ISSN 0038—3600

Southeast Asia
JOURNAL

VOLUME 11, NO. 1 1979
CENTRAL PHILIPPINE UNIVERSITY
ILOILO CITY, PHILIPPINES

Southeast Asia Journal

CONTENTS VOL. 11, No. 1 1979

Articles

Abstract

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

By Moises S. Ponteras *

INTRODUCTION

Church and State in the Philippines, 1565-1898. The political setup in the Philippines during the Spanish 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 government, and the exercise of political power by the religious. In the central government, representatives of the church or the religious orders sat in the highest councils. The friars were heavily represented in the powerful 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 machinery: they had become the government. [1]

Church-State relationship is further 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 connection 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 administration to be dominated by the prelates.[3]

He further writes:

> All these men suffered because the Church interferred 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 supremacy in the Archipelago because they sought to pacify the natives by restricting or removing the religious orders.[4]

A more precise and detailed categorization of the powers of the Spanish 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 election of municipal officials
censor of the municipal budget
counselor for the municipal council
examiner of the scholars attending 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 public works
member of the board for partitioning 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 connection 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 ecclessiastical government as well as the civil government were alike responsible for the deplorable condition of Philippine 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 privileges 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 paper "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 formulation 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 Philippine-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 experiment" in the Philippines. The specific influence might not have been adequately substantiated due to the scarcity of available materials and the insufficient 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 Fayth" 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 Massachussetts, 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.

Oathtaking 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 inexplanable 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 comitted 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'Connel on May 2, 1898, he said:

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]

POLITICAL MATTERS

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 Pl cide L. Chapelle of New Orleans to represent the church's interests in the Paris talks. Archbishop Chapelle "evidently made an agreable 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. Monsignior 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 Commission 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 ecclesiatical 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 reffered 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 Amendent, 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."[78]

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 (Massachussetts), 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 constituences in certain large northern cities . . . *The influence of the Roman Catholic Church* (underscoring 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 pronouncements 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 judgement. 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, were 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 news 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 occassion, 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 Instruction, 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 trom 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.[108]

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 Catholic 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 "interferred" 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 posibility 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 methods[123] are (were) resported 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. Continous 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 nonsectarian 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 gains[127] 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 antagonistic 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:

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

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

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

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 472.

[5]Paz 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.

[6]Parker, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 86, 88.

[7]Among the documents examined are (1) First and Second Charters of Virginia, (2) the Mayflower Compact, (3) the First Charter of Massachussetts, (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.

[8]Thomas 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.

[10]Commager, *Op. Cit.*, Document No. 66.

[11]Bailey, *Op. Cit.*, p. 28

[12]Article 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.*

[15]Bailey, *Op. Cit.*, p. 122.

[16]*Ibid.*

[17]James H. Bridge, *The Overland Monthly*, Vol. 31, Second Series (August, 1898), pp. 177-178.

[18]Henry Cabot Lodge, "Our Blundering Foreign Policy." *Forum*, Vol. 19 (March, 1895), p. 17.

[19]Alfred T. Mahan, *The Interest of America in Sea Power, Present and Future*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1890, pp. 21, 23.

[20] J. Strong, *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis.* Rev. ed. New York: The Baker & Taylor Company, 1895, pp. 226-227.

[21] Expressed by Thomas Hart Benton, quoted in Foster R. Dulles, *China and America: The Story of Their Relations since 1784.* Fort Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, Inc., p. 33.

[22] Bailey, *Op. Cit*, p. 611.

[23] Christian interest in China as of 1930s included the following: Protestant missionaries, 5,000, Catholic missonaries, 3,000, operating 307 hospitals, 758 dispensaries. 5 medical schools, and 13 colleges and universities. Armind Rappaport, *Henry Stimson and Japan, 1931-33.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1863, p. 40 (footnote).

[24] Rear-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.

[25] Frank T. Reuter, *Catholic Influence on American Colonial Policies 1898-1904.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967; H. Wayne Morgan, *America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion.* New York: John Willey & Sons, Inc. 1965, pp. 372-74.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. x.

[27] M.M. Wilkerson, *Public Opinion and the Spanish-American War: A Study in War Propaganda*, New York: Russell and Russell, 1967, p. 57.

[28] *Chicago Tribune*, No. 6, 1898, p. 6 in Wilkerson, p. 58.

[29] In *William McKinley Papers.* Quezon City. University of the Philippines Library (microfilm).

[30] John 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.

[33] James 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.

[34] Frank 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 "spiritualzones" to avoid duplication and rivalry.)

[35] The first Protestant service in Manila was led by Charles A. Glunz and Frank A. Jackson of the YMCA on August 13, 1898.

[36] *William McKinley Papers.* Quezon City: University of the Philippines Library (microfilm).

[37] Archbishop Nozaleda was actually in control of the Spanish government. Brother Edmund McDevitt, *The First Californian-Chaplain.* Fresno, California: Academy Library Guild, 1956, p. 92.

[38] In 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."

13 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 Whitelaw 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,

33 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.

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

74 *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. 435.

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. Worchester, *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 Reutor, ***Op. Cit.*** p. 129.

97 Ireland to Gibbons, May 4. 1903, Gibbon'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. 1291, 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 *in the Philippines*. Manila: National Council of Churches in the Philippines, 1967, p. 118; Jorge R. 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.

JOSEFA ABIERTAS

1894 - 1922

The First Filipino Woman Baptist to Gain National Renown

By Demy and Gloria Sonza

The province of Capiz that has produced such outstanding topnotchers in the Bar examination for lawyers as President Manuel Roxas and Justice Jose Hontiveros, also holds the distinction of having raised the first Filipino woman lawyer and Bar topnotcher, Josefa Abiertas. Abiertas was truly a brilliant lawyer, but more than that, she was a fighting moral crusader and social reformer.

Josefa hailed from the town of Capiz, now Roxas City, where she was born in 1894.[1] Hers was a life of hardship and toil from the very start. Her parents were poor and when she was eight years old, she and a younger brother were completely orphaned. Their grandmother took custody of the children but she, too, was hardly able to feed and clothe them.

Young Josefa could not have gone to school had she not been found by two American Baptist missionary couples: Dr. and Mrs. Peter Lerrigo and Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Robbins. The missionaries had her enrolled at the Baptist Home School* when this was opened in Capiz in 1904.

It was also in 1904, some time in the month of January, when Josefa accepted Jesus Christ as her Lord and Savior. With twenty-nine other converts, she was baptized by Dr. Robbins in the sea three kilometers outside the town of Capiz. From that day "her whole heart was captured by the spirit of Christ and her whole life was devoted to His service."[2]

At the Baptist Home School, ten-year old Josefa lived with other orphans in a large house on the main street. The house was rented by the Baptist Mission and served as home and school (hence the name of the institution) for the motley group of parentless children who ranged in age from three to twelve years in the case of boys and four to fourteen in the case of girls. In 1906, the Mission purchased a lot on a hill overlooking the town and erected there a large bamboo and nipa building for the children.[3]

For many years there was only one paid helper in the school, a woman named Maria, who acted as house mother. Josefa joyfully did all the chores assigned to her. In class she was very attentive and showed great eagerness to learn. She also discovered the world of books and spent all the spare time she could find in reading. Mrs. Lerrigo and Mrs. Robbins, noting the girl's intellectual curiosity and brilliance, encouraged her to study

* Now the Filamer Christian Institute, Roxas City.

diligently. Josefa responded enthusiastically and finished the elementary grades at the top of the class.

Under the influence and guidance of the missionaries, Josefa's religious zeal grew more intense every year; and when she enrolled at the Capiz High School her enthusiasm electrified her fellow students, inspiring them with a crusading spirit. She told them what it means to be a Christian, "In the simplest meaning of the word," she explained, "a Christian is Christ's man. Christ sets us free from ourselves and leads us out into a glorious world of service for God and humanity."[4]

Responding to her personal witnessing, many of her classmates became Christians. One of them wrote, "We agreed that after graduation we would all go to Mindanao to teach and convert our unfortunate brethren."[5]

Josefa met financial difficulties in high school. She could not afford to buy books, so she studied her lessons with a girl friend. Yet, despite her poverty, she commanded the respect of other students who looked up to her as their leader because she was bright and knew the meaning of life. One of her classmates, paying tribute to Josefa's personal qualities, wrote:[6]

> In 1913, Capiz had no fourth year high school class. Josefa had no money with which to go to Manila to study. She therefore sought a position in the Capiz treasurer's office. When, in 1915, a fourth year class was organized, she secured permission to work in the afternoons and to enter high school as an irregular student. The following year she completed her studies—valedictorian of the class.

She was able to finish the course together with the regular members of the class because she was allowed to perform her chemistry experiments after school hours and to study some of her subjects at home. It was physically heavy for her to be working and studying at the same time. Miss Rose Nicolet, a missionary nurse at the Emmanuel Hospital, recorded an incident about Josefa: "Well do I remember her fainting one morning in the office. She had nothing to eat that morning, and no doubt little the day before."[7] It was really a hard struggle, but Josefa's determined spirit and brilliant intellect proved equal to it.

Scholastic triumph in high school further whetted Abiertas' desire for higher education. She wanted to take up law and serve her people as a Christian lawyer. No woman in Capiz, and in the whole country for that matter, had ever thought of becoming a lawyer. The law profession had always been only for men. Josefa must have come to her decision to study law after long consideration. She saw that it was in the legal field where she could do much to correct the many evils that plagued her country. She had embraced the philosophy of social action early enough. To her, faith without work is dead.

Yet, going to law school was easier thought than done. It meant she had to go to Manila. Where would she get the money needed? Could she leave her grandmother and brother behind? Could she find a job in Manila? These and many other questions assailed her mind.

But Josefa had a strong faith in God. She knew that if it was God's will for her to become a lawyer He will provide a way. For days she prayed hard for God's guidance and help. Finally, feeling guided by the Holy Spirit, she requested for transfer of work from the Capiz treasurer's office to that of the Insular Treasurer's Office in Manila. Since she had a

high performance rating in Capiz, her request was granted. Of course, insofar as she was concerned, the approval of her request for transfer was God's work.

Trusting in God's assistance and protection, young Miss Abiertas took her aging grandmother and brother with her to Manila. That was her first trip outside Capiz but if there was any moment when she was disturbed by fear or doubt she never showed it.

In the big city, Josefa rented two tiny rooms in a boarding house. Her grandmother and brother did their best to help her with the housekeeping and this lightened a bit her work. But her earnings were not enough. Often she denied herself food that she might feed her little family.[8] She worked from eight in the morning to five in the afternoon and attended night classes at the Philippine Law School. Within a short time her Christian influence was felt in the office where she was working.

One time, Dr. Robbins, her pastor in Capiz, was in Manila and paid her a visit. "I did not need inquire whether she was there," reported Dr. Robbins. "The moment I entered the treasurer's office I could feel her in the atmosphere."[9]

Abiertas spent her money very prudently. In order to save on transportation, she walked to the office and to school. At times she was so hungry, but since she had no money for snacks, what she did was to drink water and then more water to assuage her hunger.[10] And she never complained of the hardship. Her motto was "Trust God, work hard and just keep sweet when things go wrong."[11]

The zealous Christian young lady found Manila a great challenge not so much for physical survival as for spiritual growth and social service. Aside from attending church, she associated herself with the YMCA and despite her work and schooling, found time to wage a crusade against vice and sin.

Upon her arrival in Manila in early 1916, she was appalled by the criminality and vice, especially drunkenness and prostitution, that prevailed in the city. She lost no time in starting a campaign to combat these evils. She talked to her co-workers in the office and her classmates in school to solicit their support.

"Year after year," she wrote to a friend, "hundreds and hundreds of young people go to perdition because of these drinking salons, these canteens and these red light districts. O, how I wish I were the Chief Executive of the city . . . With the help of God, I am determined to launch a fight against these evils."[12]

There were at that time hundreds of wretched girls, some of whom foreigners who were virtually kept prisoners in the vice dens of the red light districts. Abiertas took it upon herself to champion their cause. She demanded a hearing of the municipal council. Without mincing words, she told the city fathers that by permitting this nefarious practices they were inflicting a curse upon the people they were elected to serve and protect.[13]

She organized a group of like-minded young people to help her in the campaign. Together they interviewed preachers, priests, teachers, doctors, lawyers, businessmen, public officials, even the Governor-General. They talked to editors, publishers and reporters and the newspapers warmly espoused their cause. As a result, public sentiment was so aroused that the city government was forced to take action.

One night, Mayor Justo Lukban ordered the police to crack down on the vice dens. Around 600 girls were rounded up, thrown into jail and then unceremoniously shipped to Davao on 18 October 1916.[14] Instead of appeas-

ing Josefa's moral sense, the mayor's action horrifield her. She thought it was grossly unfair to the outcasts who, to her mind, deserved better treatment. Driving them away was not the best way of solving the problem. She reasoned that so long as there were places of vice in Manila, there would always be some people who would be tempted to go to those places.

The maintainers of the vice dens went to court to challenge the mayor's arbitrary decision of shipping the girls to Davao. The court ruled that Lukban's action was illegal. Consequently, many of the girls were taken back to Manila to resume their trade.

Alarmed at this development of events, Abiertas organized demonstrations and rallies against the cabarets and the red light districts. Responding to the public indignation, the city council conducted public hearings on the problem. Then, one day, the councilors voted to ban all public dance halls within the city limits, which in effect abolished the red light districts. That evening Josefa's brother found her in her room kneeling down and crying as though her heart would break.

"What's the matter, Manang?" he asked. "Has something terrible happened?"

"Yes, she answered, "something terribly glorious."

"Well, that's a funny way to act then."

"It is a way girls act when they are happy," she said, laughing and crying at the same time. Arising, she opened her notebook and stood motionless as she read for the hundredth time her favorite lines:[15]

Resistance will meet your endeavor
While striving to dare and to do;
But be like the meteor's onrush - -
Take fire and burn your way
through.

The youthful crusader's earnest labors seemed sisyphusian, however, for the owners of the cabarets simply moved them a short distance outside the city limits and continued with their business. Yet Abiertas was not disheartened. She knew that a good fight had been started and that there would be other righteous citizens who would continue it.

Corollary to her campaign against prostitution was her attack on the old idea, implanted in the Filipino popular mind by the Spaniards, which claimed that though the women must be good, the men may be as bad as they pleased. Josefa would never tolerate the so-called double-standard morality. To her what was wrong for women was also wrong for men.

She next directed her efforts against gambling. She convened a public meeting at the YMCA auditorium to protest the law permitting gambling and cock-fighting on Sundays and holidays. Speaking at the meeting, she enumerated the evils of gambling, even pointing out that it was a desecration of the day of the Lord, and then perorated: "Is this helping to make the Philippines worthy of respect of other nations? Gambling is a chain which we must break from the feet of our country: we must and we will!"[16] The hall shook with the thunder of applause.

Josefa could easily win public opinion and support not only because of the righteousness of her cause, but also because of her forensic skill. She was gifted with a golden tongue. A proof of this is that while she was only a freshman in college, she pitted her talent against the best male orators of her school and won. That was during the First Annual Oratorical Contest held at the Philippine Law School on 18 March 1917. Abiertas' oration was entitled "The Filipino Woman's Best Gift to Her Country." The piece was later included in the book, **Gems of Philippine Oratory**, and for a long time scarsely was there an orato-

rical competition in the Philippines in which some Filipino high school girl did not deliver this stirring oration.[17]

Like many other enlightened Filipino women, Josefa Abiertas wanted the Filipina to take active part in public affairs. In her-winning oration, she said:[18]

> As a daughter of the Philippines, as a part of the Filipino people, a Filipino woman can never be justified in being a mere spectator to the drama of life that is played within the four corners of her country. What affects her country affects her own self. Therefore, let her come out on the stage of Philippine affairs and let her play the part of a heroine, for it is only in doing so that she can be considered as bringing her best gifts to the altar of the land she loves.

She argued that Filipino women, especially those who have acquired an education, cannot remain neutral to the exciting events and issues of the time. The oration continues.[19]

> In this age of enlightenment .. no Filipino man or woman who is endowed with good mental perception can ever conceive the idea of such a thing as "standing still" or stagnation, for a country. Our highly adored Philippines must either go forward or slide backward, or it must rise triumphantly upward or fall ignominiously downward and be once more under some cruel hand. Of course, we all wish to see her lifted up into the atmosphere of progress and dignity. But how can this be done? Unless there is an equal force of interest, courage and patriotism from both our men and our women to push the Philippines upward, unless the women, too, of our country are willing to set their hands upon the plow which would dig up the weeds of ignorance, laziness, selfishness and superstition from the minds of the majority of our people - - - in short, unless the Filipino women are willing to make themselves "Pillars instead of pinnacles, aids instead of idols" of these Islands, the Philippines will never thrive nor climb the heights for which our patriotic sons have struggled for years.

She exhorted her fellow women to help the poor, and above all, to raise their children well and educate them so that they may become useful citizens. "One of the best gifts that a Filipino woman can give her country," she declared, "is her untiring and unremitting effort to help mitigate the deplorable condition of her less fortunate countrymen and to rear up from the cradle in her home children who are to be the bright prospects of the coming generation."[20]

She believed that education should be more than just improving the intellect. It should include the moulding of character and development of social conscience. "Moral and spiritual education should go hand in hand with mental education in enabling a Filipino woman to produce her best gifts to the country," she said and continued:[21]

> A Filipino woman who is highly educated mentally but whose heart and soul are not taught to condescend and consider the needs of her countrymen is not the woman whom the Philippines is looking for, Filipino women must be really earnest Christian women, who look not only for their own prosperity but also for their countrymen's welfare.

It was for the purpose of serving God and her countrymen that Abiertas tried hard to gain a college education. She gave to her studies the same zeal and vigor that she devoted to her moral crusade, because it was her obsession to prove that a woman could achieve as much academically as a man. During the first two years that she was in college she was the only girl at the Philippine Law School. When she learned that another girl intended to take up law, she happily

wrote, "Next year another girl will be in the Philippine Law School. She is a Christian and advocate of woman's suffrage. I hope in the near future the good Lord will help us with women representatives and senators.[22] Those were prophetic words.

Abiertas believed that a new age of women had dawned on the Philippines. When she graduated in 1920, she delivered another stirring speech, her valedictory address. The piece is appropriately titled, "The New Age of Women." A portion of the address rings with deep sentiment:[23]

> Already women are marching with great bold strides into the arena of active life. Though they are nectar-sweet, tender-hearted and soft-handed, they are not meant to be parasites. They desire not only to share men's happiness, but also life's bitter battles. Amid torn socks and garments women have burned out their wonderful energies. Day and night they have struggled to rear children only to have the subjects of their love ruined and their fond dreams shattered by the vices all around them. Our mothers thought they could do nothing, and so they bore their suffering in silence. But silence is no longer Christian; a new era has dawned. No use arguing, no use denying what woman demands. She realized that she must not only make her children angels, but must make the world safe for angels to live in.

Standing flushed and radiant, she brought forth round after round of applause as she delivered her valedictory. Then she gave the final peroration:[24]

> We will live, and gladly will we die, if through our suffering there may rise from the blue waters of the Pacific a Philippine republic proud not only of its sons, but proud, yea, doubly proud, of her loyal daughters.

Immediately after graduation Josefa prepared to take the bar examination. Long and late she studied, knowing that only about fifteen per cent of those who wanted to take the examination that year would pass. When the results were released, she obtained the highest mark of them all, and one of the best, it was said, ever achieved in the Philippines.[25]

Once she had become an attorney-at-law, she made herself the legal champion of the oppressed and the less fortunate. Among the first people she helped were some poor farmers who were being victimized by usurious, land-grabbing landowners. She thought it was a great shame that some men would accumulate wealth by causing suffering to underpaid and overworked laborers.

Because of her high grade in the bar examination, one manufacturing firm offered her a high position with a big salary. She refused the offer because she had learned that the workers in the company were not treated fairly. "If you wish me to accept the position," she told the owners of the firm, "you had better treat your employees well."[26]

In keeping with her qualification as a lawyer, she was promoted to the position of division chief in the Bureau of Commerce and Industry.[27] She also taught at the YMCA High School, not only because she needed the extra money, but because she wanted to impart to young people her Christian ideals.

She continued her campaign for morality. One vice that she earnestly wanted to minimize, if not totally eradicate, was drunkenness. In this regard, she was influenced by the Prohibition Movement that was sweeping across America during the period. To wage a massive, concerted attack on drunkenness, she organized and became the first president in the Philippines of the Women's Christian Temperance Union.[28]

The movement for woman's suffrage also received the whole-hearted sup-

port of Attorney Abiertas. She delivered speeches on feminine political rights whenever she had an opportunity to do so. At one meeting to which some senators and representatives to the Legislature had been invited, she orated: "The women must vote. It is sad to see a nation like ours clamoring for a high place in the society of nations while women have as little political rights as criminals and children."[20]

People who heard her speak on women's suffrage could not help being convinced that the Filipino women should be allowed to vote if only for the fact that one of them was a brilliant lawyer and eloquent speaker.

Attorney Abiertas never slackened her vigorous drive to improve the social conditions in the Philippines. And she never spared herself any sacrifice in her desire to press towards her ideal which was to be "like the Master in pleasing the Father and in serving humanity."[30]

The years of hardship and privation, of struggle and hard work, took a heavy toll on her frail body, and she contracted tuberculosis in the prime of youth. She was confined at a Manila hospital. One of those who visited her at the hospital was the famous American missionary, Dr. Frank C. Laubach. Dr. Laubach noticed that there was a worn out New Testament by her side on the bed. He thumbed through the pages of the little book and found that there were verses underlined with red ink. Some of the verses are:

> Even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.
>
> He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.
>
> Be of good cheer, it is I, be not afraid.

With her strong faith, Josefa bravely faced death. Finally, on 12 January 1922,[31] with her hands holding her much read New Testament, she answered the call of Him who said, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I shall give you rest."[32]

Of her it may be truly said that the good die young. Indeed, she lived true to the last lines of her slogan:

> But like the meteor's unrush—
> Take fire and burn your way through.

At the necrological service held in her honor at the Central Student Church, the Reverend Otto Houser summed up the qualities of Josefa Abiertas in the following words: "Too much can be hardly said of her fitness for leadership. She was progressive without being radical, enthusiastic without being offensive, warm-hearted without being sentimental, intellectual without being cold, poised but not stiff, purposeful but not stubborn, a reformer but not a fanatic, a trained lawyer but a Christian, a social servant but not forgetful of the Church, a student but not neglectful of the Greatest Book, a patriot but asking no pay for it."[33]

A magazine, **The Young Generation**, published the following eulogy in its issue of January 1922:[34]

> Josefa Abiertas, the woman, the Christian, the reformer, the lawyer . . . perished with the January flowers, in the springtime of her life.
>
> She is gone, but the name Josefa Abiertas shall live. The Pasig may change her course, her waters may cease to flow, but the sweet memory of that "fair flower" shall linger in our hearts.

And linger long it did. Eight years after her death, a group of prominent civic leaders, including Justice Jose Abad Santos, Don Teodoro Yangco, Dr. Rebecca Parish, Mrs. Asuncion Perez, Dr. and Mrs. Henry Steinmetz, who had known Abiertas in Capiz,

and Mrs. Josefa Jara-Martinez, founded an institution devoted to the assistance of the victims of white slavery, a social malady that Abiertas tried hard to mitigate. The Josefa Abiertas House of Friendship was inaugurated on 11 November 1930. Located at Santolan, Quezon City, the institution has served hundreds of unwed mothers and fatherless children.[35]

Undoubtedly, in the hearts of these unfortunate people, and in those of many, many others who have been influenced by her ideals and example, Josefa Abiertas continues to live. She might had been a meteor that vanished so soon but the fire that she brought had caught on and the flame is still burning.

Notes:

1 Herminia M. Ancheta, **Leading Pilipino Women** (Quezon City; P. L. Bustamante Press, 1953), p. 79-

2 Henry Weston Munger, **Christ and the Filipino Soul: A History of the Philippine Baptists** (mimeographed edition, 1967), p. 125

3 **Ibid.**

4 Frank C. Laubach, **Seven Thousand Emeralds** (New York: Friendship Press, 1929), p. 99. Hereinafter cited as Laubach, **Seven Thousand Emeralds.**

5 *Ibid., p. 91.*

6 *Philippine Prose and Poetry* (Manila: Bureau of Education, 1946), vol. 2, p. 228.

7 Laubach, *Seven Thousand Emeralds*, p. 90.

8 Munger, *loc. cit.*

9 Laubach, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

10 Munger, *loc. cit.*

11 Frank C. Laubach, *The People of the Philippines, Their Religious Progress, Preparation for Leadership in the Far East,* (New York: Gense H. Doran Co., 1925), p. 291. Hereinafter cited as Laubach, *The People of the Philippines.*

12 Munger, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

13 *Ibid.*, 127.

14 "Girls of Gardenia Deported to Davao," *The Manila Times*, October 18, 1916.

15 Munger, *loc. cit.*

16 *Ibid.*

17 *Philippine Prose and Poetry*, p. 229.

18 Munger, *loc. cit.*; *Philippine Prose and Poetry*, p. 82.

19 Josefa Abiertas, "The Filipino Woman's Best Gift to her Country, *Philippine Prose and Poetry* (Manila: Bureau of Education, 1946), vol. 2, p. 82.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 83.

21 *Ibid.*

22 Munger, *loc. cit.*

23 *Ibid.*, p. 126.

24 Laubach, *Seven Thousand Emeralds*, p. 99.

25 *Philippine Prose and Poetry*, p, 229.

26 Ancheta, *loc. cit.*

27 One of her subordinate employees at the Bureau of Commerce and Industry, Vicente T. Remitio, remempers that Abiertas was so strict against smoking in the office.

28 Laubach, *People of the Philippines*, p. 293.

29 Laubach, *Seven Thousand Emeralds*, p. 99.

30 Laubach, *People of the Philippines*, p. 293.

31 *Philippine Prose and Poetry* p. 229.

32 Matthew 11:28.

33 Roberta C. Aranzano, et. al., *Women of Distinction* (Manila: Bukang Liwayway, 1968), pp. 4-5.

34 Laubach, *People of the Philippines*, p. 293.

35 "Unwed Mothers, Their Babies, Find Refuge in Abiertas," *The Philippines Daily Express*, November 5, 1976.

THE FILIPINO WOMAN IN HISTORY

By Demy P. Sonza

"The history of the world is but the biography of great men," declared Thomas Carlyle. And someone quickly added that "behind every great man is a woman." In the Philippines, however, women have accomplished great things not behind their men but on equal footing and even in competition with them.

As far back as could be ascertained, women have played important roles in Philippine history. Unlike those of their male counterparts, however, the lives and deeds of leading Filipino women have not been well appreciated. This lack of appreciation and recognition of feminine accomplishments may be ascribed largely to the dearth of written literature on great Filipino women.

The *Maragtas* tells us, albeit historically apocriphal, that early in the 13th century, ten Malayan *datus* from Borneo accompanied by their womenfolk, children and slaves, came to settle in the Philippines. They landed in Panay and bought the island from the Negrito chieftain, Marikudo. The price of the island consisted of a golden *salakot* (hat), a golden *batiya* (water basin) and a long golden necklace. The necklace was included because Marikudo's wife, Maniwantiwan, insisted on it. This story is revealing of the influence of Filipino wives over their husbands in those early days.

That women occupied high social standing in ancient Philippines may be deduced from extant historical documents, archaeological artifacts of women-owned ornaments, and numerous folk stories extolling feminine prowess and virtues.

When the Spaniards came in the 16th century, they found the Filipino women enjoying equal rights with the men. Women could hold public office and own property. If a barangay chieftain died and had no male son, his eldest daughter took over. The legends of Princess Urduja in Pangasinan and of the kind lady ruler named Nabingka in Negros mirror the high social status of early Filipino women.

The Spaniards found in Cebu a thriving port town where trading ships from Brunei and other Southeast Asian and Chinese ports often called. The Spaniards made the friendship of King Humabon. In a short while the friars who came with the expedition were able to conduct a mass baptism of Cebuanos, thus making the first Christian converts in this part of the world. This was made possible because it was the wife of Humabon who was the first to embrace the new religion and asked to be baptized. Her royal subjects merely followed her example.

Humabon's wife was named Juana, after the mother of Charles I of Spain. As a baptismal gift, the Spaniards presented her with an image of the Holy Child. This image of Santo Nino is now enshrined in Cebu and is reputed to be the oldest Christian relic in the Far East, having survived four centuries.

A Spanish officer, Miguel de Loarca, wrote of the early Filipinos, "The men loved their wives so dearly that in case of a quarrel they take sides with their wives' relatives even against

their own fathers and brothers." Loarca continued, "The men are very fond of their wives, for it is the men who give the dowry at marriage." In many contemporaneous Western societies, it was the parents of the women who gave the dowry when their daughters were married.

In pre-Spanish Philippines, women were held in high respect by their menfolk. A proof of this is that when walking together in company, the men walked a few steps behind the women. The long period of subjection under Spain reduced the social status of the Filipino woman, relegating her mostly to the home and church, making of her a pious, shy and practically illiterate creature; servile to men, especially to the parish curate and to the Spanish officials.

Nevertheless, the Spanish era produced many women of heroic proportions. In 1762, when the British invaded and captured Manila as an offshoot of the Thirty Years War in Europe, an Ilocano couple rose to lead a revolt against Spain. Diego Silang inspired by his young wife, wrested control of all the Ilocos region and the Cagayan Valley. When he fell, his wife, Gabriela, instead of falling into despair, boldly picked up the fallen bolo and continued the fight. She was ultimately captured and hanged—the first Filipino woman to die in the gallows for her country's freedom. As the rope was being adjusted around her neck, she pitifully muttered, "My poor countrymen! They will continue to suffer many wrongs. But there will be others to lead them." Those were indeed prophetic words.

A century earlier than the Silang story, in the southern island of Mindanao, another woman heroically preferred honorable death to slavery. The woman was the wife of the famous Sultan Kudarat, who was referred to as Sultan Correlat in most Spanish chronicles. This brave sultana perished in the Battle of Ilihan, near Lake Lanao, on 18 March 1637.

The Spanish force that attacked Kudarat was personally led by Governor-General Sebastian Hortado de Corcuera. While the fiery Kudarat excited his Moslem warriors to stronger resistance, the sultana comforted the women and children who were huddled inside the *cotta* or garrison. The fight was fierce and long. In the end the tide of the battle went against the Moslems. The Spaniards smashed through Kudarat's lines and surged towards the garrison. Kudarat, though wounded in one arm, hacked his way through the pressing foe and escaped.

On seeing that everything was lost, the sultana commanded her courtmaids. "Fly for your lives! We have lost the fight! Run to the hills!" Grabbing her baby, the sultana fled. But the Spanish soldiers saw her and gave chase. Realizing that escape was impossible, she headed for a ridge and, preferring death to dishonorable capture, leaped down a high cliff. The Spaniards found her lifeless body among the rocks below, but the child which she clutched tightly to her breast was alive.

Social scientists, in analyzing the reasons for the long hold of Spain over the Philippines, give much weight to the lack of unity among the various and diverse ethnic-cultural Filipino groups. The Spaniards made use of the time-tested colonizing strategy of *divide et empera*—divide and conquer. From the beginning they pitted the Visayans against the Tagalogs, the Tagalogs against the Pampangos, the Pampangos against the Ilocanos, etc., and continuously instigated regional jealousies and hostilities. Because of this, if there were uprisings against the Spanish government these were sporadic and isolated.

Yet no people could be subjugated forever. In the case of the Filipinos, the spirit of nationalism, though painfully slow in developing, finally blossomed in the latter part of the 19th century. The flowering of nationalism led to the Reform (Propaganda) Movement and finally to the Philippine Re-

volution, an upheaval that had in its leadership not only brave and brilliant men but also self-sacrificing and patriotic women.

Among the most prominent of the feminine figures during the Revolution were Melchora Aquino, "the Grandmother of the Revolution;" Gregoria de Jesus, "the Muse of the Katipunan;" Trinidad Tecson, "the Mother of Biak-na-Bato;" Agueda Kahabagan, "the Tagalog Joan of Arc;" Marcela Agoncillo, the maker of the first Filipino flag; and Teresa Magbanua, "the Visayan Joan of Arc."

There were many others who, though less known or entirely forgotten, contributed greatly to the national cause during that crucial period of Philippine history. There was, for example, Gliceria Marella de Villavicencio, unheard of outside her native Batangas, but who lost her husband and sacrificed her fortune in support of the Revolution. She donated the first vessel to the newly organized navy of the Revolutionary Government, donated large sums of money and offered her mansion to the army for its headquarters. Then there was Nazaria Lagos of Iloilo who may rightly be dubbed the "Florence Nightengale of Panay." Like Marella, she lost her family fortune during the Revolution and Filipino-American War. Like Melchora Aquino, she nursed the wounded and sick soldiers, but it was not until very recently that her heroic labors were given recognition.

Nor were femine lives and talents mainly devoted to the struggle for freedom alone. If there were heroines of war there were also heroines of peace. In many other fields of endeavor and profession were Filipino women found taking the lead and establishing records.

In business and industry, a Filipina rose to prominence as early as the middle of the last century, even while the country was atill under foreign rule. She was Margarita Roxas de Ayala, who may be called the founder of the vast Zobel-Ayala business enterprises of today. She pioneered in commercial alcohol refining and distilling. To her likewise went the credit of forming the first coal mine company that made explorations in Cebu and Tayabas. She also founded the La Concordia College and gave much to charity.

Mention of La Concordia College brings to mind other Filipino ladies who have left indelible footprints in the fields of education in this country. There was Librada Avelino, the small, stubborn woman who founded Centro Escolar University. There was Rosa Sevilla de Alvero, the mother of secular education for girls, who established the Instituto de Mujeres. There were the Avancena Sisters—Jovita and Ramona—founders of the Colegio de Santa Ana in Molo, Iloilo, that produced such feminine luminaries as Sofia Reyes de Veyra, Pura Villanueva Kalaw and Rosario Lopez de Santos. And the history of education is not complete without mention of Francisca Tirona Benitez who founded the Philippine Women's University. In rural education, there was Fausta Labrador whose compassion for the poor made her establish a school for them in Lucena, Tayabas.

Another successful woman in business was Benigna Cui of Cebu. Like Margarita Roxas, she also shared her wealth—in fact all of what she had accumulated — with the poor. She worked hard to make a fortune, only to donate all of it to the government in order to establish and maintain a free home for the invalid in Cebu and to provide a continuing program of scholarship for a student each in medicine and pharmacy from Cebu.

In the field of letters, there was, to name just one, the celebrated Leona Florentino, whose poetry elicited acclaim in far-away Europe. In music and the fine arts, there were Maria Carpena, the singer; Praxedes Julia Fernandez, the actress; Pelagia Mendooza, the sculptor; and the noted Felicibg Tirona, among the many.

The coming of the Americans to

the Philippines posed new challenges and presented new opportunities to women in the fields of education and the professions, as well as in government service. Happily, the Filipina was found equal to these, challenges and opportunities. To embibe the freer spirit of American democratic life, the Fllipina defidently shed off part of her Spanish-taught shyness and began to assert herself as her man's partner and equal.

The first Filipino lady to win national renown and international recognition was Sofia Reyes de Veyra, writer, educator, social worker, civic leader, who became the adviser to four Philippine presidents. As wife of Resident Commissioner Jaime C. de Veyra in Washington, she projected a very good image of the Filipino women in America that historians have credited her for having helped much in advancing the cause of Philippine independence. When she returned to the Phillippines she was voted in a nationwide poll conducted by the *Philippines Free Press* in 1932 "the Most Envied Woman in the Philippines."

In the early days of the American regime there arose the beautiful figure of Pura Villanueva, first Manila Carnival queen and a strong crusader for women's rights and suffrage. With other women leaders like Maria Villamor, Gorgonia Mapa, Sofia Reyes de Veyra, Concepcion Felix Rodriguez, Josefa Abiertas and Flora Ylagan, she waged a protracted, persistant campaign to give the vote to the Filipino woman a campaign that victoriously ended in 1937 when woman's suffrage was approved in a national plebiscite. Of all Asian Women, the Filipina was the first to obtain political equality with men by being able to vote and be voted for public office.

While the movement for feminine equality with men, epitomized by the enfranchisement of the Filipino woman was going on, many Filipinas were also proving that they could be equal to their men even in such hitherto men-dominated profession as law, medicine, and journalism.

Josefa Abiertas of Capiz, for instance, after finishing the law course as a working student, took the Bar examination as the only girl in a group of 500 candidates, To the surprise of many people, she topped the examination and became the first Filipino woman lawyer. This brillant lawyer and moral crusader could have gone far had death not claimed her early.

Another lady lawyer, Carmen Planas, a great beauty, became the first lady councilor of Manila. Since Olivia Salamanca became the first lady physician in 1910, the country has produced many women doctors, some of them winning renown not only in the national scene but even in international medical circles. In 1966, for instance, Dr. Fe del Mundo was chosen president of the International Women's Medical Association.

In journalism, the competent writers of the Revolutionary period as Rosa Sevilla and Florentina Arellano were later replaced by a host of female pen-pushers whose by-lines have graced *Philippine periodicals* for the past three score and ten years.

A woman pioneer in still another field of service was Maria Orosa of Batangas. A food scientist, she discocovered new ways of preserving food and started a movement for better health through richer diet and better sanitation. Deeply dedicated to her work, not even heavy fighting during the war could make her stop her research in food science. She was engaged in this work at the Bureau of Plant Industry in Manila when a bomb hit the structure. She was wounded critically. Taken to a nearby hospital, she perished when the hospital was also hit by a bomb.

Perhaps the field that women have lorded over most is social work. The mere mention of the profession inevitably associates it with the unforgeta-

ble names of Josefa Llanes Escoda who capped a brilliant career in social work with a martydom in the last world war; and Aurora Aragon Quezon who also died a martyr's death at the hands of the communist Hukbalahap. Then there was Asuncion Arriola Perez, the person who was largely responsible for organizing the Department of Social Welfare until it gained full status as a cabinet office.

Just like the Philippine Revolution, World War II also proved that Filipino women are as brave and patriotic as their men. One woman who deserves special mention was no more than a girl: she was only a thirteen-year old high school sophomore when the war came, but she joined the guerillas as an intelligence agent. Captured by the enemy, she suffered torture without breaking up and paid for her patriotism with her young life. She was Lydia Gellidon of Manila.

In the nursing profession, which by its function is mainly a feminine field, names of volunteer nurses like Aquino, Tecson and Lagos; and professionally trained ones like Maria Tinawin, should be enshrined in the nursing hall of fame. Tinawin was a heroine of the Battle for the Liberation of Manila in 1945. Under enemy fire, she crossed the Pasig River in order to minister to the wounded American soldiers. For her heroism, General Douglas MacArthur awarded her the Medal of Honor.

Finally, women played their part not only in making history but also in writing Philippine history. In the field of historiograhy are deeply implanted the footprints of Encarnacion Alzona, Guadalupe Flores-Ganzon and Carmen Guerrero Nakpil.

Be it as First Lady of the Land as Mrs. Imelda R. Marcos, a government worker as Sofia de Veyra, an educator as Librada Avelino, a military leader as Trinidad Tecson, an artist as Felicing Tirona; an international beauty queen as Gemma Cruz-Araneta, or a simple, loving, self-sacrificing mother as Teodora Alonzo Rizal, the Filipino woman has amply demonstrated her sterling qualities that can stand comparison with the best of any race and of any land. The Philippine landscape, Philippine history, and the Filipino soul would not have been what they are today were it not for her.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN INDONESIA

The oldest Protestant church in Southeast Asia is probably the Protestant Church in Indonesia, the Geredja Protestant Indonesia (GPI) which observed its 374th anniversary last February 27, 1979. It is almost 300 years older than the Protestant Church in the Philippines.

The late Dr. Hendrik Kramer was of the opinion that the Church starts to exist at the very moment there are believers in Jesus' words: "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (Matthew 18:20).

Based on this principle, the Protestant Church in Indonesia was born on February 27, 1605, for on that day for the first time on Indonesian soil a divine service was held according to the rites of the Protestant Church in a former Portuguese fortress in the town of Ambon which had just been conquered by the Dutch.

At that time the island of Ambon, especially the peninsula of Leitimor, the Lease Archipelago, Oma (Haruku), Honimoa (Saparua), and Nusalaut were in Portuguese hands. The Portuguese had built a rather strong fortress on the coast of Leitimor in the town of Ambon, where now stand the ruins of the Dutch fortress Nieuw Victoria. The Portuguese fortress was armed with thirty cannons and garrisoned with 600 men. In its surroundings were hundreds of Indonesian Roman Catholics and forty-five Portuguese families.

The Dutch Admiral Steven van der Hagen arrived at the beautiful Bay of Ambon on February 21, 1605 with a fleet of nine ships. He was assisted in the fight against the Portuguese by the people of Hitu under the leadership of Captain Hitu Tapel of Banten who supplied twenty armed *korakoras*.

The Portuguese commander Gaspar de Mello surrendered on February 23rd, on the condition that the 600 Portuguese soldiers be allowed to leave with their arms and that the Portuguese families be allowed to stay in Ambon and to practice their religion. Admiral van der Hagen granted the terms requested by the Portuguese, but required the Catholic Portuguese families to swear loyalty to the Dutch government.

Then on February 27th, the first service was held according to the Protestant rites in one of the four churches round the fortress, attended by the Dutch, some tens of Indonesians (Amboines) and a few Portuguese.

With the conquest of Ambon, several hundred of Portuguese, twenty-three sovereigns and chieftains of Leitimor and Lease, including 16,000 of their subjects became Dutch subjects. The Hitu people who had assisted the Dutch, became their allies.

The first problem of the Protestant Church at the time of its establishment was lack of ministers to look after the spiritual welfare of more than 16,000 people who had earlier embraced the Roman Catholic religion but who were now deserted by their priests who had gone either to Manila or Goa without any successor.

In 1607, Admiral Cornelis Materlief visited Ambon for an inspection. The Dutch Governor Frederick de Houtman (1605-1611) summoned all the sovereigns. Admiral Matelief asked them what their wishes were and the sovereigns answered that they had two requests to make: 1) to send ministers as soon as possble and 2) to allow the Dutch men to marry Indonesian women as had been the case with the Portuguese, too. Matelief granted the request immediately, but asked

(*To page 43*)

A brief history of the . . . (*From page 40*)

them to be a little patient with regards to the coming of the ministers since they had to come from Holland. When the Admiral and Governor de Houtman returned to the Netherlands, each of them took a few young Indonesians with them to be trained as religious teachers.

The first parishes were Ambon and Lease, followed by Ternate, Djakarta and Banda, in the years from 1605 to 1622. Now there are parishes found in Sumatra, Java, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, (Celebes), Jusa Tenggara, Maluku (Moluccas), and West Irian.

The widely scattered parishes in the Indonesian archipelago are organized into independent churches within the alliance of the Geredja Protestant Indonesia (GPI); Geredja Masehi Injili Minahasa (GMIM), 1934; Geredja Protestant Maluku (GPM), 1935; Geredja Masehi Injili (GMIT), 1947; and Geredja Protestant West Indonesia (GPIB), 1948.

Since 1964, the missionary parishes in Central Suluwesi and Gorontalo have been organized in three separate churches within the sphere of GPI. These are the Geredja Protestant Indonesia at Gorontalo, at Buol Toli-Toli, and at Palu Donggala.

The parishes and members of the aforementioned seven churches are automatically also the parishes and members of the Protestant Church in Indonesia which is the oldest and one of the largest Protestant Churches in Southeast Asia, with more than 1,800,000 members.

Bululakaw - A Southeast Asian Deity?

*By Ramon Lagos**

Bululakaw is now regarded by Filipinos as a mythical bird, but in the past Bululakaw was worshipped as a god and not only by the people of the Philippines. There is a tradition told by the old people of Panay that Bululakaw was a god of the early Malay settlers of the islands. This tradition is corroborated by the *Maragtas* accounts as recorded by Father Tomas Santaren and Pedro Monteclaro.

According to the *Maragtas* of Santaren and Monteclaro, soon after the Borneans had acquired the island of Panay by barter from Marikudo, their leader, Datu Puti, told their priest Bangotbanwa to make an offering to their god Bululakaw and inquire from the god whether it was wise for them to stay in Sinogbohan or to move to another place. Bangotbanwa made the offering and after the ceremony he reported to Datu Puti that it was the wish of Bululakaw that they should establish their settlement in another place to the west of Sinogbuhan,

Accordingly, Datu Puti designated Datu Sumakwel to lead the job of exploration for this new place. Sumakwel took some companions on his *biniday* and sailed westward. They rounded the southern tip of Panay then sailed north-ward along the coast until they reached the mouth of a big river. And here we have the description of Juan C. Orendain as written in his book, *Ten Datus of Panay*:

> In those days, the Sibalom River converged with the Egaña River and the Apdo River and swelled into a very big river at Malandog. Near the mouth was a wide, deep pool which made it an ideal landing and anchorage for ships. Here Sumakwel tied his *biniday* and started to fish. At the first try his *salibut* (net) was filled with fish and as he went on, his catch was so tremendous that he was convinced that this was the chosen place of Bululakaw for them to settle. He looked at the waterline of the river and saw on the muddy beach big crabs feeding.
>
> Sumakwel surveyed the land and saw in his vision big harvest from the plain, much food from the rivers and the sea and game from the nearby hills and mountains . . .

Thus it happened that the Borneans in obedience to the advice of Bululakaw as revealed through their priest, transferred from Sinogbuhan to Malandog were they established their settlement.

There is, however, another version of the story of the barter and settlement of Panay by the Borneans which I have told in my yet

---

* *Ramon Lagos is a pharmacist by profession. He has been municipal councilor of Dueñas, Iloilo for several terms and is chairman of the Municipal Historical Committee. Author of the* History of Dueñas, *he is also a member of the Iloilo Historical Committee.*

unpublished book, *History of Simsiman-The Old Panay* (copyrighted 1968). This version was told to me in 1916 and subsequent years by several informants in Dueñas and the neighboring towns of Iloilo. Most notable of these informants were Ati Goyang, then 70 years of age, a Negrito lady elder who was an expert *balitaw* dancer; Tan Martin, who said he was the chief of the Negritoes in Panay since 1888: Tiago, another Negrito elder; and Segundo Lagos who had learned it from his grandfather Apoy Benito Lagos, the "Patriarch of Simsiman" in 1595 and later became the first capitan municipal of Laglag (formerly Simsiman and now Dueñas). Aside from these principal informants, I also heard the story from several other old folks of Laglag like Vicente Ario, Saturnina Labrillaso, Faustino Lanuevo and Laurencio Laurea.

While my version of the story of the coming of the Bornean Malays differs with the versions of Santaren, Monteclaro and Orendain on some points, like the place where the barter ceremony was held, our version all agree on the point about Bululakaw being the god of the Malays.

Ati Goyang, Tan Martin and Segundo Lagos said that Bululakaw was a bird and his dwelling place was the summit of Mount Madyaas in Antique. Tan Martin further said that Bululakaw was the Bathala (god) of the Malays but not of the Negritoes or Aetas.

Bululakaw was a large bird, twice bigger than the monkey-eating eagle which is considered the biggest eagle in the world. Its bill was short. The forehead was covered by thick and beautiful feathers of various colors. The eyes were set in the head like human eyes: attractive, fascinating, intelligent. The bird looked with great personality. Its neck was not long, just proportional to the body, and also covered with thick plumage of various hues. The neck could turn on all directions so that Bululakaw can easily look around.

The wings of the god-bird were strong, and when it flew made a sound which could be heard many miles away. When this sound was heard, the people of Southeast Asia knew that Bululakaw was coming and all of them, men, women and children, would come out of their houses to be able to receive the blessings of the god. Each feather of the wings had different attractive colors that reflected the light of the moon and the stars. It was said that when Bululakaw flew from Madyaas mountain and while still up there, the reflections of light from its wings reached as far as Indonesia—so multi-colored and distinct from all other lights so that the people knew that it was Bululakaw that was flying.

The tail of Bululakaw was very long. According to one legend, it was a mile long. It was golden in color. So bright was the color that when the bird was in flight a wide area of the sky was illuminated. When Bululakaw flew over a country whose people had won his favor because they had been good and religious; it shook its tail and thousands of golden droplets from the long tail showered all over the country. This meant abundance, peace, health and happiness to the people of that country.

But if Bululakaw flew over a place with its tail drawn straight to its body and did not shake it, no golden droplets fell. This meant that the people of that place were sinful and would not receive any blessing from Bululakaw. It further meant that there would be famine, hardship, pestilence and perhaps war.

Bululakaw would leave Madyaas

only once a year. It flew only during the darkest night so that its brightness could be seen all over the places where it went. It was always a non-stop flight from Madyaas and back. Bululakaw never alighted anywhere except on Mount Madyaas.

So in those days, Panay which was earlier named Aninipay, was considered the land of blessings. It was believed, therefore, by the old folks of Laglag based on the story of Bululakaw handed down from generation to generation that the people of Southeast Asia made pilgrimages to Madyaas, to worship Bululakaw. The people of Laglag were of the opinion that because Bululakaw dwelt in Madyaas, Panay was already known to the Malayan people of Southeast Asia even long before Datu Puti and his group left Borneo because of the tyranny of Sultan Makatunao.

It was the belief of these old folks, including Negrito leader Tan Martin, Ati Goyang and Elder Tiago, that when the Bornean *datus* landed in Panay in the early 13th century, it was not by accident. They already knew where Panay was and were familiar with its geography because some of them, like the *padi* Bangotbanwa, a deeply religious man, had been to Madyaas before to worship Bululakaw. The migrating Borneans really intended to come to Panay when they left Borneo because they wanted to be near the dwelling place of Bululakaw whose blessings they must have prayed for on their quest for peace and freedom.

The belief in Bululakaw as a god is now gone in the Philippines. As I said at the beginning of this article, it is now only regarded as a mythical bird. But tales about Bululakaw still abound especially among the people in the interior towns of Panay. There are also several places in Panay, Mindoro and other islands that are named Bululakaw, perhaps in memory of the once adored god-bird.

I wonder if there are traces of belief in Bululakaw that are still found in other places in Southeast Asia, especially in Borneo. If there are, then Bululakaw was indeed a Southaest Asian deity.

THE LANGUAGE POLICY OF INDONESIA *

By O. D. P. Sihombing

Before I proceed to the main subject, I would like to say a few words about Indonesia, geographically, ethnologically and culturally. These aspects, to my mind, are inseparably linked to the development of our language.

Indonesia is comprised of so many islands covering a total of about 1,998,762 square miles. There are vast stretches of water between these islands so that communication is rather a big problem. The archipelago is inhabited by about 120 million people. It is understandable therefore that as there are varied ethnic groups so are there varied habits, ways, customs and traditions. Territory-wise, Indonesia is almost seven times bigger than the Philippines. In fact it is considered as the world's largest archipelago, stretching from east to west for about 3,300 miles and north to south for approximately 1,300 miles.

While Indonesia is proud of its indigenous culture, it has not escaped influences of outside culture. Students of history only well know that my country had been subjected to the inroads of such foreign influences, first the Hinduism-Budhism, next Islam, and then Christianity. All of these brought about tremendous impact on the country's culture and left behind lasting impressions that are still noticeable even today.I can safely say that even our language has also been influenced. I understand that in the Philippines there are about 90 different dialects. In Indonesia we have as many as 250 different languages and dialects.

With this as background, perhaps there are people who may still have their doubts as to how we Indonesians have finally evolved a national language of our own. I shall now turn on the main topic.

THE BAHASA INDONESIA

The Bahasa Indonesia is not a tailored language. Neither was it existing as any other language in the world. But it has a part of a living pattern, adopted, developed and is still developing and growing for a national purpose.

The Bahasa Indonesia is closely allied to Malay, the two languages stemming from a common ancestor, another descendant of which is still spoken in the Riauw Islands and in the coastal areas of Northern Sumatra. Another of these variants, called the "Pasar Malay" was also used in port towns and became the **lingua franca** for commerce in the Indonesia-Malay region for some centuries.

With the presence of this **lingua franca**, as an accepted and understood medium of communication, it was not difficult a matter to finally evolve a national language. Indeed it was not so difficult for people to learn a new language within the same family pattern.

Our knowledge of the Malay language dates back to the 17th century A.D. based on the discovery of some old Malay inscriptions from that period in some parts of Indonesia. The

* Lecture given before the Association of Professors and Teachers of Pilipino in 1972. Reprinted from ***Indonesia,*** published by the Indonesian Embassy, Manila.

Kedukan Bukit" inscription found in Palembang, South Sumatra shows the characteristics of Old Malay. Another plaque found in Atjeh, North Sumatra dating back around the year 1380 also bore what is now recognized as the oldest preserved specimen of a Malay poem.

In view of the fact that there are more than 250 dialects in Indonesia, it is expected that doubts are to come up in the way the Bahasa Indonesia became a national language.

One leading factor which contributed to the fast spread of the **lingua franca** was that the kingdom of Sriwidjaja flourished in the 7th to the 13th centuries which ruled over regions as wide as the present Southeast Asia. The coastal areas especially became the landing places for merchants' ships and Malacca was the trading port for hundreds of years in the region. When the first Europeans came to Indonesia they found that Malay was already in wide use as far as the easternmost part of Indonesia. Malay being more flexible, readily became the medium of communication.

When the Dutch first came to Indonesia they had to employ Malay in schools as well as in church because they thought it then to be more practical and effective. At the second half of the 19th century, however, the use of the Dutch language was thought to be practical and the shortest vehicle for the Indonesians to learn and to get in touch with western civilization.

During the first decade of the 20th century, nationalism and the revolutionary enthusiasm surged, and this could be accounted for the fact that there was one language being used. Through this vehicle that was common to both the national leaders and the masses, ideas of nationalism and democracy ran faster. In midstream, the Dutch tried to stop this development. In order to mutilate the unifying effect of a rapidly evolving Bahasa Indonesia, the Dutch tried to foster regionalism and sow the seeds of separatism, prejudice and misunderstanding among the people by the colonial policy of divide and rule, and keep the Dutch language as the supreme medium to assert their power and authority. Hence, the policy of the Dutch was to make use of the language as a weapon for further domination. The Dutch were able to make use of two consecutive methods in trying to break up the national unity that was being fostered by a national language. First, the imposition of Dutch to divide the educated elite from the masses; and second, teaching of vernaculars to divide and alienate the many regions from each other.

Soon the Indonesian youth formed political and cultural organizations. The primary and intermediate objective was to attain national independence. For this purpose more and more contacts have to be made with the people. They turned to the use of Malay and so did the big political parties then in existence. Thus, the Malay language found use by even the newspapers and journals.

Guided by the desire to accelerate the national independence movement through a common medium, youth leaders from all parts of Indonesia met in Djakarta on October 28. 1928 for the Second Youth Congress. There they recognized as a principal factor in the nationalist movement the adoption and development of a national language. On that historic Congress, the youth formulated a formal pledge now called the SUMPAH PEMUDA or Youth Pledge as follows:

WE LIVE IN ONE COUNTRY—INDONESIA

WE LIVE IN ONE NATION—THE INDONESIAN NATION

WE SPEAK ONE LANGUAGE—THE INDONESIAN LANGUAGE."

The above declaration was more than a formal declaration of what in fact had been a strong working force in the Indonesian society. The rest was left for them and it remained their duty to cultivate and develop that national language in order that it could serve as modern language for the development of a national culture.

Although the approaches of the national leaders were varied, there was unanimous agreement on one particular point. There was published a cultural periodical the purpose of which was to promote the Indonesian language and literature.

In 1938, the first Congress on the Indonesian language was held in Djakarta. It discussed, among others, the ways to find new terms and spelling to form a better grammar.

The coming of the Japanese in 1942 contributed in no small measure to the development of the Indonesian language. In their desire to boost their war efforts, the Japanese occupational forces prohibited the use of the Dutch language. They adopted a double policy of fostering both the Japanese and Indonesian languages. But because the Japanese language was new and difficult for the Indonesian leaders and likewise the people, they found an excellent opportunity to develop the Indonesian language.

The proclamation of independence on August 17, 1945 finally cleared the way for the Bahasa Indonesia to become the national language. This is embodied in the 1945 Constitution. There were still some minor obstacles to the full adoption of the Bahasa Indonesia. There were those who reasoned out that the Bahasa Indonesia would never be able to give equivalent words for technical terms especially those of the sciences. This was however considered a very flimsy argument since technical terms are the easiest to adopt in any language and that any language can absorb the name of any new object that appears on the cultural horizon. The so-called purists would have none of borrowing and would rather resort to a roundabout combination of local words. They were unwilling and even refused to accept the reality that even 50% of the English language is borrowed from Greek, Latin, Italian, French and German, etc. There were also those who protested too much and preached in effect that language should not be legislated. They would rather have the sway of colonially-imposed language than have a national language adopted firmly by the people.

Having been adopted as the national language, the Bahasa Indonesia became the official language. It also became the medium of instruction in all school levels, as it is even to these days.

Development of the Bahasa was the more enhanced with the use of the language by the newspapers. Difficulties of day-to-day reporting by the press forced the journalists and writers to coin new words necessary which finally found acceptance by the reading public. Massive translations of foreign materials have been going on so that the Indonesian people carry over the achievements of the world, whether these achievements are of English, American, Italian, French, Chinese, Japanese, or even Russian, origin.

Language Institute

To assure the full development of the Bahasa Indonesia, the government has created the Panitia Bahasa Indonesia or Institute for the Indonesian Language. It is under the Department of Education and Culture. Perhaps it is similar to your Institute of National Language. The Institute has the main duty of compiling Indonesian equivalents to certain terms, create

new words or terminologies and make final selection of new words as may be suggested. The spread of the new terms is channeled through other media, such as the press, radio, government offices, schools, etc. The Institute has also the job to compile an authoritative dictionary and publishes a linguistic journal and the translations of important foreign words into Indonesia.

Developing the Language

In order to enrich the vocabulary and to meet modern requirements, the language institute has adopted certain methods to be followed:

Firstly, if a new term has to be used and there are none available in the Bahasa Indonesia, the first step is to look into the regional languages or dialects.

Secondly, if there are no appropriate terms in the regional languages then we have to adopt the new terms as used and understood in the modern way.

In evolving new words or terms used by foreign languages for the Bahasa Indonesia, the following steps are taken:

a) by translating such terms in our own language in one or two words coined together.

b) by temporarily retaining the foreign word and incorporating them as part of the Bahasa if such foreign word is internationally used in their pure form and meaning, and

c) by adopting the foreign word but modifying the structure and spelling of such words based on sound to suit our common taste and facility of the Indonesian tongue. This can be illustrated by such words as intervention to **intervensi**; television to **televisi**, etc.

I have discussed in brief the growth and development of the Bahasa Indonesia. It is a continuing process because language grows and goes with life itself. Fortunately, language is no longer a problem for my country. I am positive that it will also be so in the Philippines in the immediate future.

I say this because the different linguistic groups in Southeast Asia belong to one common group, the so-called Malayo-Polynesian or the Austronesian family. It is not surprising to note that there are many similarities not only in syntax but also in terminology and morphology in the many dialects spoken here and in Indonesia.

Against this background, I am sure that you can also evolve a national language of your own, considering the fact that you have less number of dialects than in my country, and a more compact territory. This of course can be accelerated by the adequate system of communication, transportation and mass media facilities than were existing in my country twenty years ago.

Certainly the need for a national language is a compelling one. As long as textbooks, newspapers, films, magazines, the medium of instruction, political debates and entertainment are in a foreign language, more so in the language of our former colonizers, we would remain captive to their prejudices and distortions about our selves. The virtual dictatorship that a foreign language enjoys in any one nation is oftentimes the key to frustrations in that national culture as well as to the subversion of the national democracy. Because the national language is a decisive instrument to national progress, a domineering foreign language operates as a medium for fostering colonial mentality and at worst pro-

paganda tool that subverts the national goals and ideals. The thought process of the native peoples become conditioned by foreign bias if a national language is subordinated to a foreign language.

The national language that we have developed and will continue to nourish came out from the welter of chaos and confusion left behind by our colonizers. This unity of language has been one of the most cohesive factors in bringing about a sense of unity among the Indonesian people, so that it rightfully can be called a nation. The fact that we have developed a national language out of the more than 250 dialects, more than illustrates the living reality of the motto of our Republic which is BHINNEKA TUNGGAL IKA or UNITY IN DIVERSITY.

As what your national hero Dr. Jose Rizal once said, "a nation without its own language is like a body without a soul."

Prof. Dr. Harry Spitzbardt, a West German linguist who visited Indonesia recently said he had not the slightest doubt that standardization of Bahasa Indonesia would stimulate the development of Indonesia's already high social and culture heritage.

A STUDY OF THE RESULTS IN TERMS OF ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS, OF A SPECIAL PROGRAM IN GUIDANCE *

By Josefina Y. Porter

The Problem

The study was concerned with the problem of finding out whether a specific counseling treatment condition embodied in a Special Program in guidance would induce significantly greater achievement behavior among a section of senior high school students.

The Special Program followed in this study aimed to improve: (1) the students' motivation to achieve; (2) their study habits and attitudes; (3) their grades in Physics, History, Trigonometry, Literature, and English Composition, and (4) their school attendance.

The Subjects

The students under study were the middle section of the 1975-1976 senior class of Central Philippine University High School. Section B was designated the Experimental Group; Section C, Control Group I; and Section D, Control Group II.

The Instruments

The instrument used to measure motivation of the subjects for study was the **Motivation Scale** adapted by Elma Herradura from Jack Frymier.

The instrument to measure the subjects' study habits and attitudes was the standardized inventory, the **Study Habits** and **Attitudes Inventory** by William F. Brown and Wayne Holtzman:

The Index of Achievement

The grade averages of the students under the study in the aforementioned academic subjects were the indices of academic achievements.

Index of Attendance

The reported absences of each student were the index of attendance.

The Special Program

The Special Program was a series of class sessions conducted for the Experimental Group by the researcher. During these special sessions several topics were discussed. The topics included effective methods of study, preparing for exams, learning to read and write, learning to listen, learning to communicate, and learning to be on one's own.

Statistical Procedures

Four hypotheses were formulated all predicting that the subjects would improve (1) their academic motivation to achieve, (2) their study habits and attitudes, (3) their grade averages in the different academic subjects, and (4)

* Abstract of a Doctoral Dissertation done at Central Philippine University. Dr. Porter is Coordinator, Guidance Services Center, CPU.

their school attendance.

To test the hypotheses, one-way analysis of variances was performed on the data.

The effects of the treatment conditions on the students under the study were determined through analysis of covariance. The t-test was finally used to determine means of the post-test data.

Another approach to the problem was to determine how many students in each group significantly changed after the period of study. The critical values of difference between percentages were used as indices of change. In all comparisons, a .05 level of significance was sought.

Findings

The Experimental Group and Control Group I were to be considered equal in the following criteria at the start of the study: motivation, achievement in Physics, Trigonometry, and Composition, and in the number of unexcused absences.

The Experimental Group and Control Group I were different in study habits, study attitudes, and study orientation at the start of the study.

After participating in the Special Program, the Experimental Group was no better than Control Group I in Composition and Physics. The Experimental Group was significantly different from the Control Group I in Trigonometry, World History, and Literature.

In terms of percentage of those who increased in grade or score, both groups were equal in motivation, study habits, study attitudes, and study orientation.

In terms of percentage of those who decreased in their grade or score, both groups showed that several of their members suffered decreases, however, less students came from the Experimental Group.

Conclusion

This study failed to demonstrate fully the effectiveness of the Special Program in improving the motivation, the study orientation, and the attendance of the students who participated in it. Whether in consequences or not, neither did the Program fully effect improvement in academic achievements except in three out of five academic subjects. These increases were in World History, Literature, and Trigonometry.

Recommendation for Immediate Implementation

1. Although there may be a place for general guidance to help students improve their motivation and study orientation, such a program by itself needs to be followed by specific orientation to specific subjects. Individual guidance in each subject shall be provided as soon as particular students meet with difficulty in learning.

2. The above functions in guidance should be reflected in responsibilities of personnel in the organization. While general orientation counseling as regards schooling should be the responsibility of the school's guidance center, every teacher should take it upon himself to provide specific counseling in the subject he is teaching.

It is further recommended that group counseling techniques as practiced by the guidance counselor of CPU need to be improved.

Recommendations for Further Study

It is recommended that the following studies which this present investigation due to its limitations could not include, be undertaken:

1. A replication of this same study (1) using the student's scores in the last departmental test as critarion measures instead of the cumulative average grade which was used here. It was observed that one source of the difficulty in showing the effectiveness

of the Special Program was the cumulative system of grading. Under the cumulative system, the final grade was influenced by the first, second, and third grading periods, so it did not reflect whatever changes, if any, that might have occurred during the Special Program. The only measure that shows a "net" achievement from one grading period to the next is the departmental test score. Assuming that the subject-matter content of the departmental test covered the grading period being tested, then the departmental score really measures more adequately the achievements of the students for each grading period in consideration. (2) A change in the schedule of administration of the post-test from the fourth grading period to the last or final grading period, to give enough time for the students to learn to develop, master, and use the skills and techniques taught during the Special Program.

2. A parallel study be made in the College of Engineering to determine the effects of motivation and study habits on achievements in math and engineering subjects. This study may reveal useful information that may help solve the problem of failures among a great number of freshmen students in the College of Engineering.

3. Correlational studies between level of aspirations and academic achievements.

4. Longitudinal studies of the underarchieving students in relation to such factors as personality of the teacher, method of teaching, peer group interest/values, and students' evaluation of their teachers.

5. A follow-up study of the subjects of this Experiment in their college years to see whether the Special Program conducted may have delayed usefulness to the motivation, study habits and skills of the students after some time had elapsed.

THE MOBILE SCHOOL

An Educational Innovation Conceived and Organized to Help Develop the Rural Communities and the Countrysides

By Melquiades F. Pugne *

"The ultimate yardstick of development in the 70's and 80's will be the extent to which it touches and improves the day-to-day lives and welfare of human beings, the Filipinos."

– President Ferdinand E. Marcos

BASIC CONCEPT

The rural areas of the Philippines are teeming with idle manpower consisting of out-of-school youths and unemployed adults. Census figures show that six out of seven Filipinos live in close to 30,000 barrios dotting the countrysides. Out of the total Philippine population of about 45 million, about 15 million are young people belonging to the 7-24 years age bracket Over 65 per cent of this country's youth population are in the rural areas. Ninety-five per cent of the needy youths are out-of-school.

The province of Iloilo is predominantly rural with 72.7 per cent of the total population residing in rural areas and only 27.3 per cent in urban areas.

According to the latest survey the out-of-school youth in the rural areas in Region VI, number 340,777 or 10.7 per cent of the national total of 3,178,459. Iloilo ranks second in the number of out-of-school youths which is 113,820 or 33.4 per cent of the regional total.

There is an imperative need to train and develop this unutilized manpower in order that they can contribute to the productivity of the nation and generate incomes for themselves and their families.

The Mobile School provides extension services to the rural communities to help train and develop the people so that they will be able to improve their economic and social conditions as well as liberate themselves from a life of constant struggle and deprivation and release their human potentials. By providing the people of the community with skills and by reorienting their attitudes and values, the Mobile School becomes a catalyst of change in the rural communities and in the little places in the countrysides which have long remained dormant, unchanged and undeveloped.

* Dr. Melquiades F. Pugne is Provincial Schools Superintendent, Division of Iloilo.

WHAT IS A MOBILE SCHOOL?

The Mobile School is an innovative project conceived and developed to help improve the rural communities. Bringing its training staff and equipment to the community where the need for training and development is urgent, it provides programs designed to help those who are willing to rise above the present level of living by means of honest efforts and productive pursuits. Through its various services the people especially the out-of-school youths and unemployed adults are helped to become self-actualizing individuals to depend on their own capabilities, talents and human potentials.

The Mobile School is essentially a school on wheels which goes out and penetrates through the remote barrios, villages, and countrysides and other parts of the rural communities. The main focus of the program is directed to the out-of school youths and adult citizens who have urgent need for education and training. It provides non-formal education embracing the essential aspects of living—social, economic, moral, health, physical and political. The principal activities of the Mobile School consist of assistance programs designed to develop the productivity of the people and help them generate more income.

Although the hub of the total program consists of skill training and related practical work, the mobile school includes a purposeful action-oriented scheme towards the integrated development and transformation of the client community involving the process of community organization and social development. Other significant activities include continuing education, citizenship, literacy, sports and physical fitness, health and sanitation, population education, and other related socio-cultural activities. The mobile school supplements rather than duplicates the functions of other agencies concerned with the development of the community along these aspects. However, the development of vocational and technical skills useful in the day-to-day life of the people is the main strand of the mobile school program.

OBJECTIVES

Among the major objectives of the Mobile School are the following:

1. To help in the development of cottage industries, agro-fishery, trades and industries, arts and crafts and other related economic activities by developing the knowledge, skills and attitudes especially of the out-of-school youths and unemployed adults in the rural areas and the countrysides.

2. To help expand employment opportunities, increase people's income and utilize idle manpower in the rural areas for productive pursuits.

3. To help the people make effective use of local raw materials and other resources immediate to the community, develop their creative talents and resourcefulness and provide wholesome leisure-time activities.

4. To help out-of-school youths and adults develop their human potentials through functional programs in continuing education, citizenship training and practical activities to raise their earning capacity as well as develop positive habits towards work.

5. To help in the development of cultural and artistic talents especially of the youths and jobless adults.

6. To support the food production, Green Revolution, sanitation and

beautification, applied nutrition, family planning, health and physical fitness programs of the government.

7. To bring about better school and community relations to the end that the various development projects of the government may be better carried out.

ORGANIZATION

The Mobile School is a joint and cooperative human resources development program, initiated and organized by the Division of Iloilo with the cooperation of the local or national government or other private agencies.

Barangay leaders, PTA officers, local clubs, social and civic club members and other goverment agencies and community members are involved in the program. Their experience, and their material and psychological support are solicited to insure the successful accomplishment of the project.

Teachers, demonstrators, and lecturers from private sectors, contribute to the success of the project by helping in the training and by giving technical assistance when needed.

As much as possible local materials and local talents are utilized in the undertaking of any project of the mobile school.

BASIC GUIDE FOR ORGANIZING AND MANAGING THE MOBILE SCHOOL

1. Establish relationship with the community;
2. Help people identify their needs;
3. Determine community resources;
4. Help people decide suitable training programs and projects;
5. Translate intent into action; try out the project;
6. Develop attitudes and behavior of the clients so that they will support the Mobile School program;
7. Stabilize the Mobile School program and insure the continuance of the program;
8. Create a self-renewal capacity among the clients;
9. Plan disengagement from the project;
10. Make terminal assessment of the program undertaken.

TRAINING COURSES

Courses suitable to the needs of the locality are offered by the Mobile School upon request of enough number of applicants. Examples of these practical courses are the following:

Bamboo craft
Buri craft
Basketry
Coco vinegar-making
Dressmaking
Embroidery
Fiber craft
General mechanics
General metal work
Farm mechanics
Horticulture
Fish processing and food preservation
Fish culture
Fish capture
Mushroom culture
Flower-making
Patis-making
Shrimp kroepeck-making
Shell crafts
Slipper-making
Tailoring
Wood craft
Weaving

Supplemental instructions are provided hand in hand with the

principal courses offered along other useful areas of community living to provide a well-rounded and integrated program as well as to meet such other development needs of the government as follows:

Food and applied nutrition
Population education
Environmental education
Health, sanitation and beautification
Family planning (planning for better family living)
Citizenship training
Literacy
Continuing education

TRAINING SCHEDULE

The schedule and length of training is flexible. The length of the training time depends upon the course selected. However, a minimum of 300 hours is needed for a regular course. A course may take a few weeks or several months to terminate depending on its difficulty or complexity and frequency of meetings.

SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS

Training is offered free to participants and no fees of whatever kind are charged.

Tools may be self-provided or may be donated by some private persons, clubs, organizations or agencies.

Supplies and materials for projects of participants undertaking personal assignments are supplied by them and the finished products become the property of the participants concerned.

CERTIFICATE OF PROFICIENCY

A certificate of proficiency is awarded upon successful completion by the participants of the course taken.

Demonstration classes and lectures on any of the above courses are given in between classes whenever the need arises. Mass media channels are utilized including PTA meetings, community assemblies, club meetings, and other effective means of mass communications.

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

The following are the requirements for admission in the Mobile School:

1 Applicants must show interest and aptitude for the course;

2. He must be physically fit for work;

3. He must be at least twelve years old;

4. He should preferrably belong to the lower income level family;

5. He must show evidence that he can profit from the training offered;

6. Out-of-school youths and jobless adults are preferred.

A certificate of attendance is given to those who attend demonstration classes of short duration.

OUTCOMES OF THE MOBILE SCHOOL

The mobile school has demonstrated through its action-oriented programs a high capacity to carry out desirable community changes especially in increasing the skills and abilities of the people and in modifying their behavior. It has proven that by bringing the resources of the school to the people of the communities, development, growth, or advancement of the community can be well enhanced.

The mobile school has been found to be an effective instrument in strengthening the bond of relationship between the school and community. Lessons from the project experience were many and varied, and considering the impact that this innovative project has made in the rural communities, its potential as the catalyst for change and rural development is great and far-reaching.

Southeast Asia Journal

Volume 11, Number 1 1979

The order in which the articles appear in this journal does not indicate relative merit.

Responsibility for views expressed in the articles is assumed by their authors. Those views do not necessarily reflect the position of Central Philippine University. Divergent viewpoints are especially encourage.

This magazine is published twice a year. Subscription rates: ₱6.00 annually, P3.00 per copy; foreign rates—$4.00 annually, $2.00 per copy. Send inquiries to the Editor. Checks and money orders are payable to Central Philippine University, Box 231, Iloilo City, Philippines.

PUBLISHED BY
CENTRAL PHILIPPINE UNIVERSITY
ILOILO CITY, PHILIPPINES, 1979

CPU PRESS
Jaro, Iloilo City