

THE RELIGIOUS INFLUENCE ON AMERICAN POLICIES IN THE PHILIPPINES, 1898 - 1916

By Moises S. Ponteras *

INTRODUCTION

**Church and State in the Philip-
pines, 1565-1898.** The political set-
up in the Philippines during the Span-
ish period was chiefly characterized
by the union of Church and State.
It should be noted that the conquest
and colonization of the Archipelago
was a joint effort of the Spanish sword
and the Christian cross. Commenting
on this union, Agoncillo and Alfonso
point out:

. . . one of the most unwelcome
features of Spanish colonization was
the encroachment of the church
upon the jurisdiction of the govern-
ment, and the exercise of political
power by the religious. In the cen-
tral government, representatives of
the church or the religious orders
sat in the highest councils. The friars
were heavily represented in the po-
werful Permanent Commission on
Censorship. . . In the towns the
masses were subject to the will of
the parish priest, who dominated
the town officials. Indeed, in the
towns, the friars and priests became
integrated into the government ma-
chinery: they had become the gov-
ernment. ¹

Church-State relationship is fur-
ther described by Parker:

Ecclesiastical officials, from the
archbishop to the sacristan, owed
their appointment to him (Spanish
king). Soldier and priest advanced

together, the Church was supported
out of the public revenue, and all
Church affairs, with little or no con-
nection with political matters, were
regulated from Madrid than from
Rome.²

Such political arrangement would,
therefore, find Church interference in
the civil government inevitable. Of
this interference, Cunningham writes:

The control of the government by
the Church was made easier from
1668-1762 because the governors
selected were "mild and pious" and
allowed themselves and their admin-
istration to be dominated by the
prelates.³

He further writes:

All these men suffered because
the Church interfered in the affairs
of State. . . . Within the eighteen
months preceeding Admiral Dewey's
victory in Manila, Generals Blanco,
Polavieja, and Primo de Rivera were
removed from the nominal supre-
macy in the Archipelago because
they sought to pacify the natives by
restricting or removing the religious
orders.⁴

A more precise and detailed cate-
gorization of the powers of the Span-
ish friars is given by Father Juan
Villegas, in his testimony before the
Philippine Commission. The powers of

* Prof. Moises S. Ponteras is on the faculty of U. P. in the Visayas, Iloilo City, but is at present finishing work for his doctorate at U. P., Diliman, Quezon City.

the parish priest were:

inspector of primary schools
president of health board and
board of charities

inspector of taxation
president of the board of public
works

president of the board of statistics
president of the board of census
president of the prison board
certifies as to the correctness of
cedulas

certifies as to the character of
of a person

certifies as to the man's condition
before he can be admitted
to the army

must be present during the elec-
tion of municipal officials
censor of the municipal budget
counselor for the municipal coun-
cil

examiner of the scholars attend-
ing the first and second
grades in the public schools
censor of plays, dramas, and
comedies

inspector of the food provided to
prisoners

member of the provincial board
on matters pertaining to pub-
lic works

member of the board for parti-
tioning crownlands.⁵

In his criticism of education in
Spanish Philippines, Parker writes:

Secondary and higher education
was in complete charge of the
friars.

Much of the backwardness in the
Islands was due to the close connec-
tion between Church and State
whereby the educational system was
brought under the domination of
the friars and remained there in
spite of the effort to secularize the
system. The entire ecclesiastical
government as well as the civil

government were alike responsible
for the deplorable condition of Phi-
lippine education.⁶

What has just been presented is
the typical picture of the union of
Church and State during the Spanish
regime. The change of political and social
fortunes at the close of the nineteenth
century in the Philippines placed the
Church and the Spanish friars in a
very uncomfortable situation. They
were reluctant to give up the privi-
leges they once enjoyed for more
than three hundred years. Hence, it
would not be a surprise if attempts
were made to "influence," in one way
or another, the formulation and/or
implementation of certain policies by
the new colonial administration.

Definition of terms. In this pa-
per "religious influence" is meant the
efforts of Protestant, Catholic, and
Aglipayan groups (Protestant and
Catholic in the United States and in
the Philippines; Aglipayan, only in
the Philippines) to effect the formu-
lation and/or implementation of certain
American policies in the Philippines.
By "American policies" is meant
those measures adopted by American
authorities, either persons or offices,
authorized to rule the Philippines from
1898 to 1916. The period is limited to
approximately two decades of Philip-
pine-American relations because it was
during this period that the religious
influence was markedly visible and
active.

It is, therefore, the thesis of this
paper that the religious groups --
Protestants, Roman Catholics, and
Aglipayans -- had exerted no little
influence in the formulation and/or
implementation of American policies
relative to the "democratic experi-
ment" in the Philippines. The specific
influence might not have been ade-
quately substantiated due to the scar-
city of available materials and the in-
sufficient time for research, but it is
the sincere belief of the investigator
that he has done his humble share in
illucidating an aspect of Philippine

history and ardently hopes that further and more intensive research can be carried on by better qualified students of Philippine history.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Religious foundations of American democracy. An examination of the early documents in American history reveals the mark of the religious influence on American institutions. The English colonists had GOD a part in their political agreements. Phrases such as "by the Grace of God, in propagating of Christian Religion," "of the knowledge and worship of God," "in the name of God," "Saviour of Mankind," and "the Christian Faith" are frequently found in the historical documents.⁷

Persecuted in England the pioneer English colonists migrated to the New World to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience. Among the colonies established primarily on religious foundations were Massachusetts, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.⁸ The Christian religion was a pervasive factor in the life of the people. Thomas Bailey gives a vivid picture of colonial life:

Religion still had a powerful grip on the people. The Sabbath was observed with rigidity, church attendance was faithful, and long-winded sermons were followed with apt attention. The Bible was universally read as the infallible word of God, supplemented by such religious books as Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* and Baxter's *Call to the Unconverted*.⁹

When the thirteen colonies declared their independence in 1776, the Founding Fathers wrote into the historic document the principle of religious freedom expressed as follows:

That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be

directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence, and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience, forbearance, love, and charity towards each other.¹⁰

It was not until the founding of Rhode Island by Roger Williams that the "separation of Church and State" became a fundamental principle in American democracy. In this colony there was complete freedom of religion and the people were not taxed to support a state church.¹¹ Henceforth, these twin principles — freedom of religion and separation of Church and State — followed the American flag wherever it flew. Later, the Founding Fathers incorporated these concepts into the American Constitution.¹²

Contemporary American society.

While American democracy vouches for secularism, nevertheless, the religious influence runs deep in the culture of the people. The Americans as a whole have religious affiliations with organized churches. The pulpit has been actively influencing the lives of million Americans. No single country in modern times has done so much in spreading the Gospel of Christ throughout the world as the United States.

Oath-taking of public officials, appointed as well as elective, is over an open Bible. The phrase "In God We Trust" is engraved on American coins. Despite Supreme Court rulings in 1962 and 1963 that banned religious activities in public schools, "church leaders, educators and parents nationwide are waging an uphill struggle to bring to U.S. youngsters a new interest in religion . . ."¹³

Despite the strong secularism and materialism in the American society, the United States which was founded on religious foundations more than three and a half centuries ago has remained a Christian nation. Just re-

cently New Hampshire and Connecticut enacted laws allowing voluntary, nondenominational prayer in the public schools. Governor Meldrim Thomson called the measure a "good bill that's needed for America," and said he "couldn't care less if the Supreme Court thinks it unlawful."¹⁴ Similar measures are being considered by other State legislatures. In view of these developments, it will not be a surprise if religion, particularly Judaism and Christianity, will continue to exert its influence on the affairs of the States as the occasion demands.

Religious influence on overseas expansion. The overseas expansion of the United States in the closing decade of the nineteenth century was not a surprise to students of American history. It was simply the culmination of the expansionist tradition of the Americans, whose expansion from the original thirteen colonies began with the settlement of the territory east of the Mississippi River from the Great Lakes in the north to Spanish Florida in the south by virtue of the Treaty of Paris of 1783.¹⁵

Subsequent territorial expansion added to the nation the Louisiana Territory, purchased from France in 1803; Texas annexed in 1845; Mexican Cession, 1848; Gadsden Purchase from Mexico, 1853; Oregon Territory, 1846, and Florida from Spain, 1819.¹⁶

In an editorial, James H. Bridge wrote of the inevitability of American expansion:

... the subjugation of a continent was sufficient to keep the American people busy at home for a century but now that the continent is subdued, we are looking for fresh worlds to conquer.¹⁷

Henry Cabot Lodge, one of the most ardent American expansionists, wrote in 1895:

The modern movement is all toward the concentration of people and territory into great nations and large dominions. The great nations are

rapidly absorbing for their future expansion and their present defense all the waste places of the earth. It is a movement which makes for civilization and the advancement of the race. As one of the great nations of the world, the United States must not fall out of the line of march.¹⁸

Another expansionist was Admiral Alfred Mahan who also advocated American expansion overseas. He argued that:

whether they will or not, Americans must now begin to look outward. The growing production of the country demands it. American increasing volume of public sentiment demands it.¹⁹

The foregoing sentiments express the "spirit of expansion" of America, motivated by commercialism and political imperialism. In 1896, Josiah Strong, a Congregationalist minister, published a book advocating the "imperialism of righteousness." He believed in the "manifest Destiny" of the Anglo-Saxon race to bring the Gospel of salvation to the peoples of the world. He challenged his fellow Americans:

Is it manifest that the Anglo-Saxon holds in his hands the destinies of mankind for the ages to come? Is it evident that the United States is to be the home of this race, the principal seat of his power, the great center of his influence? . . . We stretch our hands into the future with power to mold the destinies of unborn millions.²⁰

After the United States acquired the Oregon Country it was anticipated that the region could supply the needs of Asia and "science, liberal principles in government, and the true religion might cast their lights across the intervening sea."²¹

The interest of American Christian churches in foreign missions was similarly echoed by Thomas Bailey when

he wrote, "The missionary-conscious churches were on the look-out for new overseas vineyard to till."²²

It is quite evident that the mood for overseas expansions was supported by the desire to spread the Gospel of Christ among peoples far across the seas. As soon as China was opened to American trade, missionaries were sent to that country.²³ These agents of American expansion laid the foundations of American institutions.

The Spanish-American War. The armed confrontation between Spain and the United States in 1898 was not an accident of history. It was "but the final episode in a century of diplomatic ill-feeling, sometimes dormant, but more often dangerously acute."²⁴ This was the observation of Rear-Admiral F. E. Chadwick, who believed that the root of the conflict was in the Peace of 1763, the seeds of hatred fully germinating in the last Spanish-American conflict in 1898.

It was in this conflict that the Vatican made an attempt to intervene as requested by the Spanish Queen Regent through the American Archbishop John Ireland. The mediation, however, was a failure, partly because of the public reaction against any papal intervention.²⁵

The outbreak of the Spanish-American War was due to a number of important factors, among which were the De Lome's Letter, the sinking of the "Maine," the intense propaganda of the American press against the atrocities in Cuba, and the imperialist mood of the American nation. The aroused public opinion might have helped shape American policy that led to war, although H. Wayne Morgan believed that President McKinley did not surrender to any sudden or inexplicable war hysteria of the people and the "yellow" press. By intervening in Cuba, the McKinley administration merely accepted its inability to solve the Cuba issue peacefully.²⁶

Marcus Wilkerson, writing on the influence of the public opinion on American intervention, said:

The press and pulpit were also urged with "voice and prayer" to continue their help to the righteous cause of the men who are so bravely fighting for home and native land.²⁷

Protestant ministers were very vocal in their condemnation of the uncontrolled atrocities committed by the Spanish soldiery on the hapless Cuban people. The pulpit was freely used urging the government to intervene. The *Chicago Tribune* once reported, "When the Quakers begin to grow belligerent it is a sign that the country is getting stirred up."²⁸

When President McKinley requested Congress for action in Cuba, Protestant groups lost no time in endorsing the action of their President. Among these groups was the Presbytery of Philadelphia which sent the following resolution to McKinley:

Resolved: that the members of the Presbytery hereby pledge themselves to give their hearty moral support to the government of the United States in its present struggle with Spain, and to this end we recommend to all our ministers and people to give themselves continually to prayer and supplication for the speedy termination of hostilities and the restoration of an honorable and permanent peace to our beloved country.²⁹

The Spanish-American War was viewed as a God-given opportunity to realize America's "Manifest Destiny" in the Orient. Among those who shared this feeling was Archbishop John Ireland, who was a close friend of President McKinley.

In a letter to Dennis J. O'Connell on May 2, 1898, he said:

POLITICAL MATTERS

The result of this war will be to strengthen and enlarge our Navy, and reach out for new territory. If the Pope in the future is to have any world-wide prestige, he must deal as never before with America. Tell all this in Rome. And even if we do not hold Cuba and the Philippines, the Church there will be organized on the lines of Americanism.

I do not, I confess, like our present war; but great good will come from it, the enlargement of American influence.³⁰

The Protestant reaction to Admiral Dewey's victory expressed optimism in the spread of Protestantism. The Gospel would be freely proclaimed in Cuba and the Philippines once they were freed from Spanish rule.³¹ *The Methodist Review* suggested "foreign missions" as the "foreign policy of the United States."³² These reactions of the Protestant groups caused the Catholic press to label the Spanish-American War as a "Protestant Crusade."

Two months after the Battle of Manila Bay Dr. George F. Pentecost, acting Chairman of the Foreign Missions Committee of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, challenged the Assembly of the new opportunities for evangelization made possible by the acquisition of the Philippines.³³ In that same month of July representatives of Foreign Missions which had missions in Latin America met in New York to "plan for a harmonious and effective occupation of the Philippine Islands, Cuba and Puerto Rico."³⁴

Thus was officially formed the Protestant foreign missions to the Philippines. The first missionaries arrived in Manila in April, 1899, although a number of Protestant chaplains came along with the American troops in 1898.³⁵

Surrender of Manila. After Admiral Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet he was in virtual command of Manila Bay and could easily attack the city of Manila. In a cable to the Secretary of the Navy on May 13 he reported:

I am maintaining strict blockade of Manila by sea. Great scarcity of provisions in the city. I believe the Spanish governor-general will be obliged to surrender soon. I can take Manila at any moment. To retain require in my best judgement well-equipped force of 5,000 men. Spanish force is estimated 10,000 men. The rebels are reported 30,000 men.³⁶

Meanwhile, Admiral Dewey communicated with the Spanish governor-general for the surrender of Manila, but there was no positive reply. Before a group of officers he was reported to have remarked. "Why in the name of common sense don't some of the Catholics enter Manila and tell that Archbishop of yours to call this thing off? 37

An officer took the Admiral's words seriously. With the permission of General Anderson, Captain William McKinnon, chaplain of the First California Volunteers, made a heroic attempt to obtain the peaceful surrender of the city through a personal interview with the Spanish authorities. Unmindful of his personal safety he succeeded in entering the Walled City and met with Archbishop Nozaleda and Governor-General Jaudenes, but failed to effect the surrender of Manila.³⁸

The surrender of Manila was finally accomplished through the efforts of the Belgian Consul.³⁹ To save the honor of Spain, Dewey would accept the Spanish offer of surrender only after a "mock battle."⁴⁰ The secret agreement was known only to the highest officials of both sides.

While these events were transpiring in the Philippines, negotiations for a ceasefire were being made in Washington, D. C. A day before the "Mock Battle" took place, the Protocol of Peace was signed by Secretary of State Day and Jule Cambon, French Ambassador to the United States, who represented Spain. Article 3 of the Protocol gave the United States the right to "occupy and hold the City, bay and harbor of Manila, pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace which shall determine the control, disposition and government of the Philippines."⁴¹

Terms of Capitulation. Since there was no direct communication between the State Department and Dewey because the latter had cut the Philippine cable, McKinley's Proclamation of the Ceasation of Hostilities relayed on August 12 was not received in Manila not until August 16. By this time Manila had already capitulated, the terms of which were signed on August 14. In this document the religious influence is somehow evident in one of its provisions, which reads:

This city, its inhabitants, its churches and religious worship, its educational institutions, are placed under the special safeguard of the faith and honor of the American Army.⁴²

However, despite this provision there were isolated cases of looting and destruction of church properties which were reported to the authorities in Washington.

Peace Negotiation in Paris. Article V of the Protocol of August 12, 1898 provided for a final agreement to end formally the war. It says:

The United States and Spain will each appoint not more than five commissioners to treat of peace, and the commissioners so appointed shall meet at Paris not later than October 1, 1898, and proceed to

the negotiation and conclusion of a treaty of peace, which treaty shall be subject to ratification according to the respective constituent forms of the two countries.⁴³

President McKinley lost no time in appointing the members of the American Peace Commission. At this point the American Catholics wanted a Catholic member in the panel, so they suggested the name of Dr. Edward D. White, Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and considered a Catholic authority of Napoleonic Code use in the Philippines and a democrat. Unfortunately for the Catholics, Justice White refused the nomination.⁴⁴ Those appointed to the Peace Commission were William R. Day, Cushman K. Davies, William P. Frye, George Gray and Whitelaw Reid.

Failing to have a Catholic in the Peace Commission, the Vatican designated Archbishop Placide L. Chapelle of New Orleans to represent the church's interests in the Paris talks. Archbishop Chapelle "evidently made an agreeable impression upon the Commissioners." Senator Gray and some of the others (said) that the Church had acted with the usual wordly wisdom in selecting such a person for this work.⁴⁵

Frank Laubach, commenting on the role of Chapelle, said:

It (Treaty of Paris) had been a defeat for Spain, but it was a victory of the friars, who outwitted the American Government. Archbishop Chapelle of New Orleans was present at the negotiations. He insisted that the United States should purchase the islands for \$20,000,000 while President McKinley insisted by cable that the United States should receive her title by conquest. The Church, having more at stake, persisted longer and won.⁴⁶

The chief problem of the Roman Catholic Church was the reconcilia-

tion of the separation of Church and State and the protection of Church's interests. In formulating its final position, the Vatican was guided by three propositions: (1) If the Philippines were returned to Spain, anti-friar feeling would continue; (2) if independent, anarchy might prevail or a non-Catholic power might take over; and (3) if under the United States, the Church would be in competition with Protestants. Rome opted for the third proposition.

In connection with these courses of action for the Vatican to take, Archbishop John Ireland could have a hand. Monsignor Dennis J. O'Connell had to cable Ireland from Rome -- "Help hold Philippines."⁴⁷

It could be presumed that Archbishop Ireland could have influenced the Vatican in opting for American acquisition. It was he who advised Rome that

In the settlement of Church affairs in Cuba and the Philippines, Rome should yield gracefully to the separation of Church and State, and merely seek full liberty of possession of her present temporalities.⁴⁸

Treaty of Paris. The efforts of Archbishop Ireland and Chapelle were richly rewarded with the conclusion of the negotiations on December 10, 1898. Both prelates were able to influence the terms of the Paris talks. The Roman Catholic Church was able to insert into the final Treaty provisions which definitely protected its interests to the dissatisfaction of the Filipino revolutionaries. Of this matter John Farrell wrote:

Nothing in the Treaty of Paris, concluded December 10, 1898, worked to the disadvantage of the Catholic Church. The eighth, ninth, and tenth articles of the treaty protected the religious and property rights of persons and corporations.⁴⁹

Ireland and Chapelle seemed to give the impression that the American

Government had pro-Catholic sympathies. Communications of other Catholic prelates interpreted the favorable position of the Church as an effect of the cordial Church-State relations. In a letter of Sebastiano Martinelli to Mariano Cardinal Rampolla, Vatican's Secretary of State, a revelation of the Administration's pro-Catholic position could be discerned. A portion of the letter reads:

The President and the Cabinet are disposed to grant whatever may be reasonably expected by the Catholic Clergy of those regions, for they well know that the Clergy is the surest and the most effective medium to keep order . . . I think that the religious orders are in no danger of being suppressed or deprived of property.⁵⁰

Acquisition of the Philippines by the United States. It has been pointed out that the Vatican was for the retention of the Philippines by America. On October 25, 1898, Commissioners Davis, Frye, and Reid issued a statement saying:

We believe public opinion in Europe, including that of Rome expects us to retain whole of the Philippines and would prefer that to any other solution save the impossible one of restoration of Spanish power over all the islands.⁵¹

Archbishop Nozaleda, when asked by Chaplain McKinnon about the Church under Filipino control, remarked that the only hope of the Church in the Archipelago was for America to retain possession of the islands.⁵² McKinnon himself predicted that the day the United States withdrew would mark the end of Catholicism in the Islands.⁵³

The Treaty of Paris is the concrete proof that the Roman Catholic Church was for the retention of the Philippines by the United States. This position was primarily motivated by the desire to protect its own interests.

The acquisition of the Philippines was a gradual process of weighing pros and cons. In the end idealism give way to practical and imperialistic considerations. Morgan analyzed the Republican posture when he said:

The decision to acquire the Philippines was the logical culmination of a generation's tendencies in America and the world foreign policies. It was "new" in formally recognizing the realities and necessities of America's situation in the world affairs. It was "liberal" in promising to extend abroad the best parts of American ideal. It was "practical" in emphasizing the prospects of trade and political power in world markets. It was "historic" in the broadest sense as the first major step toward the policies that made America a great power in fact as well as potential.⁵⁴

President McKinley, in his Instructions to the Peace Commission, expressed his justification on his stand regarding the Philippine question. He said:

The Philippines stand upon a different basis. It is none the less true, however, that, without any original thought of complete or even partial acquisition, the presence and success of our arms at Manila imposes upon us obligations which we can not disregard. *The march of events rules and overrules human action.* (Underscoring provided) Avowing unreservedly the purpose which has animated all our effort, and still solicitous to adhere to it we can not be unmindful that, without any desire or design on our part, the war has brought us new duties and responsibilities which we must meet and discharge as becomes a great nation on whose growth and career from the beginning the Ruler of Nations has plainly written the high command and pledge of civilization.⁵⁵

The demand for the cession of the whole archipelago started with the desire to take Manila, or a naval station in the islands, then the whole island of Luzon. Various pressures - to take or not to take - were exerted on the President. McKinley had to take his time.

Honesto Villanueva wrote of the religious influence on the acquisition problem. In part he said:

It seems evident that members of the clergy exerted some influence on public opinion and the administration. They were desirous of gaining new fields for missionary work, the Protestants being especially zealous. American missionaries abroad urged the administration for the extinction of Spanish rule in the Philippines and their petitions were forwarded to Paris by the Department of State. Catholic dignitaries in the United States also favored American retention of the Philippines.⁵⁶

The decision to retain the Philippines was no doubt religiously tinted. An incident was told of an interview in the White House on November 21, 1898 with a group representing the General Missionary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal. As the visitors turned to leave, the President held them back saying:

Hold a moment longer! Not quite yet, gentlemen. Before you go I would like to say just a word about the Philippine business . . . The truth is I didn't want the Philippines, and when they came to us as a gift from the gods, I did not know what to do with them . . . I sought counsel from all sides - - Democrats as well as Republicans - - but got little help. I thought first we would take only Manila; then Luzon; then other islands, perhaps, also. I walked the floor of the White House night after night until midnight; and I am

not ashamed to tell you, gentlemen, that I went down on my knees and prayed to Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night.

And one night late it came to me this way -- I don't know how it was, but it came: (1) That we could not give them back to Spain—that would be cowardly and dishonorable; (2) that we could not turn them over to France or Germany—our commercial rivals in the Orient—that would be bad business and discreditable; (3) that we could not leave them to themselves—they were unfit for self-government—and they would soon have anarchy and misrule over there worse than Spain's was; and (4) that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellow men for whom Christ also died. And then I went to bed and went to sleep and slept soundly . . . and the next morning I sent for the chief engineer of the War Department (our map maker) and I told him to put the Philippines on the map of the United States (pointing to the large map on the wall of his office), and there they are, there they will stay while I am President.⁵⁷

The incident of a "heavenly intervention" in resolving the Philippine question clinched the President's annexation plan which he had been toying in his mind since Dewey's victory. The decision to acquire the Philippines was made. And it was the religious influence that delivered the last stroke that drove the "nail of annexation" in its place!

Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation. Article III of the Treaty of Paris provided that Spain had to cede the Philippines to the United States. The Treaty also provided that it would only take effect after its ratification by the governments of both countries.

However, before the Paris Treaty could be ratified by the American Senate, President McKinley issued on December 21, 1898 his "Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation," which was the first definite statement of American policy toward the Philippine question.⁵⁸ The issuance of the Proclamation was a tacit expression of McKinley's decision of November, 1898. He had taken for granted that the Treaty of Paris was in the bag.

It seems that the underlying motive of American colonization was "to educate the Filipinos and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the best we could by them, as our fellow men for whom Christ died." This motive is simply an overt expression of the "Manifest Destiny" that the Americans believed. The "Benevolent Assimilation" policy was therefore issued to temper the ugly head of the "Imperialism of righteousness" as preached by Josiah Strong.⁵⁹ The military administration was then entrusted

. . . to win the confidence, respect, and affection of the inhabitants of the Philippines by assuring them in every possible way that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of a free people, and by proving to them that the mission of the United States is one of benevolent assimilation, substituting the mild sway of justice and right for arbitrary rule.⁶⁰

The annexation position was also justified by Theodore Roosevelt who wrote:

. . . But as it is, this country will keep the islands and will establish therein a stable and orderly government so that one more fair spot of the world's surface shall have been *snatched from the forces of darkness* (under-scoring supplied) ⁶¹

The spirit of the Benevolent Assimilation Policy was later incorporated in McKinley's Instructions to the Se-

cond Philippine Commission. The Commission was to emphasize "upon all occasions the just and beneficent intentions of the Government of the United States."⁶²

Pacification campaign, 1898-1912.

With the establishment of military government, it was assumed by the Americans that the Philippines was theirs to govern. Subsequent events confirmed this observation: the Treaty of Paris, the Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation, the arrival of ground troops, the ratification of the Paris Treaty two days after the outbreak of the armed conflict between the Americans and Filipinos. To the Americans the armed confrontation was but a "pacification campaign" to bring the country under American rule. During this period the religious influence in the course of events was also present. Individual persons and organizations took active part in winning the Filipinos to the American side.

One of the most active participants was the Catholic Chaplain McKinnon. As the first Superintendent of Schools he was able to establish in the city of Manila 32 schools with 4800 pupils.⁶³ He recruited teachers composed of Filipinos, Spaniards, Americans, and *mestizos*. McDevitt, praising the work of McKinnon, wrote:

In his dual capacity as priest and army officer, McKinnon helped much in effecting the peaceful transition from Spanish to American control. His frequent visits and missions, in both urban and rural areas; built up friendly relations between the conquered and conqueror.⁶⁴

McKinnon was reported to have helped in negotiating the surrender of Aguinaldo together with Francis Doherty, another American Catholic priest.⁶⁵ Indirectly, McKinnon contributed to the capture of Aguinaldo by Funston whom the Catholic Chaplain saved from a possible court martial.⁶⁶

A member of the Schurman Com-

mission who disliked missionaries reversed his opinion upon his arrival in the Philippines. He said that the introduction of evangelical Christianity was essential in solving the problems of the government.⁶⁷ Protestant missionaries did their share in the pacification campaign. James Rodgers, the first Presbyterian missionary to arrive in the Philippines, testified that they were looked upon as friends of the Revolutionary Government against the Roman Catholic Church and the Spanish Government and were welcomed by the Filipinos.⁶⁸

The Protestant missions concentrated the work on the proclamation of the Gospel of Christ, translation of the Bible into the people's dialects, establishment of schools and hospitals, even among the cultural minorities. In their preaching they lived by example the true meaning of religious liberty and the separation of Church and State.

Vatican-Washington relation. Vatican recognized the wisdom of Archbishop Ireland's advice for the Pope to deal with America after her victory over Spain.⁶⁹ Cardinal Rampolla, Secretary of State, had a regular correspondence with Ireland in an attempt to find some form of smooth contact short of formal diplomatic exchange between the Vatican and Washington.⁷⁰ Catholic prelates in the United States contributed much in this project of Rome. Catholic influence on the President increased in intensity during the administration of Roosevelt, who wanted to keep up his popularity with the Catholics. He even consulted his Catholic friends on many controversial issues. Among those who exercised strong influence on Roosevelt was Cardinal Gibbons.⁷¹

Vatican revived the practice of royal patronage in the appointment of ecclesiastical personnel for the Philippines, although in an informal manner. The Administration felt flattered by exercising selective privilege in the

appointment of American priests in the Philippines. The appointment of Giovanni Baptiste Guidi as Apostolic Delegate to the Philippines was referred to President Roosevelt.⁷²

The Philippine Bill of 1902. During the debate on the Philippine Bill Congress received memorials from the Catholic dioceses and lay organizations protesting the religious provisions and the alleged discriminations against Catholics. The objection centered on the provision authorizing the insular government to buy the friar lands, or to acquire them under the power of eminent domain.⁷³

Since the Philippine Bill would lay the foundations of the Filipino autonomy and prepare them (Filipinos) eventually for independence, the Catholic leaders expressed anxiety on the future of Catholicism and the Church's temporal interests in the Philippines. There was a hidden fear that the primacy of the Church would be threatened after independence in the face of anti-Catholicism of many Filipinos, particularly the educated elite, the Aglipayan Schism, and the advance of Protestantism.

The Clarke Amendment, 1916. The position of American Catholic dignitaries on Philippine independence was one of opposition. Here is what Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore said:

I am irrevocably opposed to any proposal that would commit this nation to a scuttle policy in the Philippines — today, tomorrow or a fixed time in the future — and I say this wholly in the interest of the social, material and moral advancement of the United States — no less than of the Filipinos themselves.⁷⁴

The Cardinal reiterated his feeling in his reply to Resident Commissioner, Manuel Quezon:

I have given this matter very careful consideration, and I really feel that the views expressed by me in the interview were prompted in the interest of the Filipino people. I

am convinced, that for the present at least the welfare of the Islands will be better safeguarded under the care and direction of the United States. There is a great difference between independence and liberty. There are countries which have independence but no liberty or freedom, whereas the Philippine Islands, although for the present not enjoying independence, have freedom and liberty. There are countries which have independence but no liberty or freedom, whereas the Philippine Islands, although for the present not enjoying independence, have freedom and liberty.⁷⁵

Archbishop Harty, the highest religious authority in the Philippines in the first decade of American rule, stated a similar vein of thought: "It would be a burning disgrace for the United States to abandon the Philippines. I want to use that word. It would be a shame."⁷⁶

It was not, therefore, a surprise when the Catholic segment opposed the Clarke Amendment to the Jones Bill providing absolute independence to the Philippines in not less than two years, nor more than four years after the approval of the Bill, with no guarantee of protection after the American withdrawal.⁷⁷

The Springfield Republican (Massachusetts), in its issue of May 3, 1916, explained the defeat of the Clarke Amendment:

The defeat of the independence clause of the Philippine bill in the House was directly to the defection of some twenty-eight Democrats, the majority of whom represent constituencies in certain large northern cities . . . *The influence of the Roman Catholic Church* (underscored supplied) is seen by observers of these facts. As for the Roman Catholic Church, it is opposed to Philippine independence as much as it ever was in the days of Spanish rule. Its interests might be under the control of the old revolutionary element; besides, independence from

the Vatican point of view, is a step nearer, perhaps, to Japanese domination — Japan is pagan.⁷⁸

Manuel Quezon, in his letter to Cardinal Gibbons of February 27, 1913, must have hit deeply when he asked:

Can it be that the history of some of the Latin Republics, or the experiences of France and Portugal, all Catholic countries, in their dealings with the Catholic Church, has influenced that attitude of the Church hierarchy in this country? Does it fear that the Filipinos, if given their independence, would seize the property of the Catholic Church in the Islands or fail to respect its rights?⁷⁹

The actuation of the American clergy in the Philippines and the Roman Catholic Church in the United States was not, however, supported by the Filipino Catholic priests. In a letter to President-elect Woodrow Wilson through Resident Commissioner Manuel Quezon, they expressed their "ardent hopes that his (Wilson's) administration may bring to the Islands a government for and by Filipinos." Reverend Silverio Manalo of Pandacan, one of the signers, explained their stand:

We believe that the interests of Christianity in the islands . . . can be better protected under a Filipino independent government. We have, therefore, no greater desire than the liberty of our country, liberty which means the free and just management of our national and international affairs through the will and sovereignty of the people . . .⁸⁰

PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

"To educate the Filipinos, uplift and civilize and Christianize them" was the social aspect of the American experiment. This colonial concept found expression in the official pronounce-

ments of the authorities and laws of the government.

Transplanting American political and social ideas was no easy task in view of the different conditions. On this matter Frederick W. Atkinson, one of the earliest general superintendents of schools in the country, wrote:

The problem of establishing a modified American school system in the Philippine Islands, under existing conditions, is also the problem of supplanting an old school system deeply interwoven with religious beliefs and social institutions of a semi-civilized people.⁸¹

The problem of control was less knotty than changing the curricular set-up. According to Charles Elliott

The transfer of the control over education from the Church to the State was effected with very little difficulty. The delicate subject was handled with tact and good judgment. The higher places in the Church passed to American Catholics who were familiar with the American school system, and those who did not sympathize with it soon recognized and bowed gracefully to the inevitable.⁸²

Education as a military strategy.

The responsibility of laying the foundations of American colonial education was entrusted to the American Army, whose leaders believed that education "would so quickly promote the pacification of the islands."⁸³ Military funds were appropriated, textbooks and school supplies provided free as schools were opened whenever and wherever possible with the soldiers as the first teachers.⁸⁵ In his report to the Secretary of War, Major General E.S. Otis presented an encouraging account of the initial efforts:

In Manila and a few other cities where our troops are stationed to give inhabitants protection, schools have been established. Parents and

children are eager for primary school instruction and very desirous to acquire a speaking knowledge of the English language.⁸⁵

The first superintendent of schools was the Catholic chaplain Captain McKinnon, whose appointment was questioned by the American Protestants. In an explanation to the Adjutant General, General Otis clarified the issue — Chaplain McKinnon successfully performing duties of superintendent of schools under verbal instructions; no formal orders of appointment issued.⁸⁶

After a year of operation as “educators” the military made recommendations for the establishment of a secular system, supported and controlled by the State. Among these recommendations were:

No sectarian schools should remain on the books of the Department.

Steps should be taken to make all instruction of the schools in the English language.

The schools supported by the government be absolutely divorced from the church. If the natives desire schools in which religious instructions is to be given, that they furnish the entire support for same from private resources, but that attendance at these latter schools should not excuse the children from attendance at the public schools, where English is taught. In addition, the parochial church schools, if such are maintained, should be required to be equal in character or general instruction to the public schools.⁸⁷

Act No. 72 (Education Act) Acting on the recommendation of the military authorities, the Philippine Commission enacted Act No. 74 establishing the Philippine public school system.⁸⁸ The chief features of the new system were: (1) public-supported from the taxes of the people,

(2) centralized administration, (3) secular in curriculum, (4) free and open to all, (5) English as the medium of instruction, and (6) Faribault Plan of religious instruction.

The Education Act was in compliance to President McKinley’s Instructions to the Second Philippine Commission: “It will be the duty of the Commission to promote and extend and, as they find occasion, to improve the system of education already inaugurated by the military authorities.”⁸⁹

Catholic reaction. While the Filipinos welcomed the innovation, the Roman Catholic hierarchy was generally critical. Spokesmen of the Church and the Catholic press “attacked the ban on religious instruction in the public schools of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines as indicative of the anti-Catholic element in American

imperialism.”⁹⁰ The objections ranged from the appointment of ex-Protestant preachers and missionaries as administrators and teachers to the adoption of textbooks biased against Catholicism. Letters from American Catholic dignitaries, and the Catholic press and American priests in the Philippines poured into Washington denouncing the alleged abuses of public school officials and discriminations against the Catholics.⁹¹

Optional religious instruction. The most touchy of the public school issues was optional religious instruction. Section 16 of Act 74 provided:

No teacher or other person should teach or criticize the doctrines of any church, religious sect or denomination, or shall attempt to influence the pupils for or against any church or religious sect in any public school established under this Act. If any teacher shall intentionally violate this section, he or she shall, after due hearing, be dismissed from public service.

Provided, however, that it shall be lawful for the priest or minister of any church established in the pueblo where a public school is situated, to teach religion for one-half an hour three times a week in the school buildings to those public-school pupils whose parents or guardians desire it or express their desire therefor in writing filed with the principal teacher of the school . . . 92

The religious instruction program was patterned after the Faribault Plan of Archbishop Ireland.⁹³ This Plan was reluctantly accepted by the Catholic leadership. What was really desired was "a more benevolent attitude on the part of the government."⁹⁴ If the leaders had their way they would like the religious instructions subsidized by the State. Salamanca's analysis of the attitude of the American prelates is much near the truth:

The American prelates may indeed have been familiar with the American system, but they did not like it applied to the Philippines: tolerant at home, they became almost zealots and bigots abroad. If they did not openly ask for an abandonment of the Faribault Plan, perhaps, it was because the plan was the "brainchild" of Archbishop Ireland, the Catholic prelate of his day closest to the Republican Administration in the United States and to whom they later turned for assistance in resolving far greater religious issues between the United States and the Catholic Church in the Philippines — such as the friar question and property claims arising out of the Aglipayan Schism.⁹⁵

Concession to the Catholic Hierarchy. The militant objection of the Catholic clergy to the religious policies in the Philippines brought about certain concessions from the Administration, especially during the term of Theodore Roosevelt. Catholic administrators were appointed to top positions in the Department of Public Ins-

truction, among whom were Elmer Bryan to take the place of Atkinson who was a Protestant; G.A.O. Reilly as superintendent of city schools in Manila. James Smith took the place of Moses in the Philippine Commission. In a special arrangement with President Roosevelt, 200 Catholic American teachers were appointed in 1902 to Philippine positions. So special was the arrangement that:

With the cooperation of the Civil Service Board and the Philippine Superintendent of Education all of the teachers recommended by the Archbishop (Ireland) would be given *Pass* examination and would be sent directly to assignments in the Islands.⁹⁶

In a letter to Cardinal Gibbons Archbishop Ireland expressed fear that the arrangement could be politically dangerous to the President and suggested that no publicity should be made in the press.⁹⁷

In a cable to Secretary Root, Governor-General Luke Wright reported:

About 2700 native teachers employed in the islands, all of whom are Catholics . . . 2 American teachers in Manila alone.⁹⁸

In addition to the special favors granted to the Catholic group, a very special concession was also extended: 12 religious feast days as school holidays.

The Pensionado Program. Act No. 854 of the Philippine Commission established the Pensionado Program. Through this Program Filipino scholars, both boys and girls of senior high school grade, were sent to the United States for training and higher education, and upon their return they would be working with the government. The Program was the "brainchild" of William A. Sutherland, whom Governor Taft asked to be the Superintendent of the Filipino students. Sutherland was a former Ame-

rican chaplain who later served as Taft's Spanish interpreter.⁹⁹

The Pensionado Program went on smoothly until the Catholic leaders called the attention of Governor Taft and President Roosevelt to the "religious bias" of Sutherland in the placement of the scholars in sectarian and state colleges and universities in the United States. Archbishop Harty, in a letter to a priest in the United States, denounced Sutherland:

Mr. Sutherland's plan of placing many of the Filipino students in sectarian colleges has lessened the regard of the people for the American Government. I have met much dissatisfaction on this point in the provinces recently. The Government is blamed and not Mr. Sutherland to whom the blame really belongs.

When you see Mr. Roosevelt, bring this matter to his attention. The attitude of Mr. Taft in ruling on this matter was excellent but the retention of Mr. Sutherland and wife in that service is a blunder. The matter has been brought before me in a score of letters from all parts of the Islands.¹⁰⁰

As a consequence of this communication, President Roosevelt advised Edwards of the Bureau of Insular Affairs to "enjoin Superintendent of Schools to place pensionados in the same 'moral and religious surroundings' that they had in the islands."¹⁰¹ The President also instructed Taft to meet Sutherland about the problem, suggesting the transfer of the Superintendent to something else. He even remarked that "Harty has been a good fellow and a good friend of ours."¹⁰²

This interference of the Roman Catholic dignitaries was not unknown to the Protestant groups, causing them to denounce the Roosevelt administration as pro-Catholic. But they were not as militant as their counterpart. However, a consolation for the Protestants was expressed by the first

American Protestant missionary in the Philippines, James B. Rodgers:

In regard to unfair treatment of Protestants in the matter of public office, we have no complaint. In spite of the fact that though we are less than half a million, including adherents and minors, high positions are and have been held by members of the evangelical churches.¹⁰³

RELIGIOUS MATTERS

The United States did not have a religious policy similar to that of Spain. The two cardinal principles of "religious freedom" and "separation of Church and State" have been ingrained in her traditions so that any detour is subject to criticism. President McKinley instructed the Taft Commission

To keep the separation of Church and State real, entire, and absolute.

(That) no law shall be made respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof and that free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession shall be allowed.¹⁰⁴

This was the basic policy of the United States in religious matters. It was a policy of neutrality between religious groups whose doctrines and practices have to be propagated in the free "market of ideas" in open competition.

However, the policy to enforce impartially the two basic religious principles in the Philippines:

... led directly to the introduction of Protestantism and contributed to the early successes of the Aglipay Movement. The presence of Protestants and Aglipayans in turn, complicated the controversy over the educational policy (and other policies with religious color) of the United States.¹⁰⁵

Catholic opposition to Protestant endeavors. The opposition of the Catholic leaders to the coming of Protestant missions was understandable in view of the historical background. Traditionally, the Catholic Church is opposed to religious freedom and separation of Church and State, especially when it is in the majority and/or in union with the political power of the State.

In an article in the *Catholic World*, A.P. Doyle wrote:

Were I in authority I would persuade every Protestant minister to stay away from Manila. I would select the most thorough Americans among the Catholic priests of the country and establish an *entente cordiale* between them and the civil authorities.¹⁰⁶

Immediately after the conclusion of the Spanish-American War, a group of prominent men went to the White House to urge President McKinley that the freedom of religion be established in the Islands (Philippines) especially in view of Archbishop Ireland's plea to the contrary.¹⁰⁷

The Protestant mission in the Philippines progressed snail-paced primarily because of the opposition of the Catholic clergy, whose influence on the people was still significant. Cases were reported of violence committed on Protestant groups due to the influence of Catholic priests.¹⁰⁸

In an answer to Mrs. Maria Longworth Storer, a close Catholic friend of Roosevelt, the President said: "I cannot stop and I cannot urge the stopping of missionaries going anywhere they chose."¹⁰⁹

A typical example of the attitude of Catholic authorities on Protestant work or related endeavors is expressed by Leo A. Cullum:

The doctrine of 1920 is still the fundamental statement of the Catho-

lic Church's position with regard to the YMCA and is the basis of the uniform disapproval of the Y by Catholic authorities all over the world . . . the Y is a Protestant organization.

YMCA, founded in London in 1844 by George Williams for the promotion of evangelical Christianity. Central doctrine: The YMCA seeks to unite those young men who (regard) Jesus Christ as their God and Saviour according to the Scriptures, etc. . . .¹¹⁰

An appraisal of the American priests who came to the Philippines to help protect the interests of the Catholic Church against religious competitors is aptly given by Salamanca: "tolerant at home, they became almost zealots and bigots abroad . . ."¹¹¹

In defense of the religious policy of the State. Commissioner James Smith, the Catholic nominee to the Philippine Commission, defended the policy of neutrality of the government, that is, leaving the different religious organizations to carry on their activities unmolested—a policy of being a protector and an arbiter.

The Philippine Government has endeavored, by every means in its power, to secure to the ministry of the Catholic Church the rights, powers, and liberties enjoyed by other citizens. The statement that the friars have been refused permission to return to the parishes is as false as the statement that they have been denied the protection of the law.¹¹²

It would seem unbelievable that "history repeated itself" in the early years of the American rule, when the American prelates who had taken over the leadership of the Catholic Church in the Philippines would restrict religious freedom to other religious groups, principally the Protestants, and obtain concessions to favor the Catholics. They "interfered" in the affairs of

the State in a manner similar to the interference of the Church during the Spanish rule.

The Friar Problem. One of the ticklish problems that the American government had in its hands was how to resolve the friar controversy—expulsion of the friars and the ownership of friar lands. The gravity of the issue was analyzed by Reuter:

The friar question had perplexed the American government for over four years. For the administration it stood as the principal stumbling block to a peaceful assimilation of the Philippines. With the removal of the friars and the purchase of their lands other lesser problems might be settled through negotiation or by a firmer administration of government policies.¹¹³

At the close of the Philippine Revolution against Spain and before the conclusion of the Treaty of Paris, Aguinaldo's government had recovered most parts of the Philippines from Spanish control and had as prisoners friars and nuns singled out as oppressors.¹¹⁴ Church properties and those owned by the religious orders were automatically taken over by the revolutionary forces.

Although the Treaty of Paris recognized the legitimate rights of the Church to its properties, the United States government could not enforce the provisions without incurring the hatred of the Filipino elite whom the Americans would like to court for their support to the new colonial rule.

As early as 1901 the plan to buy the friar lands by the American government was decided by the Roosevelt Administration. Governor Taft was chosen to head the "mission" to Rome. Roosevelt did not call it a diplomatic mission but

It is simply that the governor of the Philippines will stop at Rome on his way to the Philippines in order

to go straight to the headquarters of the business corporations with which he has got to deal in acquiring that business corporations' property.¹¹⁵

The American proposal to Pope Leo XIII consisted mainly of (1) to buy all agricultural lands owned by the religious orders, (2) withdrawal of the Dominican, Augustinian, Franciscan, and Recollect friars, and (3) compromise on charitable trusts.¹¹⁶ These proposals were rejected by the Vatican on three counts:

Measure would be contrary to positive rights guaranteed by the Treaty of Paris and would consequently put the Holy See to conflict with Spain which would have every reason to protest much more.

Such a measure would be, in the eyes of the Filipinos and the entire Catholic Fold, the explicit confirmation of all the accusations brought against the said religious by their enemies, accusations of which the falsity or at least the evident exaggeration cannot be disputed.

Finally, if the American Government, respecting as it does individual rights, does not dare interdict the Philippine soil to the Spanish religious of the four orders above named, how could the Pope do it, the common father of all, the supporter and born defender of the religious?¹¹⁷

The Vatican, nevertheless, did not discount the possibility of the sale of the friar lands, but the negotiation must be in Manila. On the withdrawal of the friars the Pope could not agree because the friars comprised two-thirds of the clergy and as of the present, there were no replacements, either Filipinos or Americans.

The final negotiation for the purchase of the friar lands was done in Manila on December 22, 1903 when the contract was signed. However,

after the lands were surveyed in 1905 the final amount paid for over 400,000 acres was ₱6,934,433.66.118 Further sales were made under the Commonwealth Government and the Philippine Republic.

The withdrawal of the friars from the Philippines was resolved quietly. A reorganization of the Catholic Church was made, giving the management of the affairs in the Philippines to the American prelates. Meanwhile, Spanish friars quietly left the country, so that by 1903 their number was only 246 from 1,013 in 1898.

The Aglipayan Schism. Another thorny problem of the government was the Aglipayan-Catholic conflict. It began as the Philippine Revolution was about to end Spanish rule in the country. As the parishes were left vacant by the fleeing Spanish friars, the Filipino rebels took control and gave them to Filipino priests who were in sympathy with the establishment of a "national" church under Rome.

To prevent the impending break of a big segment of the Filipinos from the Catholic Church, the Vatican sent Archbishop Chapelle to settle the controversy. Unfortunately, Chapelle was too pro-friar in his attitude and actuations, so that his bungling of the highly sensitive issue brought about the final phase of the Aglipayan Schism.¹¹⁹

The confiscation of church properties by the Aglipayans was the core of the complaints of American prelates in their correspondence with fellow dignitaries in the United States and American authorities. Governor Taft had suggested to Catholic authorities to take their cases to the courts, but the latter had no faith in the courts because the judges were former revolutionaries, hence, anti-Catholic; or the judges were Aglipayans, and therefore, would be biased in their decisions.

Meanwhile, the Philippine Government tried to be as impartial

as possible in the conflict and acted as protector and/or arbiter whenever rights were violated. Taft, on January 10, 1903, issued an Executive Proclamation providing for "Peaceful Possession" until the issue could be settled by the courts. The Philippine Commission enacted Act 1376 on July 24, 1905 providing for the speedy disposition of controversies as to the right of administration, or possession of churches, convents, cemeteries, and other church properties as to ownership and title.¹²⁰ The law empowered the Supreme Court to decide the issue. Thus, in 1906 the Supreme Court sustained the decision of Court of First Instance upholding the ownership of the churches by Rome.¹²¹ Catholic ownership of the properties in question was again sustained in a decision made on the so-called Insular Cases. At last the Aglipayan-Catholic controversy had been resolved.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The study has fairly examined the role of the three religious groups, namely, — the Roman Catholic Church, the Protestant missions, and the Aglipayan Church — in the formulation and/or implementation of American policies in the Philippines from 1898 to 1916. The events leading to, during, and after the Spanish-American War attested to the inevitability of the religious influence. The historical and cultural orientations of both Americans and Filipinos provided a fertile setting of the developments that transpired during the inclusive period.

The Catholic Influence. Of the three groups, the Roman Catholic Church exerted the greatest degree of influence in terms of scope and intensity. This is logically understandable for "the stakes were high for the Catholic Church . . . so that the religious issues inherent

in the American occupation became a primary interest."¹²² If the Spanish friars were to the Spanish government, the American prelates were to the new colonial government. The analogy specifically refers to the efforts of the Catholic dignitaries and the Catholic press to verge certain political and social policies in favor of the Catholic Church. By heeding the advice of Archbishop Ireland for the Church "to deal directly with the Americans as never before," Rome reaped an abundant harvest although not to the full satisfaction of the Catholic segment. For the Church to fight for its legitimate rights is natural and justifiable, but when illegal and immoral methods¹²³ are (were) resorted to to wring privileges, then a condemnation is equally justifiable.

The change of political control over the Islands brought some doubts and fears among Catholic circles on the future of Catholicism in the country in the face of a possible Protestant evangelization. However, when the smoke of battle cleared the Church had the upperhand in influencing American policies. The Treaty of Paris protected Church's property rights. Continuous and vigorous representation with the American authorities caused changes in policies and structure in the colonial government. Internal reforms were introduced, the Philippine Church was reorganized placing the supervision and control under the leadership of American prelates. The new blood infused brought about new vigor and vitality to cope with the problems the Church was forced to face.

The Roman Catholic Church triumphed because the "gates of hell" had not "prevailed" against it!¹²⁴

The Protestant influence. The Spanish-American War, otherwise called by the Catholic press as the Protestant "Crusade" was indeed a God-given opportunity for the

Protestant foreign missions to spread evangelical Christianity. The difficulties encountered by the Philippine missions were not new to the American missionaries, knowing fully well that Catholicism was deeply rooted among the people. The missionaries stood for religious freedom and the separation of Church and State as they knew and practiced in the United States. They did not ask for special privileges for themselves and their adherents but for the impartial implementation of these two basic principles. For only in the free market of ideas could they spread the Protestant interpretation of the Christian message. All they asked was the chance to be heard and they were heard.

The Protestant influence on American policies might not be great as that of the Catholic, but it should be remembered that it was the Protestant motive "to educate, civilized, and Christianize" the Filipinos that clinched McKinnley's decision to take the Philippines. The greater part of the Protestant participation in the colonial government was in helping lay the foundations of the Anglo-American civilization as a new layer of the culture of the Filipino people.

To the Protestant missionaries and their followers are attributed the training of the youth in leadership through the YMCA, which Governor Taft complimented, "No single non-governmental and non-sectarian institution at present is doing much for the Filipino youth as the YMCA."¹²⁵ To them is also credited the introduction of scouting, athletics, modern medical and nursing services, and various forms of social work.¹²⁶

Yes, theirs was not so much in influencing the formulation of government policies to their favor but rather in lending a hand in attain-

ing the gradual assimilation of the Filipinos into the American experiment of western type democracy on Philippine soil with both native and foreign cultural ingredients. Not so much in quantitative gains¹²⁷ but in the quality leadership and a liberal perspective of life as a contribution to the building of a New Society.

The Aglipayan Influence. The Aglipayan Movement began with a loud bang but it weakened after the Insular Cases were decided in favor of the Roman Catholic Church. For a time American authorities had to delay the implementation of the property provisions of the Treaty of Paris for fear of alienating the Filipino elite and a significant portion of the masses. The government avoided to be identified as pro-Catholic Church.

There was not any substantial Aglipayan influence on the formulation of government policies, except those of Taft's "Peaceful Possession Proclamation" and the elevation of the issue on church ownership to the Supreme Court for resolution. The Aglipayans had been insistent on letting the courts decide the conflict, but the Catholic leaders were at first antagonis-

tic to the idea, having some misgivings about the courts. Any visible influence was in the local communities where the Aglipayans were in the majority and/or the town officials were Aglipayans or in sympathy with them.

Had the United States recognized Philippine Independence after the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Independence Church (the official name of the Aglipayan Communion) would have had the upperhand in the religious life of the country. However, despite its drawback it has proved the thesis that the Filipino clergy is more than capable to manage its own religious matters without any foreign support!

If the Christian faith is believed to be the "salt" and the "light" of society, then its influence on the government is certain and inevitable. While standing squarely on religious liberty and the separation of Church and State, the government should take the churches as partners in nation building. And the guideline for such a relationship should be the admonition of Jesus Christ: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's."¹²⁸

FOOTNOTES:

¹Teodoro A. Agoncillo and Oscar N. Alfonso. *History of the Filipino People*, Revised edition. Quezon City: Malaya Books, 1967, p. 102.

²Donald Dean Parker. "Church and State in the Philippines, 1565-1896" (unpublished B.D. dissertation. University of Chicago, 1936). p. 19.

³Charles Henry Cunningham, "Ecclesiastical Influence in the Philippines," *The American Journal of Theology*, XXI (August, 1918), p. 176, quoted in Parker.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 472.

⁵Paz Policarpio, "The Literature of the

Propaganda Movement, 1882-1895" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of the Philippines, Manila, 1925), quoted in Demy Sonza, *Mightier Than The Sword*, pp. 84-85.

⁶Parker, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 86, 88.

⁷Among the documents examined are (1) First and Second Charters of Virginia, (2) the Mayflower Compact, (3) the First Charter of Massachusetts, (4) the Charter of Maryland, (5) New England Confederation, (6) Maryland Toleration Act, (7) Pennsylvania Charter of Privilege, (8) Declaration of Independence, and (9) Virginia Statute of Religious Liberty. Henry S. Commager (ed.), *Documents of American History*, 6th edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1958.

- ⁸Thomas Bailey, *The American Pageant: A History of the Republic*. Second edition. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company, 1961, pp. 13-143.
- ⁹*Ibid.*, p. 73.
- ¹⁰Commager, *Op. Cit.*, Document No. 66.
- ¹¹Bailey, *Op. Cit.*, p. 28
- ⁹²Article I of the First Ten Amendments, Commager, *Op. Cit.*, Document No. 87
- ¹³"Comeback for Religion in Schools?" *U.S. News & World Report*, Vol. 79, No. 7 (August 18, 1975). p. 56.
- ¹⁴*Ibid.*
- ¹⁵Bailey, *Op. Cit.* p. 122.
- ¹⁶*Ibid.*
- ¹⁷James H. Bridge, *The Overland Monthly*, Vol. 31, Second Series (August, 1898), pp. 177-178.
- ¹⁸Henry Cabot Lodge, "Our Blundering Foreign Policy," *Forum*, Vol. 19 (March, 1895), p. 17.
- ¹⁹Alfred T. Mahan, *The Interest of America in Sea Power, Present and Future*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1890, pp. 21, 23.
- ²⁰J. Strong, *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis*. Rev. ed. New York: The Baker & Taylor Company, 1895, pp. 226-227.
- ²¹Expressed by Thomas Hart Benton, quoted in Foster K. Dulles, *China and America: The Story of Their Relations since 1784*. Fort Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, Inc., p. 33.
- ²²Bailey, *Op. Cit.* p. 611.
- ²³Christian interest in China as of 1930s included the following: Protestant missionaries, 5,000, Catholic missionaries, 3,000, operating 307 hospitals, 758 dispensaries, 5 medical schools, and 13 colleges and universities. Armand Rappaport, *Henry Stimson and Japan, 1931-33*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1863, p. 40 (footnote).
- ³⁴Rear-Admiral F. E. Chadwick, *The Relations of the United States and Spain in Diplomacy*. quoted in Olcott, *The Life of William McKinley*, Vol. II. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916, p. 382.
- ²⁵Frank T. Reuter, *Catholic Influence on American Colonial Policies 1898-1901*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967;
- H. Wayne Morgan, *America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1965, pp. 372-74.
- ²⁶*Ibid.*, p. x.
- ²⁷M.M. Wilkerson, *Public Opinion and the Spanish-American War: A Study in War Propaganda*, New York: Russell and Russell, 1967, p. 57.
- ²³*Chicago Tribune*, No. 6, 1898, p. 6 in Wilkerson, p. 58.
- ²⁹In *William McKinley Papers*. Quezon City. University of the Philippines Library (microfilm).
- ³⁰John Y. Farrell, "Archbishop Ireland and Manifest Destiny," *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 33. No. 3 (October, 1947), p. 292.
- ³¹*Missionary Review of the World*, Vol. 21 (June, 1898), p. 462, in Reuter, *Op. Cit.*, p. e3.
- ³²*New York Freeman's Journal*, July 23, (1898), p. 1, in *Ibid.*, p. 112.
- ³³James B. Rodgers, *Forty Years in the Philippines; A History of the Philippine Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1898-1939*, New York: The Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, 1940, p. 1.
- ³⁴Frank Laubach, *The People of the Philippines. Their Religious Progress and Preparation for Spiritual Leadership in the Far East*. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1925, pp. 177-178. (In 1904 the different Protestant missions agreed to divide the Philippines into "spiritual zones" to avoid duplication and rivalry.)
- ³⁵The first Protestant service in Manila was led by Charles A. Glunz and Prank A. Jackson of the YMCA on August 13, 1898.
- ³⁶*William McKinley Papers*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Library (microfilm).
- ³⁷Archbishop Nozaleda was actually in control of the Spanish government. Brother Edmund McDevitt, *The First Californian-Chaplain*. Fresno, California: Academy Library Guild, 1956, p. 92.
- ³⁸In Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, McKinnon is honored with a statue portraying him in his military uniform as he strides up the beach toward Manila to seek to effect, single handed and unarmed, the peaceful capitulation of that city by the Spaniards. *Ibid.*

39 The surrender negotiations began with British Consul Rawson-Walker, and after his death, were continued with Belgian Consul M. Edouard Andre.

40 This was "real" battle with casualties on the combatants, Chaplain McKinnon was one of those wounded.

41 Olcott, *Op. Cit.*, Vol. II, p. 73.

42 *Ibid.*, p. 170, in Agoncillo and Alfonso, *Op. Cit.*, p. 237. In a letter to Secretary of War Root on May 19, 1898, McKinley gave the following instructions: "All churches and buildings devoted to religious worship and to the arts and sciences, and all schoolhouses are, so far as possible, to be protected, and all destruction or intentional defacement of such places, of historical monuments, or archives, or works of science and art, is prohibited, saved when required by urgent military necessity."

43 Senate Document No. 62, Part I, p. 233, 55th Congress, 3rd Session.

44 Reuter, *Op. Cit.*, p. 17.

45 H. Wyne Morgan (ed.), *Making Peace with Spain, The Diary of Whitetaw Reid, September-December, 1898*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965, p. 67

46 Lauhach. *Op. Cit.*, p.130; Blount asserted that Chapelle told him later in Manila that he (Chapelle) got into the treaty the \$20,000,000 purchase price for the islands. Blount, *American Occupation of the Philippines, 1898-1912*. New York: P.P. Putman's Sons, 1912, p. 133-4.

47 Correspondence as of August 2, 1898.

48 John Farrell, "Archbishop Ireland and Manifest Destiny," *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (October, 1947), p. 296.

49 *Ibid.*, p. 11.

50 Quoted in John T. Farrell, "Background of the Taft Mission to Rome," *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (April, 1950), p. 10.

51 Morgan, *Op. Cit.* p. 240.

52 McDevitt, *Op. Cit.*, p. 192.

53 *Ibid.*

54 Morgan, H. Wyne, *America's Road to Empire. The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965, p. 105.

55 Morgan, *Making Peace with Spain*, pp. 236-37.

56 H. Villanueva, *The Diplomacy of the Spanish-American War*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, Inc., 1949. 51. p. 29.

57 Olcott, *Op. Cit.*, II, pp. 109-111, quoted from a report of an interview by General James F. Rushing and confirmed by others who were present; *Christian Advocate*, January 22, 1903; Aguinaldo and Pacis, *A Second Look at America*, 1957, p. 65.

58 Agoncillo and Alfonso, *Op. Cit.*, p. 274.

59 *Supra*, p. 10.

60 Agoncillo and Alfonso, *Op. Cit.*, p. 274.

61 T. Roosevelt, "Expansion and Peace," *The Independent*, LI (December 21, 1899), 3401-05 in William H. Harbough (ed.), *The Writings of Theodore Roosevelt*, 1967, p. 34.

62 Agoncillo and Alfonso, *Op. Cit.*, p. 292,

63 McDevitt, *Op. Cit.*, p. 100.

64 *Ibid.*, p. 106.

65 *Ibid.*, p. 111.

66 *Ibid.*, p. 204; See *Annual Report of the War Department*, 1901, Part 4, p. 99

e Rogers, *Op. Cit.*, p. 9

67 *Ibid.*, p. 6.

68 *Supra*, p. 14.

69 Reuter; *Op. Cit.* p. 130.

70 *Ibid.*, p. 117.

71 *Ibid.*, p. 131.

72 Charles Elliott, *The Philippines to the End of the Commission Government. A Study in Tropical Democracy*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs, Merrill Company, 1917, a. 47.

73 *Baltimore News*, February 19, 1913, quoted in John A. Beadles, "The Debate in the United States concerning Philippine Independence, 1912-1916," *Philippine Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (July) 1968), p. 426.

15 Quoted in *The Filipino People*, Vol. 1, No. 7, (March, 1913), p. 61

76 Quoted in Henry C. Ide, "Philippine Problems," *North American Review*, Vol. 186, No. 624 (November, 1907), p. 611,

77 Beadles, *Op. Cit.*, p. 485.

78 *Ibid.*, p. 438

- 79 *The Filipino People*, Vol. 1, No. 7 (March, 1913), p. 6.
- 59 *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- 81 F. W. Atkinson, "The Educational Problem in the Philippines," *The Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 89, No. 583, (March, 1902), p. 360.
- 82 Elliotte, *Op. Cit.*, p. 60.
- 83 U.S. Bureau of Census, *Census of the Philippine Islands, 1903*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905, Vol. III, 621.
- 84 *Ibid.*, p. 640.
- 85 Extract from Report of Maj. Gen. E. S. Otis, U.S. Army, *U. S. Senate Document No. 129*.
- 86 Correspondence II, 923 (of Gen. Otis), in McDevitt, *Op. Cit.*, p. 102.
- 87 Military Government, P. I., *Annual Report of Major General Arthur MacArthur*. U. S. Army, Commanding, Division of the Philippines, 1901. Vol. 2, pp. 28-33.
- 88 Enacted January 21, 1901. For the details, see Dean C. Worcester, *The Philippines, Past and Present*, New York: Macmillan, 1914; Public Laws and Resolutions 1900, Vol. I, pp. 6-10.
- 89 George A. Malcolm, *The Government of the Philippine Islands*. Rochester, N. Y.; The Lawyers Co-operative Publishing Company, 1916, p. 216.
- 90 Reuter *Op. Cit.*, p. 113.
- 91 Frederick J. Zwierlein, *Theodore Roosevelt and Catholics, 1882-1919*, St. Louis, Missouri: The Reverend Victor T. Suren. 1956.
- 92 Quoted in Bonifacio Salamanca, *The Filipino Reaction to American Rule, 1901 - 1913*. Hamden, Conn.: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1968.
- 93 Also called Faribault and Stillwater Plan. see James H. Moynihan, *The Life of Archbishop John Ireland*. N.Y.: Harpers & Brothers, 1953, pp. 84-102.
- 94 Opinion of Gen. James F. Smith, Secretary of Public Instruction in 1903.
- 95 Salamanca, *Op. Cit.*, p. 80.
- 96 Taft's letter to Root, Nov. 22, 1902, in Reuter, *Op. Cit.* p. 129.
- 97 Ireland to Gibbons, May 4, 1903, Gibbons's Correspondence, Box 100, in Reuter.
- 98 Cable as of July 9, 1902. in "The School question in the Philippines," *The Catholic World*, Vol. 75 (July, 1902), p. 431.
- 99 W. A. Sutherland, *Not by Might: The Epic of the Philippines*. Las Cruces, New Mexico; Southwest Publishing Company, 1953.
- 100 Library of Congress, Ms. Division: *Roosevelt Papers*, in Zwierlein, *Op. Cit.* p. 196.
- 101 Oct. 17, 1904, National Archives (U.S.), in Salamanca, *Op. Cit.*, footnote No. 75 of Chapter V.
- 102 Morrison, Vol. IV, p. 1201, in Zwierlein, *Op. Cit.*, p. 197.
- 103 Rogers, *Op. Cit.*, p. 197; Dr. Barlett and Dr. Benton, first and third presidents of the University of the Philippines, respectively, were Protestant ministers; Dr. Bocobo, also U.P. president; Dr. Osias, first Filipino superintendent of schools.
- 104 Full text in *Annual Reports of the War Department*, 1901, Vol. I: Report of the Secretary of War, Part I, Appendix B, pp. 72-76.
- 105 Salamanca, *Op. Cit.*, p. 97.
- 106 A. P. Doyle, "Religious Problem in the Philippines," *Catholic World*, Vol. 68 (October, 1898), p. 124, in Reuter, *Op. Cit.*, p. 78.
- 107 Rogers, *Op. Cit.* p. 12.
- 108 Laubach, *Op. Cit.*
- 109 Letter to Mrs. Storer, May 18, 1900, Elthing E. Morrison (ed.), *The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt*, II, 1298.
- 110 Leo A. Cullum, "The Religion of the YMCA," *Philippine Studies*, Vol. I No. 3 & 4 (December, 1953), p. 249.
- 111 *Supra*, p. 38.
- 112 Letter of Commissioner Smith to President Roosevelt, October 24, 1903, *Roosevelt Correspondence, Letters Received*, Box 62, in Reuter; *Op. Cit.*, p. 132.
- 513 Reuter, *Op. Cit.*, p. 105.
- 114 An attempt was made by General Otis to effect the release of 130 friars and nuns held prisoners by Aguinaldo who refused to release them. These prisoners were, however, released when the American troops captured them later. *Ibid.*, pp. 66-68.
- 115 The Taft Mission was planned by Roosevelt, Root, Hay, and Ireland at the suggestion of Vatican's Secretary of State

Rampolla. Protestant editors Lyman Abbott of *Outlook* and William H. Ward of *The Independent* had agreed to back up the Administration. See *Outlook*, Vol. 69 (December 28, 1901), p. 3029.

116 Reuter, *Op. Cit.*, p. 144.

117 National Archives, *Cable Correspondence of Root and Taft.*, p. 51, quoted in Zierlein, *Op. Cit.*, p. 50.

118 Original price was \$7,239,784.66; Agoncillo and Alfonso, *Op. Cit.*, p. 333; Also "4th Report of the Philippine Commission, 1903," *House Doc. No. 2*, Vol. 6 58th Congress, 2nd Session, p. 43.

119 Agoncillo and Alfonso, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 279-287.

120 Peter G. Gowing, *Islands Under the Cross. The Story of the Church in the Philippines*. Manila: National Council of Churches in the Philippines,

1967, p. 118; Jorge B. Coquia, *Church and State Law and Relations in the Philippines*, 2nd edition. Manila: Rex Book Store, 1974.

131 Laubach, *Op. Cit.*, p. 149.

123 Reuter, *Op. Cit.*, p. 110.

Supra, p. 38.

124 *The Holy Bible*, Matthew 15:18.

125 Laubach; *Op. Cit.*, p. 179. While it is non-sectarian it has been identified with Protestant groups.

126 For details of these activities, see Laubach.

127 As of the Census of 1918, the Protestants totalled only 123,362, roughly 1.3% of the total population. *Census of 1918*, Vol. II, p. 50.

128 *The Holy Bible*, Matthew 22:21.