

An Outline of a Toynbeeian Approach to Philippine History during the Spanish Regime

“The Philippines are unique in having a North American as well as a Spanish chapter in their history — unique and also lucky because Spain and the United States are complementary to one another as representatives of different elements in Western Christian civilization”.¹

Arnold J. Toynbee

It has often been observed that a definitive history of the Philippines has yet to be written. Perhaps the reason for this lack is that most of our historians tend to be ultra-nationalistic and forget Toynbee's dictum that only at the level of a whole civilization can the events of national histories become really intelligible.

To cite two examples. One of our more prominent historians once went to the extent of saying that Spain had no religious motive in coming to the Islands because in the agreement between Charles V and Magellan no mention was made of Christianizing the Islands. Not only is this to ignore the significance of Magellan planting the Cross as well as the standard of Spain in Homonhon and the missionaries saying the Mass on the shores of Limasawa.

¹ Pamphlet reproducing Arnold J. Toynbee's article in *The Observer*, London, 16 December 1953, p. 3.

It is to be ignorant of the zeal exhibited by Magellan in instructing Humabon and his family in the Faith such that Pigafetta, the chronicler of the expedition, brings Fr. Pedro Valderrama, the secular priest, into the picture only at the moment of baptism. Nor was Magellan the exception in engaging in spiritual as well as political conquest, for as Fr. Lucio Gutiérrez notes: 'In the 16th C. one does not know where the conquistador ends and the missionary begins'.² But above all it is to forget that Charles V was Holy Roman Emperor and it had been a standing policy since the time of Charlemagne of the Hapsburg monarchs to convert to the Catholic Faith any heathen land that was conquered. Indeed if one has ever visited the Hall of the Emperors in Frankfurt, Germany, he would come across the portraits of the Hapsburg rulers from Charlemagne to Francis Joseph. Under each portrait he would find a caption indicating the ideal of that particular king. And he would be pleasantly surprised in finding Charlemagne adopting the 'slogan': "CHRISTUS IMPERAT". Not Carolus Magnus, but Christ! While Charles V himself wrote in a memorandum after listening patiently to Luther at Worms: "My predecessors, the most Christian Emperors of the German race, Austrian archdukes and dukes of Burgundy, were until death the truest sons of the Catholic Church, defending and extending their belief in the glory of God, the propagation of the Faith and the salvation of their souls".³

Another event that could bear a slight reinterpretation is the encounter between Magellan and Lapu-lapu. This has invariably been presented as that of a liberty-loving chieftain resisting the unwarranted intrusion of a foreign invader and *nothing more*. This traditional picture, however, changes a little if we remember that Raja Humabon had agreed at the urging of Magellan to become a vassal of Charles V. Fr. de la Costa asks: "Did Humabon realize what it meant to be a vassal? Perhaps, for he had vassals of his own. Lapu-lapu, lord of Mactan was his vassal, but not a very obedient one".⁴ We think that equally important as Humabon's was Magellan's understanding of what vassalage entailed. Now the term "vassal" is derived from the French 'vassi' and since

² Gutiérrez, Lucio O.P., *Philippiniana Sacra*, Vol. XI, No. 32, May-Aug. 1976 p. 216-217.

³ Walsh, William Thomas, *Philip II*, Sheed & Ward, London 1938 p. 34.

⁴ De la Costa, Horacio S.J., *Readings in Philippine History*, MDB Printing, 1973, p. 16.

the time of the Carolingian rulers of the Franks it referred to *free-men* rendering *free* service to the king or some other lord and subject only to his jurisdiction. Vassals therefore were far from being slaves or serfs. Indeed more often than not they were the privileged, because the military members of the community. But the main point is that the personal contract between lord and vassal involved reciprocal duties on the part of either. "For the act of homage entitled the lord to authority over his vassal who rendered military service according to his status. In return the lord had to protect the vassal in time of strife, assist him in court and uphold his property rights".⁵ That is, if the vassal (e.g. Humabon) had the duty of helping his lord (in this case Magellan as representative of the Spanish sovereign) in his battles, the Captain-General (i.e. Magellan) had no less the duty of helping his vassal (i.e. Humabon) in subjecting his enemies. So Magellan would have thought. It would have surprised Magellan greatly if he had been told that he had no 'casus belli' against Lapu-lapu. This of course is not to undervalue Lapu-lapu's bravery nor his own reason for fighting; that if he did not relish being a vassal of Humabon, much less that of being a vassal of a Spanish conquistador.

If Toynbee is right that a whole civilization is the proper historical unit, there is no basis for the complaint that our own history as a nation up to 1872 is the history of Spain in the Philippines. For whether we like it or not, our national history was linked to that of Spain for almost four centuries and it is, therefore in the light of Spanish civilization or better still that of Western Christendom that our national history can only be rendered intelligible.

Some of our more recent historians have realized this as witness Dr. Henry William Scott who calls attention "to the need of a new study of the early Spanish accounts by a Filipino with sufficient understanding of 15th C. European culture to interpret the ethnocentric and motive expressions".⁶ One such Filipino we believe was the late Fr. Horacio de la Costa, S.J. and it is therefore from his READINGS IN PHILIPPINE HISTORY that we

⁵ *The New University Library*, Caxton Publishing Co. Ltd., London, 1967 Vol. 5 p. 378 under article *Feudalism*.

⁶ Scott, Henry William, Ph.D., "Pre-Hispanic Source Materials of Philippine History", *Unitas*, Vol. 41, No. 3, Sept. 1968, p. 425.

have culled the main events (as well as numerous insights) that are mentioned in this Outline. What is especially commendable in Fr. de la Costa's work is that it is a history of the Philippines by those who made it (active participants) or who saw it made (contemporary eyewitnesses) and thus obviates the mistake most often committed by historians: that of reading history backwards. An example of this was a book entitled: 'The Mistrial of Jose Rizal' which cited a decision rendered in 1966 by the Supreme Court of the United States.

PART I (1565-1663)

I. CHALLENGE: Successful Colonization

RESPONSE: Pacification

According to Toynbee, in contrast to primitive societies which are static, civilizations are in a constant process of development. And civilization develops because of creative activity. But creative activity flourishes only in situations in which, because of their difficulty, men are roused to unprecedented effort. The best way therefore of explaining historical events, according to the world renowned British historian, is through the formula: Challenge-Response.

So we must begin by asking: What was the response of the Spanish conquistadores to the challenge of colonization?

Because of the enormous cost of the expeditions and the difficulties of the return voyage to Spain, Charles V little by little became disillusioned with his enterprises in the East Indies. Indeed there came a time when he ceded his rights to the Moluccas to Portugal for 350,000 ducats. Spain respected this treaty of Saragossa (1527) until 1542 when a new expedition was launched in Mexico under the command of Ruy Lopez de Villalobos. This expedition to the East is important for two reasons. It landed in Mindanao which Villalobos named *Ceasarea Caroli* in honor of Charles V thus taking Spain's claim to Mindanao as an integral part of the Philippines. And it was also Villalobos who named the country 'Las Felipinas' in honor of the Crown Prince who was later to ascend the throne of Spain in 1556 as Philip II.

In deciding to colonize the Philippines, Philip II decided that the expedition should not only start from Mexico, but that the Islands would be ruled from that Hispanic-American country. Why so? The most probable reason was that the conquest of Mexico was the first instance of a successful Spanish colonization. As Prof. Rafael Bernal, erstwhile Secretary of the Mexican Embassy in the Philippines, writes: "The Spanish experiments in the Isles and in the coasts of Panama, Colombia and Venezuela were nothing more than a series of successive failures. All ended either in a war with the Indians or in Spaniards dying of disease and hunger".⁷

In contrast, the colonization of Mexico was so successful that after only 40 years of Spanish occupation (1521 to 1560), Hernán Cortés could boast that Mexico had been changed from a mere colony to a nation, nay, a Republic of laws. Now the members of Legaspi's expedition were of a mixed variety. There were *peninsulares* (Spaniards born in Spain) like Legaspi and Urdaneta; *Criollos* (Spaniards born in the colonies) like the Salcedos; and even *Mestizos* (half-Spaniard and half-Indian) like Lope Martin and Arellano. But all of them had passed the major part of their lives in Mexico and had learned from Cortés the secret of successful colonization. And what was this secret? It was embodied in the advise given by Cortés to his generals: "Treat them (i.e. the Indians) well. Treat them with fondness".⁸ In this way Cortés was able to prevent unnecessary friction with the natives and enabled him to colonize Mexico in such a short time. Cortés called his policy PACIFICATION.

It was this policy that Legaspi was to apply to the Philippines and with a success that paralleled that of Mexico. Indeed Legaspi once was accused of cowardice by his own men because of his kindness to the natives. Is it true that pacification was only a euphemism used by Philip II for the harsher term 'conquest'? Not if we remember that Philip II despite the many wars that he waged abhorred war as such and only engaged in it when there was a question of defending justice or the Faith. His suppression e.g.

⁷ Bernal Rafael, "La Experiencia Mexicana en Filipinas", *Unitas* Vol. 37, No. 1 March 1964 p. 56. "El experimento español en las Islas y en las costas de Panamá, de Colombia y Venezuela no fue mas que una inacabable sucesión de fracasos... todos fracasaban y terminaban en guerras de indios, o los españoles muriéndose de enfermedades y de hambre".

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 63 "Tratadles bien. Tratadles con caricias".

of the revolt in the Netherlands was justified for he was its legitimate ruler. And the invasion of England by the Armada? This was occasioned by the beheading of Mary, Queen of Scots, in the eyes of her contemporaries, the legitimate Queen of England and the champion of Catholicism in Great Britain. As Hilaire Belloc puts it: "The outrage (of the beheading of Mary Stuart on Feb. 8, 1587) raised a prodigious storm throughout Christendom. Philip of Spain launched the Armada against England (in 1588) to avenge it..."⁹ Nothing could be more historically untrue than to consider events such as these as due to Philip II's ambition of extending the Spanish empire.

The policy of pacification is clearly embodied in the instructions of the Audiencia of Mexico to Legaspi and his crew as they set out from the port of Navidad on the 20th of Nov. 1564.

"With the advice of the pilots in your company, you should steer a straight course so as to reach the Islands, and thus fulfill the aims which His Majesty principally has in mind, namely, to make known to the natives of those parts our holy Catholic Faith, and to determine the return route from thence to this New Spain (Mexico), in order that by trade and commerce and other lawful means which can in conscience be employed, his patrimony and (that of the) royal crown of Castile may be enhanced in spices and other riches be brought hither. You should make every effort to enter into and maintain friendly and peaceful relations with the natives... informing them of the goodwill and affection which His Majesty bears them and treating them as well as possible..."¹⁰

Note that the religious policy implicit in Charles V's instructions to the explorers is now explicit in Philip II's instructions to the would-be colonizers. Indeed even Dr. Rafael Palma, former President of the University of the Philippines, who cannot be accused of partiality for Catholicism, being the President in his time of Philippine Free-masonry, admits that "Spanish colonization in the Philippines was characterized by the chief policy of converting the natives to Christianity. Its motive therefore was *not* to exploit the Islands but to save the souls of their inhabi-

⁹ Belloc, Hilaire, *Characters of the Reformation*, Sheed & Ward, 1938 p. 190.

¹⁰ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 18.

tants".¹¹ Spanish colonization was thus colonization in the most *idealistic* sense of that term, where the mother country shares her most precious possession (in the case of Philip's Spain: Christianity) with her daughter colony.

Note also the importance of finding a return route to Mexico which Urdaneta would later successfully accomplish thus insuring the possibility of Spain having an outpost in the Orient. But above all, note the insistence on the policy of pacification, of treating the natives as well as possible, of cultivating and keeping their friendship.

True enough that the Audiencia also mentions spices and other riches to be found in the Islands. But the colonizers found no spices in the Philippines nor silver as in Mexico and Peru and so the Islands proved a financial drain on the Spanish treasury. But despite the urgings of the more economically minded to give up the Islands, Philip II in 1588 decided to retain the Philippines. And his reason? True to his belief that if it was a king's duty to serve God first, Philip's answer to those who thought in terms of what Spain could get out of the Islands instead of what she could give them, was the following:

"that even for the conversion of a single soul which he found here, he would surrender all the treasures of the Indies and if these were insufficient, he would give away the revenues of Spain most willingly".¹²

Together with the above-mentioned fundamental decision to retain the Islands, Philip II, ever conscientious, answered the many questions sent by the Audiencia of Manila through its colonial agent, Fr. Alonso Sanchez, S.J. Regarding defence, Philip II ordered the providing of Manila and 4 other strategic points in the archipelago with a citadel and wall. Regarding civil government, Philip emphasized that colonial officials were to be prohibited from engaging in commercial enterprises. Even agriculture was not forgotten since provision was made for the sending of 100 farmer settlers and their families to the Islands at royal expense. Hospitals and hostleries were to be subsidized. There

¹¹ Palma, Rafael, *Our History*, Manila, 1929 p. 5 as quoted by Prof. Zaide in *Philippine History for High Schools*, p. 58.

¹² Kobak, Cantius O.F.M. and Fernández, Pablo, O.P., *Philippiniana Sacra* Vol. XV, No. 13, Jan.-April, 1980, p. 137.

were moreover provisions regarding finance, *native rights* etc. As Fr. de la Costa points out:

"Such were the measures taken by Philip to remedy abuses and improve conditions in the remote colony that bore his name. Some of them would prove unworkable because unfitted to local conditions; others would become a dead letter through lack of adequate sanctions; still others would have to be revoked such as the abolition of the *audencia*. In the whole, however, they reflect great credit on the *statemanship* of the monarch who framed them and the colonial agent (Sanchez) who informed and advised him. . . . To frame good laws is one thing; to put them into execution is another. The success of the latter depended largely on the next governor of the Philippines, who would indeed have to be, as Sanchez insisted, a pearl among governors. Philip told Sanchez to pick his man. And Sanchez found Gomez Perez Dasmariñas".¹³

In his brief tenure of office (1590-1593) Dasmariñas could number among his accomplishments, the fortification of Manila with a wall, the suppression of banditry in Zambales and above all, an acceptable solution to the vexing question of tribute.

II. CHALLENGE: Reconciling tribute with Justice

RESPONSE: The *Encomienda*

Scarcely had the challenge of conquest with a minimum of bloodshed been met, when the Council for the Indies was faced with the problem of "how to derive a *revenue* from the conquered people without violating simple justice". And the response that Philip II and his advisers elaborated was the *Encomienda*. The establishment of the *Encomienda* system was embodied in the instructions to the Governor of the Islands signed by Philip II at Segovia Wood in 1573:

"After the land has been pacified and the inhabitants thereof and their rulers brought under our sovereignty, let the governor divide the land among the settlers, with their consent, in such wise that each one shall have charge of the natives of his portion, with the duty of defending and assisting them and providing them

¹³ De la Costa, *The Jesuits in the Philippines 1581-1760*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1961, p. 98.

with a missionary who shall teach them to live virtuously, besides the other services which encomenderos are required to render the inhabitants of their territory... The people who have been brought under our sovereignty are to be *persuaded* to pay a *moderate* tribute of the fruits of the earth in recognition of the universal lordship which we hold over the Indies and We direct that the tribute thus rendered be given the Spaniards to whom these encomiendas have been granted to enable them to discharge their obligations".¹⁴

From the foregoing it is clear that 1) the Encomienda system was an extension of the policy of pacification; 2) that the grant was *not of property but of jurisdiction* over a definite territory and its inhabitants; 3) that the encomendero had the duty of defending his encomienda, of maintaining peace and order and supporting the missionaries therein; 4) that it was in consideration of these services that he was entitled to collect tribute; 5) that the tribute was to be moderate, well within the means of the subject peoples.

True enough that some encomenderos betrayed their trust and exploited the natives, but not all. There was Salcedo e.g. whose contribution to the pacification of Laguna de Bay, Cagayan, Bicolandia and Catanduanes entitled him to an encomienda in the Ilocos. Till his death in 1576, Salcedo run his encomienda so well that his paternal rule became a model which his successors strove to follow.

As to those who abused their power, their reason was embodied in a letter they sent to Fray Domingo de Salazar, O.P., first Bishop of the Philippines, who from the moment of his arrival in the Islands in 1581, like Bartolomé de las Casas in America, had protested against all forms of injustice being committed against the natives. Their letter reads thus:

"We have seen service in the conquest and pacification of these Islands and their settlement, some of us 10 years, some 12, others 15, with only the original grant-in-aid which the officials of your Majesty's treasury of New Spain released to us in Mexico on our way hither. It was soon spent by reason of the necessities we encountered in the pacification of the natives and so we have

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 31.

been forced to rob them and impose on them in other ways, burdening our consciences in this in order to subsist. We thus have a heavy load on our souls which we are unable to shake off by reason of our great poverty".¹⁵

It is to the credit of these colonizers that they admitted their wrongdoing and desired to do better by the natives. And it is to the credit of Philip II that he provided a fund to enable the impoverished conquistadores to make restitution for the injustices committed during the conquest. And it is to the credit of the Synod of Manila (1582-6) headed by Bishop Salazar O.P. to have called the attention of the King to the need of making restitution.

That Salazar wanted justice to be the basis of tribute collection is shown in the distinction he made regarding the various regions of the Philippines. (1) Those which enjoyed the advantage of thorough pacification and Christian civilization were to pay the full tribute (2) those pacified but not yet Christianized 1/2 of the tribute; and (3) those neither pacified nor Christianized were to pay no tribute at all.

The equating of 'tribute' with an unjust exaction rather than a 'tax for revenue purposes' is due, we believe, to the erroneous *absolute* opposition made in modern times of the terms 'subject' and 'citizen'. If a citizen is free, then a subject is a slave. But subjects are not citizens. Ergo... But to reason this way is to forget that

"the subjects of a *king* are not slaves nor are they citizens of a republic. Yet like citizens, subjects have membership in the political community. *They constitute the people whom the king serves as well as rules*, unless he is a tyrant, for only as a tyrant does he treat them as if they were his own property to be used for his own pleasure or interest".¹⁶

Now Philip II though a king was far from being a tyrant. Indeed even when yet a prince he was *against despotism* as shown in his letter to his father Charles V who had asked his opinion regarding the Emperor's intention of looting the Church's properties.

¹⁵ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 23.

¹⁶ *Britannica Great Books*, Vol. I, *The Great Ideas. A Syntopicon I* under the title *Citizen*, p. 219.

"In France people may tolerate such practices owing to the fact that the *King of France* rules rather like a *despot* than as *natural lord* and follows his *whim* rather than his *reason* which your Majesty will not do; and besides the French people will as your Majesty knows put up with everything... These realms and your subjects in them expect to be treated in a different fashion in accordance with their valor, their character and their merits in your Majesty's service".¹⁷

Notice that even Spaniards including the Prince himself are said to be subjects of the King without any pejorative connotation being attached to that term. All subjects including Filipinos are those people whom the king serves as well as rules, and this service by the king and his colonial representatives is emphasized in the *encomienda* system. No service on the part of the governor, no tribute on the part of the governed.

But some natives of the Philippines were 'citizens' as well as 'subjects' in the Aristotelean sense that they participated in the administration of the colony. The need of leaving local government to the native magistrates was emphasized by the Synod of Manila on the reasoning that

"the *alcaldes mayores* (the Spanish provincial governors) were not qualified to attend to the details of the administration... Let them leave those matters to the native magistrates, who without incurring the expense of hiring interpreters and scribes, but solely by word of mouth, can administer them better than the *alcalde mayor* with his interpreters and scribes, because of their familiarity with local conditions".¹⁸

And the colonial government followed the Synod's suggestion.

Was it the interest of the Church in the total welfare of the natives as evidenced by the colonial bishops considering it their duty to minister not only to the religious, but to the economic, political and social well-being of the people that accounted for the rapid Christianization of the Islands?

¹⁷ Walsh, William Thomas, *op. cit.*, 1938, p. 40.

¹⁸ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 30.

III. CHALLENGE: Forming a Christian Civilization

RESPONSE: Building Church-centered Towns

Fr. de la Costa, in describing the first efforts to Christianize the Philippines, asks: "What natural attraction could the religion of the conquerors have for the conquered? How was it possible to spread the gospel of peace with the sword?"¹⁹ Perhaps it was due to the fact that the conquistadores adopted the policy of pacification and did not unsheathe the sword unless it was absolutely necessary. Perhaps most of the *encomenderos* did their duty of financially supporting the missionaries in their apostolate. But of course the main credit must go to the missionaries themselves and that is why Tomas de Comyn, a Spanish Liberal, writing in 1810 says the following

"Of little avail would have been the valor and constancy with which Legaspi and his worthy companions overcame the natives of the islands, if apostolic zeal of the missionaries had not seconded their exertions, and aided to consolidate the enterprise. The latter were the real conquerors; they, who without any other arms than their virtues, gained over the goodwill of the islanders".²⁰

What must have convinced the natives of the truth of the Gospel message was that the missionaries practised what they preached, what with their unselfish devotion to their ministry, with their willingness to undergo privations in spreading the Faith and above all for their championship of justice and human rights. In 1591, for example, Bishop Salazar issued a manifesto containing 25 articles with the main purpose of reminding the *abusive* *encomenderos* that

"the *encomienda* was established more for the benefit of the natives than of the *encomenderos*, and that the *encomenderos* cannot be called, because they are not, lords of the natives, but rather their advocates, tutors and protectors".²¹

Nor was Salazar the only one or even the first to take up the cudgion for the natives. The Augustinian Fr. Martin de Rada who accompanied Legaspi had done this before him.

¹⁹ *ibid.*, p. 26

²⁰ Comyn, Tomas de, as translated by William Welton, *State of the Phil. Islands*, London, 1821.

²¹ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 25.

But the missionaries did more than convert the Filipinos to Christianity. They were the ones mainly responsible for the buildings of our many towns. Why were they eager that towns should be built? Because they realized that the principal obstacle to the rapid Christianization of the Filipinos was their dispersal in small scattered settlements. By introducing the people to the settled life of towns, the natives could also acquire more easily the arts and usages of civilization.

What many do not realize is the close connection between the building of towns and the rise and spread of civilization. But the very term 'civilization' is etymologically related to the term 'city' and a town is a center of population which is intermediate between a city and a village in organization. As we read in the Columbia Encyclopedia:

"The medieval walled town had much in common with the ancient city-state. Civilization was largely built by substantially autonomous and self-sufficient communities on this scale. . . . Literacy is now usual in civilizations, but literacy is not essential, since the Greeks of Homer's time could neither read nor write, but they were members of groups that had cities, and this is characteristic of civilized men".²²

Did the natives take to town life as ducks to water (as the trite saying goes)? Not if we believe de la Costa who opined that

"considering that the natives took it so ill to leave the little dwellings where they were born and near which they have their farms and other sources of livelihood, one can imagine the protracted struggle that the colonizers had to persuade the natives of the advantages of town life and *must therefore admire the patience, the toil, the vision and the endurance of those responsible for its making*. And these were chiefly the missionaries as evidenced by the fact that the names of Philippine towns are more often than not those of Dominican, Franciscan or Augustinian saints".²³

The interest of the missionaries in towns is shown further by the actuation of Bishop Salazar when a huge conflagration wiped out most of the city of Manila. The bishop besought the

²² Columbia Encyclopedia, Columbia University Press, 1946, p. 1777.

²³ De la Costa, *The Jesuits in the Philippines*, p. 350.

Governor Diego Ronquillo to see to it that henceforth the citizens should build their houses of stone roofed with tiles instead of wood roofed with straw. To the objection that there was no stone available, the bishop went in person to look for quarries. He also ordered the tools whereby the stones could be cut. In all this it was his own money that he spent. Soon many of the citizens followed the example of the enterprising bishop.

If the missionaries were responsible for our many towns, can we not say that we owe to them not only our Religion, but the very advancement of our civilization? Indeed the religious were the ones mainly responsible for most of the social services — schools, orphanages, hospitals. The missionaries also introduced new plants and animals, new industries, the arts and sciences of the West. They established printing presses and libraries. They studied the native folklore, the native language, the native culture.

It might be urged that there were towns also on Maguindanao and Sulu and these brought to the natives the advantage of Muslim civilization. Even granting that the majority of these were towns rather than mere trading posts, still these were 'medieval' towns, for the Muslim South had feudal governments way down to the 18th C., if not beyond, if we are to believe Dalrymple's report to the East India Company in 1769.

"It is a common though very erroneous opinion that all parts of India are under the dominion of despotic princes; the eastern islands in general are on the contrary under a feudal government. Every man, as it customary in such states, is habituated to bear arms and to avenge himself. . . ." ²⁴

IV. CHALLENGE: Transforming a Feudal Society into a Modern Nation

RESPONSE: Commercial Capitalism and a Common Religion

Were the towns built by the Spaniards in the Philippines medieval or modern towns? If the former, President Rafael Palma might be right in claiming that "Spain has undoubtedly left here a civilization, a culture, but it was of medieval charac-

²⁴ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 201.

ter”²⁵ implying that Spain could only give what it had: not a modern but a medieval civilization.

In the first place, distinction must be made between culture and civilization. According to ethnologists, the term ‘culture’ applies to the way of life of a people and applies equally well to a primitive society as to classical Athens, but the term ‘civilization’ can apply only to the latter. But our main question is: What distinguishes a modern from a medieval town? In *MEDIEVAL EUROPE*, authored by H. C. Davies of Oxford University, we read:

“In modern Europe the town is an administrative district of the State and is organized under a standard pattern. In medieval Europe the town-charter was frequently a compromise with the caprices and interests of a petty *signeur*”.²⁶

Applying this test, we see at once that the towns built by Spain in the Philippines which were of uniform pattern throughout (each *pueblo* being administered by a *gobernadorcillo* and composed of several villages each under a *cabeza de barangay*) must have been modern towns, towns by a modern nation.

The transition from the feudal system to the modern nation-state is described by Toynbee thus:

In the history of Western Europe the external challenge of the Scandinavian tribes caused the former to respond with the feudal system... But the operation of the system itself presented a further — and this time a more internal challenge arising out of the social, political and economic conditions it entailed. It became clear that a new relationship between class-divided individuals was needed — the response of Western civilization was the rise of the national sovereign state”.²⁷

So our problem reduces to: Was Spain in the latter half of the 16th C., a feudalistic society or a national sovereign state? To make the problem clearer, let us tackle the problem from two points of view: the economic and the political.

From the economic point of view

“feudalism or manorialism or simply the medieval economy was mainly characterized by the organization of

²⁵ Palma, Rafael, *Historia de Filipinas*, p. 671 as quoted by Fr. Fidel Villaroel O.P., *Unitas*, March 1973 p. 51.

²⁶ H. C. Davies, *Medieval Europe*, Oxford University Press, p. 217.

²⁷ Doay, William H., *Philosophy of History*, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964, pp. 85-86.

production and consumption in estates or village communities aiming at something close to self-sufficiency. The transition from this economy to one of exchange for profit took place over centuries. It began with the cessation of foreign invasions and incursions (Normans, Magyars, Saracens) in the 10th C. and continued till the 14th C. when due to the plague known as the Black Death (1348-9) Europe suffered a widespread economic depression.

Modern Capitalism in contrast to the foregoing rudimentary capitalism of the Middle Ages is supposed to have begun around 1500 A.D. As we read in *The Rise of Capitalism*:²⁸

"From the early 16th C. on, European trade began a new career of growth and this second wind punctuated though it was by cyclical contractions and some longer declines has in effect continued to the present day... What set it off? More than even the first surge, this one was linked to territorial expansion, this time across the ocean, in the New World and the Orient. The Americas contributed primarily bullion in unheard of quantities, swelling the money supply and making possible even greater expansion of commercial credit. The Orient contributed its old staples — spices, silks, cottons — but in greater quantities and on a more direct, hence profitable basis. The 16th C. saw the beginning of world as against international trade... In this enlarged arena, new commercial expansion came to the fore. The first fruits of maritime expansion — the spices of the Indies, the silver of the Americas went to the IBERIAN countries".²⁹

If we have quoted the foregoing excerpt in some detail, it is to show that if Capitalism characterizes the modern as distinguished from the medieval economy, its first form usually called COMMERCIAL CAPITALISM first arose in 16th C. Spain and Portugal.

But why were Spain and Portugal not able to convert this new-found wealth into lasting economic growth? Why did they lag in the next phase — Industrial Capitalism — behind England, France and Holland? Many reasons are given, most of them debatable. But if we are to believe Earl J. Hamilton and John

²⁸ *The Rise of Capitalism*, edited by David S. Landes, Harvard University, Macmillan Co., New York, 1966 p. 1.

²⁹ *ibid.*, pp. 4 and 5.

Maynard Keynes, two very noted modern economists, A, if not THE, principal factor in the promotion of industrial capitalism was the gap between prices and wages because this permitted a higher rate of profit and thus a more rapid accumulation of capital. As Hamilton puts it:

"In France and England the vast discrepancy between prices and wages, born of the price-revolution, *deprived laborers of a large part of the income they had hitherto enjoyed*, and diverted the wealth to the recipients of other distributive shares. . . . For a period of almost 200 years, English and French capitalists (and presumably those of other economically advanced countries) must have enjoyed income analogous to those American PROFITEERS reaped from a similar divergence between prices and wages from 1916 to 1919".³⁰

What, was *profiteeing* then the main factor in the growth of industrial capitalism? If in Spain, industrial capitalism did not thrive, was it because "Philip and his Cortes would have considered the modern economist's attempt to promote prosperity by deliberately raising prices a little insane, if not positively evil"?³¹ Was then Philip who forbade the export of manufactured articles to the colonies on the ground that it raised the prices in Spain such that "we who worked here cannot live" way ahead of his time in advocating what the modern world now calls SOCIAL JUSTICE?

How about the political aspect? Political feudalism as shown by the War of the Roses in England lasted till nearly the end of the 15th C. Indeed Richard Nevile, Earl of Warwick (1428-1471), the Kingmaker, is often described as the Last of the Barons. England became a national sovereign state only with the Tudor dynasty. So with France which became a national sovereign state towards the end of the reign of Louis XI (1423-1483). Spain emerged from political feudalism when Castille was united with Aragon through the marriage of Isabella and Ferdinand. More than any other sovereign it was Isabella who was responsible for the transformation of Spain from a conglomeration of feudal manors into a united Spain which by the time of Philip II had

³⁰ As quoted by Pierre Vilar in article: *Problems of the Formation of Capitalism*, in: *The Rise of Capitalism*, edited by Landes, p. 27.

³¹ Walsh, William Thomas, *Philip II*, p. 119.

become the greatest power in Europe, not to say the world. Walsh describes the event of Isabella becoming Queen thus:

"Isabel heard the news (of the King's death) in Segovia. Her first act was to put on mourning clothes and go to the church of St. Michael to pray for the repose of the King's soul. When she returned to the castle she was notified by Cabrera and the chief men of Segovia that she would be crowned Queen of Castile on the morrow, St. Lucy's day. Destiny had strangely put into the hands of a girl the power she had dreamt of using. THE MIDDLE AGES WERE PAST and MODERN SPAIN WAS TO BE BORN".³²

The Spanish colonizers faced the same challenge as Isabella of transforming the Philippines from an aggregate of feudal villages into a modern united nation. For there is no doubt that the Islands were a feudalistic society when the Spaniards came to her shores. As Fr. de la Costa notes:

"Nothing about the early Filipinos struck the first Spanish settlers more forcefully coming as they did from a Europe of centralized monarchies, then that they had no kings. Except at a few trading posts like Manila and Cebu, where rajahs held sway in a manner familiar to the subjects of Philip II, the Filipinos lived in small scattered settlements under the patriarchal rule of independent chieftains. These kinship grounds were called barangays. . . . When the Spaniards were able to examine the barangays at close quarters, they found it had much more in common with European society than they had thought at first. Not with European society as they knew it, but with an early stage in its development, that of the early Middle Ages, when a warrior class bound together by fealty to a warlord lived on the labor of serfs and slaves, and gave them in exchange protection and a rough and ready source of justice. . . . So much was the case that Fray Juan de Plasencia in describing the social structure of the Tagalog barangay, fell easily and naturally into the language of Spanish feudalism".³³

For the rough and ready source of justice, Spain substituted laws as the modern world understand it, laws dealing with peno-

³² Walsh, William Thomas, *Isabella the Crusader*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1939 p. 49.

³³ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 3.

logy, civil rights, commerce, mining and even copyright. More important were the laws dealing with the new problems created by the Spanish conquests. Influenced by the theories of Francisco de Vitoria who antedated Grotius, and is now acknowledged as the real founder of International Law, the Council for the Indies passed such laws as the *Leyes de las Indias*, *Las Siete Partidas*, *Las Leyes de Toro*, unmatched in the defense of the natural rights of the American Indians. Among those influenced by the theories of Vitoria was Salazar who as Bishop of Manila applied the former's theories to the relations between the Spanish *conquistadores* and the native Filipinos. If Vitoria exercised a strong influence upon Salazar, Las Casas, the Apostle of the American Indians, exercised an even stronger one. Unrelenting in his drive against the injustices committed against the native population, Salazar has well merited the epithet of "the Las Casas of the Philippines".

Salazar's struggle against Man's inhumanity to Man is shown most vividly in his struggle against slavery. Debt slavery was a feature the Filipino *barangay* society had in common with those of Malay people elsewhere. Nor were the Spanish *conquistadores* above the practice of owning slaves themselves. What Fr. James Broderick S.J. says of the Portuguese *conquistadores* applies equally well to their Spanish counterparts:

"The Portuguese conquerors suffered from divided minds, as did the English conquerors and all other conquerors. They were as sincerely religious as they were heartily imperialistic, and when they seized the unfortunate Africans and brought them to Lisbon or Goa, it was not entirely for the sake of cheap labor. They genuinely wanted to Christianize the heathen even when often badly in need of being Christianized themselves. They had no color prejudice, treated their slaves humanely and frequently intermarried with them. But the fundamental objection remains".³⁴

What attitude did Salazar adopt against such a well-entrenched and almost universal custom? Among his first acts as Bishop of Manila was to try to implement the Royal Decree brought by the Augustinians to the Islands in 1581 granting absolute freedom to all Filipino slaves in the hands of the Spanish *conquistadores*. Despite protests on the part of slave owners and Spanish officials

³⁴ Broderick, James, S.J., *St. Francis Xavier*, Image Books, 1957, p. 54.

including Governor Ronquillo, his successor Governor de Vera noted that in 1585 many slaves had been freed. The Spaniards who still refused did so on the ground that wealthy natives (especially the *datus*) still owned hundreds of slaves. Salazar, therefore, waged an all-out war against slavery, whether the owners were Spaniards or Filipinos. The result of his efforts resulted in Philip II enacting a Royal Decree in August 9, 1589, ordering the emancipation of ALL slaves in the Philippines.

From the foregoing it is clear that the legislation passed by the Spanish crown in defense of the oppressed and against slavery was mainly due to the efforts of Salazar and the other missionaries. Indeed Professor Edward G. Bourne, an American historian of the colonial period, notes that one of the most humanitarian results of the Spanish conquest was the uprooting of slavery in the Philippines. And he attributes this mainly to the efforts of the first *missionaries* and the Spaniards who loyally cooperated until slavery was completely eradicated.

We have seen Salazar's campaign against the abuses of the *encomenderos* and against slavery. We have seen his part in the rebuilding of the city of Manila after a disastrous fire. As head of the Synod he had worked such that Filipinos be given a share in government. Salazar together with Philip II himself, Legaspi, Rada, Sanchez, Dasmariñas, and others undoubtedly belong to the breed of leaders called by Toynbee 'creative minority', who are aware the challenges of their time originate responses and thus advance civilization. That many of these creative personalities are religious is not surprising, considering that in the welding of our feudalistic *barangays* into a national body politic, the role of the Church cannot be underestimated. As Toynbee points out:

"In the whole of Asia there are only two predominantly Christian countries, the Lebanon at the western end of the great continent and the Philippines here off Asia's eastern coast. In both countries, the Christianity is Roman Catholic, and ever since the maritime nations of Western Europe made themselves temporary rulers of the world by mastering the oceans, the CATHOLIC CHURCH has shown a marvellous capacity for fusing together peoples of different races".³⁵

Fusing them into what? What else than into a single nation or body politic. If Toynbee is right, Spain by the mere fact of

³⁵ Toynbee, Arnold, *The Observer*, London, 16 Dec. 1953, p. 283.

bringing Catholic Christianity to our shores, has been responsible for our national unity. And if this is so, how can some of our historians claim, without any shred of historical evidence, that the Spanish policy here was to 'Divide and Conquer'? Indeed, how can one divide what is not yet a unity, a whole, a region admitted by these same historians to be fragmented by intense tribal rivalries?

Of course the unity of our people would have been enhanced by a common language as well as a common religion. The missionaries are usually blamed for not adopting Spanish as the medium of instruction in the schools. What is forgotten is that the only schools then obtaining were parochial schools committed primarily to religious instruction and the parish priests argued with good reason, that with the limited means at their disposal, it was impossible to teach Christian doctrine properly in Spanish. Furthermore, we must remember that the colonizers always acted in line with their Mexican experience. Now

"the Spanish missionaries had tried to introduce the Castillian language among the various Mexican groups, but found it an almost impossible task, and therefore adopted a policy of learning the language of the natives in their work of proselytization".³⁶

This is then one, if not the main reason for Spanish not becoming the universal tongue of the Filipinos.

Furthermore, we must look upon the policy of the friars of teaching in the dialects as a part of the policy of pacification. The latter policy became successful in Mexico because the colonizers there (to use the words of the Mexican scholar, Prof. Bernal) became 'indianized'. That is, they adopted the customs of the natives: ate what they ate, drank what they drank and we may add, spoke dialects they spoke. In short, the friar in those marvellous and heroic ages, did not wait for the natives or indios to come to him, he went to the *indios*. He met them more than half-way.

Another good result may have been the retention of our native customs and culture. If there is the complaint that our people, especially the young ones, are too 'Americanized' in their outlook and customs, may it not partly be due to the imposition of the

³⁶ Rodriguez, Isacio, O.S.A., *Historia de la Provincia Agustiniiana del Ssmo. Nombre de Jesús*. I. *Bibliografía*, Manila, 1963, p. 129.

English language in our schools since the start of the American regime?

V. CHALLENGE: Of Effective Government

RESPONSE: Centralized Authority

A common religion, as we have seen, fostered our national unity. This was also enhanced by a centralized form of government "with the governor virtually a king" in the words of Agoncillo who believes that this was but a reflection of the *absolutism* that obtained in Spain in the 16th and 17th C. Thus he says:

"The doctrines of Machiavelliarism and mercantilism were popular in Europe during the 16th and for the most part of the 17th C. And in Spain absolutism reigned, perhaps much more than in Florence that gave birth to absolutism... Drawing from the teachings of Machiavelli (*The Prince*) even the administrators of the overseas empire were granted vast and extensive powers. In the Philippines the governor-general was virtually a king and even the countervailing devices that Spain hopefully substituted to prevent his excesses were useless".³⁷

Even granting that Machiavelli's doctrines influenced some states in Europe, it could not have struck root in the Spain of Philip II. For Machiavelli isolated politics from religion, morality, law and history, but Spain under Philip was precisely wedded to religion, morality, law and history. One cannot emphasize the union of Church and State in Philip's Spain and at the same time claim it to be Machiavellian. One cannot eat his cake and have it too. The objection might be raised that Machiavelli recognized the value of moral behavior in the ruled. True enough, but Machiavelli expected the ruler to emancipate himself from all moral restraints. Whatever may be said against Philip II, emancipation from morality cannot be attributed to him since he was considered by all the foreign ambassadors who attended his court as the justest of monarchs. As to religion, he was so devoted to it that he has been erroneously maligned as a religious bigot.

True enough that Philip's Spain was a hereditary monarchy. But what kind of monarchy was it? Was it a despotism which sacrificed the welfare of the subjects to the monarch's self-aggrandizement? This is again to read history backwards and to apply

³⁷ Agoncillo, Teodoro and Guerrero Milagros, *History of the Filipino People*, Quezon City, 1970, p. 81.

to the monarchies of the 16th and 17th C. in Spain, characteristics that belong to the age of Louis XIV, the age already influenced by the Protestant doctrine of the divine right of Kings. Far from being a despotism the Spanish regime of those times were popular monarchies. Just compare Louis XIV's boast: "I am the State" with the following statement of Isabella *La Católica* to the rebels who wanted the hated Cabrera to be ousted as governor of Segovia. "My vassals and servants, say now what you desire, *for what suits you is agreeable to me*, since it is for the *common good* of the city".³⁸ And Walsh who has written the definitive English biography of Philip II commenting on the answer of Philip II to his father already quoted adds: "It not only shows the tact and judgment and grasp of affairs the Prince had attained in his twentieth year but reveals the *healthy spirit of independence that checked despotism in Spain*, at once the most Catholic and the most *truly democratic* society in the world".³⁹

Furthermore Agoncillo seems to forget that hereditary monarchy met satisfactorily the needs of those times, (late 15th & 16th C). As H. C. Davies says:

"Good government in the Middle Ages (the author considers the closing years of the 15th C. as still belonging to the Middle Ages though actually it was the beginning of modern times) was only another name for a public-spirited and powerful monarchy. Such monarchies existed in the Western state (the national sovereign states of England, France and Spain), they rested upon the shoulders of a middle class of small landowners and wealthy merchants. It may seem strange that this class which desired strong government for purely practical and material reasons should uniformly have accepted hereditary kingship as the one form of government practicable in a large community. The grand danger to be avoided at all costs was that a *disputed succession* would leave the daily work of government in abeyance and open the door for destructive party conflict. . . . When we further recollect that hereditary kingship was sanctioned by use and want, was the most intelligible symbol of national unity and possessed as of right all the prerogatives which were necessary for effective government, it is not a wonder that even those to whom the doctrines of popular sovereignty and social contract were perfectly familiar,

³⁸ Walsh, William Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

³⁹ Walsh, William Thomas, *Philip II*, p. 76.

acquiesced contentedly in a form of government which the modern world regards as unreasonable and essentially precarious".⁴⁰

The modern world after the American and French revolutions might indeed look with disdain upon hereditary kingship because of its abuses in later ages, but to do so at the public-spirited and effective monarchies of the 16th and early 17th C would still be another case of reading history backwards.

It is true that the Governor-General had vast powers, but this was necessitated by the conditions of the times. Indeed Agoncillo admits as much when he says: "The integrating of the Philippines with the Spanish Empire *necessitated* the establishment of a strong paternalistic and *highly*-centralized government".⁴¹ How a government can be despotic and paternalistic at the same time is beyond me. Furthermore, how could the colonial government unite the warring tribes into a single nation if authority were not centralized? Even granting that the governor general was virtually a king, does it follow that he was a despot? And Philip II made sure that the governor-general would not degenerate into a despot by providing several checks on a strong executive. There were 1) the Royal Audiencia - the Supreme Court of the colonial government - which represented the rule of Justice. 2) The Clergy - which represented the higher law of Charity or perhaps better stated, the rule of Conscience - 3) the VISITADOR - whom the king sometimes sent for the purpose of investigating the affairs of the colony - and 4) the RESIDENCIA - a court conducted by an incoming governor-general. Several governor-generals were indeed subjected to the *residencia*. In comparison, how many of our modern governments have devices to ensure the accountability of their leaders? In short, the colonial government as planned by the Hapsburg line of Spanish kings was intended to be a government of laws and not of men.

VI. CHALLENGE: Moro piracy

RESPONSE: Military Expeditions

We have seen that through the influence of the Church and the centralized authority of the State, the Philippines developed

⁴⁰ Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 168-169.

⁴¹ Agoncillo, Teodoro and Guerrero, Milagros, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

into a single nation. But this nation was limited to Luzon and the Visayas. Mindanao remained for centuries outside the sway of the colonial government. Indeed the next challenge to the Spanish outpost in the Orient after it had attained a certain degree of stability came from the Malay Muslims of Maguindanao and Sulu, often referred to as the MOROS.

It is often claimed that the term 'MORO' was an epithet to the Muslims of the South by Spaniards in *derision* when the real reason is that their religion was the same as those of the African Moors from whom Isabella liberated Spain. Indeed the word 'MOOR' is not of Spanish coinage. According to the Oxford Dictionary, it is derived from some ancient North African word. Anyhow, the Moors were people of mixed Berber and Arab race, Islamic in religion, who in the 8th C. A.D. invaded Spain.

Now the Maguindanao and Sulu Muslims were seamen who lived on 'trade', a euphemism during that time (1570 to 1650) as de la Costa points out for 'piracy'. This was partly due to the fact that the Maguindanao plains while producing rice and sago palm for food, produced nothing of value for exchange. As to Sulu, most of the land was infertile. Articles of trade were to be found in the Visayas and much better than these, people who could be enslaved and sold in the lucrative slave markets of Asia. The Maguindanaons and Suluans were just settling down to their profitable trade when the Spaniards came.

But why should the Muslim Malays of Maguindanao and Sulu want to enslave the Visayans who were Malays like themselves? The Muslim Malays came to Sulu in the last decade of the 15th C. Their power and culture became predominant in the regions of South East Asia by virtue of the conquest of the Madjapahit empire by the Malaccan empire in 1478 A.D. Though their stock and race were identical to the Shri-Visayan Malays who had come earlier to the Visayas, the latter were basically pagans and animists, while they were steeped in Hindu-Arabic and Muslim culture.

Now for Muslims the world is divided into two parts: that part (*dar al Islam*) where Allah's will is obeyed by the believers and that other part (*dar al harb*) where Allah's will is disregarded by the unbelievers. And what is the stance of the house that submits to Allah to the house of strife? Most probably it was *jihad*, holy war, which the Muslims considered a sacred obligation.

Either the unbeliever is converted or if he refuses to accept Islam, either executed or enslaved. That the Muslim Malays at the very best looked down upon the Malays of the Visayas is evident from the statement of Rajah Soliman to Marshal Goiti that though he was pleased to become the friend of the Spaniards, the latter should understand that he and his followers were *not painted Indians*, which was the epithet given by the Spaniards to the Visayans because of their custom of tatooing their bodies.

It was of course the Governor-General who had the responsibility of responding to the Moro challenge. As early as 1581, Governor Sande sent Esteban Rodriguez de Figueroa to Jolo. Following the traditional policy of pacification, Figueroa offered a treaty of friendship and commerce to the reigning rajah on condition that the latter cease from piracy, but this was refused. Beaten in two encounters, the rajah offered to become a vassal of Philip II. But no sooner had Figueroa set sail for Manila, than the Moros resumed their piratical raids since no permanent garrison had been left behind. Indeed the Moro raids on the Visayas increased in range and destructiveness in the succeeding decades and came to be contained only when Governor Sebastian Hurtado de Corcuera, sometimes dubbed as the Last Conquistador, destroyed their principal strongholds in Mindanao and Sulu in 1637-1638 and established a fort at Iligan.

The military expeditions to the South against the Muslims are examples of what Toynbee calls unsuccessful responses to unduly strong challenges. A partial reason why the colonial government could not effectively prevent the incursions of the Moros into the Visayas was that Philip II had become the legitimate King of Portugal as well as of Spain in 1580 and had given the Philippine colony the task of defending the Spice Islands as well as itself and this dual task proved to be beyond the colony's limited resources.

VII. CHALLENGE: Dutch Aggression

RESPONSE: Heroic Naval Defense

The colonial government had to defend the Spice Islands against the Dutch. For the Dutch in Europe led by William of Orange, called the Silent, had begun to revolt against their *lawful* sovereign, Philip II. There may be those who would say that

Philip II being Spanish had no right to rule over the Dutch. But as Hilaire Belloc points out: "It is essential in history to read every period according to the spirit of that period, even when that spirit has disappeared or has been so modified that we moderns have difficulty in understanding its strength.... (Now) in the 16th C. all the morals of the time took it for granted that the ruler of a monarchic country should be the senior representative of the Blood Royal".⁴² And in the case of the Netherlands that was Philip. One might ask: How about a people's self-determination? As Belloc would say: "That theory was invented long after".

Anyhow to cripple the rebels financially, Philip II closed the port of Lisbon to them, Lisbon being the place where the Dutch obtained their spices to sell them at a great profit to the northern countries. The Dutch who were in the meantime developing into a sea-power decided to get the spices directly from the Moluccas. To overwhelm the Spanish garrisons in the Spice Islands, the Dutch opted to carry the war to Iloilo from where the Moluccas garrisons were provisioned. But the Spaniards ably defended both the Moluccas and Iloilo garrisons, forcing the Dutch "to go for the jugular-Manila".

The Dutch reasoned correctly that if Manila were blockaded, the Spanish South China trade would suffer. But the Philippines under Governor Juan de Silva proved equal to the occasion and despite great odds won the naval battle of Playa Honda (1617). De Silva intoxicated by his victory believed that together with the Portuguese fleet he could destroy once and for all the Dutch East Indies fleet. The Portuguese, however, failed to keep the rendezvous at Malacca, where moreover de Silva died of dysentery. Unfortunately in manning his great fleet, de Silva had stripped his own bases in the Philippines and it was there that the Dutch attacked. The resulting Dutch victory saw the Spice Islands forever lost to Spain.

The wars continued but for the colonial government it had become a purely defensive one. In 1620 the Dutch fortified a naval station in Formosa; the Spaniards and Filipinos countered with a rival base at Keelung. Naval battles were fought on and off through the following years with neither side getting a decisive victory.

⁴² Belloc, Hilaire, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-181.

In 1646 the Dutch tried to blockade Manila not only from China but from America. Against two squadrons of 5 and 7 ships respectively — one to intercept the junks near the Ilokos coast and the other to waylay the galleons from Acapulco near St. Bernardino straits, the colony could only send two superannuated ships. Yet the Spaniards got the better of the naval encounter and as one of the commanders, Lorenzo de Ugalde, puts it:

“It was so signal a victory the like of which has never been witnessed in these seas that this noble, loyal and pious city ascribed it to the special assistance and intercession of the most holy Mary, Queen of the Angels, under the invocation of the Rosary, and as a lasting memorial of its gratitude, appointed the second Sunday of October of every Year to be celebrated as a feast-day in the church of St. Dominic”.⁴³

This feast, called La Naval de Manila, is still celebrated up to the present day.

“By the middle of the 17th C., the Netherlands was in practically complete control and the Spice Islands came to be known as the Dutch East Indies... The Indonesians by and large sank into a state of *apathy*. The word colonialism has such unpleasant meanings to-day that it is all too easy to be unfair to the Dutch. They brought energy and enterprise to the tropics. Such islands as Java are so exuberantly fertile that then and now enough to eat could be gathered with little effort. The needs for shelter and clothings are likewise so easily met in so warm a place. Without the Dutch therefore it seems unlikely that the tin mines, the oil wells, the rubber, pepper, quinine, sugar, coffee and tea plantations would have been developed. The unhappy side of this picture is that most of the income from these enterprises flowed back to Holland. The Islanders benefited but little though they supplied the hard manual labor. Banks, businesses, shipping were all managed by the Dutch. Some Indonesian princes usually sultans were allowed to maintain a certain amount of pomp but their real authority was severely limited. Though the Dutch introduced an educational system for the islanders, it did not go much beyond the elementary level. About the highest training it offered to an Indonesian was for a clerkship”.⁴⁴

⁴³ De la Costa, *Readings*, pp. 53.

⁴⁴ *Lands and Peoples*, Grolier Inc., New York, 1961, Vol. 5, pp. 224-225.

Notice that the foregoing appraisal is by one who did not want to be unfair to the Dutch. Notice also what Indonesia under the Dutch was an *exploitation* colony, defined by the Columbia Encyclopedia, as a colony established for exploiting a region rich in resources with commercial possibilities where the inhabitants may or may not possess a high level of culture. Whereas the Philippines were a colony with which Spain shared her most precious possession, Christianity, the Spice Islands were a colony whose resources were exploited for the benefit of the Dutch themselves. Regarding education, in comparison with the one in Indonesia where the natives did not go much beyond the primary level, the natives of the Philippines were given secondary education in the 1660's and later admitted to the Jesuit University of San Ignacio and the Dominican University of Sto. Tomas. They were given the same gentleman's education ending in a Bachelor of Arts degree as the Spaniards in Spain. Again in contrast to the Indonesian sultans who were given pompous but only token authority, the converted datus of the Philippines were given real authority regarding local affairs.

What needs to be underscored however is the statement that after the Dutch conquest, the Indonesians by and large sank into a state of *apathy*. For this is confirmed by Toynbee when visiting both Indonesia and the Philippines after World War II, he noted that

"The Philippines have also suffered most of the major trials that have afflicted other Asian countries that were temporarily conquered by the Japanese... The Philippines are being faced with the common Asian population problem and the other common problem of finding the capital for developing the country's natural resources. The problems are uniform, but the reactions are not. While all the recently liberated Asian countries I have visited are making the same effort to become effective members of the family of modern nations, one is conscious in the Philippines of a vivacity and optimism that are not so much in evidence in some of the neighboring countries".⁴⁵

VII. THE PAMPANGO REVOLT

The long duel between the Spaniards (and the Filipinos) and the Dutch in South East Asia ceased with the signing of the

⁴⁵ A. Toynbee, *The Observer*, London, 16 Dec., 1953.

Treaty of Westphalia (1648) which marked the end of the Thirty Year's War in Europe and brought peace both to the European powers and their colonies.

The colony survived the Dutch wars but at a very high price. Forced labor had been resorted to so that ships could be built. The colonial government did not, most probably because they could not, pay a just wage to the native mariners who sailed the ships and manned the guns. By 1657, the treasury was not only empty. It owed the native towns and villages over ₱200,000 for the supplies it had requisitioned from the provinces. The situation became intolerable when the Pampangos who were the main recruits were subjected by dishonest overseers to additional exactions. The Pampangos presented a bill of particulars to Governor Manrique de Lara and not receiving satisfactory reply what began as a mutiny of draft laborers became a general revolt in 1660. The Pampango revolt is important because it was the Pampangos who were the most socially organized and had rendered the greatest service to the colonial government.

Did the Pampangos revolt because of forced labor or because of the injustice of not being paid for their work? Is it true that forced labor was designed to exploit the colony's human resources? Was forced labor a feudal institution that reduced the drafted laborers to the condition of serfs, if not of slaves? Many considerations tend to show that these claims of Agoncillo are unwarranted.

If the Pampangos revolted because of forced labor they should have revolted *before, not after* being drafted. Unlike serfdom, not to say slavery, forced labor was limited to 40 days a year, and in later centuries to 15. It must be remembered furthermore that forced labor was directed to public works that ministered to the common good: the building of towns, of bridges, of churches, of ships. At present many nations are requiring a sector of their citizenry to devote part of their time and energy to the public good. Since what modern nations call 'national service' is required by law and not purely voluntary, from one point of view, it is forced or statute labor. Just one example. Is the intention of our leaders who require our medical graduates and nurses to spend several months after graduation ministering to the health of our less fortunate brethren in remote areas which have never seen

physicians a case of exploitation of human resources? Such statute labor, such national service may even have been responsible for the rise of civic consciousness among the Filipinos during the Spanish times. For if one has helped built a church or the 'presidencia' of a town, is it not likely that one will defend the same against those who would seek to destroy it? To those who would object that such statute labor was limited to Filipinos and did not extend to Spaniards, we must remember that the Spaniards were considered as part of the administration. Indeed the datus who administered local affairs were also exempt from forced labor. Their work of administration was their contribution to the common good. Only the natives who did not participate in administration were required by forced labor to work towards the same end.

If it was not forced labor that caused the Pampangos to revolt, it must have been the injustice of not being paid their due. And why were they not paid? Because the colonial government especially after the Dutch wars was far from being financially solvent. Indeed Archbishop Garcia Serrano diagnosed the situation correctly when he said that 'the revolt was due on the part of the Pampangos to the intolerable burdens which put them beyond the limits of endurance: on the part of the government to the chronic state of near-bankruptcy which had made it incapable of relieving these burdens'.⁴⁶

Why was the near bankruptcy of the government the probable cause of the non-payment of the draft laborers? Because in the so-called REPARTIMIENTO which consisted in obliging the native of a town to work on government enterprises, it was obligatory to pay the daily wage fixed by the Crown. As Prof. Rafael Bernal puts it:

"The REPARTIMIENTO can be appreciated in the Philippines especially in the dockyard constructions in Cavite, (and) as in Mexico in the enormous constructions of convents and schools, of the cathedral of Mexico, of aqueducts and roads. We will not discuss the justice or injustice of this system. But if we consider the situation obtaining, possibly among all the colonizers of the world, only the Spaniard resolved as a matter of principle to pay a just daily wage, when all the other countries of the

⁴⁶ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 58.

world in those times, including Portugal took advantage of the work of slaves captured in wars more or less illegitimate. The repartimiento will bring in America as in the Philippines great racial and social disturbances because it was prolonged unduly, but in its *origins* it was possibly the *justest* form of bringing to completion the enormous tasks that a new culture required and at the same time to compensate the natives for the work realized".⁴⁷

Because it was prolonged *unduly*! This we believe was the main shortcoming of the Spanish regime in the Philippines. Laws and institutions which were justified in their origins by the needs of the times were prolonged too much because the colonizers had changed from what Toynbee called a creative to 'merely dominant minority'. As Toynbee points out "the stagnation, if not the breakdown of civilization occurs when a minority which through a failure of creativity has lost its claim to the *mimesis* of society at large insists nevertheless in imposing its will on it".⁴⁸

Was Governor Manrique de Lara lacking in creativity in dealing with the Pampango revolt? In facing the revolt the Governor sealed the rebels at Arayat to prevent their reaching Manila. In this he showed himself a great general. But then he enticed the rebels with promises to come to Manila to negotiate. Once in Manila the Governor stopped the negotiations and had the rebel leaders executed. In employing Machiavellian treachery to put down the Pampango revolt, Governor de Lara put himself definitely in the class of leaders designated by Toynbee as a 'merely dominant minority'. For if the Governor had been

⁴⁷ Bernal, Rafael, *La Experiencia Mexicana en Filipinas, Unitas*, Vol. 57, No. 1, March 1964, p. 65.

"El repartimiento se apreciaba en Filipinas, especialmente en las obras de los astilleros de Cavite como en México en las construcciones enormes de conventos y escuelas, de la Catedral de México, de acueductos y construcciones de caminos. No vamos a discutir aquí la justicia o injusticia de esos repartimientos. Pero sí podemos considerar que ante la situación creada, posiblemente entre todos los colonizadores del mundo, solamente el español desde un principio, resuelve pagar un jornal justo, cuando todos los demás pueblos de la tierra en aquel tiempo incluyendo los portugueses, se aprovechaban del trabajo de esclavos hechos en guerras mas o menos lícitas. El repartimiento traerá en América como en Filipinas grandes disturbios raciales y sociales *porque se prolongó demasiado*, pero en sus orígenes fue posiblemente la forma más justa de llevar a cabo los enormes trabajos que toda una nueva cultura exigía y a la vez compensar a los indígenas por el trabajo realizado".

⁴⁸ A. Toynbee, as paraphrased by Dray, William H., in: *Philosophy of History*, p. 86.

more creative, he would have sought and made use of some other technique than treachery to put down the rebellion. Nay, he could have prevented this since he had received the list of grievances that unacted upon had led to the uprising.

Not only civil officials of the colonial government seem to have become a merely dominant minority. Even some leaders of the Church had changed from being unselfish missionaries to parish priests who served Mammon rather than God. Granting some prejudice on the part of Governor Corcuera (since civil authorities did not often see eye to eye with ecclesiastical ones), his report to the King of Spain in 1651 attest to some breakdown in both discipline and idealism on the part of the religious".

"I must now call your (ie. the King's) attention to something else and that is, that the ministers of the Gospel and pastors of souls ought not to give scandal to the natives by conduct at variance with their teaching whether by unchastity or by charging them exorbitant fees for burials, baptisms, weddings and other ministries".⁴⁹

Not only were not all the religious orders not guilty of abuse in their relations with the natives, but one may add that neither were all the members of each congregation. Those who abused their power must have been quite few, the exception rather than the rule. For we believe that what the philosopher Salvador de Madariaga says about the friars that accompanied the conquerors in Latin America applies equally well to their counterparts in the Philippines.

De Madariaga notes:

"The religious side of the mighty adventure was kept alive by the wonderful activity of the friars. They were not, of course, fundamentally different from the conquerors. They were in fact conquerors *a lo divino*, as the phrase went in Spain in those days. They stood more for the *universal* rather than for the individual pole of Spanish psychology. . . . The sense of daring, of sacrifice, of achievement, which we found in the conquerors also animates the friars. While the conquerors strove hard to rise and acquire honor and greatness, the friars strove hard to humble themselves. "The Indians mar-

⁴⁹ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 63.

velled at the fortitude of the preachers and more at seeing *them so averse to gold and silver* of which the secular Spaniards made so much" — writes a contemporary author. This example was at first the only language in which the friars convey their faith to the natives and they spoke it even to the risk of death".⁵⁰

For those interested in the names of the heroic evangelizers of Christianity in the Philippines, all they have to do is to read works like "DOMINICOS DONDE NACE EL SOL" by Pablo F. Fernandez O.P. and "THE JESUITS IN THE PHILIPPINES" by Horacio de la Costa, S.J. Reading these and similar works regarding the other religious orders that labored so zealously in the propagation of the Faith in the Islands, they cannot but agree with this beautiful summary of de la Costa:

"The general impression that emerges from this survey is surely that of man who whatever their faults, continued with courage and perseverance the work of their pioneering predecessors, continued it often at the peril of their lives, in lonely outposts, for interminable desert stretches of seemingly barren years; stumbling occasionally, yet never faltering or turning aside from their long haul which drew the people of the Philippines from the darkness of paganism to the broad daylight of Christianity".⁵¹

A hundred years that saw the erection of the structure of Spanish civilization in the Philippines; of successful colonization through pacification; of the linking of tribute with justice in the encomenda system; of the laying of the ground work of a Christian civilization through church-centred towns; of the transformation of a feudal society into a modern nation through a common religion and centralized authority. Creative leadership is shown by conquistadores like Legaspi and Salcedo, by such missionaries as Alonso Sanchez and Bishop Domingo Salazar; by governors like Gomez Perez Dasmariñas and from the military point of view at least, Sebastian Hurtado de Corcuera, sometimes dubbed as the Last Conquistador.

Certain events however conspired to prevent the Philippines from becoming an Oriental Camelot. Moro piracies prevented

⁵⁰ *Latin America Yesterday and Today*, edited by John Rothchild, Bantam Pathfinder Edition, Madariaga's *Conqueror of the Cross*, pp. 74-75.

⁵¹ De la Costa, *The Jesuits in the Philippines*, p. 481.

Mindanao and Sulu from becoming an integral part of the Philippines. The colonial government could not effectively suppress the Moro raids on the Visayas because it had also to defend the Spice Islands against the Dutch who in Europe had revealed against their lawful sovereign Philip II and coveted the spices of the East Indies for themselves. The Thirty Years' War in Europe had its counterpart in a see-saw battle in the Orient. The Dutch wars did not cease till the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. With this treaty the Spice Islands definitely became the Dutch East Indies, while the result for the Philippines was that it became economically prostrate. The chronic near-bankruptcy of the colonial government incapacitated it from paying a just wage to the men it drafted to defend the Islands thus leading to the Pampango Revolt which unfortunately was suppressed by employing Machiavellian technique.

What will the next hundred years bring to the Christendom of the East? This we shall see in Part II.

PART II (1664-1763)

I. CHALLENGE: Economic Rehabilitation RESPONSE: Local Production

With the cessation of the Dutch wars the colonial administration was no longer faced with the problem of external aggression. Nor were the Moros a threat since Governor Corcuera destroyed their principal strongholds in 1637-1638. Indeed the peace and quiet in the home front from 1645 to 1660 was perhaps the reason why Governor de Lara dismantled the garrisons built by Corcuera in the South, aside from the fact that he needed soldiers in Luzon to meet the threatened invasion (which never materialized) of the pirate Koxinga in 1662.

Governor Diego Salcedo (1663-1668) therefore could concentrate on the rehabilitation of the shattered economy. He was creative enough to see no reason why the Philippines should import what it could produce locally. Accordingly he had wheat planted by the natives in Laguna and Batangas where the soil was fertile, and had one of his engineers begin mining iron in the province of Camarines.

But while encouraging local production of what he deemed were necessities for the Islands, Governor Salcedo, whose mother was Flemish, imported European goods through the Dutch in Indonesia. Not only this. He admitted Dutch nationals and even gave them employment. The Manila merchants besides being gradually ruined by Dutch competition saw many of their compatriots becoming unemployed. They protested to the Council of the Indies, but this being a long way off, could not offer an immediate remedy. In their desperation they accused the Governor of consorting with heretics (the Dutch being Protestants) before the Commisary of the Holy Office. Paternina, the Augustinian Commisary, was prevailed upon by the merchants to arrest Salcedo on the ground that it was demanded by the common good. Salcedo in irons was being shipped to Mexico to be tried by the Inquisition when he died on board. Paternina in turn was later divested of his office by the Council and ironically died in the same longitude and latitude as his victim. One thing that can be gathered from this incident is that the Council of the Indies was after justice and did not always favor the ecclesiastical as against the civil authority.

A brief digression on the Spanish Inquisition which has so often been maligned by those who do not know its origins. This institution was established by Ferdinand and Isabella to uproot the *Conversos*, i.e. those Jews who pretended to be converted to Christianity but were in secret league with the Moors to re-establish Mohammedanism in Spain. These *Conversos* were, to use a modern phrase, fifth-columnists and for their treason deserving of death at the hands of the State. But how does the Church enter into the picture? The *Conversos* 'had returned to the principles and ordinances of Jewish superstition and falsehood', and thus in the eyes of the Church were heretics.

One cannot understand the Church's role in the Inquisition if one does not know that to its way of thinking and that of Christendom in general, heresy was among the worst evils in the world since it involved the ruin of souls. This is the reason why even saints did not openly condemn the Inquisition. As James Broderick points out in connection with St. Francis Xavier:

"He could stand anything but it (heresy) and so was ready even for burnings to prevent it. His attitude was the obverse of his passions to love for souls that consumed him, a love the modern unbelieving liberal or humanitarian could never as much as quest at. Rather than judge St. Francis by the Inquisition, it would be more sensible to judge the Inquisition by St. Francis. That men such as he and St. Ignatius, its frequent victim, saw no injustice in the tribunal's proceedings is an argument not to be despised by those who seek the truth rather than the legends of history"⁵²

In so far as the *Conversos* were heretics, the Church was against them; is so far as they were subversives, the State was against them—and it was the State that actually put them to death. Did the Spanish monarchs have any basis for suspecting the *Conversos* of subversion? They had even a *historical* basis, for it was the Jews of Spain, as the *Jewish Encyclopedia* itself records, who invited the Moors to enter the peninsula and possess themselves of the property and lives of the Christians.

One could object that perhaps Ferdinand and Isabella had a good reason for establishing the Spanish Inquisition, but what reason had Philip II for reviving it since Spain had already become a world power in his time? Walsh's opinion is that 'the Prince was beginning to see the two cosmopolitan forces at work in the 16th Century: the internationalism of the Catholic Church and the internationalism of the Jews'⁵³. We must remember that 'in every country, as Jewish writers still boast, they (the Jews) encouraged those Christian divisions which are called heresies'⁵⁴. Indeed they were the ones who fomented the Albigensian heresy in the South of France against which the first Inquisition was directed! The result of the dispersion of the Jewish race was to increase their power in the country which they had emigrated. And wherever their power increased, they strove as in past times to destroy Catholic Christianity. Could Philip II, fervent Catholic that he was, be indifferent to heresy becoming widespread throughout his kingdoms? And did he have any weapon except the Inquisition?

⁵² Broderick, James, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

⁵³ Walsh, William Thomas, *Philip II*, p. 94.

⁵⁴ Walsh, William Thomas, *Isabella the Crusader*, p. 96.

It is true enough that the Inquisition in later ages was abused (what human institution is not!) and served as a tool of unscrupulous individuals, perhaps including religious, to extend their power or to reduce that of their enemies. In short, it was made a political football and the case of Governor Salcedo and Paternina might have been an instance of this.

Of more importance however is the question: Why did the Manila merchants react, violently even, against Governor Salcedo's interference with their trade? Because Manila's prosperity derived mainly from the galleon trade—which was really between China and Mexico with Manila as the seat of exchange.

II. CHALLENGE: National Prosperity RESPONSE: The Galleon Trade

The emphasis on the galleon trade by Spain has come under severe criticism. But the galleon trade cannot be understood except in the light of the economic doctrine known as Mercantilism. And Mercantilism in turn is but the economic counterpart of the political doctrine of national sovereignty. Mercantilism believed that foreign trade was the best means of accumulating national wealth which in turn was intended to increase the power of the nation-state. In the case of Spain the foreign trade, as with other European powers, involved their respective colonies. Theoretically therefore the foreign trade should have been between Spain and the Philippines. But the Philippines produced little for export except sugar, logwood and pearls from Sulu. What could be exchanged were the products of China which had found their way to the Islands. From time immemorial, the Chinese had exchanged silk and other items for Filipino products. This trade was not as flourishing as some authors make it out to be. For except for the pearls of Sulu, there was nothing in the Philippines which the Chinese coveted much. But the Spaniards had silver and the Chinese prized silver as much as gold. This explains why South China was one participant in Spain's foreign trade. The other was the port of Acapulco of Mexico because as we have

already seen the Philippines were governed indirectly through Mexico.

As to Agoncillo's criticism that 'the implementation of the doctrine (of Mercantilism) resulted in the sequestration of the colony, for its raw materials should flow only into the mother country and the finished manufactures of Spain should not find any competition', how could it be otherwise? It would be naive to expect a national sovereign state of the 17th Century, England e.g. to share the raw materials of India with either Spain or France or the Netherlands; or the Netherlands to ask rival powers to exploit the raw materials of the Spice Islands. I doubt too whether any Power of that time (or any time) would allow competition against her own products in the colony she claims to be exclusively her own.

Again the claim that Spain stuck to Mercantilism long after the other European Powers had turned to *laissez-faire* is far from the truth. Adam Smith to whom many trace the idea of *laissez-faire* wrote the *Wealth of the Nations* in 1776 and as many observe must have been living in an England which still practised the Mercantilist system. Indeed the American Revolution was partially triggered by the Mercantilist policies of the England of George III. The conclusion thus is that most of the European powers adopted free trade only in the 1st quarter of the 19th Century and Spain did so in 1834.

As to the question of why the galleon trade was limited to Spaniards, a hint is given by Agoncillo himself when he points out that the galleon trade was also the chief source of *official* as well as individual *income* in the colony. Spain could *not* subsidize the Philippine colony in the 17th Century. Some attribute Spain's bankruptcy to Philip III's (1598-1621) policy of exiling the whole Moorish population except Christians and young children in 1609, with the result that the loss of the Moorish labor ruined agriculture and commerce. Whatever the reason, colonial officials had to turn to the galleon trade for payment of their salaries and for recovering whatever expenses they had incurred in accepting the post, which in the case of the governor-generals were quite high.

⁵⁵ Agoncillo, Teodoro and Guerrero, Milagros, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

That only few benefited from the galleon trade and that mostly government officials though deplorable is understandable enough considering that the galleon trade was a government monopoly and naturally enough those near the center of power were in the most advantageous position to make a killing. The same however never meant to enrich government officials. For there were

“detailed norms to ensure that the *entire* Spanish community had a share in the trade according to merit and need. Boletas were normally awarded to widows, orphans and as government pensioners as a form of *social security*, because even if such persons did not have the money to ship anything, they could always sell their boletas to the highest bidder”.⁵⁶

The foregoing shows that while the merchants expected to get at least 150 to 200% of their investment, the poorer members of the Spanish community were not completely forgotten.

Did the Spaniards as a result of the galleon trade get richer and richer while the Filipino natives get poorer and poorer? Not if we believe a Jesuit newsletter of 1657 part of which reads as follows:

“There is no doubt that the natives had had their full share of the trials which the wars, succeeding one another almost without interruption, have brought with them: and that many of them are poor; but they are much better off today than they have ever been. . . . Their dress is very similar to that of the Spaniards . . . that is to say, many of them wear silk with collars and chains of gold; which means that they are not as needy as they are commonly thought to be especially those who live in the vicinity of Manila.”⁵⁷

But it was observed that whoever got the silver first, it eventually wound up in the hands of the Chinese. Why this is so is the theme of the next article.

CHALLENGE: Economic Domination by Chinese

RESPONSE: Exclusion laws, additional taxation

The date that the Chinese first came to the Philippines is a matter of controversy. Terrein de Lacouperie opines that the

⁵⁶ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 72.

⁵⁷ De la Costa, *The Jesuits in the Philippines*, p. 347.

Chinese had knowledge of the Philippines as early as 200 A.D. This seems to be confirmed by the archaeological discoveries of Chinese 'Jar-Burial—Culture' in various parts of the Philippines. Anyhow the Chinese migrations reached their height during the Ming dynasty from 1368-1644.

The Chinese in the Philippines were known as SANGLEYS, Chinese term meaning 'merchants'. To prevent the economic domination by the Chinese, Governor de Leon in 1671 proposed that besides the annual residence tax imposed for the privilege of staying in the Philippines, the Chinese should be levied an additional tax of ₱10.00 (undoubtedly a very small sum for the SANGLEY who knew how to rake in money).

Governor de Leon was not the first to be disturbed by the Chinese problem. Decades before him, Governor Dasmariñas had complained to Philip II that the native textile industry was being ruined by the importation of cotton from China; that the Chinese silk exported to Mexico would ruin the silk industry of Granada and that while the Chinese could settle and invest in the Islands, Spaniards could not do so in China. Dasmariñas therefore suggested that if the Chinese could not be entirely excluded from the Islands, their immigration should at least be limited. In this he was opposed by the missionaries who hoped to convert the sangleys and through them be able to evangelize China. The protectionist policy of Dasmariñas was later supported by Archbishop Santibañez who held that the Chinese used the natives for their corrupt pleasures and their monopoly of the retail trade unduly raised the price of foodstuffs. Dasmariñas anti-Chinese policy however failed because most colonial officials were persuaded by the gifts of the Chinese merchants to adopt the opposite stance.

Though theoretically confined to the Parian (the Chinatown of those times), the Chinese somehow managed to spread out to the provinces where they fleeced the native inhabitants. How they went about doing this was described by Archbishop Camacho in 1701 thus:

"They disperse to the provinces, give gifts to the alcalde mayor and the parish priest to allow them to establish a shop in an outlying place. They sell for

double the price the cloth they buy in Manila. They sell goods on *credit* at such an interest that the native discover at harvest time that he owes his entire crop of rice to the sangley. Also they absorb like sponges all that the provinces can produce and resell them to the Spaniards in Manila. Thus do they strip and pick clean the district where they settle and where is the district where they do not?"⁵⁸

Archbishop Camacho's description of the Chinese way of doing business has a contemporary ring to it. It shows the Chinese as expert middlemen who can make a huge profit out of both buyer and seller.

But why was it the Chinese rather than the Spaniard who got wealthy in the Islands? Because as Bishop Salazar had already written to Philip II,

"the Spaniards had given up being tradesmen altogether since they looked down upon certain occupations as below their dignity. They preferred to order their clothes and shoes from the sangleys and frequented too Chinese restaurants. And the *sangleys* proved to be not only excellent silversmiths and bookbinders but even competent physicians and apothecaries".⁵⁹

In other words, the Chinese engaged in any occupation where they could make money. Even if some Spaniards made killings in the galleon trade, they spent much as they were 'good livers'; indeed prided themselves like the French on their 'joie de vivre'. In the beginning at least the Chinese had simple wants.

But why did the native Filipinos not engage in the trades just like the Chinese? Because what the Vicomte de Pages observed in Luzon in 1768 was as true, if not more so, in the 17th century.

"From the natural richness of the soil the natives seemed to have imbibed a kind of vanity, which, joined to the universal practice of mutual charity and beneficence, makes them averse to any laborious occupation".⁶⁰

Necessity is the mother not only of invention, but of hard work. Since the native would not starve however poor he is, because of the kindness of a richer relative, why should he not

⁵⁸ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 75.

⁵⁹ *ibid.*, p. 39.

⁶⁰ *ibid.*, p. 125.

take it easy? Like the Chinese he too had simple wants which could easily be satisfied, but unlike the former he was not impelled by the profit motive. No wonder then that it was the Chinese who became economically dominant in the Islands.

Not only were the Chinese more industrious than either Spaniard or Filipino, because being foreigners they had to work harder in order to survive, but they had more working days. The Church has sometimes been blamed for multiplying the number of holidays, but to the credit of some of the colonial bishops it must be said that they were not unaware of the problem. Among these was Archbishop Juan Angel Rodríguez who campaigned to reduce the number of holidays which, according to him, amounted to 121 to a more reasonable limit.

Incidentally the assertion (made of course in the 20th. C.) that the colonizers worked the natives many times to the point of death (unlike the English who killed their Indians outright) seems to be contradicted by this fact that there were so many holidays when both Spaniards and Filipinos did not work but rather rested, not to say, enjoyed themselves.

From the fact that the Chinese were more industrious than either the Spaniards or the Filipinos, does it follow that the latter were lazy? Perhaps an observation made by Bodin, the famous French philosopher, is here relevant. He said: "The Spaniard is marvelously *lazy* outside arms and conquest". De Madariaga's comment is: "No laziness in all this. A different tendency of the human spirit, that is all!" Why does the Latin American historian and philosopher say so? Because

"those men (the conquistador and the friar), when the urge to conquer or to convert died down in them, were apt to feel somewhat helpless, and they relaxed into mere *being*, leaving the *doing* to others. *Next to conquest and conversion, no action seemed worthwhile in their eyes.* The middle stretches of life had no hold on them, and for the most part, they let them lie fallow, waiting for more stimulating tasks and days. Some found this stimulus in commerce, perhaps because in those days storm and pirates turned commerce into something so near gambling. Others found it more straightforward and simpler also to gamble at the green table, and it was even possible to come across blends of commerce and gambling... Nearly all gave themselves to the even more hazardous

gamble of love, then highly spiced with death. And then, of course, there was civil war".⁶¹

The foregoing excerpt explains a lot of things. It explains the attraction of the galleon trade e.g. for the Spaniards with the high risk and high stakes involved. It explains why the Spaniards looked down upon certain occupations as below their dignity and left these to be done by the Chinese. Especially was this so because the Spanish *conquistadores* were not like the English colonizers of America frontiersmen or farmers, but rather soldiers and administrators.

The foregoing psychology of the Spanish *conquistador* has influenced both the Latin-American and the Filipino. Their supposed indolence was really a distaste for boredom and repetition and fascination with sporadic and glorious events. Their disinclination to the mechanical arts and crafts was only an indication of the high-spiritedness inherited from the Spanish *conquistador*. Their allergy to routine work led them to abandon the retail trade to the Chinese. No wonder then that the wealth of the country finally ended in the hands of the Chinese.

III. CHALLENGE: Conflict between the Regular and Secular Clergy

RESPONSE: Development of a native Secular Clergy

Since the galleon trade was between Acapulco and Manila, one effect was that the Spanish civic officials tended to flock to Manila, leaving the administration of the provinces in the hands of parish priests who were mainly friars.

Why was it friars who in the main run the parishes? Because there were few secular priests in Spain and fewer still who cared to emigrate to the colonies. Accordingly Philip II requested Pius V to grant a dispensation from the provision of the Council of Trent (1545-1563) that required *secular* priests to administer *new* parishes. This petition was granted by the Pope in the Apostolic Brief EXPONI NOBIS in 1567 which allowed regulars to serve as parish priests without diocesan authorization and

⁶¹ De Madariaga, Salvador, *The Friar and the Conquistador*, in: *Latin America, Yesterday and Today*, 1973, pp. 76-77 (ed. John Rothchild).

exempted them from the authority and jurisdiction of the bishops. This was the reason why the parish priests were inclined to obey their religious superior rather than the bishops, who naturally enough wanted to have some control over the parish priests belonging to their dioceses. The governors also insisted that they had the right to approve parish appointments by the decree of *patronato* thus making the conflict a three-cornered one.

The only possible solution to the problem was the development of a native secular clergy. But this would take a long time coming and in the meantime all the mission stations which later became parishes remained in the hands of the regular clergy.

This included the Augustinians who had come with Legaspi in 1565, the Franciscans who came in 1578, the Dominicans in 1587, the Jesuits in 1581 and the Augustinian Recollects in 1606. While the Augustinians, Franciscans and Dominicans spread the Gospel in Luzon, the Jesuits and Recollects evangelized the Visayas and Mindanao.

It was only late in the 17th C. that the royal government adopted the policy of developing a *native* secular clergy and that on the petition of a French missionary bishop, Mons. Francois Pallou, Vicar Apostolic of Siam. How the French bishop became involved in the solution was providential. Bound for China, he was driven by a storm to Manila whose religious authorities (not knowing what to do with him) put him on a ship bound for Spain. There he was able to obtain in 1677 a royal cedula decreeing the opening of seminaries to the natives. Not much later the Dominican and Jesuit universities began to admit Filipinos to the course of studies leading to the priesthood.

But why so long before the opening of seminaries for the development of the native clergy. We must remember that the Spanish colonizers were always basing their policy in the Islands on their *American* experience. Because the Indian priests in the American colonies had turned out to be incompetent, the council of Mexican churches had ruled that in the future, native Indians were not to be admitted to Holy Orders and unfortunately this ruling was extended to the native Filipinos since the Philippines at that time were a dependency of Mexico.

Incidentally the epithet of *INDIOS* given to the native Filipinos is according to some of our historians a sign of superiority

complex on the part of the Spaniards. The truth was that the explorers who first reached the Islands thought they had reached India by going west, just as the Portuguese had done by going east. What more natural then, than to call the natives INDIOS. Columbus made the same mistake and that is why the natives of America were also called INDIOS or in English INDIANS.

Would the natives have preferred to have been called Filipinos, a term reserved for Spaniards born in the Philippines, rather than Indios? We do not know. What we do know is that those historians who resent the term 'vassal' should also resent the term 'Filipino' being applied to the native for "Filipino" would have underscored the fact that the native had become "vassals" of the Spanish king.

It is against this background of their American experience that we can appreciate why the response of the religious orders in the Philippines to the decree of 1677 opening seminaries to the native Filipinos was far from enthusiastic. As a matter of fact, the Archbishop of Manila at that time, Fray Felipe Pardo shared the belief of the regular clergy that Filipinos were incapable of assuming the responsibilities of the priestly state.

It seems strange that Archbishop Pardo could have so little faith in the capacity of the natives to become competent priests, when Bishop Salazar, his forerunner had so much faith in the capacity of the natives to become good local magistrates. Especially as one reason given for promoting a native secular clergy (by the then attorney-general of the colony) was that "a native of standing in his community who speaks the language as his mother tongue and who had received a solid grounding in religion and civility is more likely to get results of a permanent nature in the conversion of infidels than someone to whom the language and community are foreign"⁶² which sounds very similar to the Synod's statement that "the civil magistrates must be familiar with the laws, customs, uses and abuses of his community, and this the provincial governor cannot do" and hence the need for native magistrates. Perhaps Archbishop Pardo believed that becoming a priest was a much harder task than becoming a local magistrate?

⁶² De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 88.

Anyhow, the question of Filipino natives being congenitally incompetent for Holy Orders was answered by looking at the first products of the newly opened seminaries. As Fr. Juan Jose Delgado reported "there were native priests, who albeit they are Indians, can serve as examples to confound Europeans".⁶³

IV. CHALLENGE of Dictatorship

RESPONSE: Popular Uprising

We saw the struggle between Governor Diego Salcedo and Paternina. About half a century later a similar conflict arose due to the iron-handed solution of Governor Fernando de Bustamante of the problem of 'graft and corruption'. Finding Manila merchants owed the government ₱200,000, Bustamante

"collected the debts by confiscating the silver consigned to private persons aboard the incoming galleon. He then issued orders of arrest against the royal treasury officials for malfeasance in office; against the members of the Audiencia for opposing the arrest; against officials he suspected of taking bribes and when these sought to escape arrest by taking refuge in the various convents, against the churchmen who harbored them"⁶⁴

The incident reached its climax with Bustamante's arrest of the *aged* Archbishop Cuesta who was hustled to Fort Santiago. For at the report of the outrage,

"the nobles came out of sanctuary and took up arms. Following their example, merchants and citizens, Spaniards and Indians armed themselves and rushed pell-mell through the streets shouting: 'Long live the Faith! Death to the tyrant! Despite the attempt of some of the religious to prevent the massacre, and the plea to the governor to adopt a more conciliatory attitude, Governor Bustamante fired at one of the citizens wounding him, who shot back wounding Bustamante's right arm. Another man brought his sabre down on the Governor's head felling him. The Governor's son raising his sabre to strike another citizen received a musket shot through the heart. Then did the multitude cry: "The tyrant is dead! Long live the Faith!"⁶⁵

⁶³ *Ibidem*, *Readings*, p. 91

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 70.

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 71.

The foregoing report of a *French* Jesuit, an *eyewitness* to the event give the lie to Agoncillo's claim that "it was the attempt to stabilize the finances of the government that led to Bustamante's murder by the friars in 1719".⁶⁶ To stabilize the government's finances might have been Bustamante's 'good' reason, but what was the *real* reason? The counsellors of state, the nobility and the merchants saw it rather as 'insatiable greed'. As to the friars being responsible for the 'murder', we see that the friars did not enter into the picture, were not involved until the nobles took sanctuary in the convents and that was the religious who tried to prevent a massacre. Furthermore, Bustamante's own soldiers sensing that the multitude only wanted to free the aged Archbishop refused to fire at the citizens but only into the air. Again why should the multitude shout 'Death to the tyrant! Long live the Faith', if the friars were in the wrong and Bustamante in the right?

That the populace was on the side of the Archbishop rather than the Governor is further confirmed by the fact that on the very same day that Bustamante was killed (Oct. 11, 1719) the whole citizenry clamored for the Archbishop, and marched to the Fort where he was imprisoned, urged him to take the staff of command (i.e., the governorship) for the sake of peace, to which request he acceded and served until July 24, 1721, when his office was transferred to the duly appointed successor in the person of Marquis de la Torre.⁶⁷

Though the Bustamante affair took the aspect of a conflict between the religious and the civil power in the end, with the citizens on the side of the former against a tyrannical dictator; its beginning was due to the confiscation of the silver of the merchants engaged in the galleon trade. It was this over-emphasis on the galleon trade that also explains to a great extent why the colonial government was so powerless against the Moro incursions into the Visayas up to the middle of the 18th C.

⁶⁶ Agoncillo, Teodoro and Guerrero, Milagros, *op. cit.*, p. 100. Cfr.

Philippiniana Sacra. Vol. XII No. 35, May-August, 1977. *From Prison to Governor* by Pablo Fernandez, O.P. Jose Arcilla, S.J., quoting *Chronicles of the Apostolic Province of the Descalced Friars of our Holy Father St. Francis in the Phil. Islands, China, Japan etc.* by Fray Juan Francisco de San Antonio, Manila 1744, Vol. I, pages 187-188.

⁶⁷ Fernandez, Pablo O.P. and Arcilla, Jose, S.J., *Philippiniana Sacra* Vol. XII, No. 35, May-Aug. 1977, pp. 187-188.

As late as the close of the 18th century, Spanish missionaries still went to Mindanao to convert the Moros to the Faith. That this was the primary motive of Spain was even acknowledged by the sovereigns of Mindanao, Fakymolano Mahomed Amoroodine and Mahomed Kybad Zacahriel Raja Moodo in their letter to His Britannic Majesty, King George III. "*The Castilians intermeddle with our holy religion; the Hollanders are for usurping dominion and sovereignty; the English are for trading only*".⁶⁸ Of course these Muslim rulers were ignorant of the history of India and of Indonesia where the British and the Dutch at the start came for *trading* only, but ended being masters of these vast territories.

But while the missionaries made some penetration however slowly into Moroland, it was not so with the civil power. The abandonment by Governor de Lara of the southern garrisons put Sulu and Maguindanao definitely out of the sphere of Spanish political influence. No wonder these regions developed along the same lines as the Muslim states of Borneo and the Malay peninsula whence they had come and with which through the centuries they had maintained close connections.

The power and prosperity of the Moros continued to depend heavily on the slave traffic with the Visayans as the source of supply. The Visayans did their best to defend themselves. But their best was to build *watchtowers* which enabled them to know when a raid was coming and thus have time to flee to the hills. The fort in Zamboanga was restored but its only effect was to stimulate the Moros to new heights of piratical achievements. The change is vividly described by Archbishop Martinez de Arizala thus:

"these same Moros, these Sulus, Maguindanaos, Tedongs and others who strike such fear in us, are those who not so long ago were pests whom the Filipinos held in contempt, petty piratical thieves who infested, like rats, the barns where the rice is kept. But to-day they wage a full-scale war, carried on with formidable fleets".⁶⁹

Indeed by 1750, the Manila government simply gave up trying to cope with the Muslims.

Why was the colonial government so powerless against the Moros? According to Archbishop de Arizala "it is our sins that

⁶⁸ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 198.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

have lent audacity to these savage Moros; our vices and transgressions have blunted our arms".⁷⁰ In short, the Muslims were the scourge of God.

An added factor was the perennial poverty of the treasury.

"The Galleon traders made very large profits but were lightly taxed. Whatever revenue there was barely sufficed to pay the salaries of the government officials, leaving no funds for public works, communication and defense. But the main factor was the lack of civic spirit or pride among the colonists which could be touched by the plight of the Visayans or aroused by the insolence of the Moros. Their attitude was that as long as their business with America was flourishing what happened outside of Manila was none of their business".⁷¹

CHALLENGE: Change of Dynasty

RESPONSE: From Idealism to Materialism

What were the causes of this decline in the chivalric, not to say the heroic spirit among the colonists? Why was it that in the first half of the 18th Century, there was no longer any of the likes of Juan de Salcedo or Martin de Goiti to battle the Moros? Why was it that the *average* colonist was no longer his brother's keeper?

One of the causes was the change of dynasty from Hapsburg to Bourbon. Even under the weakest or most frivolous Hapsburg king, Spain remained a missionary State so much so that even the *conquistadores* had a missionary outlook on life. Especially was this so in Spain's first century in the Philippines when as Fr. Gutiérrez points out, one does not know where the conquistador ends and the missionary begins. Now whatever the shortcoming of a missionary, his vocation is to think of himself last, if he thinks of himself at all. But with the advent of the Bourbon dynasty, the secularization of Spain begins. In short, there is a change from the idealistic to a materialistic outlook on life.

The founder of the Spanish Bourbon dynasty was Philip V (1700-1756) who was born at Versailles. Son of Louis, the dauphin of France, he was bequeated the kingdom of Spain by

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

Charles II, resulting in the War of the Spanish Succession. Backed as he was by his grandfather, Louis XIV of France, Philip V became the First Bourbon King of Spain through the Peace of Utrecht in 1713. One of the effects of this was that France which had been the traditional enemy of Spain now became her ally. French ideas and ideals were soon influencing Spain. But France unfortunately had become the seat of secularization in Europe.

How this came about is a long story but even a short sketch is necessary for understanding subsequent events that took place both in Spain and her colonies. Perhaps it is best to begin with Cardinal Richelieu who succeeded in consolidating the French monarchy by his capture of La Rochelle, the center of power of the Huguenot aristocracy. Paradoxically, while Richelieu was against the Huguenots politically, he was for completely tolerating Calvinism as a religion. The result was that the Calvinists had the opportunity to develop a dislike of the Catholic Church amongst the people.

Louis XIV, known as the Sun King, succeeded to the throne in 1643, when he was barely five years old. Until 1661, the country was ruled by Cardinal Mazarin, who extended the system of *absolute* government set up by Richelieu. After Mazarin's death, Louis concentrated power in his own hands, choosing ministers from the bourgeoisie thus reducing the nobles who were mainly Huguenots to mere figureheads. Not only this. He revoked the Edict of Nantes which had granted toleration to the Calvinists. This drove many of the Huguenots to exile. Those who remained behind, many of them very wealthy men holding a disproportionate number of posts in the commerce and finance of the country, were roused to a tradition of hatred against the monarchy and of course to still stronger hatred of the traditional national religion. As Belloc points out: "it was from this that, later on, the opposition to the principle of monarchy in France, and the fashionable anti-clericalism of the 18th Century proceeded".^{71a} This anti-clericalism was in the next century to spread to Spain.

While Louis XIV of France was indirectly responsible as we have seen for the development of the anti-Catholic feeling in France and subsequently in Spain, he was also in a way responsible for

^{71a} Belloc, Helaire, *op. cit.*, p. 346.

a changed economic outlook in both countries. Among the ministers who contributed most to the material prosperity of the Sun King's reign was Colbert, who advocated the promotion of farming, the development of basic industries under State control, and the creation of companies for foreign trading. These he believed were policies necessary if France was to be financially stable and the greatest power in Europe.

One person in the Philippines who was most probably influenced by Colbert was the Jesuit Father Murillo Velarde, who believed that the main defect of the Spanish colonists in the Islands was not so much that they were not virtuous as that they were not settlers. As he himself puts it:

"these colonists looked upon the Philippines as an inn and not as a home, who came as transients, married (here) by accident and died in expectation of leaving the Islands".⁷²

What then was the remedy? Comparing the Philippines with Spanish America Fr. Murillo Velarde pointed out that:

"the Spaniards have settled and populated America because of its productivity but on the other hand there is not here a stable economy of agricultural estates and basic industries. *Wealth has no roots in the country* . . . To this state of backwardness there is a prompt and patent remedy which the more advanced nations have adopted to their great advantage. It is the formation of chartered companies. These have become as it were the public and permanent reservoirs from which the national wealth flows in a steady stream and is equitably distributed to all according to the capacity of each".⁷³

In short, chartered companies were the answer (as Colbert had suggested in France) to the chronic poverty of the colonial treasury and the need of permanent settlers in the Islands.

This was written by Fr. Murillo Velarde in 1745. But before the formation of chartered companies could be effected, there came an interruption — the Seven Years' War (1757-1763) — in which Spain became embroiled because of the family compact signed at Versailles, where in the Bourbon King of Spain, then

⁷² De la Costa, *Readings*, pp. 96.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

Charles III, promised to come to the aid of his relative, the Bourbon King of France in case war should break out between France and England who in the 18th Century were battling for world supremacy.

VI. CHALLENGE: The British Attack

RESPONSE: Valorous but Futile Defense

The Seven Years' War saw Britain waging war against France and against Spain as the latter's ally. An expedition from British India, more specifically Madras, reached Manila on the 23rd of September 1762, without the Philippines having an official news of the outbreak of the War. Despite feverish preparations, Manuel Antonio Rojo, concurrently Archbishop and Governor was unable to prevent Draper, the British commander, from landing near Malate Church and ultimately occupying Intramuros on the 6th of October 1762.

Archbishop Rojo however before surrendering Manila and Cavite was able to commission Simon de Anda to keep the provinces loyal to Spain. Not only this. Even Parañaque continued fighting. "The fact that there was no Spaniard there did not prevent the Filipinos there to honor the allegiance to Spain".⁷⁴ This is very revealing. Why this manifestation of extreme loyalty to Spain, if the Spanish regime in the Philippines was, as some ultra-nationalists would claim, out and out corrupt, incompetent and repressive?

It was different in the Ilocos. Diego Silang learning of the Spaniards' plight raised the standard of revolt which spread to Cagayan and Pangasinan. This uprising according to Agoncillo was due to 'the *anomalous* collection of tribute and the *excesses* of the *alcaldes mayores* in the exercise of the *'indulto de comercio'*'.⁷⁵ Is this not an admission that not the tribute as such but its anomalous collection, not the *indulto de comercio* as such but the excesses in its exercise, was the cause of the revolt? Anyhow, Silang realized that he had to ally himself with the British to withstand Anda's seasoned troops. The British appointed Silang *alcalde mayor* and *sargento mayor* of Ilocos with

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁷⁵ Agoncillo Teodoro and Guerrero, Milagros, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

power to appoint subordinate officials, obviously to have a second front against Anda. But before Diego Silang could join forces with the British, he was shot by an assassin by the name of Manuel Vicos, a Spanish mestizo. According to Agoncillo, Vicos committed the assassination with the obvious approval of the bishop. This is doubtful to say the least. For how could Bishop Ustaris, admitted to be 'virtually a prisoner in Vigan' have such a power at the time when Diego Silang had so much military success in the field of battle? This is not to underestimate either the bravery or the patriotism of either Diego Silang or his wife Gabriela, who continued the revolt even after the death of her husband, but to question the impartiality of those historians who see the church authorities or the friars behind every dastardly plot.

The Seven Years' War ended in 1763. In the peace treaty it was agreed that the Philippines should be returned to Spain.

What would have happened if the Philippines had become a British colony? This is of course mere speculation. We have however Nehru's appraisal of Clive whose defeat of the Nawab at Plassey in 1757 led to the British domination of India.

"In his person and in his deeds, he (Clive) illustrates how empires are built up. He was daring, adventurous, and extremely *covetous*, and his revolution did not falter before forgery or falsehood. On the unsavory foundation of treason and forgery was built up the British empire in India. But such more or less is the way of all empires and empire-builders"⁷⁶

Nehru would have realized how unwarranted his generalization was had he known how Legaspi built the Spanish empire in the Philippines. Legaspi followed to the letter the instructions of the Audiencia to enhance the royal patrimony of Philip and the royal crown of Castile by trade, intercourse and other *lawful* means which can *in conscience* be employed. In contrast to Clive, Legaspi personally died a poor man and mourned by the natives as well as by his fellow-Spaniards.

Clive was of course a member of the British East India Company, the tribe of merchant-adventurers, who in the words of

⁷⁶ Nehru Jawaharlal, *Glimpses of World History*, The John Day Co. New York, 1942, p. 324.

Nehru 'did not trouble to distinguish between bona-fide trade, and plunder pure and simple'. There was subsequently control by the British Parliament but in the main India's destinies were in the hands of a set of merchant-adventurers. "Government was largely trade and trade was largely plunder". Even if Nehru, belonging as he did to the conquered people, was to a certain extent biased against the English rulers of India, his *J'Accuse* is not altogether groundless as shown by the fact that both Clive and Hastings (supposedly the greatest of the English rulers of India) were both impeached and censured by Parliament for their avarice. Regarding this censure, Nehru says:

"So England satisfied her conscience by censuring and trying these men, but in her heart she admired them, and was willing enough to profit by their policy. Clive may have been censured by Parliament but they have put up a statue to him in front of the India Office in White Hall in London and inside his spirit dwells and fashions British policy in India".⁷⁷

How different the treatment of Spain of her errant colonial governors. They were tried before the RESIDENCIA — a court of inquiry into the governor's conduct in office which his successor was empowered to hold. At this court, anyone in the colony, Spanish or native, rich or poor, could file a charge. Amongst those tried and condemned by the RESIDENCIA were Governors Sande, Cruzat and Corcuera, the last being imprisoned in Fort Santiago and subjected to a colossal fine. And this despite Corcuera's achievements among which was his containment of the Moros, showing that for the colonial government, no one was above the law.

1664-1763

Another hundred years. With the cessation of the Dutch wars and the temporary containment of Moro piracy, we see Governor Salcedo's attempt to rehabilitate the economy by stimulating local production. His pro-Dutch sympathies however leads him to trouble with the merchants engaged in the galleon trade who accuse him of heresy before the Commissary of the Holy Office. Overemphasis on the galleon trade caused civic officials

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* p. 326.

to concentrate in Manila leaving the provinces in the hand of the parish priests who were mainly friars. The friars because of the decree of Pius V tend to obey their religious superiors rather than the bishop. The civil officials make it a three-cornered conflict by invoking the *royal patronato*. Attempt to solve the problem by developing a native secular clergy began in 1677 with the opening of seminaries to the natives. The struggle between the civil and ecclesiastical officials is renewed in the Bustamante affair. The shout of the people "Death to the tyrant! and Long live the Faith!" show where their loyalty and sympathy lay. Though the Bustamante affair ended in a conflict between the religious and civil powers, its beginning was due to the confiscation by the governor of the silver of the merchants of the galleon trade. Obsession with the galleon trade explains the indifference of the colonists to the plight of the Visayans and the insolence of the Moros. Fr. Murillo believed that the civic spirit of the colonists could be aroused by the formation of chartered companies which would insure that Wealth would have a root in the Islands. But before this could be effected there came the Seven Year's War between France and Spain on the one hand and England on the other, resulting once more in a shattered economy.

PEDRO GABRIEL*
University of Santo Tomas

* Pedro Gabriel, Ph.D., is a professor in the Graduate School of the University of Santo Tomas. He has written many essays on Philosophy, especially comparative studies on Eastern and Western Philosophy. He studied Thomistic Philosophy under the famous Dominican philosopher-theologian Fr. Angel de Blas.