of January, 1904, he used an idiom closer to that of the followers of the Katipunan. He disclaimed being the author of the movement to create an independent church:

The cause can be explained in one word - the friars. The various religious orders that infested the Philippines had entirely forgotten the Gospel and the law of God, and during the latter part of their three centuries stay they also defied the law of man. They made and unmade governors by their wealth and power and were the real rulers. Their thousands of unpunished crimes, including the taking of daughters forcibly from families for lust and having those deported who opposed them, have burned into the souls of the people who have not forgotten nor forgiven. Now the day of reckoning has come, and with the assurance of liberty of conscience, we have cast off the yoke of the friars for ever. This separation from Rome is the climax of all the appeals and petitions vainly sent to the Vatican during the past thirty years, by pious Catholic people, to have their real grievances redressed.

He referred to the executions of Burgos, Gomez, and Zamora, 'on the false accusation of the Spanish friars'. God had not forgotten the martyrs 'nor have the outraged Filipino people forgiven the real murderers':

If asked concerning the stability of this movement, I answer it has stuck its roots deep; it has been watered by the blood of martyrs ... it has continued for thirty years, and why should it not continue now under religious liberty?

Aglipay stressed the 'liberalizing influences' at work on the development of the new church and spoke in terms of 'religious progress ... largely influenced by the Bible'. His Unitarian and rationalist theology was far removed from the folk beliefs of his followers, as has been pointed out. But he did identify the schism as the culmination.

78 'Aglipay Writes of His Church', from the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, translation in The Manila Cabilenews, 10 January, 1904, 6.
of the 'internal' revolution which had begun in 1872 and while, in his public statements, he used concepts alien to the values and perceptions of the popular religious tradition of the masses, he at least acknowledged the popular inspiration of the Aglipayan movement, while ilustrado laymen like Buencamino and de los Reyes dismissed indigenous 'superstitions' as 'fanatical'. It was because Aglipay had fought in the revolution even after Aguinaldo's capture, and could respond to the aspirations of the people, that he could command the adherence of a mass following in the new church. For this reason he was considered indispensable by de los Reyes, and even his fellow priests such as Pedro Brillantes unquestioningly conceded his place as religious leader of the movement. 79

The failure of the Taft Mission to Rome to secure Vatican aid in withdrawing the Spanish religious orders from the Philippines, and the news of the proposed apostolic constitution for the Philippine Church finally persuaded Aglipay and those other Filipino priests who still clung to the hope that their struggle with the Spanish clergy would be

79 Isabelo de los Reyes tried to persuade Aglipay to form an independent church soon after his return to the Philippines in October, 1901. They held meetings with the Protestant missionaries, Dr. Homer C. Stuntz, J.C. Goodrich, Leonard P. Davidson, and James B. Rodgers in late 1901 or early 1902. Gen. Allen, Chief of the Philippine Constabulary, was persuaded to assure Aglipay that the United States administration would not oppose the creation of an independent church. 'Biographical Notes on Archbishop Gregorio Aglipay' in Grove to Allen, op. cit.; see also Achutegui and Bernad, I, 249. In February, 1901, de los Reyes had written to an unnamed Filipino priest offering him a bishopric in 'the Filipino church'. The 'question of dogma' in the new church would be 'left to you priests'; Taylor, Insurgent Records, file 630.5; and Philippine Insurrection, I, 516.
resolved for them that open schism was the only solution. The response of the Filipino clergy to the constitution, *Quae mari Sinico* is revealing for the insight it provides into the dilemmas confronting the Filipino clergy in late 1902 and the divisions appearing between radical and conservative factions under the strain of conflicting demands for allegiance. The Vatican had considered issuing a constitution for the Philippine Church in January, 1902, but it was deferred, possibly because preliminary negotiations had begun for a United States mission to make representations concerning the church in the colony. However, news of the proposed constitution leaked out and Filipinos had ample warning that Rome would not vindicate the Filipino clergy or arrange the withdrawal of the friars. On 10 January, 1902, *The Manila American* carried a report of a Papal Apostolic Constitution 'which will settle ecclesiastical questions in the Philippines definitely'. The reported constitution was much the same as the actual constitution signed in September and brought by Guidi and promulgated on 8 December, 1902,

almost a year after the newspaper summary. The final constitution, *Quae mari Sinico*, had been seen by the Aglipayans before Guidi's arrival so that Aglipay was able to publish a reply to it on the same day that it was officially promulgated from Manila Cathedral.

The promulgation of the Apostolic Constitution created intense hostility among many of the Filipino clergy and their supporters. The *Iglesia Filipina Independiente* had formally existed for over three months and, as de Achutegui and Bernad point out, the new church had already been given form and substance in the first three Epistles issued by Aglipay on the 2, 17 and 29 October of 1902. *Epistola III* of 17 October, 1902, contained a declaration of principles which clearly affirmed separation from Rome as absolute, 'not only because of the very human question of the spoliation and disregard of the Filipino clergy in its offices and ecclesiastical properties but principally because of the imperative need to re-establish in all its splendour the cult of the unique God truly and purely through His holy words, words which under the

---

81 The report in January claimed that the constitution was to be issued 'in a few days'. The first part of the constitution was said to recount the history of the Church in the islands; the second to explain necessary disciplinary measures for the clergy; and the third to explain the actual organisation of the Church. A provincial council of Manila was to be called by which the ecclesiastical laws made by the council of Archbishops and Bishops of Latin America in Rome in 1899 would be extended to the Philippines, with modifications. The secular and regular clergies would continue as at present, but four or five new dioceses would be created and Americans would take charge of them; The *Manila American*, 10 January, 1902, 1.

82 Lewis Bliss Whittemore, *Struggle for Freedom; History of the Philippine Independent Church* (Greenwich, Connecticut, 1961), 110. Aglipay's reply to the Apostolic Constitution is his *Epistola V* of 8 December, 1902, published in the *Doctrina y Reglas Consitucionales de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente* (Manila, 1904), 72-79. De Achutegui and Bernad believe that Isabelo de los Reyes probably wrote the epistle; I, op. cit., 206, n.43.
reign of obscurantism had been deadened and disfigured...'.

But while the 'religious slavery' of Rome and the friars had been emphatically thrown off by the Aglipayans in August, the Apostolic Constitution was more than a 'disappointment' to Filipinos and the document had more influence on dividing the Philippine Church than de Achútegui and Bernad allow. The American scholar, James A. Robertson commented that

The letter was criticised from one end of the Philippines to the other as being pro-friar and as giving no relief to the Filipinos. Guidi, who was a man of great good sense, counseled that the wishes of the people be met so far as possible, but he was unable to stem the tide of revolt aroused again by the letter. The excitement caused by the formal launching of the schism, great as it had been, was not equal to that brought about by the resentment against the letter and the fear lest friar rule be once more established. The consequence was that many who would have nothing to do with the schism before now embraced it eagerly, and it grew rapidly.

The Constitution confirmed the worst fears of Catholics who had refused to support the Iglesia Filipina Independiente in August; James A. LeRoy observed in 1904 that 'the Filipinos, even the more conservative, almost unanimously interpreted it as a pro-friar document ... [and] opposition to the bull has for nearly a year back given the schism, born of mere agitators, the moral status of a real popular movement'. Its promulgation 'greatly complicated Monsignor Guidi's mission of conciliation - in fact, practically rendered it a failure'. Its unpopularity

---

83 Epistola III, Manila, 17 October, 1902, in Doctrina y Reglas Constitucionales, ibid., 56.

84 Religious Revolution in the Philippines, III, op. cit., 203-204.

'has been the chief cause of the growth of the schism in the Philippines' and, 'many conservative Filipinos not identified [with Aglipay] are openly sympathetic' to the schismatic church. Even among loyal Catholics, 'a movement frankly hostile to the new American bishops has, directly in consequence of the terms of the bull, lately been agitating the ranks of those loyal to Rome'.

James A. Robertson believed that after the publication of _Quae mari Sinico_

There was no longer thought of an accord with Rome. The schism received new recruits every moment from all parts of the Archipelago. Now the Independent Church received the impetus which was to bind it together and give it the force that might make it a serious antagonist of Mother Church. Filipinos, on finding that there was no hint in the letter of a withdrawal of the friars, declared that they were being fed once more on promises of secularization which would never materialize. They saw in the letter, indeed, as was said, only an intention on the part of the papacy to fasten the friars upon them forever.

As well as Aglipay's own commentary on the Apostolic Constitution a number of other contemporary analyses of it have survived: the discussion by LeRoy in his article in _The Independent_; the enthusiastically approving analysis of the Filipino priests, Father Manuel E. Roxas and Father Mariano Sevilla; and the reply to their defence by the Aglipayan Ilocano priest, Father Pío Romero.

---

86 James A. LeRoy, 'Protestant View of the Catholic Church in the Philippine Islands', reprinted from _The Independent_, in _The Manila Cabelenews_, Sunday Supplement, 6 March, 1904, 5. See also LeRoy's discussion of _Quae mari Sinico_ in _Philippine Life in Town and Country_, op. cit., 91-92, where he describes it as 'written almost as if in vindication of the friars', with 'an almost open contempt for the Filipino clergy'.

87 Robertson, _art. cit._, 331.

88 Manuel E. Roxas, _Consideraciones sobre la Constitución Apostólica Quae mari Sinico_ del 17 de Setiembre de 1902, with the _Reflexiones_ of Mariano Sevilla (Bulakan?, January, 1903); Pío Romero, _Mi Ultimo de Alarma al clero secular de Filipinas ó sea Refutacion a las 'Consideraciones sobre la Constitución Pontificia QUAE MARI SINICO' publicados por el Licenciado Sr. D. Manuel Roxas_ (Vigan, 1903).
The bitter exchange between Fathers Roxas and Pío Romero was particularly significant given their previous collaboration with Aglipay in Vigan in 1899. Pío Romero had been a major influence on the clergy of Nueva Segovia in rallying them behind Aglipay at the time of his excommunication in April of that year. Acting as Aglipay's secretary, he issued an order on 21 July, 1899, instructing the clergy to destroy any copies of the decree of excommunication that should come into their hands. He was one of the two priests from Ilocos Sur to immediately join the Iglesia Filipina Independiente in August, 1902. After Roxas had declined, Romero was nominated Aglipayan Bishop of Rizal. Rodriguez describes him as the real author of many documents which appeared under Aglipay's signature, and as 'the most intelligent and audacious' priest among the Vigan clergy. Father Romero had been a professor in the seminary at Vigan in 1899 and had persuaded other members of the faculty to support Aglipay in his struggle with the Spanish hierarchy. In 1899, Pío Romero was excommunicated by Archbishop Nozaleda at the same time as Aglipay for 'contumacious disobedience'. In

89 Pío Romero to the Parish Curates and other priests of the Vicartex of Isabela and Nueva Vizcaya, 21 June, 1899, Document 76 in de Achutegui and Bernad, III, op. cit., 208-209. General Tinio had already warned Bishop Hevia Campomanes against appointing Pío Romero as ecclesiastical governor because he was 'Aglipay's right hand man'; General Manuel Tinio to Bishop Hevia Campomanes, Vigan, 24 October, 1899, Document 87, in de Achutegui and Bernad, ibid., 236-37. See also Isacio Rodriguez, II, op. cit., 207.

90 De Achutegui and Bernad, I, op. cit., 228.

91 Rodriguez, I, op. cit., 242ff. Pío Romero acted as secretary of the Paniqui Conference of 23 October, 1899; see Chapter III.

92 Ibid., II, 271.
1898, Father Roxas had identified passionately with the cause of the Filipino clergy as a letter from him to President Emilio Aguinaldo reveals. Speaking on behalf of the clergy of the Philippines he thanked Aguinaldo for presenting the cause of the Filipino clergy to General Otis thus bringing to the attention of the whole world the plight of the Filipino clergy under the friars. Spain and the Spanish religious orders had terribly persecuted the native clergy, making martyrs of the priests tortured in Vigan (in 1896) and perpetrating a 'Filipino Golgotha' by executing Fathers Burgos, Zamora and Gomez in 1872 and the three priests from the Camarines, Fathers Díaz, Herrera and Prieto, in 1897. The Filipino clergy could no longer accept Spanish friars as parish priests or positions as coadjutors under foreigners, nor should Spaniards act as Bishops or Archbishops. On behalf of the Filipino clergy he declared with all his heart their unconditional adhesion to the Filipino cause. Roxas and Pío Romero collaborated in 1899 in publishing what Rodríguez calls 'absurdly wild defences' of their leader, Aglipay. It was because of this involvement with Aglipay in 1898-1899 that Roxas was named Bishop of Rizal in the new church in August, 1902, an appointment which he strongly repudiated in a protest published in

93 Manual E. Roxas y Manio to Emilio Aguinaldo, [15 November, 1898] Document 38 in Rodríguez, II, op. cit., 219-21, and see Insurgent Records, 208.8. See also Chapter III.

94 Rodríguez, II, ibid., 244. See also Fray Florentino Fernández, Historia de las conquistas de Cagayán por los revolucionarios Tagalos y de la prisión y cautiverio de los padres Dominicos, ministros evangelicos en dicho valle, reproduced as Document 50, in Rodríguez, II.
Libertas soon after. 95

Pío Romero and Roxas represented in their opposite reactions to the Constitution, Quae mari Sinico, the division it provoked among the Filipino clergy. Roxas, at the time of writing his Consideraciones, was a parish priest in Bulacan, re-establishing himself in the Roman Catholic Church. 96 In early 1900 he still hoped that the Filipino people, after all their sacrifices, could find independence but by the end of the year he was apparently convinced that the clergy had to accept the fact of American rule and adjust to it. Father Mariano Sevilla was probably influential in persuading Roxas and some other Filipino priests to accept the new order and to return to the Roman Catholic Church. 97

95 For the announcement of the bishops chosen by de los Reyes and Aglipay see The Manila American, 9 August, 1902, 1; and for Roxas' Protesta, see Libertas, 16 August, 1902; and de Achútegui and Bernad, I, 185.

96 For an indication of Father Roxas' reactions to the visit of Chapelle and the imposition of American rule, see the letters of P.P. Roxas, and Regino García to him in 1900: P.P. Roxas to Manuel E. Roxas, Paris, July, 1900; and Regino García to Roxas, Manila, 14 January, 1900; in Taylor, Insurgent Records, Roxas Papers, file 623. Father Roxas corresponded with Fathers Sevilla and Consunji on the possibility that the first Apostolic Delegate, Chapelle, could resolve the religious divisions among the clergy in early January, 1900, and his change of mind probably began in that period; see José Consunji and Mariano Sevilla to Manuel Roxas, Manila, 3 January, 1900, in Taylor, Insurgent Records, ibid.

97 For examples of Sevilla's appeals to other Filipino priests in 1900 to reaffirm their loyalty to Rome and to accept the American regime, see the circulars and petitions in his papers, Taylor, Insurgent Records, file 619. Father Sevilla represented in his career the trials endured by the Filipino priest who remained loyal to Rome while sympathising with the nationalist cause. He was deported to Guam in 1872 by the Spaniards and again to Guam on 7 January, 1901, by the Americans: see Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, op. cit., 95; and Taylor, ibid.
By the time of Quae maris Sinico his reconversion was complete. The arguments Roxas advanced in his Consideraciones in 1903 were the opposite of those he put forward in 1898 and 1899. The exchange between the two men symbolised the wider confrontation between those priests who accepted or rejected Roman authority and the right of Spanish bishops to resume control of the church prior to handing it over to Americans.

The Constitution was written in the lofty and cautious style usual in contemporary papal documents. The clauses dealing with the secular clergy were balanced by those concerned with the regular clergy and, superficially, there was an attempt at even-handedness in the pronouncements made on each. Nevertheless, it made no concession to the major demand of the Filipino clergy that they have Filipino bishops. LeRoy warned that while Americans might consider the bull reasonable enough, Filipinos considered it confirmed their worst fears that the friars were to continue to control the parishes and, even more seriously, to continue to dominate the Philippine Church by using their role as advisers to the new bishops. Americans who had no suspicion of a 'friar plot' could interpret the Constitution as decreeing that the Church was to be secularised gradually and the friars were to be eventually relegated to mission work and teaching positions in the colleges and seminaries:

But think as we may about the bull, we may as well face the fact that the Filipinos almost unanimously put the darkest interpretation possible on every clause of it, and regard it as a frankly pro-friar document ... they call attention to its very brief notice of the services of the native priests and the oft-repeated injunctions about stricter discipline among them, as evidence that the friar view as to the permanent subordination of the native clergy is vindicated; they believe the new American bishops' "consultors" will invariably be friars who will prejudice them accordingly; they say reform in the seminaries and education of native priests has been promised periodically for two hundred years with very little result ......
LeRoy thought that Americans also had cause to be disappointed with *Quae mari Sinico*. During the negotiations with the Taft Mission in July, 1902, the Vatican had verbally promised Governor Taft that the friars would be withdrawn from the Philippines 'as rapidly as possible'. Taft had stated this publicly on his arrival back in Manila. The Constitution made it obvious even to the most optimistic American reader that the friars were to remain permanently in the Philippines. 98

De Achútegui and Bernad have pointed out that in fact the Apostolic Constitution contained changes which while not immediately sweeping, were destined to have far-reaching consequences. The most important provisions were the suppression of the Patronato, the proposed creation of new dioceses, the suppression of the ancient privileges of the regular clergy in the Philippines and the evident desire that the Filipino clergy should be better trained and increased in number. 99

As an analysis of Filipino criticisms of the Constitution will show, however, the secular clergy was well aware that *Quae mari Sinico* recognised only those changes which were already facts. The Patronato could not be continued under an American regime committed to separation of church and state. The few hundred regular clergy left by 1902 could not resume the control of the great majority of parishes which they controlled in 1896. By allowing the friars to act as consultors to the bishops, the Constitution increased their influence as far as possible within the circumstances of 1902.

98 LeRoy, *cit.*

99 Achútegui and Bernad, I, 205-206.
Indeed, barely concealed by the judicious phrasing of the document, it is possible to see a comprehensive plan to preserve as much of the Spanish church into the twentieth century as possible. The hostility to Chapelle from Filipinos and Americans had made the need for tact apparent to the Vatican but the implications of the Constitution are that Rampolla and Leo XIII agreed with the Bishops of the Manila council of 1900 that, as far as practicable, the Philippine Church should be kept out of Filipino hands.

The Constitution opens with a short history of the evangelisation of the Philippines. The Preface acknowledges that the change of sovereignty from Spain to the United States ended the application of the Patronato real by which the Spanish kings had accepted responsibility for the Philippine Church:

and thus it is, that the Church came to be placed in more favorable conditions for liberty, each party preserving its respective rights, intact and secure.

Manuel Roxas believed that this concession to the new order was the most important part of a 'transcendental' document which called the Philippine Church to a higher level of perfection and as an example the countries of the East for their religious destiny. By accepting the extinction of the Patronato, the Holy See had reduced Spaniards, including Spanish friars, to mere foreigners with no more right to interfere in the Philippine Church than Frenchmen or Belgians. 'All those sad questions over Prelacies and parishes which inflamed hostility have ceased because the Spanish

100 Constitución Apostólica de S.S. el Papa Leon XIII para las islas filipinas, en Latin, Castellano, Ingles, Tagalo, Ilocano y Visaya (Manila, 1902).
religious can no longer claim rights or privileges to rule the parishes, nor appeal to the Patronato which could make presentation of Prelacies'. The Provincial Synod, prefigured in the Constitution, would establish a new ecclesiastical order in the Philippines. 

Pío Romero rejected this claim that the church had won greater liberty 'by the fortunes of war': the only liberty had been won for Belgians, Frenchmen and others who could now take up parishes and bishoprics in the islands. The Filipino clergy had won no greater freedom: only the Roman Church had won an advantage from the Spanish defeat.

The approval of the Vatican of the new religious liberty now possible in the islands, and a complimentary reference to the Taft Mission to Rome, were, as LeRoy noted, a 'graceful compliment' to the United States (although he wondered how Catholic Spain would regard it). Many of the Filipino clergy, however, while welcoming the end of the Patronato and the unique powers of the Spanish Court over the Philippine Church, did not accept the American insistence on an 'absolute' separation of church and state, as they had demonstrated during the Malolos debates on religion in late 1898. Some were suspicious of the forthcoming Provincial Council. Pío Romero warned that the friars would try to use it to reimpose 'slavery "world without end, Amen"'.

The Constitution is divided into twelve clauses, the first of which deals with the new division of dioceses. The existing dioceses were too large and too heavily populated to be administered effectively and so,

101 Roxas, op. cit., 7-8.

102 Pío Romero, op. cit., 9-10.
while preserving the Archdiocese of Manila and the dioceses of Cebú, Nueva Cáceres, Nueva Segovía and Jaro, four new dioceses would be erected: Lipa, Tuguegarao, Capiz and Zamboanga. The Marianas Islands would be created a Prefecture Apostolic directly administered from Rome. Father Roxas believed that this first clause demonstrated the new freedom of the Vatican to direct the affairs of the Philippine Church unencumbered by the Patronato. Previously, such a redivision of ecclesiastical organisation would have required Spanish approval. The Holy See was also free to appoint to the new dioceses bishops of its own choice whereas before, the Spanish Kings had that right and naturally they always presented Spaniards and usually friars. Roxas supposed that the forthcoming Provincial Council would legislate on the appointment of bishops, hinting that this would allow Filipinos to be chosen. The erection of a Prefecture Apostolic, in Roxas' view, confirmed the rest of the Philippines as a normal church and not one of 'the category of infidel countries administered by missionaries as China and other regions are'. The nine dioceses constituted 'a perfect Hierarchy with its proper parishes and ordinary bishops'.

Pío Romero dismissed with contempt Roxas' 'gratuitous suppositions' that the Provincial Council would control the appointment of bishops. It would not be possible for Filipinos to influence the choice of bishops or to prevent those who desired the elimination of the Filipino clergy from gaining power. As for the creation of a Prefecture Apostolic: did not this prove that the Pope did indeed regard the Philippines as a land of infidels. The Pope did not respect the Filipinos' national dignity.
nor think of them as anything but servile. LeRoy observed that at the time the increase in the number of dioceses was announced 'the Vatican informally promised the appointment of one or more Filipino bishops'. Those Filipino priests who believed with Father Roxas that the Constitution opened the way for the appointment of Filipino bishops were angered when, in July, 1903, it finally became clear that the proposed redivision of the church was not to take place for some time, and that the existing dioceses were to be filled with American bishops. The demand for a Filipino bishop recurs constantly in the arguments produced by Filipino priests in 1902 and 1903. Those Iloilo priests who petitioned Guidi in January and February, 1903, rejected the Apostolic Constitution as founded on a fictitious view of the real situation and as confirming the Spanish religious orders in their dominance of the Filipino secular clergy. Their consciences made it necessary for them to warn him that they would resist the imposition of the Constitution and would not obey it. The Spanish bishop in charge of the Diocese of Jaro, they argued, should be removed and an ecclesiastical governor elected by the Jaro clergy put in his place. Aglipay himself believed that 'the marvellous spread of the separation from Rome' was due to the Papal Delegate, Guidi, who 'deliberately changed the recently printed papal promise to appoint four Filipino bishops by appointing American bishops in their stead':

104 Pío Romero, op. cit., 10-12.


106 Silvestre Apura and Práxedes Magalona to Juan Bautista Guidi, Molo (Iloilo), 12 January, 1903, copy in Newberry Library, Chicago.
This was a crafty Jesuit trick to introduce the 'ruling nation question' by making it appear that our opposition is to the Americans instead of the friar-ruled American bishops. We resent the sending of French, Italian, Hottentot or any other friar-controlled priests to rule us. We have capable Filipino priests of our own to govern our Church and in the same manner as the American Civil Commission recognized the ability of Filipinos to sit on the Supreme Court, be Governors of Provinces, and even Commissioners, we demand recognition; and having been refused by the Church of the Italian Cardinals we have established our own Filipino Independent Catholic Church.107

Those members of the clergy of Iloilo and Ilocos Sur who had refused to join Aglipay in late 1902, temporarily defied Church authority in 1903 when it became apparent that the demands for a Filipino bishop were to be ignored.

The second clause of the Constitution set out the relationship between the Metropolitan Archbishop of Manila and the suffragan bishops which was to continue 'as set forth in the ecclesiastical laws already in existence' but informed by strengthened bonds of 'love and charity'. Roxas interpreted this unexceptional statement to mean that the Holy See had decreed that 'the time of privileges and exceptions is past' and that the church would be governed by more regular conventions henceforward.108 Pío Romero believed that the contrary was true: the friars had increased their hold on the church by gaining control of the offices of Canons attached to the Cathedrals, offices which before had been held by secular priests.109

107 'Aglipay writes of his Church', The Manila Cablenews, 10 January 1904, 6; taken from the Independent.


The third clause advised that a College of Canons should continue in Manila, the offices to be conferred by the Archbishop except those reserved to the Holy See or subject to election or patronage. The other Cathedrals were also to establish Colleges of Canons and until this could be done, the bishops were to choose as consultors 'individuals distinguished in piety, learning and executive ability, chosen from one or other body of the clergy'. If for any reason, they should be unable to act as advisers, the bishops would supply their places 'with others chosen from the most worthy of the rest of the clergy, secular as well as regular'. LeRoy observed that it was this clause which Filipino critics of the Constitution interpreted as opening the way for the new bishops to be dominated by 'friar advisers'. Roxas believed that as Spaniards no longer enjoyed the special rights conferred by the Patronato, the appointment of regular priests as Cathedral Canons and episcopal advisers did not mean Spanish friars would have most influence in the new hierarchy: consultors could be Italians, French or of any other nation. Romero pointed out that under Spain, the regular clergy were not permitted to act as Canons, and that the Constitution gave them greater influence than before.

The fourth clause dealt with the means for filling a temporarily vacant see. Clause five was particularly controversial and aroused a great deal of opposition from the Filipino clergy who believed that they had been unfairly singled out for censure. The Filipino press alleged that the clause on 'The Secular Clergy' was merely a polite way of denying them their rights. LeRoy's opinion was that 'the most favorable Filipino opinion expressed of it has been that it merely repeated, and in terms less strong and definite than usual, promises of secularization of the Philippine Church made at intervals during the last two hundred years'.
The Constitution began by conceding that 'as experience has clearly shown that in every part of the world a native clergy is of great utility, let the bishops procure with all diligence that the number of native priests be increased, in such a way however, that those who are entrusted with the ecclesiastical functions be prepared beforehand in all piety and discipline and be known to be worthy of having such offices conferred upon them'. The Filipino clergy who proved themselves worthy were to be 'gradually promoted to higher dignities'. The clergy were warned that they were not to be guided by partisanship. Common law prohibited those in the service of God from engaging in secular business, but, in the circumstances, the Constitution declared that 'this must be avoided in a particular manner in the Philippine Islands by men who belong to the ecclesiastical state'. Since union of mind was essential to every great and useful enterprise, all priests, without exception, 'whether they belong to the secular clergy or the regular [must] cultivate in a most special manner this union of mind for the good of Religion'. It was becoming that those who constituted the one body of which Christ was the head should not bear envy one to another but should love one another with fraternal charity. The bishops were to convocate Synods as often as possible to promote this charity and to preserve strict discipline. Priests should be required at least once every three years to make retreats. The clergy were to be encouraged to undertake spiritual exercises and to hold conferences on points of morals and liturgy. Roxas thought this

110 This section is similar to the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of 12 July, 1900, printed in Libertas, 11 September, 1900, ordering Filipino priests to remain aloof from internal political struggles and to avoid factional feeling.
section was 'intelligent' and 'obvious and natural', while stressing the requirement that priests should not involve themselves in secular affairs. Romero observed that the paragraph more properly applied to the friars than to the Filipino clergy for the friars were involved in Spain and in the Philippines in political struggles to maintain their privileges and powers.

Each bishop was advised to use every means to support a seminary in their diocese, by clause six of the Constitution. The seminarians should 'never without grave cause ... be given permission to return to their families'. The government of the seminary should be entrusted by the Bishop 'to the most deserving person, whether he belong to the secular or to the regular clergy'. Only those who 'having been diligently trained in science and virtue, may be an ornament and benefit to the diocese' should be ordained. During at least the first five years after ordination priests should be obliged to undergo annual examinations in dogma and morals, Chosen seminarians should be sent to Rome where a house was to be opened for the most promising Filipinos.

This Holy See on its part, will take care that the best means be provided for raising the secular clergy to the highest culture and for giving them the best ecclesiastical formation, to the end that in due time they may be fit to replace the regular clergy in fulfilling the duties of the pastoral charge.

LeRoy found that Filipinos reacted to this clause by saying that it meant the friars were to stay indefinitely in the parishes as well as continuing to control the seminaries. Roxas believed that the Constitution was correct in implying that Filipino priests suffered from inadequate preparation, although they possessed great capacities. They had carried on the faith for six difficult years during the revolution, but now they would benefit from the new training to be offered by the seminaries.
Romero thought that training in Rome would probably corrupt rather than improve Filipino seminarians. The Filipino clergy should train their own seminarians, as they had done in the seminary at Vigan until 1872 with the Vincentian Fathers assisting them. Filipino secular priests were more attached to the bishop than members of independent religious orders and inspired greater trust among their Filipino students. The imposition of foreign priests as instructors in the seminaries was an insult to the capacity and virtue of the native clergy. Roxas had offered the Filipino clergy an 'immense insult' in attacking their character. The real defenders of the Filipino clergy had been Filipinos like Father Burgos and not foreign regulars. The Filipino clergy had indeed carried the faith during the six difficult years of revolution but now were they to be discarded as useless by the Holy See? Romero pointed out that the vague promise in the phrase 'that in due time they may be fit to replace the regular clergy' was indefinite and actually confirmed the regular clergy in their control of the parishes.¹¹¹ The editor of Father Pío Romero's analysis, the former Augustinian friar who had joined the Aglipayans, Salvador Pons y Torres, added his own comments on this clause of the Constitution. He believed that Father Roxas had not been following his conscience in claiming that the Filipino clergy were ill-prepared for the task of administering the parishes. They had proved their devotion and capacity in the six years of revolution during which they were left alone to serve the church without the benefit of even a pastoral letter. The real causes of any deficiencies in the Filipino clergy could be traced to the deliberate policy adopted by the bishops

¹¹¹ Romero, op. cit., 17-23.
and the religious orders to reduce them to assistants. The Holy Spirit apparently wished that the Pope should always be an Italian and the clergy of Spain Spaniards. Was it a crime that the Filipino clergy held the noble and legitimate aspiration that was held by the Roman, Spanish, French and other clergies? If the United States had a cosmopolitan clergy it was because the United States was a cosmopolitan nation; but the Philippines was not cosmopolitan but a true nation historically and ethnographically speaking where the general practice of the Church of establishing an ecclesiastical government composed of elements of the country ought to apply. If this did not happen it would be the fault of Father Roxas and other timid and fearful companions of his if the Philippines had to experience a 'small hurricane'.

The seventh clause dealt with religious education of the laity in church schools, urging the Bishops to take effective measures so that the books used were not tainted with error. The Dominican university merited the praise of the Holy See for 'the integrity of its doctrine', 'the excellence of its doctors' and the great service it had rendered. The University was confirmed in its title of Pontifical University. Roxas briefly commented that this clause affirmed that generally the Filipino people were sufficiently instructed in religion and that their previous [religious] customs were worthy to be continued.

In article eight, the Holy See promised that 'taking advantage of the new order of things which has come to pass in these regions', it would provide for 'those members of the religious orders who wished to return to the mode of life set down in their institute'. The Holy See

most earnestly enjoined upon all the members of the religious orders that they religiously fulfil the obligations which they took upon themselves when they pronounced their vows, "giving no offence to any man". The laws of enclosure were to be inviolably kept and the religious were to be bound by the Decree of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars of 20 July, 1731, confirmed by Clement XII in the Apostolic Letter, Nuper pro parte of the same year. The rule and limits of the enclosure of regular clergy were to be fixed according to the other decree on this matter laid down by the Propaganda Fide on 24 August, 1780 with the approbation of Pius VI. All religious living in the Philippines were to be careful above all things to render all reverence and obedience to those whom "the Holy Ghost hath placed to rule the Church of God"... and united with the secular clergy by the strictest bonds of accord and charity, let them have nothing more at heart than to employ all their energy in the work of their ministry, and to be all of one mind, to the edification of Christ's body.

To the end 'that every element of discord be completely rooted out, the clergy were in future to observe the Constitution Firmandis promulgated by Benedict XIV on 7 November, 1744, and the Romanos Pontifices of 8 March, 1881, by which Leo himself had decided various points of controversy between the bishops and the missionaries of England and Scotland.113

Father Roxas' response to this clause was enthusiastic. With serenity and love, from the height of the Vatican, the Supreme Pontiff had examined the vicissitudes of the Philippine clergies and declared that the domination of one clergy by the other would cease and the church would be governed by the common, usual rule applied elsewhere.

113 LeRoy, art. cit. See also Chapter IV, 373.
The regulars would continue to be an important factor and useful for the care of the faithful, as they were elsewhere, but they would no longer enjoy the privileges of the Spanish period. Both clergies were to be united in charity. Critics of the Constitution pointed out that, whatever the implied rebuke to the regular clergy in the admonition to obey the hierarchy and to forget past bitterness, it did not suggest that the regular clergy should withdraw from the parishes and return to the cloistered life: this would merely be supported if individuals wished to make that choice. Pío Romero believed that the Vatican's exhortations for reconciliation were dangerous. The Filipinos hated the friars for the most weighty and deepest of reasons and such hatred indicated the abuses the friars had perpetrated. The Roman Pontiff knew that the friars had governed the Philippine Church despotically with the whip: they hated the Filipinos and the Filipinos repaid them in kind. The whole world knew this, however loving and serene the Vatican pretended to be. A loving, just Pope would separate his children if he saw that they wished each other dead. Rather than the friars being an important factor for the good of the Filipinos, their presence provoked hatred and mutual enmity. They deceived the people with false oaths and miracles. The reconciliation recommended by the Apostolic Constitution would be violent and destructive. The friars of today were consumed not so much by religious fervour as by the fervour for omnipotent power in political and religious affairs, for the freedom to live alone with their millions in gold. The riches accumulated by the religious orders had caused the ruin and the relaxation of the monastic Rule in past centuries; such wealth alone was reason enough for the religious corporations
to be banished. The Epistola V of Gregorio Aglipay interpreted the clause as encouraging the return of the friars to the parishes. The Pope had decreed that the friars and the secular clergy should unite but there would not be concord and charity because the friars would usurp the secular clergy of its rights and treat it as they had before. 

Article nine decreed that the bishops were to decide which parishes were to be entrusted to the religious orders after having conferred with the Superiors of those orders. If any dispute should arise over such appointments which could not be settled privately, the case should be brought before the Apostolic Delegate, Father Roxas admitted that this paragraph had provoked diverse interpretations but, in his view, it was reasonable for the regular clergy to have charge of parishes because the Filipino secular clergy could not minister to all Christians in the Philippines. Further, he argued that the Constitution referred to the religious orders in general and not specifically to the Spanish regulars who had previously controlled ecclesiastical discipline in the islands. He assumed that the friars would not return, in any case, to parishes served by Filipino priests, although the Constitution was silent on this. Father Pío Romero thought that the Filipino clergy had demonstrated over the past six years that they could fulfil the needs of the church even under the most difficult circumstances. The text of this paragraph was clear and explicit and did not require Father Roxas' But

114 Romero, op cit., 27-29.
115 In Doctrina y Reglas, op. cit., 76.
116 Roxas, op. cit., 12.
'considerations' on its 'transcendental' meaning: it simply signified that the friars were to return to the parishes that they had controlled before; even though there were Filipino clergy presently ministering to those parishes, they were to be regarded as vacant.\textsuperscript{117} The clause on the parishes was described in Aglipay's Epistle as absolutely in favour of the friars and absolutely unfavourable to the Filipinos. It ignored the provisions of the Council of Trent. The text of the paragraph on the parishes revealed clearly the 'malicious intent' of the Constitution. Perhaps it was only fitting that the Filipino Roman priests should quickly, lose their parishes by hanging to the skirts of the astute friars.\textsuperscript{118}

The clause on Missions, the tenth in the Constitution, urged that at least one house be established in each province where some eight Religious might reside whose only obligation would be to visit the faithful in the cities and towns and cultivate the spiritual life of the community through sacred preaching. Particularly in areas 'still uncivilized and given to the barbarous worship of idols', stations should be established for the priests engaged in missionary work. Such stations should be situated so that later they could be raised to Prefectures and Vicariates Apostolic when the needs of the converts required it. To support the cost of such work, each diocese was to form societies of men and women whose task was to collect offerings from the faithful for a mission fund administered by the bishop. The Aglipayan Epistle merely comments that the friars themselves were idols set up for the poor.

\textsuperscript{117} Romero, op. cit. 29-30.

\textsuperscript{118} Doctrina y Reglas, op. cit., 76.
Filipinos to worship. LeRoy indicates some confusion among Filipino commentators on this clause: they pointed out, he writes, that under Catholic Spain the number of monasteries established outside Manila was strictly limited to three for each order. In fact, the Constitution does not require each order to establish a religious house in each diocese but for at least one order to do so.

The eleventh paragraph of the Constitution is concerned with ecclesiastical discipline and enjoins the clergy to practise in deeds what they teach by their words. The people looked to the priests as models to be imitated; thus,

it is absolutely necessary that the clergy should have lives and manners so completely ordered that nothing may be seen but what is grave, moderate, and religious, in their dress, deportment, words, and all other things....

For the restoration of discipline and for the execution of the Apostolic Constitution the Apostolic Delegate Extraordinary had been sent to the islands. The Delegate had been instructed to take proper measures to announce a Provincial Synod as soon as circumstances permitted.

Father Roxas considered this plan to hold a Provincial Synod the sublime provision of the Constitution. The appointment of an Apostolic Delegate with extraordinary powers indicated that the Holy See recognised the gravity of recent events in the Catholic Philippines. Councils had been used in the church before to suppress heresy and other evils or to reestablish and perfect ecclesiastical discipline. The Philippine Council would reunite the Philippine ecclesiastical authorities and reestablish peace in the church. Pio Romero ridiculed Roxas'

Aglipay also asks why the Vatican should send missionaries to cities and towns; Doctrina y Reglas, op. cit., 77.

Roxas, op. cit., 13-14.
confidence in the Apostolic Delegate and the Council. So far, the Delegate had achieved nothing (by 1903); whether the Council would materialise and whether it would benefit the secular clergy were doubtful. 121

The concluding section of the Constitution exhorted the people of the Philippines to preserve unity and peace as members of the Brotherhood of Christ. The good of religion which was the source of the virtues which in the past had flourished among the people of the Philippines demanded it. The country could gain nothing but harm and misfortune from public disturbance.

Let reverence be paid to those in authority, according to the precept of the Apostle, "for all authority is of God" (Rom. XIII, 2).

The Holy See was separated from the Philippines by distance but its people were under its patronage and particular love.

The Constitution ended with a paragraph declaring null any earlier ecclesiastical provisions applied in the Philippines and forbidding anyone to 'violate or to presume to contradict' this Constitution. The Holy See made its own conception of authority clear in the final warning that if anyone did presume to criticise the Apostolic Constitution he would incur the indignation of Almighty God and the Apostles Peter and Paul. All Catholics were obliged to accept its provisions without question as the definitive statement on the character and organisation of the Philippine Church.

The Dominican journal Libertas made it obvious in its comments on the Constitution that the religious orders interpreted it as a

121 Pio Romero, 31-33,
vindication of their stand during the revolution, and the determination of their superiors (on Chapelle's order) to resume parish work once the first Apostolic Delegate had advised them that this was the proper course for them to follow. Libertas argued that those Filipino priests who criticised the Constitution necessarily fell into schism because they refused to accept the authority of the Pope to act as head of the church. Any distinction between his general power or his authority of right and his authority to act was spurious; such distinctions undermined the social order as well as ecclesiastical discipline.\textsuperscript{122}

Libertas was accused of denigrating the Filipino clergy in a series of articles published from late December, 1902, into January, 1903, which stressed the authority of the Constitution and the obligation of Filipino priests to accept it. An anonymous Ilocano priest in an article included in Pío Romero's attack on Father Roxas denied that the Constitution was binding on the Filipino clergy, quoting the writings of theologians who claimed that papal decrees could be interpreted as threatening the particular interest of religion in a particular area, and that therefore the parish priest could suspend their application 'in the privacy of his own parish'. The Pope was the supreme head of the church but he governed in two ways: divinely and humanly. When he made infallible pronouncements on Faith and Morals he was acting as divine head of the church but in other matters he could be mistaken.\textsuperscript{123} Such arguments were directed to those

\textsuperscript{122} See the series of articles, 'La táctica sectaria y la Constitución Apóstolica' in Libertas, December and January, 1902-1903, particularly the issue for 12 January, 1903.

\textsuperscript{123} 'Un Clerigo Ilocano', 'Disertación Canonica', in Pío Romero, op. cit., 38-43.
priests who had refused to join Aglipay in August but who could not accept the Apostolic Constitution in December.

The reaction to the Constitution was more extreme among the clergy who had already broken away from Rome. In the Aglipayan view, the Pope had demonstrated in the Constitution that he accepted friar characterisations of the Filipino people as 'vicious and inept'. Filipinos were reminded that in Europe, Leo XIII was spoken of as Anti-Christ. He made a mockery of his opening claim that he welcomed the new liberty enjoyed by the church under the American regime by concluding with a total prohibition against any questioning of the Constitution: Jesus Christ had invited discussion but Leo XIII put himself above being questioned.

The Aglipayan Epistola V is more concerned with attacking the Constitution and the Pope than with making an appeal to the Filipino clergy who had so far remained within the Roman Catholic Church. The Pope despised the Filipinos and would force on them bishops, canons, directors of seminaries, and parish priests who were all friars, and if the Americans succeeded in expelling the original Spanish religious others would take their place, perhaps after being naturalised in the United States. Those Filipinos who remained within the Roman Church got what they deserved. The Epistola provoked Father Mariano Sevilla's attack on the 'ungovernable and sectarian enemies of religion' in his Reflexión, included with Father Roxas' defence of the Constitution. The outraged

124 There is no support in the official text of the Constitution published in Manila in 1902 by the Colegio de Santo Tomas for this claim.

125 In Doctrina y Reglas, op. cit., 77-79.

126 In Roxas, op. cit., 15-16.
rejection of the Constitution by these elements had given the wrong impression that all the Filipino clergy and people were hostile to it. In fact, the Constitution completely satisfied the aspirations of the Filipino clergy and people; the Holy See had declared an explicit remedy to the antagonism between regular and secular clergies which had been the root cause of the religious problems of the past. The Patronato had ended for ever and with it the privileges held by the regulars under Spain. 'Low appetites and insane ambitions' were the real cause of the schism which brought a horrible disgrace on the country and its people. There is no doubt that, whatever the particular motives of self-interest which influenced factions within the Filipino clergy to accept or reject the Constitution, the controversy it created was an expression of that dilemma which had confronted the Filipino clergy even before 1872. Because of the issues involved it was not possible to adopt a moderate line: either the individual priest left the Roman Catholic Church entirely or he submitted entirely. Manuel Roxas could not contemplate leaving the Church. When his name was included by de los Reyes as a bishop-designate in the independent church he issued a strong public protest in Libertas in which he claimed that 'it fills me with shame to think that our love for our sacred religion and our unconditional and unshakeable adherence to the Roman Pontiff should be put in doubt'.

The Jaro clergy actually declared a 'temporary' rejection of Roman authority but eventually they too returned. At the time of the Aglipayan revolt, the clergy of Panay and Negros were already in open

127 'Protesta' of Manuel E. Roxas, Libertas, 16 August, 1902; and see Achutegui and Bernad, I, 185.
revolt against the Spanish hierarchy. In January and February, 1903, Fathers Silvestre Apura and Praxedes Magalona warned the Apostolic Delegate that 'the native clergy will resist the order and not obey it' if the hierarchy attempted to impose the new constitution upon them.

The apparent failure of their first letter and of their meeting with Guidi in late January, provoked intense disquiet and the creation of committees in the pueblos of the diocese supporting the 'nueva Iglesia cismatica' (the Aglipayan Church). Although they signed themselves 'loyal sons of the Church', and deplored the spread of Aglipayan influence, their demands to elect an ecclesiastical governor from the diocesan clergy and their refusal to accept the Apostolic Constitution made their position untenable. About one-third of the 73 secular priests of the diocese withdrew their obedience from the Spanish Bishop, Andrés Ferrero, and elected Father Nicolas Valencia from their own number, instead. At a meeting on 15 July, 1903, 25 secular priests of the diocese formally seceded from the Roman Catholic Church and formed an independent church, the Iglesia Católica Apostólica, which 'renounced all obedience to papal authority' but retained the 'Roman Catholic creed'. The Iloilo schismatics had resisted overtures from the Aglipayans in February and continued to hold aloof after 15 July. The Manila Times commented that 'it is plainly to be seen that race friction between the Visayans and the people of Luzon has something to do with the attitude of the two seceding

128 Silvestre Apura and Praxedes Magalona to Juan Batista Guidi, Molo, Iloilo, 12 January, 1903; Jaro, Iloilo, 7 February, 1903; in Box 1298, Newberry Library Collection, Chicago. The crisis was threatening even in 1902; see The Manila Times, 8 February, 1902.

129 Achútegui and Bernad, I, 230. Fathers Crispino Hinolan, Silvestre Apura, and Cornelio Salas were the leaders of the movement.
factions in holding apart from each other'. In fact, regional rivalries were only a part of the reason. The Iloilo clergy, however determined to have a Filipino bishop and to resist Quae mari Sinico, could not bring themselves to accept Aglipayan departures from orthodox Roman Catholic teaching. At first, the Aglipayans hailed the Iloilo schism as a 'glorious campaign' to assert the rights of an independent Filipino clergy against Roman despotism. An article by Father Hinolan in El Tiempo of Iloilo, attacking the Apostolic Constitution, was praised in Pío Romero's Mi Ultimo Grito de Alarma. Father Hinolan, with Fathers Apura and Trono, had been removed from his curacy for signing a Memorial on behalf of the Jaro clergy addressed to Monsignor Chapelle, in 1900. But Hinolan's ultimate refusal to join the Aglipayans and the determination of the 25 priests who formed the Iglesia Católica Apostólica to retain Roman doctrine eventually earned them the abuse of the Aglipayan clergy.

130 The Manila Times, 20 July, 1903; the new church was subject to the ecclesiastical governor elected by them, Father Cornelio Salas of Bago, Negros. The Aglipayan clergy of Negros was led by Father Lorenzo Paloma, IFI Bishop of Negros; Hernaez Romero, op. cit., 220-25. Aglipay visited Negros in March, 1903. For the background to the Iloilo crisis, see Taylor, Philippine Insurrection, II, 405ff.

131 'El Incidente Hijaldia-Hinolan', by 'Un Clerigo Filipino - Visayo', Kalampitaw, 8 June, 1903, in Pío Romero, Mi Ultimo Grito de Alarma al Clero Secular de Filipinas (Manila, 1903), 45-49. The Memorial, que la Comisión del Clero de la diócesis de Jaro presentó a Monsénor La Chapelle, delegado Apostólico de S.S. en Manila (Manila, 1900), protested that Bishop Ferrero was an agent of the friars dedicated exclusively to returning the parishes held by Filipino priests to the religious orders, and asked that the Delegate obtain Ferrero's resignation.

132 See Aglipay's Epistóla VI 'Sobre el Pseudo-Romanismo de Jaro', Manila, 17 August, 1903, in Doctrina y Reglas Constitucionales, op. cit., 80-86. He described the decision of the Jaro clergy to reject the right of the Pope to discipline them while not rejecting Roman dogma as a most erroneous solution to their confrontation with the hierarchy. They were a Roman clergy without a head, in the 'absurd' position of having to believe in their own excommunication. A religion that lacked science could contain no good.
By November, the Filipino clergy who declared their 'temporary' separation from Rome publicly declared their renewed adherence to the Holy See. The occasion for their retraction was the arrival of the American Bishop, Frederick J. Rooker.  

It can only be surmised that the presence of an actual bishop was too much for that section of the clergy who did what they could to obtain a Filipino bishop but could not break with the Roman Catholic Church. The Aglipayans henceforward carried on the schism alone in Jaro.

At the same time that the Iloilo clergy was debating whether to join the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, the Iglesia Católica Apostólica, or to remain obedient to the Roman Catholic hierarchy, the clergy of Ilocos Sur who had not joined Aglipay in 1902 were confronting the same problem. At a meeting of the clergy of the province at Bantay on 1 July, 1903, it was decided to address a protest to Monsignor Guidi against the appointment of American priests to the diocese. To have Bishop Hevia Campomanes replaced by an American Bishop (it was to be Bishop Dennis Dougherty) was a defeat for their campaign to Filipinise the Philippine Church. Father Eulogio Alcid of Bantay was elected President of 'the Council for the Defence of the Clergy of Ilocos'. The four resolutions of the Bantay Assembly affirmed the clergy's 'permanent union and communion with the Holy See', but a 'suspension' of all acts of obedience for foreign bishops; that an Exposition was to be elevated to the Holy See through the Apostolic Delegate explaining that for the good of the

133 The Manila Times, 3 November, 1903, 1.

Church, foreign bishops would not be obeyed as this would consolidate the schism in Ilocos Sur; that a Commission was to be named to carry the decisions of the Assembly to the schismatic clergy of Ilocos Norte to explore their reactions to the resolutions adopted by the Assembly; and that a telegram and an Exposition be immediately sent off to the Apostolic Delegate declaring the united feeling of the clergy of the province against the appointment of a foreign bishop. The Exposición y Protesta sent to Guidi asserted the opposition of the clergy of Ilocos Sur to the news that a foreign bishop had been named to assume control of the diocese against the manifest wishes of the clergy as expressed in recent expositions to the Holy See. The clergy were profoundly saddened and affected by the news of the appointment because they knew that if a foreign bishop were to come, it would be impossible to put down the schism already dividing the province. The Aglipayan clergy of Ilocos Norte replied to the resolutions sent to them from Bantay by welcoming the cessation of the 'offensive attitude' displayed to them by the Roman priests of Ilocos Sur and hoped that in future both clergies could treat each other as brothers with the love and fraternal charity of true disciples of Christ. The Ilocos Norte clergy applauded the resolution to refuse obedience to any foreign bishop, and affirmed their own opposition to any foreign bishop attempting to exercise episcopal jurisdiction over the Philippines. Under Filipino bishops it would be possible for all Filipino priests to work towards unity. But a

135 Acuerdos de la Asamblea Eclesiástico del Obispado de Nueva Segovia, Bantay, 1 July, 1903; included in Pio Romero, op. cit., 50.

136 Exposición y Protesta de la Asamblea dirigidas al Sr. Delegado Apostólico, Bantay, 1 July, 1903, signed by Eulogio Alcid, Presidente de la Junta, and Francisco Racca, Secretario.
'Final Important Note' attached to this reply made it clear that the Aglipayan clergy would not accept the first resolution of the Bantay Assembly: that the Filipino clergy should remain united and in communication with Rome although refusing to obey the directive to accept a foreign bishop. 137

It is apparent that the Aglipayan movement encompassed all the contradictions and paradoxes of the revolution and the colonial situation which had provoked the revolution. Its ideological confusion between the leadership and their followers reflected cultural and religious differences between the Hispanicised mestizo elite and the rural and urban poor. The confusion in its doctrine and ritual suggested the confusion of values and goals in Filipino society. Its dedication to rationalism and science and its popular religious fervour pointed to the cultural duality of Philippine life. It was at one and the same time a front for the political machinations of a small group of shrewd, self-seeking individuals; the creation of a man who had absorbed European anarchist and Unitarian ideas and used them to write a body of dogma for a church supported by followers for whom such ideas were incomprehensible; the vindication of those Filipino priests who could no longer tolerate being humiliated by a foreign hierarchy; and a popular movement. In the provinces its most ardent supporters were those priests and laymen who were being denounced and informed on by the very men who controlled

137 Contestación del Clero Independiente de la Provincia Ilocos Norte a la Asamblea del Clero Romano de Ilocos Sur y de La Unión, Bacarra, 5 July, 1903; in Pío Romero, ibid, 52-53. Achútegui and Bernad appear to misread the point at issue in this document; I, 231.
the movement in Manila. 138

Recognising this complexity, it is obvious that explanations of the Aglipayan movement which simply claim that it owed its success and character to 'a wave of Filipino nationalism' are inadequate and misleading. 139 This is, however, the usual explanation put forward by historians sympathetic or antagonistic to the new church. It is described as 'having only one central tenet, a fierce nationalism'. This nationalism was the 'vital force' which led to its foundation and sustained it. 140

Historians of the Aglipayan movement, while working from quite different assumptions, agree that it was important second only to the revolution itself in the struggles of 1896-1907. The Jesuit scholars, Pedro A. de Achutegui and Miguel A. Bernad imply a condemnation of the movement when they describe it as 'the violent overthrow of an existing order of things, as violent a revolution in the ecclesiastical sphere as was the Revolution against Spain and America'. 141

When Gregorio Aglipay celebrated 'pontifical mass' on 26 October, 1902, for the new church, Emilio Aguinaldo sent a letter which was read out in which the ex-President of the Republic identified the Aglipayan Church with the 'liberation of the enslaved and the betterment of the unfortunate'; Achutegui and Bernad, I, 201. Rumours in the American press alleged the new Church was a creation of the Katipunan society and a threat to American rule; The Churchman, November, 1902.

138 Camilio Osias and Avelina Lorenzana, Evangelical Christianity in the Philippines (Dayton, Ohio, 1931), 173-74.


140 Religious Revolution in the Philippines, I, 216.
historian, Teodoro A. Agoncillo, while holding an opposite view of the revolution and the religious schism, has written of the Aglipayan Church, the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, that it was the one enduring result of the Philippine revolution. The new church, although founded in 1902 during the American regime, had its origin and inspiration in the revolutionary struggle and remained, after the collapse of the Philippine Republic, the 'living symbol of the revolution'. But because of their preoccupations with confirming their own responses to the revolution and the schism, neither Roman Catholic nor secular nationalist historians have pursued the implications of the insights contained in such occasional judgements.

It is particularly surprising, given the concern of nationalist historians to rehabilitate the 'revolution from below', that writers such as Teodoro Agoncillo have not given more attention to the significance of the Aglipayan movement. Aglipayanism receives sympathetic but perfunctory treatment in Agoncillo's books with the implication that although the creation of an independent church was an expression of Filipino 'nationalist' aspirations, its creation was peripheral to the 'real' political struggles fought between Filipinos, Spaniards, and Americans during and after the revolution. Nationalist historians have also been content to describe the Aglipayan movement in conventional, 'religious' terms, concentrating on the foundation of an ecclesiastical organisation and on the subsequent rivalries between the institutional Aglipayan church and the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Despite his recognition of the symbolic

142 Malolos, The Crisis of the Republic, 669; A Short History of the Philippines, 144-48; with Oscar M. Alfonso, History of the Filipino People, 286.
significance of the Aglipayan schism and its connection with the movement begun by the executions of 1872, Agoncillo himself presents the Aglipayan Church in unnecessarily narrow, ecclesiocentric terms as a new formal institution performing similar functions to the Roman Catholic Church but free from the control of foreign bishops and regular clergy and, ultimately, from the Pope. The creation of the *Iglesia Filipina Independiente* was primarily a 'reaction of the nationalistic priests to centuries of disparagement and prejudice'. The schism was the culmination of the long process by which the Filipino clergy fought to free themselves from the domination of an ecclesiastical hierarchy composed of Spanish friars.143

Of course, the Aglipayan movement was, in a very important sense, the final step in the secularisation and Philippinisation controversies which had divided the Spanish and Filipino clergies through the nineteenth century. Recognition of this historical dimension to the schism of 1902 allows a fuller understanding of the Aglipayan movement than that provided by explanations which concentrate on the actions of Apolinario Mabini, Isabelo de los Reyes and Aglipay himself between December, 1898 (and the attempt to create a national church) and August, 1902, when the *Iglesia Filipina Independiente* was declared. Agoncillo links the declaration of an independent church in 1902 to the 'racial conflict' which began with the martyrdom of Fathers Burgos, Gomez and Zamora. But, by emphasizing the nationalist goals of some elements in the revolution and in the Aglipayan church, Agoncillo does not explore the themes which are suggested by his connection of the schism with the shift in

consciousness provoked by the executions of 1872. The Aglipayan movement also drew strength from regional and political rivalries, attracting support in some provinces rather than others and finding favour with elements of the provincial principalía anxious to retain local influence which the removal of the Spanish friars had made possible in 1898.\textsuperscript{144}

The Aglipayan movement, then, was complex and contradictory, drawing on political and class antagonisms, regional divisions and clerical rivalries.

If the secular nationalist historians have tended to treat the Aglipayan movement cursorily and simplistically, writers committed to a religious position have distorted the movement in other ways. Roman Catholic, Protestant and Aglipayan writers have produced a considerable literature on the Iglesia Filipina Independiente but they have concentrated on the institutional repercussions of the schism and the conflicts it provoked between different ecclesiastical organisations to the exclusion of the broader significance of the movement in the context of the revolution and of American rule.

While the nationalist historians present the new church in terms of their own nationalist assumptions, the historians arguing from a religious position have been preoccupied with the detail of juridical disputes and validity or otherwise of the charges and counter-charges made by Aglipayan and Roman Catholic leaders in the bitter confrontations which continued after 1902.

Protestant writers have generally been sympathetic to the broad direction of the Aglipayan movement as they understand it, assuming that the movement was a delayed enactment in the Philippines of the European

\textsuperscript{144} See the earlier discussion in this chapter drawing on Doeppers, \textit{art. cit.}, passim, and Achútegui and Bernad, I, 211-216.
Reformation. Aglipay is pictured as a Filipino Luther come to challenge the evils of Romanism. The Reverend John Marvin Dean, for instance, assumed that the Aglipayan schism was the inevitable consequence of 'the distrust felt by the more intelligent Filipinos of a system so full of extortion and fraud as the so-called Roman Church had proven itself ... a system which tolerated and encouraged if it did not actually nourish the sins of the friars'. An Episcopalian minister wrote in 1904 that the freedom of conscience made possible by the new American regime allowed Filipinos to disassociate themselves from 'the daily debauchery of Christianity ... here in the Orient' by a church that was 'one of the strongholds of the powers of darkness, an enemy of truth, and an enemy of purity'. The American Dominican, Father Ambrose Coleman, complained in 1905 that the Aglipayan Church had been written up as

a laudable and natural revolt against the spiritual tyranny of Rome, such as produced Protestantism in the sixteenth century. According to this view, the Filipinos, under the protection of the American Government, are now shaking off the yoke of Rome as their minds are opening to the light of the Gospel.

Other than the Unitarians, the Protestant churches were wary of committing themselves to the Aglipayan movement until they could be sure it would

---

145 See, for instance, Osias and Lorenzana, op. cit., 174.

146 John Marvin Dean, The Cross of Christ in Bolo Land (Chicago, 1902), 201.

147 Mercer C. Johnston to Bishop Charles H. Brent, Manila, 30 June and 6 July, 1904, in Brent Papers. Johnston could not bring himself to agree that the American Episcopalians should recognise the Aglipayan Church because he believed the Aglipayans had inherited the worst sins of Romanism, particularly in their sexual promiscuity.

adopt a correct theology and practice, but many Protestant writers assumed that the independent church was a move away from Roman error towards Protestant truth. The relations between the Aglipayan leadership and the Protestant missions were complicated and negotiations were prolonged over fifty years, but, whatever the difficulties preventing an open alliance in the early years of the movement, the shared antipathy to Rome is reflected in Protestant historical writing on the independent church. Roman Catholic writers have exaggerated this alliance: Achutegui and Bernad claim that the collaboration between the Aglipayan leadership and the Protestants existed from the beginning of the schism and that they 'joined forces' putting the Catholic Church on the defensive 'fighting against an alliance of Aglipayans, Protestants, and a government that seemed to favor anything as long as it was not the Catholic Church'. At the time of the actual break with Rome, many of the founding members of the church denied they were Protestants or Romanists, being 'ni unos ni otros' (neither one nor the other) according to the editor of El Grito del Pueblo, Pascual H. Poblete. Aglipay and his advisers certainly sought recognition and support from the Episcopalians and others after 1902, and were described by one American missionary as 'very friendly and open with us ... almost siding with us against Rome'. Regarded as a proto-Protestant movement, the schism did not require any sophisticated analysis of why it gathered so much support in 1902-1904 or what it meant to the ordinary supporter: Protestant writers tended

149 De Achutegui and Bernad, I, 248.
150 Quoted in 'La Iglesia Filipina', The Manila American, 8 August, 1902, 10.
151 Quoted in Frank Charles Laubach, op. cit., 147.
to assume that its early success was a natural result of the end of three centuries of 'Roman despotism'.

Roman Catholic writers on the Aglipayan Church obviously proceed from a different set of assumptions but, again, these have inhibited a full recognition of the complex nature and aspirations of the Aglipayan movement by concentrating on the formal, institutional structures erected by the movement, subjecting them to the test of orthodoxy according to Roman Catholic teaching. Ultimately, the histories of the schism by Roman Catholic writers are intended to demonstrate that the Iglesia Filipina Independiente was 'invalid' or 'heretical'. De Achútegui and Bernad, for instance, are careful to prove that the Aglipayan bishops (the term appearing in inverted commas) were invalidly consecrated 'as every Catholic priest knows', and that it was 'a misnomer to speak of an Aglipayan theology' because it was 'a scrap-heap of doctrinal fragments'. 152 Bishop Rooker, the American who assumed control of the Diocese of Jaro in 1903, thought at the bottom of the movement lay 'race hatred' and the sinister desire that 'the orient should be for the orientals'. The supporters of the Katipunan had 'put on the soutane of the priest', and become the "Independent Philippine Church", using the cloak of religion to pursue the insurrection. 153 Roman Catholic

152 Achútegui and Bernad, I, 279-80; 382-83.

153 Rooker to Roosevelt, Jaro, 9 May, 1904; Roosevelt Papers, micro. film reel, 44, series 1. Rooker echoed the Spanish friar view that the schism was the work of 'a few turbulent and secretarian individuals, held in ridicule by those of honorable conscience' who 'ignorantly aimed to give certain problems - political, social, ethnical, and purely economical - a religious character' (Alcocer, Pastoral Letter, 2). See also Hendrick to Roosevelt, 28 September, 1904, Roosevelt Papers.
historians have explained the movement and its goals in terms of the ideas and motives of its leaders, particularly of Aglipay and de los Reyes.

The intention is to prove the inauthenticity of the Aglipayan Church by showing it to be incompatible with Roman Catholic doctrine. William Henry Scott has referred to the 'Roman tactic of conducting scholarly research on Aglipayanism itself, taking as the premise the traditional Roman Catholic faith of the Independent members and extending to them a sympathetic welcome to "come home" after being led astray by their leaders'. This approach is typically expressed in the use made by Roman Catholic writers of the retractions of prominent Aglipayans, notably that by Isabelo de los Reyes in 1936. The 'subtle bias' which Scott discovers in the scholarship of writers such as de Achutegui and Bernad is a result of their commitment to one side of the religious controversies which they analyse as historians. More fundamentally, Roman Catholic histories of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente proceed from the assumption that the schismatic church was 'wrong' not only because it denied the authority of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and taught heresy, but because by doing so it set itself against the real nature of man and the world.


155 A copy of the retraction is held in the archives of the University of Santo Tomas. For a note on the controversy over the retraction see de Achutegui and Bernad, op. cit., 537; and see Philippines Free Press, 10 October, 1936, 23. The dispute over the de los Reyes' retraction is reminiscent of that over José Rizal's retraction which was allegedly signed by him on the eve of his execution.

156 Mary Dorita Clifford has observed that 'the belligerence of the participants in the controversy has clouded the real issues with justifications and recriminations' in Studies in Philippine Church History, 224.
Nevertheless, one advantage which writers with a religious commitment do enjoy over the secular nationalist approach is their recognition that differences of doctrine and belief are not merely rhetorical or incidental to 'real' life. Although the debate has been confined within unnecessarily narrow limits, Aglipayan, Protestant and Roman Catholic scholars at least acknowledge that such doctrinal differences express real contradictions and conflicts between groups with competing views of how Philippine society was to be ordered and what values and goals were proper for that society. This relevance of doctrinal difference to actual social and political attitudes was most obvious when Aglipayans and Roman Catholics differed on specific issues such as the role of church and state in education and in matters of public morality such as the laws relating to marriage and divorce. But even the most apparently abstract theological dispute reflected ideas about man and his nature which were relevant to the actual life of Filipino society. As de Achutegui and Bernad have pointed out, secular historians who assume that the Aglipayan and Roman Catholic churches were really 'the same' in the sense that they performed the same 'religious' functions ignore the significance of the very different views held by both churches on the nature of man and society as well as their conflicting understanding of revealed truth. What Roman Catholic, Protestant and Aglipayan writers have failed to do is to relate the doctrinal and theological disputes, which they rightly insist are important, to the world-view of the groups who accepted or rejected Aglipayan or Roman Catholic thought.

157 De Achutegui and Bernad, I, 378.
Aglipayan writers themselves have not yet produced a convincing explanation of the full significance of their church in the context of the revolution and the struggle for independence under American rule.

In the narrow sense, the Aglipayan Church did survive the American occupation and so continued into the twentieth century the demands of the religious reformers of the nineteenth. The Aglipayan Church gradually declined into a minority church supported by little more than five per cent of the population by 1960. But what the Aglipayan movement meant to its supporters among the two million or so of its adherents in the first decade of the twentieth century is yet to be fully explained.

158 Pedro S. de Achútegui, art. cit., 15, has a table showing the decline in proportional membership of the IFI between the Census of 1916 and that of 1960. See also the discussion in Achútegui and Bernad, I, 366-67.
CONCLUSION

The Revolution of 1896 was the critical moment for the emergence of an authentically Filipino national community. It was significant as an inner struggle to overcome internal social and cultural divisions between elite and masses as much as a political struggle to gain independence from Spain. In the event, partly because of American intervention but even more because of these internal divisions, the Revolution failed to resolve the tensions between landowner and tenant, Hispanicised *ilustrado* and traditional peasant, rationalist, liberal intellectuals and radical folk religionists. The ideology and political programme of the progressive reformers derived from European models which were remote from the experienced aspirations and values of most Filipinos in 1896. At the same time, the rhetoric of independence and individual rights popular with the leaders of the Republic of the second phase of the Revolution disguised real conflicts of interest between wealthy and impoverished Filipinos, those with property and privilege to protect and those who wanted a radical restructuring of Philippine society and a redistribution of its wealth. By degrees, a leadership assumed control which was actually hostile to the substantive aims of the Revolution, in preparation for the eventual enthusiastic collaboration of prominent *ilustrado* 'Revolutionary' leaders with the United States.

This thesis has been concerned not so much with the political and economic dimensions of the confrontation between elite and masses exposed by the Revolution but with that confrontation at the level
of ideas, values, and beliefs. The most fruitful way to approach these questions is through an analysis of the religious struggles which were such a crucial part of the larger struggle of 1896-1904. The Roman Catholic Church, because of its omnipresent role in Spanish colonial life, and because of its comprehensive involvement with all Filipinos, politically, economically, intellectually, culturally, morally and religiously, is the key institution at the centre of the struggle. But the Church also contained its own contradictions and internal tensions, reflecting as well as shaping the confrontations in the total society. By examining the religious issues which divided Filipinos, Spaniards, and eventually Americans, between 1896 and 1904, it is possible to see the contradictions of Philippine society in sharp relief. The religious struggle was at the very centre of the revolutionary effort to reconcile incompatible views of man, society, and God. The struggles over the relationship between church and state, the rights of the Filipino clergy, the authority of the bishops and the role of the religious orders were of great political importance in themselves but they raised fundamental questions about the proper constitution of Philippine society and ultimately involved the most basic question of all: what did it mean to be a Filipino?

The three-sided struggle between Spanish clergy, Filipino liberal nationalists, and radical folk revolutionaries, became four-sided with the intervention of the Americans, but the church remained the central issue in the struggle to impose one definition of society on the Philippines. The struggle was also religious in a broader sense in that the contending groups perceived it as one concerned with
the meaning and nature of man and human history. The economic and political issues which divided one group from another were real divisions but the struggle was not simply a political and economic struggle and it cannot be understood outside the context of ideas, values and beliefs which formed the world-views of those involved.

To understand the nature of this ideological and religious struggle, this study traces the religious controversies which preceded and followed the Revolution. It begins with an analysis of the colonial church and the process by which Spanish Roman Catholic values and ideas influenced and were transformed by an existing religious culture. The institutions and organisation of the colonial church are examined as is its economic support. The world-view of the Spanish friars is then examined and their opposition to reform and to popular radical movements is placed in its historical, theological and international context. The Filipino clergy occupied an ambiguous and symbolically crucial position in a colony founded and administered as a mission dedicated to a universal God as well as a possession of imperial Spain. Their long struggle to gain recognition inspired both the secular nationalists and the folk radical movements of the latter part of the nineteenth century. Their importance in the Revolution and their ambiguous relationship with the revolutionary leadership are examined in Chapter III.

With the collapse of Spanish rule and the transfer of sovereignty to the United States, the terms of the religious struggle were radically altered. In this new situation, the various groups competing for control of the church and of the colony looked to the Vatican to solve the problems of a racially divided clergy, the friar estates, and the question of religious authority itself. The debate over the proper function of the Filipino clergy continued as a bitterly divisive issue
after 1900 as did the position of the religious orders in the colony once their superiors had decided they were to continue to perform parish work.

Contrary to accepted views of the religious settlement worked out under the Americans, the religious problems which had contributed so largely to the revolutionary movement itself, were not solved in the early American period. The Apostolic Delegate sent to the Philippines in 1900 was concerned to restore the rights and institutional authority of the colonial church rather than with either the resolution of deeper problems of belief and values or with the demands of the American administration that the clergy adapt to American secular principles concerning church and state, education, religious toleration and a secular legal code. The Vatican plan for the Philippine Church as set out in *Quae mari Sinico* did not meet the expectations of many Filipino priests nor did it address other than institutional problems in its response to the religious crisis which entered a critical phase in 1902. The Constitution broadened a schism which had found support among a minority of the Filipino clergy some months earlier.

The *Iglesia Filipina Independiente* which emerged from the schism of 1902 contained within itself all the contradictions of Philippine society. Its leaders and followers held incompatible 'cosmologies', incompatible class interests, and opposite responses to American rule. While the independent church proclaimed its commitment to national independence and owed its support to nationalist sentiment, some of its founders, those in the Federal Party, were advocating assimilation of the Philippines into the United States. Nor were the perceptions and values of the clergy of the new church and its lay leaders compatible. The contradictions and ambivalence of the Aglipayan
movement were the first substantial indications of the failure of the Philippine Revolution to establish a Filipino cultural identity founded on a core of fundamental, shared values and beliefs relevant to the historical experience of the Philippines and the inherited traditions of the Filipino people. The Revolution was a creative attempt both from above (ilustrado liberal nationalists) and below (folk revolutionaries) to overcome the contradictions of colonial society and to discover a way of reorganising Filipino society as an independent nation state. That the aspirations of the 'poor and dispossessed' as expressed in the Katipunan and the folk religious movements which accompanied the Revolution should fail to be realised in the 'real' world of colonial power, international politics, elite manipulation and so on, is not surprising although the Revolution was fought long and hard by poor peasants and poor townsmen. The resources of the elite, their organisational sophistication and the pragmatic way they could manipulate events in their own interests or according to their understanding of 'progress' are not denied. But the failure of the Revolution, as revealed in the religious struggles of 1896-1904 was not simply the failure of elite and masses to find common ground if that were possible. Rather, it was the failure of the 'revolution from below' which, while it expressed the authentic aspirations of the people, lacked any means of retaining its vision of a 'New Eden' once confronted with the demands of the politics of the modern nation-state.
### TABLE 1

Dominicans in the Philippines

1896

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Bishops</th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Parish Curates</th>
<th>Missionaries</th>
<th>Companions</th>
<th>Vicars in Convents</th>
<th>Choristers</th>
<th>Novices 'de Obediencia'</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bataan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangasinan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarlac</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cagayan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabela</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva Vizcaya</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batanes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>233</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† From Estado General de los religiosos y religiosas de la Provincia del Santísimo Rosario del Sagrado Orden de Predicadores de Filipinas en el año 1896 (Manila, 1897).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Jesuit Fathers</th>
<th>Coadjutors</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manila:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ateneo Municipal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escula Normal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observatory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mindanao and Adjacent Islands:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Diocese of Jaro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamboanga Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamboanga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetuan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Mercedes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabela de Basilan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joló Residence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joló</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tamontaca Residence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotabato</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polloc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamontaca</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Davao Residence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davao</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peña Plata</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>4516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigaboy y Mati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Diocese of Jaro:</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diocese of Cebu:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caraga Residence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caraga</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cateel Baganga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th>Coadjutors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surigao Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surigao</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinagat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer y Taganaan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigaquit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numancia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabuntog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantilan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandag</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lianga</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bislig</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Butuan Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butuan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talacogon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veruela</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jativa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dapitan Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapitan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubunga y Dipolog</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balingasag Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balingasag</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talisayan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alubijit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumilao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Diocese of Cebu</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>177086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

- In Manila: 38 Fathers, 26 Coadjutors
- In Diocese of Jaro: 20 Fathers, 15 Coadjutors
- In Diocese of Cebú: 41 Fathers, 27 Coadjutors

* Includes 13 scholastics

† Taken from Mision de la Compañía de Jesús en las islas Filipinas Estado General al principiar el año 1896 (Manila, 1896).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Missions</th>
<th>Parishes</th>
<th>Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archdiocese Manila</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>929,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva Segovia</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>525,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebu</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>254,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaro</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>610,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>249</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,320,667</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals (271)</strong></td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(231)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,327,667)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3

Augustinians in the Philippines†

1896 - 1897

† Taken from the Resumen General in Eladio Zamora, O.S.A., Las Corporaciones Religiosas en Filipinas (Valladolid, 1901), 217. Father Zamora's totals are almost all inaccurate as the summary is presented. His totals are given in brackets below the actual totals. Elsewhere he says that the Augustinian Fathers administered 210 pueblos (parish towns) in 1880, and 201 pueblos and 8 missions in 1879 (page 215) and that, in 1879 the Christian population of these parishes was 2,353,539. As there is no evidence that the Augustinian mission suddenly expanded between 1880 and 1896, the amended totals in the above table are probably closer to the actual numbers than Zamora's totals. He also leaves out the Diocese of Nueva Caceres but the Augustinians were never very numerous there (Phelan, Hispanization, Map 2), and those parishes they did control in Albay and Camarines had been ceded to the Franciscans. Pedro G. Galende, O.S.A., gives the number of Augustinian religious in 1896 as 240 ministering to 2,237,466 souls; 'The Augustinians in the Philippines, 1565-1890', Boletín Eclesiástico de Filipinas, XXXIX, No. 435, Jan-Feb, 1965.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Parishes</th>
<th>Total number souls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tondo</td>
<td>Malate, Pateros</td>
<td>148,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tambobon</td>
<td>Pineda, Taguig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Jose de Navotas</td>
<td>Paranaque y Malabaye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noveliches</td>
<td>Pasig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batangas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batangas</td>
<td>Cuenca, Talisay</td>
<td>209,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibaan</td>
<td>Lipa, Bauan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Jose</td>
<td>Tanauan, Taal y S. Luis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulacan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulacan</td>
<td>Pulilan, S. Ildefonso</td>
<td>188,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malolos</td>
<td>Baluag, Guinguito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sta. Isabel</td>
<td>Angat, Norzagaray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barasoain</td>
<td>Bustos, S. Miguel de Mayumo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paombon</td>
<td>Quingua, Bigaa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagonoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calumpit</td>
<td>S. Rafael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva Ecija</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabiao</td>
<td>S. Antonio, S. Juan de Guima</td>
<td>107,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Isidro</td>
<td>Jaen, y S. Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gapan</td>
<td>Aliaga, Zaragoza, y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manicling</td>
<td>Licab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penaranda</td>
<td>Cabanatuan, Sta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bongabon y Santor</td>
<td>Rosa, Talavera y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sto. Domingo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From Fr. Elviro P. Pérez, Catalógo Bio-bibliográfico de los Religiosos Agustinos de la Provincia del Santísimo Nombre de Jesús de la islas Filipinas (Manila, 1901), 826-32.
### TABLE 4 (Cont.)

**Iloilo:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barangay</th>
<th>Barangay</th>
<th>Barangay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iloilo</td>
<td>Iloilo</td>
<td>Iloilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>La Paz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leganes</td>
<td>Leganes</td>
<td>Leganes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavia</td>
<td>Pavia</td>
<td>Pavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oton</td>
<td>Oton</td>
<td>Oton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigbauan y Cordoba</td>
<td>Tigbauan</td>
<td>Tigbauan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimbal</td>
<td>Guimbal</td>
<td>Guimbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miagao</td>
<td>Miagao</td>
<td>Miagao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pototan</td>
<td>Pototan</td>
<td>Pototan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number souls: 340,205

**Pampanga:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barangay</th>
<th>Barangay</th>
<th>Barangay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacolor</td>
<td>Bacolor</td>
<td>Bacolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betis</td>
<td>Betis</td>
<td>Betis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sta. Rita</td>
<td>Sta. Rita</td>
<td>Sta. Rita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guagua</td>
<td>Guagua</td>
<td>Guagua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesmoan</td>
<td>Sesmoan</td>
<td>Sesmoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubao</td>
<td>Lubao</td>
<td>Lubao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floridablanca</td>
<td>Floridablanca</td>
<td>Floridablanca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porac</td>
<td>Porac</td>
<td>Porac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number souls: 243,246

**Tarlac:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barangay</th>
<th>Barangay</th>
<th>Barangay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarlac</td>
<td>Tarlac</td>
<td>Tarlac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number souls: 47,749

**Concepcion:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barangay</th>
<th>Barangay</th>
<th>Barangay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concepcion</td>
<td>Concepcion</td>
<td>Concepcion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Dionisio</td>
<td>San Dionisio</td>
<td>San Dionisio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajuy</td>
<td>Ajuy</td>
<td>Ajuy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number souls: 45,064
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capiz</th>
<th>Panay</th>
<th>Bao</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibisan</td>
<td>Pilar</td>
<td>Tapas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loctugan</td>
<td>Panitan</td>
<td>Cuartero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumalag</td>
<td>Maayon</td>
<td>Pontevedra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumurao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number souls:</strong></td>
<td><strong>116,953</strong></td>
<td><strong>119,677</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antique</th>
<th>S. Pedro</th>
<th>Barbaza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dao</td>
<td>Patnongon y Caritan</td>
<td>Tibiao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antique</td>
<td>Valderrama</td>
<td>Culasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Jose de Buenavista</td>
<td>Bugason</td>
<td>Sebaste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibalon y Egaña</td>
<td>Guisihan</td>
<td>Pandan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Remigio</td>
<td>Nalupa Nuevo</td>
<td>Cagayancillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number souls:</strong></td>
<td><strong>119,677</strong></td>
<td><strong>258,866</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cebu</th>
<th>Minglanilla</th>
<th>Dalaguetete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talamban</td>
<td>Naga</td>
<td>Alcoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opon</td>
<td>S. Fernando</td>
<td>Boljoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordoba</td>
<td>Carcar</td>
<td>Nueva Caceres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Pardo</td>
<td>Sibonga</td>
<td>Oslob y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talisay</td>
<td>Argao y Hernandez</td>
<td>Santander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number souls:</strong></td>
<td><strong>258,866</strong></td>
<td><strong>148,518</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilocos Norte</th>
<th>Vintar</th>
<th>S. Pedro de Cabitaoran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lauag</td>
<td>S. Miguel de Sarrat</td>
<td>San Nicolas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacarra</td>
<td>Piddig y Solsona</td>
<td>Batac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasuquin</td>
<td>Dingras</td>
<td>Pauay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagpartian</td>
<td>Banna</td>
<td>Badoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number souls:</strong></td>
<td><strong>148,518</strong></td>
<td><strong>148,518</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4 (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Santa</th>
<th>Candon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ilocos Sur:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinait</td>
<td>Santa</td>
<td>Candon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabugao</td>
<td>Narvacan</td>
<td>Sta. Lucia y Salcedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magsingal</td>
<td>Sta. Maria y Na.</td>
<td>Tagudin y Sevilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantay y San Ildefonso</td>
<td>Coveta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santiago y S. Esteban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number souls:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106,985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>S. Juan</th>
<th>Aringay y Cava</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangar</td>
<td>S. Juan</td>
<td>Aringay y Cava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balauang</td>
<td>S. Fernando</td>
<td>Agoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namacpacan</td>
<td>Bauang</td>
<td>Tubao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacnotan</td>
<td>Naguillang</td>
<td>Sto. Tomas y Rosario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number souls:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118,983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>La Paz</th>
<th>Pilar y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abra:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangued</td>
<td>S. Juan</td>
<td>Pilar y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayum</td>
<td>S. Gregorio</td>
<td>Villavieja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores</td>
<td>S. Juan</td>
<td>Alfonso XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucay</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number souls:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32,065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>S. Emilio</th>
<th>Concepcion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Tiagan</td>
<td>S. Emilio</td>
<td>Concepcion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Lepanto</td>
<td>S. Emilio</td>
<td>Concepcion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Lepanto</td>
<td>S. Emilio</td>
<td>Concepcion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Bontoc</td>
<td></td>
<td>2166 souls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Quiangan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Benguet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Amburayan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Tiagan</td>
<td>S. Emilio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Lepanto</td>
<td>S. Emilio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Bontoc</td>
<td>Sagada</td>
<td>Basao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Quiangan</td>
<td>Sapao</td>
<td>S autos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Benguet</td>
<td>La Trinidad</td>
<td>Daclan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Amburayan</td>
<td>Alilem</td>
<td>Suyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cabacan</td>
<td>1464 souls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number souls:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2166 souls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3880 souls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>329 souls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44 souls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1009 souls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1464 souls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 4 (Cont.)**

General Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>non-Christians</th>
<th>Priests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>940,906</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaro</td>
<td>623,302</td>
<td>35,080</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebu</td>
<td>258,866</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva Segovia</td>
<td>414,392</td>
<td>172,954</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,237,466</strong></td>
<td><strong>211,534</strong></td>
<td><strong>240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5
Ecclesiastical Organisation of the Philippine Church
ca. 1896*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Spanish Clergy</th>
<th>Filipino Clergy</th>
<th>Laity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1,811,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Segovia</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>997,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Cáceres</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>691,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebú</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,748,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaro</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,310,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>967</strong></td>
<td><strong>675</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,559,998</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Taken from 'El Archipelago Filipino, hechos por algunos padres de la misión de la Compañía de Jesús en estas islas' (Washington, 1900); reproduced in John R. M. Taylor, The Philippine Insurrection against the United States, 5 vols., I (Pasay City, 1971), Exhibit 5, 155. W. E. Retana (ed), 'La Política de España en Filipinas', Madrid, 15 March, 1898, No. 181, puts the total number of clergy as 1700 in 1896, of whom 980 were Spaniards (including 30 Spanish secular priests). Retana underestimates the number of Jesuit, Dominican and Augustinian priests according to Tables 1, 2 and 3. Other estimates give between 943 Spanish priests (Nozaleda interview in Freedom, 10 May, 1899); 1, 124 (Taft Commission Report, 24 January, 1901, 23); 1,180 (John N. Schumacher, 'The Catholic Church in the Philippines: Selected Readings', Manila, 1970, 312); and 2414 (Ralph J. Mailliard, 'An Investigation of the Philippine Friars Land Case and Related Church Problems', Ph. D., Loyola University, Chicago, 1942, 2-3). The Schurman Commission listed about 2388 Spanish clergy (Report, Washington, 1900). The last two estimates include clergy actually in Spain and elsewhere but belonging to the same Province of the Order; see Thomas Middleton, O.S.A., 'Religion and Education in the Philippines, a Review of the Commissions' Reports, 1899 and 1900', Pennsylvania, 1903, 4-5. The 'Archipelago Filipino' table apparently confuses the laity population of Nueva Cáceres with Nueva Segovia.
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