

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

PART III. 1764-1861

I. CHALLENGE: Rehabilitation of a Shattered Economy RESPONSE: The Tobacco Monopoly.

Clive and Hastings are not the only examples of the British policy of 'Economics' without Ethics. There were famous sea-pirates like Francis Drake and Thomas Cavendish who are even honored as Elizabethan naval heroes. And these piracies continued up to the 18th Century as evidenced by Commodore George Anson pouncing on the Manila-bound galleon, the *Nuestra Señora de Covadonga* as late as 1743. Indeed the French Renouard commenting on the Moro piracies says: "Do they (the Moros) have a surplus of captives? They take them to Borneo, Jolo and Bantam to sell or to barter for gold dust, pearls and the merchandise of Bengal and Coromandel brought hither by a people who are their masters in piracies, namely, the English".¹

If we mention the foregoing, it is because British piracies in the 17th and 18th Century were partly responsible for the decline

¹ De la Costa, Horacio S.J., *Readings in Philippine History*, Bookmark, Manila, 1965, p. 199

of the galleon trade. Of course the major reason was that the British occupation of India and the partitioning of China's ports among the European powers raised the cost of Chinese and Indian goods. And since the galleon trade had been essentially 'the system of buying cheap in Asia and selling dear in America', the inevitable result was the decline of the Manila-Acapulco trade. Furthermore the British occupation of Manila resulted in the loss of the funds of the OBRAS PIAS (which lent out money for the galleon trade being the forerunners of modern commercial banks in the Islands) thus compounding the Philippines' economic misfortunes.

But it was not only the Philippines that was commercially bankrupt. So was the Spanish Empire as a whole. The 17th Century saw a vertical drop in the colonial population. In 1597 e.g. Mexico had 2½ million inhabitants; in 1607, 2 million and in 1650, 1½ million. The result of this depopulation was that mining declined and mining profits fell. The rise in costs of silver production led to a fall in prices and with the decrease of the gap between prices and wages, there ensued less capital for investment purposes and subsequent lessening of economic prosperity. Indeed W. Borah calls the 17th Century, "New Spain's Century of Depression".² The depression in Mexico automatically affected Spain which depended to a great extent on Mexican silver. What made matters worse was Philip III's policy in 1609 of exiling the whole Moorish population except the children and those who had become Christians which resulted in the reduction of the labor force of continental Spain and the consequent decline of agriculture and commerce.

It was only in the 18th Century with its price-rise and its favorable conditions for profit and capital that a revival occurred in the Spanish colonial systems. Colonial mining once again profited from a numerous and available labor-force, the population of Mexico e.g. rising back again to 2,000,000. Meanwhile in Spain proper the change from the Hapsburg to the Bourbon dynasty, effected as we have already seen by the Peace of Utrecht in 1713, proved a saving factor for Spain's economy. For influenced by

² Borah, W., *New Spain's Century of Depression*, Berkeley, 1951, as quoted in the *Rise of Capitalism*, ed. by David S. Landes (Harvard University) The Macmillan Co. N.Y., 1966, p. 38.

French economists there arose in Spain a group which bombarded the Council of the Indies with projects of development on how to effect the economic recovery of the Spanish Empire and thus were called PROYECTISTAS.

The *proyectistas* formed an economic society in Spain which soon had its counterpart in the Philippines: The Economic Society of Friends of the Country founded by Governor Basco in 1781. Influenced by the French Physiocrats (Quesnay, du Pont de Nemours, Turgot) who emphasized mainly the *wealth derived from nature and in metals*, Governor Basco exerted great efforts to develop the *agricultural* and *mining* industries of the Philippines. His Society founded the first agricultural school in Manila, besides introducing better methods of agriculture by importing new farm implements from abroad. It also imported birds from China to fight the locusts which usually ravaged Philippine crops. Most important of all, commercial agriculture was given primacy over the galleon trade. Nor was the exploitation of mineral resources forgotten, for as we have seen the economic stagnation of the Empire was partly due to the decline of mining in Mexico in the 17th Century.

Grandiose as were the aims of Governor Basco and the Patriotic Society of Manila, their first venture — the silk industry — was not a success. This was because the colonial government still applied the principle that “it was expedient for the colony to maintain itself by means the *least burdensome to the inhabitants*” and this meant *not* requiring from the natives such agricultural labor as was not free and spontaneous.³

Stated otherwise, compulsion could be resorted to only if the project was by the government and directed to the common good. Since some compulsion was necessary to effect the agricultural revolution, the real break-through in the colony's economic development came only with the establishment of the tobacco monopoly — which was a State monopoly. The State in the first place limited the planting of tobacco only to those regions best suited to its growth, thus applying the *proyectistas*' dictum that the only way to salvage the economically impoverished Spanish empire was to make each part contribute to the whole what it could best produce.

³ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 115.

The vision of Fr. Murillo Velarde in 1743 of a chartered company was fulfilled by the establishment of the Royal Philippine Company in 1785, a monopolistic trading company with the exclusive privilege of purchasing Filipino and Chinese goods at Manila selling these directly to Spain instead of through Mexico. This chartered company was responsible to a great extent for the development of commercial agriculture in the Islands.

Many are the criticisms that have been leveled at the tobacco monopoly, especially in its implementation, but actually during that time it was the only means for rehabilitating the shattered economy. Indeed so successful was the tobacco monopoly and the other operations of the Royal Philippine Society that it not only balanced the colonial budget but reversed the flow of revenue such that it was now the colony that was subsidizing Spain instead of being as heretofore subsidized through Mexico.

What role did the religious play in the economic rehabilitation of the country in the latter part of the 18th Century? The *projectista* Murillo Velarde was a Jesuit scholar. So was Matias Octavio who was not only a theoretical economist but a technocrat as well, for he actually knew how to produce indigo, the dye with which most of the textiles of that time were colored.

II. CHALLENGE: Agricultural Revolution

RESPONSE: Friars Lands.

The shift from the galleon trade to commercial agriculture required the cultivation of large tracts of lands. Amongst these were the so-called friars lands which hitherto had been used only for *pasture*. Why were the friars lands quite extensive? Well, here is the answer. Pasture or grazing lands cannot be small especially if intended to support religious orders of many members.

Agoncillo claims that "the large estates passed from the *encomenderos* to the religious orders". That this should be so is very *improbable* on two counts: 1) It was the members of the religious orders who criticized the *encomenderos* for their injustices and it is not likely at all that the latter would be so magnanimous as to bequeath their property to their critics. 2) The *encomiendas* were grants *not of property*, but of jurisdiction. This is the reason

why the encomiendas became the provinces in later centuries, with the *alcalde mayor* or provincial governor taking the place of the encomendero as head of the encomienda now turned into a province. It would seem furthermore that the statement that 'the friars lands were *Filipino* properties usurped by the religious orders who were familiar with the devious ways of landgrabbing'⁴ is purely gratuitous. For granting for the sake of argument that the encomiendas were grants of properties, how could they be the properties of the natives since the encomenderos were all Spaniards?

But enough of gratuitous speculations. Let us see what Thomas de Comyn (admitted by Agoncillo himself to be a knowledgeable social scientist) has to say about the ownership of lands at the turn of the 19th Century. According to him there were four kinds of properties 1) The Dominican and Augustinian orders owning the friars lands. 2) the Spanish proprietors who were less than a dozen persons 3) the principal *mestizos* and indians (natives) who formed the real body of farming proprietors and 4) the natives who owned small strips of land situated around their dwellings.⁵

Comparing the first and third classes, Comyn points out the following: the members of the third class (the mestizo and native oligarchs) engaged in money lending at usurious rates. For the natives spending much on continuous celebrations had to borrow money from the mestizo *hacendero*. The mestizo lends him on condition that he mortgages his land by the contract known as *Sanglang-bili*. Every time the native goes to the mestizo for money, he gets it on the same terms until the amount borrowed becomes so great that he cannot redeem his land. From being an independent farmer the native has become a landless tenant. It would seem from the foregoing that the natives lost their properties not to the friars but to the mestizo and native hacenderos.

In contrast, the friars lands are from the start big, being originally pasture lands and increased by the donations of pious souls who died without heirs. To cultivate these ecclesiastical farms the lessee (*inquilino*) pays a *moderate* ground rent. It is for-

⁴ Agoncillo, Teodoro and Guerrero, Milagros, *History of the Filipino People*, Quezon City, 1970, p. 342.

⁵ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 127.

bidden to increase the ground rent even though the prices of everything else has increased enormously. Neither are the friars allowed to lease the land to others unless the lessee fails to pay the ground rent for two consecutive years. As de Zuñiga notes:

"this is a policy of which the *inquilinos* take very unfair advantage by selling their interest in them or mortgaging their leased land to those wealthier than themselves or subleasing it at rents higher than they themselves pay. So by the mere fact of being *inquilinos* without doing a stroke of work they make more than the estate owners (i.e. the friars) themselves."⁶

From the foregoing it is clear that the religious orders did not enrich themselves through the friars lands. On the contrary, Comyn notes

"that far from living in opulence and accumulating the immense revenues some of the religious communities in America enjoy, they (the friars) stand in need of all they earn and possess for their maintenance and in order to discharge the various duties and obligations annexed to the missions with which they are entrusted".⁷

Alas for the friars! Instead of being pictured as their contemporaries saw them as the victims of their *inquilinos*, they are pictured by later 'historians' or (are they merely propagandists) as the villains themselves. But this is not to be wondered at since with the change of dynasty from Hapsburg to Bourbon, French ideas had crossed over to Spain (and later to the latter's colonies) and France during the latter part of the 18th Century had become anti-clerical influenced no doubt mainly by Voltaire (1694-1778), often regarded as the epitome of 18th Century France and notorious for his slogan against the Catholic Church 'Ecrasez l' infame'.

CHALLENGE: Control of Parishes by Religious Orders

RESPONSE: Native Ordinations

Perhaps it was also Voltaire, an inveterate enemy of the Jesuits who influenced Charles III to expel the Jesuits from Spain in 1767. Or was Charles III's reason the Jesuitic opposition to his concen-

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 127-128.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

tration of power in the monarchy, since he is described as a benevolent and liberal-minded *despot*? Whatever the reason, Charles' anti-Jesuitic policy was applied the following year to the Philippines. But the other religious orders simply took over the posts vacated by the Jesuits and the problem of the control of the parishes by the religious orders, looked upon with disfavor both by the government and by the bishops, remained.

Although seminaries for native priests were already in operation, the friars in charge of the parishes were reluctant to turn these over to the secular clergy whom they charged as a class with incompetence. Archbishop Sancho however did not share the friars' view and moreover wanted these to accept his authority unconditionally. If they (the friars) refused, he took away their parishes and gave them to the native priests. Since these were few in number, he admitted applicants to the seminaries without rigorous screening and ordained them immediately after a cursory training. The ill effects of the Archbishop's policy soon became apparent. Reports circulated that

"the native parish priests instead of being a father of souls were cruel to the extent of subjecting even maidens to the lash. Some were said to visit suspicious houses at suspicious hours. Some were always intoxicated. Some spirited away the income of the parish."⁸

The net result was to confirm the friars' belief that the Filipinos, like the American Indians, were congenitally incapable of the full responsibility of the priesthood. Since this belief eventually came to be shared by the bishops themselves, the friars were restored to and thus remained in control of the parishes and through these of the native population.

Governor Marquina complained against the excessive power of the regular clergy forgetting that it was partly the incompetence and corruption of the provincial governors which left the friars no alternative but to take even civil matters into their own hands. And this was due to the fact that the applicants for administrative posts in the colonial government were not from the best sector but the riff-raff of Mexican society. It was Comyn who reported that

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 133

"it is a fact common enough to see a hairdresser or lackey converted into a governor; a sailor or a deserter transformed into a district magistrate, collector or military commander of a populous province without any other counsellor than his own crude understanding or any other guide but his passions".⁹

The contrast between the friar priest and the civil official impressed the French naturalist Sonnerat who visited the Philippines in 1772. He wrote that

"The alcalde in office when we arrived allowed no one to do business with us, because he wanted to supply us with whatever we needed. But the *parish priest*, a *just man* and *zealous for the welfare of his flock*, opposed him and made him allow the natives to share the business which he wanted all to himself".¹⁰

Notice that as late as the 18th century, in the view of impartial foreign observers, the friar parish priest cuts out a much better figure than the civic administrator. The view that the majority of the friars were corrupt and abused the natives is simply not supported by history. Indeed de la Costa after a review of the activity of the Jesuits in the Philippines up to the time they were expelled opined that

"the general impression that emerges from this brief survey is purely that of men 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 stretches of seemingly barren years; stumbling occasionally, yet never faltering or turning aside from that long haul which drew the Philippines from the darkness of paganism to the broad daylight of Christianity".¹¹

And what is true of the Society of Jesus is likewise true of the other religious orders, if our anti-religious historians would but care to read the documented works of the historians of various religious congregations, as for example *Dominicos donde nace el Sol*, by Fr. Pablo Fernandez, O.P. and Fr. Isacio Rodriguez, O.S.A., probably the best and most scholarly historian of the Philippines.

Perhaps an excuse for the avarice of the alcalde mayor was that his appointment was only for a year and thus he had to take

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

¹¹ *The Jesuits in the Philippines*, p. 481.

as much advantage as he could of his short tenure. Somehow he had to recover the expenses he had incurred in securing his appointment for his salary was ridiculously low.

But what was the reason why the central government could not do anything to remedy this anomalous situation in the colonies? A contemporary wrote:

"Many are the causes which within the last ten or twelve years have influenced the mercantile relations of the Islands and prevented their organization on permanent and known principles. The chief one, no doubt, has been the frequent and unforeseen changes, from peace to war, which have marked that unhappy period".¹²

1763—Seven Years' War against Britain.

1779—Spain and France support the American Revolution against England.

1796—Spain joins Revolutionary France against England.

1799—Napoleon from Consul becomes Emperor.

1804—Napoleon puts his brother Joseph on the Spanish throne.

1808—Napoleon invades Spain leading to the guerilla war of the Spanish partisans.

So many wars in so short a span of time. Truly the mother country in turmoil and these chaotic conditions could not but have disastrous effects on the daughter colony.

CHALLENGE: Napoleonic Domination of Spain

RESPONSE: The Cádiz Constitution and the Mexican Revolution

Napoleon invaded Spain in 1808 but met fierce popular resistance on the part of the Spaniards. As Fr. de la Costa points out:

"More, perhaps, than the masterly campaigns of Wellington, the guerilla, 'the little war' of the Spanish partisans contributed to Napoleon's downfall by bleeding white his imperial legions; and ever since then, peoples overran by arrogant armies have learned from it how they might, though crushed, fight back".¹³

¹² *Ibid.*, *Readings in Philippine History*, p. 138.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 165.

In 1810 however Napoleon still dominated the whole of Spain except *Cadiz* and its surroundings. Here the Spanish Cortes assembled and enacted a constitution similar to that of Revolutionary France but with one improvement: it extended the RIGHTS OF MAN not only to the Spaniards but to all the Spanish subjects everywhere.

When the Ilokanos heard of this constitution they inferred rightly that being Spanish subjects they were entitled to exemption from tribute and forced labor. The governor had to explain that the Liberal constitution of Cadiz did make all men equal, but some like themselves less equal than others. The Ilokanos grumbled a little but accepted the explanation.

The criollos of South America however were not as easily satisfied. For them liberalism meant complete self-government. So when Ferdinand VII, the legitimate heir of Charles IV was restored to the Spanish throne after Napoleon's defeat and tried to impose despotic rule, the Mexicans rose in revolt.

Even before Ferdinand VII had been reinstated in 1815, Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, a priest, had raised the standard of revolt in 1810, issuing from his parish church the 'grito de Dolores'. Gathering an immense number of natives, he sought to establish freedom in Mexico. At first Hidalgo and his lieutenants, Allende, Morelos, Guerrero, Matamoros won startling successes, but later Hidalgo gradually gave way. He lost a decisive battle at Calderon bridge (Jan. 1811) and fleeing was captured and executed by the Spanish. Morelos and Matamoros soon also met defeat at the hands of the "Spanish" generals Calleja del Rey and Itúrbide. Guerrero was driven to the wilds. But somehow the revolution continued. It took a new turn when General Itúrbide in the plan of Iguala espoused the cause of independence and established a conservative government. Itúrbide became Emperor but it was not long before republican leaders, Santa Ana and Guadalupe Victoria, led another revolution. Itúrbide's empire collapsed and a republic was set up. Notice that Mexico became independent with General Itúrbide who was once the leader of the Spanish forces against Hidalgo and that for him the independence of Mexico meant primarily the proclamation of himself as Emperor. Notice also that there were at least two revolutionary movements antagonistic to each other. Such particularism would be the bane of Mexico in the succeeding generations.

The feat of General Itúrbide aroused a similar attempt in the Philippines. Governor Juan Antonio Martínez because of the poor quality of the Officers' Corps in the Philippine regiments brought Peninsular officers from Spain in 1822. The Mexican Spaniards who composed the bulk of the Officers' corps took this policy ill, and started a conspiracy. Among the conspirators was Captain Andres Novales who being assigned to Mindanao proclaimed himself there as Emperor of the Philippines. Novales however unlike Itúrbide had only a regiment behind him, not an army, and much less a nation. Loyal Filipinos called out by the Spanish officers surrounded Novales' pitiful force and captured him. Next day, he and Sergeant Mateo met their death before a firing squad.

The conspiracy of Novales (1832) coming so soon as it did after the declaration of independence in Mexico (1821) put the colonial government on guard. Henceforth the Spanish authorities became suspicious of any association among its subjects whether of creoles, mestizos or natives. One such movement which was ruthlessly suppressed was the Confraternity of St. Joseph organized by Apolinario de la Cruz. Told to disband by the ecclesiastical authorities, it called instead a revival meeting. Panic-stricken the government sent troops from Manila to Tayabas resulting in a frightful massacre of old men, women and children. This was in 1841. The death of such harmless folks aroused a storm of indignation in Manila. As the episode became a target of public criticism, the officials involved tried to disclaim responsibility, the audiencia accusing the governor who in turn blamed the colonel who led the expedition.

News of Apolinario's 'rebellion' resulted in the arrest of criollos and mestizos supposedly implicated in the affair. These were later released when no evidence was found against them. But as de la Costa notes: "the incident showed the widening gulf between the Peninsulares who held the reins of government and most of their subjects".¹⁴

In putting down the 'uprising' in Tayabas, the Cagayan, not the Tayabas regiment was used. This was necessitated as a security measure. If this was a case of 'divide and rule', it had an opposite effect. For soon afterwards, the Tayabas regiment itself rebelled and even got possession of the citadel. Certain

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 214.

artillerymen however opened the gates to let in the loyal troops who after a battle of several hours overcame the rebels.

“However at the height of the conflict, the rebels were heard to cry out to their countrymen to rise in arms and fight for independence. This was the first time that the word INDEPENDENCE had been uttered in the Philippines as a rallying cry”.¹⁵

V. CHALLENGE: Collapse of the Galleon Trade

RESPONSE: Free Trade

The revolution in Mexico with the self-proclaimed Emperor Itúrbide confiscating in 1821 the more than ₱2,000,000 due Manila merchants for their exports saw the complete collapse of the galleon trade. Fortunately in 1882 the Spanish Cortes granted foreign firms the right of foreign residence in the Islands and in 1829 the right to engage in agricultural and manufacturing enterprises.

The growth in commercial agriculture — in sugar, abaca, and indigo — had as side-effects the expanded cultivation of rice, the principal food crop of the Philippines. The area of cultivation was no longer limited to the provinces of Central and Southern Luzon but extended even to the Cagayan Valley and to Negros.

The foreign firms — mainly British and American stimulated agricultural production for export by means of crop loans. They were able to make short-term advances to crop growers because they received funds for deposit at interest. In short, they functioned actually as commercial banks. Several Filipinos followed their example notably Damaso Garricho and Francisco Rodriguez. In 1851, a government bank was established and this assumed partial control of the funds of the OBRAS PIAS, literally PIOUS WORKS since the original idea was to use its funds and the interests it had acquired from the galleon traders for charitable purposes.

The net result of this economic development in the first half of the 19th Century was the formation of a money economy with the consequent rise of a middle class, who would opt for a good administration, for as Aristotle long ago had observed: ‘No state can be well-administered unless the middle class holds sway’.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 215.

In the rise of the Filipino middle class, the role of the Chinese mestizo cannot be underestimated. As Fr. de la Costa points out:

“the Chinese mestizo derived from his father, whether by heredity or discipline, many of his admirable qualities. But he did not remain Chinese. His mother — and his mother’s family — took care of that. He was born and remained a Filipino, and by his energy, enterprise and thrift — combined, it must be admitted with pretty sharp practises now and then — became a prosperous and influential member of his community. The spread of the Chinese mestizo strain through the provinces and the rise of a Filipino middle class was surely not purely coincidental”.¹⁶

Though the main thrust of economic development in the first half of the 19th Century was in agriculture, there were some ventures in the manufacturing field. A Spanish mestizo, a certain Mr. Roxas, set up a gunpowder factory and a spinning mill. A Portuguese, Don Jose Huet, established a factory for making paper which however failed. Most successful was the carriage enterprise of an American by the name of Hood, who because of superior manufacturing and marketing techniques, reduced the importation of this product almost to nothing.

Far more significant than the manufacturing enterprises initiated by Spaniards and foreigners was the development of the native industries. This was chiefly in shipbuilding, the casting of artillery and church bells and metal works for ships. Around the 1820’s weaving had become an extensive cottage industry in Bulacan and the town of Baliwag was producing hats for export. Iloilo had a flourishing textile industry, especially in luxury items, where quick-changing fashions dictated colors and patterns. The mats of Gumaca and Atimonan had no peer.

The internal trade in agricultural products and locally manufactured items were almost entirely in the hands of Filipinos. It was not however until 1844 that internal commerce grew by leaps and bounds. For it was in that year that the provincial governors were deprived of the license to engage in trade (the so-called *indulto de comercio* first granted in 1751) which they had hitherto enjoyed. Thousands went into business who could not do so before because of the ‘monopoly’ enjoyed by these officials.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

CHALLENGE: Interest of England and France in the Muslim South

RESPONSE: Definitive Integration of Mindanao and Sulu into the Philippines

We have seen that among the foreigners who took advantage of the grant of the Spanish Cortes in 1822 to reside and engage in industry in the Islands were the British. Long before this the British had had trade relations with the South. Indeed the British were being invited by the Muslims to settle near Maguindanao in the latter part of the 18th Century, not only because it was good for trade but that it would give them a powerful ally against the Spaniards to the north and the Dutch to the south. They offered the island of *Meangis* as the site of a trading post hoping it would become as prosperous as the British settlement at Balam-bangan in North Borneo, which had been ceded by Sultan Alimud Din of Jolo to the British East India Company in gratitude for the help of its agent, Alexander Dalrymple, in restoring him to his throne after the Seven Years' War.

Dalrymple had hoped that contact with the British would change the Muslims of Sulu from obsession with sensibility to honor (which made them warlike) to the acquisition and security of property. But this was not yet to be till around the middle of the 19th Century. In the 1770's the Sulus had not yet lost their piratical *élan*. Indeed around 1800, they had set up advanced bases in Mindoro which they used during the raiding season returning only to Jolo when they were ready to dispose of their captives, mainly wealthy chiefs and religious missionaries, whom they bartered for rice, money or cattle. "The Moro raiders also reaped where they had not sown for wherever they saw a field ready for the harvest, they harvested it as coolly as you please".¹⁷

The government could not do anything against the Moros seeing that these oftentimes even captured the vessels the alcaldes sent to trade from island to island. Seeing the government so powerless, some of the Visayan towns took measures for their own defense. This included building ships called *barangayanes* specifically designed to give chase to the Moro *pancos*. The moment the latter were sighted, the Christian towns sounded the alarm and the chase began. Since the *barangayanes* were faster

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

than the pancos they almost always worsted the Moros, who took to flight as soon as they saw these coming.

It was a *religious* of Cebu, Fray Julian Bernero, parish priest of Boljoon, who first devised this method of protecting his people. His plan was so successful that the neighboring towns of Argao, Dalaguete, and others under the direction of their respective parish priests followed his example. The result was that the Moro raiders no longer dared to show themselves near the island of Cebu. Here again we see the parish priests performing for the people when the civil officials were in default.

In 1845, the colonial government was able to get steam-powered gunboats for use against the Moros. More steam-vessels were added in the 1850's and 1860's and these finally persuaded the Sulu pirates to leave the Visayas alone and to transfer their piratical activities to the Straits of Macassar, the Sea of Celebes and the Sulu sea.

Meanwhile Louis Philippe, who had secured the throne of France in 1830, with the help of the constitutional monarchists and thus is known as the Citizen King, finding out that France was behind in the scramble for colonies and trading stations in the Far East told his foreign minister Guizot to do something about it. After considering and rejecting several possible locations for a French naval and trading station, Guizot pinpointed the island of *Basilan*. The attack of the *Basilanos* on a French naval vessel in 1844 gave Lagrené, the French envoy to China, the excuse to intimidate the Sultan of Sulu whom the *Basilanos* acknowledged as their sovereign to ceding to France the island of Basilan on the payment of \$100,000. A vigorous protest on the part of the Spanish government however caused Louis Philippe to desist from signing the treaty. The colonial authorities then established a military outpost on Basilan as a token of effective occupation.

The British meanwhile who had been able to establish a naval station in Labuan because of a treaty with the Sultan of Brunei, went to Jolo to establish a treaty of friendship and commerce (1849) which included the article that the Sultan of Sulu would not make concessions of territory within his dominions or acknowledge the sovereignty of any other State without the consent of Her Britannic Majesty. This Brooke treaty was not ratified however within the stipulated period and Spain insisted that Britain

first should have answered the protest of the governor of Zamboanga who had claimed that the Sultan of Sulu had no power to sign a treaty since the latter was not a sovereign himself. Britain answered that the Sultan had denied submission to the Spanish government or even that the protection of Spain interfered with the rights of Sulu to regulate her foreign relations.

The British claim however was rendered academic when Governor Urbiztondo in 1851 launched a massive attack on Jolo resulting in the capture of the town. The only way out for Sultan Mohammed Pulalun was to sign a treaty making Sulu and its dependencies an *integral* part of the Philippines under the sovereignty of Spain. Relying on this treaty, the Spanish government closed the port of Jolo to foreign trade in 1860. This was a heavy blow to the Sulu aristocracy who had turned from piracy to foreign trade as Dalrymple had hoped about a century before. Sultan Mohammed Jamalulul Kiram wrote to the British governor of Singapore and Malacca to ask for help. Britain however was not prepared to support Sulu against Spain. However she did protest the prohibition of trade with Sulu. After several negotiations Spain agreed to open Sulu again to foreign powers with the result that gun-running from Borneo kept Sulu supplied with firearms.

To prevent the possible rebellion of the Muslim South and its eventual conquest by Britain, Governor Malcampo in 1876 attacked Jolo with the purpose of bringing the Sulu Archipelago once and for all under Spanish sovereignty. Hard-pressed for funds, Sultan Mohammed Alam, gave favorable consideration to a proposal of Baron Overbeck and Alfred Dent of the North Bornean Company to "cede" his territories in North Borneo to the Company in return for an annual sum of ₱5000.00 to be paid him and his heirs. But what was the nature of this agreement? Was it a cession or a lease? And did the Company acquire property rights only or also political sovereignty? Thus began the problem of Sabah.¹⁸

CHALLENGE: Spain's retention of her remaining colonies

RESPONSE: The Carlist Wars

Mexico and the other Latin-American colonies had been lost to Spain around the 1820's. And we have seen how France and

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

England coveted the southern part of the Philippines. One would expect Spain to be united if she were not to lose her remaining colonies, Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines. But instead what do we find? A house divided against itself.

In 1838, an observant official in the Philippines wrote to his superiors in Madrid:

"We may still manage to retain this precious portion of the Spanish monarchy, provided we lose no time in taking preventive security measures and exercise the keenest foresight in planning judiciously and promptly putting in motion the administrative reforms demanded by a new and different age... Their (i.e. the Philippines') greatest affliction and that which probably gives rise to all the others is the state of perpetual discord in which the white population there lives... The chief causes of this profound malaise are in my opinion, the complexities and contradictions of that mountain of laws, ordinances, regulations, cédulas and royal decrees, which pass for colonial legislation... the unbridled greed for gain and general disregard of moral principle; and the extension hither of our domestic quarrels".¹⁹

The domestic quarrels referred to were the Carlist wars. Isabel II had become Queen in 1835 (at the age 2) with her mother Maria Cristina as Regent. She had been able to ascend the throne because of the abolition of the Salic law which limited the succession to male heirs. Her uncle Don Carlos was for the maintenance of the Salic law (which would have made him King) and therefore was considered a 'conservative'. Maria Cristina in order to safeguard the rights of Isabel to the throne was forced to head the Liberal faction, which unfortunately was subdivided into the 'moderados' and 'Progresistas'. Internicine strife thus rocked Spain for the succeeding decade. Thus in 1840, General Espartero, a Progresista banished the Regent Maria Cristina and assumed the regency himself. In 1843 General Narvaez leading a coalition of Moderados and Republicanos ousted Espartero and restored Isabel to the throne. Isabel's reign (b. 1833; d. 1868) was thus characterized by a rapid succession of short-lived liberal ministries interrupted by military coup d'états.²⁰

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 172.

Such rapid changes in the administration in the mother country with their contradictory policies were naturally reflected in the daughter colony. Whoever was in power in Spain appointed his relatives to run the colonial government. Nepotism became rampant. Thus a contemporary witnessed that:

"the new governor of the Philippines, General Alcala, is a relative of Espartero (then military dictator in Spain). The new lieutenant-governor, General Crespo, is a relative of General Alcala. The prospective Intendant of Finances, Señor Valero, is a brother of an aide-de-camp of Espartero. Every key position is given to Espartero's men".²¹

What was needed was that the colonial civil service should be staffed by honest and competent men with a fixed tenure of office. Incidentally it has been remarked that the Roman Empire lasted for so long even though most of the Emperors were incompetent, some frivolous and some even mad, because of the excellent civil service that obtained.

Since no colonial officer was sure of his tenure, he was tempted to make hay while the sun shone. Hence the inevitable corruption in the colonial administration. Since even the governor-general in Manila held power only when still in the good graces of whoever was in power in Spain, it was noted by the British governor of Hongkong Sir John Browning

"that the captain-general should be invested with a large amount of power, subject of course to personal responsibility as to its becoming exercise, instead of having continuously to refer to the Spanish cabinet in Madrid, thus making him impotent to correct any great abuses or to introduce any important reforms".²²

In short, the governor in the Philippines no longer had the same power of *independent* decision that his predecessors had in the 16th and 17th Century. Perhaps then the formulators of the policy known as CUMPLASE were right after all. The basis of the formula "Obedezco pero no cumpro" was indeed reasonable. For the great distance between Spain and the Philippines rendered impossible the king's or his Council's knowledge of the particular

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 173.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 169.

conditions obtaining in the Islands that would necessitate the modification or non-applicability of a decree based on general principles. Stated otherwise, CUMPLASE gave some leeway to the governor-general to use his discretion in the implementation of any colonial legislation.

In the nineteenth century then the governor-general may prove to be dishonest and corrupt. And so with the majority of those in the colonial government. All that was required of them was "that they be related to the one holding the reins of power in Madrid and to be a good liberal".²³

CHALLENGE: Of Liberalism

RESPONSE: Anti-clericalism

Spanish Liberalism was a daughter of French Liberalism and was born with the influx of French ideas into Spain consequent upon the change of dynasty from Hapsburg to Bourbon.

As a political philosophy, Liberalism postulated the freedom of the individual, democratic institutions (like representative government and universal suffrage), upholds the rights of Man, is opposed to standardization and state interference and is essentially individualistic in outlook.

Now French liberalism was anti-clerical having been influenced by the Encyclopedists who in the main were not only against the monarchy but against the Church.

"It assumed that one cannot be a good Liberal and a good Catholic at the same time. This of course was a false assumption, but the social and intellectual settings in which Liberalism developed tended to encourage such wrong notions".²⁴

That the foregoing dichotomy is false can easily be shown. Taking Liberalism as emphasizing democracy and democracy as meaning the political sovereignty of the people, one can easily see no essential incompatibility with Catholic doctrine. On the contrary if we take St. Thomas as the representative Catholic thinker, we will be surprised to read in his discussion of the question: "Who is competent to make laws?" the following:

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

"A law, properly speaking, regards first and foremost the order to the common good. Now to order anything to the common good belongs either to the whole people or to someone who is vicegerent of the whole people. Hence the making of laws belongs either to the whole people or to a public personage who has care of the whole people, for in all matters, the directing of anything to the end concerns him to whom the end belongs".²⁵

In the foregoing we see St. Thomas giving the rationale behind democracy, direct or indirect, or as it is sometimes called, pure or representative democracy.

How about the doctrine known as the divine right of Kings which seems to be incompatible with the sovereignty of the people? One who studies European history carefully will find out that this is a Protestant, not a Catholic doctrine. Indeed it was James I, the king of England who wrote the Authorized Version of the Bible, who first inaugurated its full and undisputed practice by claiming that the Crown of England was not only imperial, i.e., subject to no other lay state but also not subject to any moral authority as was the Pope in the Middle Ages. Since according to divine right theory the ruler was responsible to God alone, it followed that he was not accountable to his subjects at all. The way to absolute monarchy or better stated despotism was open. No wonder Louis XIV of France (1638-1715) would soon have the audacity to say: "L'etat c'est moi" (I am the State!)

In contrast as Mortimer Adler points out, Aquinas' answers to the questions: "Who is entitled to make laws for society? and "What gives the laws their authority over us?"

"rests on principles of right and justice and are opposed to answers which stem from the proposition that might makes right. All power and authority, in his view, ultimately come from God, but they do not pass directly from God to create kings by divine right. They are vested by God in the people as a whole. The power and authority which the people have from God to make the laws under which they live, they can either exercise directly or delegate to representatives of their own choosing. In either case, they are self-governing. They cannot rightly be subjected to laws laid down for them by one who wields political power without their consent and

²⁵ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Q. 90, a. 3.

without duly constituted authority". And Adler concludes: "Here in Aquinas is one of the *first clear* statements of the doctrine of *popular sovereignty*".²⁶

If there is no basis for Liberalism being as such anti-clerical, why did it become so in Spain? Politically, says de la Costa,

"the Spanish clergy was conservative and even Carlist and therefore Spanish liberals were sorely tempted to be anti-clerical, a temptation many of them found difficult to resist".²⁷

But why should the Spanish clergy be politically conservative? If we remember that Spanish liberalism was like its progenitor French liberalism anti-clerical, it would be naive to expect the Spanish clergy to side with a political party committed to the destruction of the religious orders. In short, it was a simple case of self-preservation.

As Father Pablo Fernandez points out

"At this time, the liberals Mendizabal, Alonso and Becerra, who disposed at their whim the religious destinies of Catholic Spain, *had despoiled the religious Orders, broken the relations with Rome and embittered by all means the sad condition of the Spanish clergy.* The tenacious resistance that the Government in the Philippines backed up by the metropolitan government (in Spain) opposed to the plans of Mons. Segui (Archbishop of Manila) in 1841 with respect to Mons. Badia, is a proof of the *anti-clerical policy* of so many who figure in the ecclesiastical history of Spain in the middle of the 19th Century".²⁸

From the foregoing it is clear that the anti-clericalism of the Liberals in power in Spain infected the colonial officials in the Islands. These in turn soon communicated their anti-clerical views to the Filipinos with whom they came in contact.

In this they were aided by newly-arrived army officers who having grown up amidst revolutionary changes in the home coun-

²⁶ The Great Ideas Program, Vol. 2. *The Development of Political Theory and Government*, ed. Mortimer Adler and Peter Wolff, Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 1959, p. 72.

²⁷ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 174.

²⁸ Fernández, Pablo O.P. *Dominicos donde Nace el Sol*, Barcelona, 1958, p. 489.

try were used to insulting the religious with impunity. Soon even the creoles who having lodged in the parish houses and should have known better took delight in abusing the hospitality of the fiars by

"broadcasting the foibles of the priest, and what is worse, exaggerating and even inventing them. Did the friar in his pleasure at having a fellow-countryman for company break out a bottle or two and grow a little merry? The story is that he became drunk. Did a woman with child in her arms come to speak with the parish priest about one of the countless problems that are in a parish? The story is that the priest's paramour came to see him with his child".²⁹

It was these actuations of liberal Spaniards that fostered the anti-friar stance of the populace. As early as 1841, a Frenchman, Barrot, perceived this when he wrote:

If prospects of emancipation really exist, the Spaniards assist them wonderfully by teaching the population to lose the respect they used to have for their *spiritual guides*, who are almost the only Europeans dispersed throughout the colony and are to-day the only instruments by which the government can act upon it".³⁰

In adopting such an anti-friar stance, did these Spanish liberals foresee the consequences of their action? As Fr. de la Costa puts it:

"Did they allow the possibility that because of the unique historical role of the Spanish clergy in the governance of the colony, they might be loosening the hold on the native population not only of the conservative Church but of the liberal State"?³¹

CHALLENGE: Shortcomings of the Colonial Government
RESPONSE: The rise of native leadership

We have seen that almost simultaneously with the spreading of liberal ideas in the Islands, the country was experiencing economic progress in trade, commerce and manufacturing. The advent of a money economy did not only give rise to a middle

²⁹ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 175.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

class. It increased the duties of the *gobernadorcillo* enormously. Among the duties of the town mayor as reported by Azcarraga, the provincial governor

“were the collection of taxes, the listing of young men available for service in the armed forces and statute labor. He had judicial functions like trying orally civil suits and punishing petty misdemeanors. He was responsible for the building and repairing of roads and bridges and the operation of ferries”.³²

Azcarraga's comment is that ‘the *gobernadorcillo* has become of all officials the most heavily laden with work and responsibility and at the same time the lowest paid and the least esteemed’. How he was able to raise the municipal funds necessary to meet all these services was a ‘miracle’. Among the unorthodox methods used by the town mayor was to require passengers on ferry boats to pay 2 or 4 cuartos when statute laborers were supposed to be transported gratis. The town mayor also asked the families to feed the prisoners; they could not do so, the complainants on the premise that they were the ones interested in having the crime investigated.

What is important to note is that the *gobernadorcillos* were members of the *principalia*. The upper-class *Filipinos* were thus becoming acquainted with the problems of their respective towns. We have seen them taking initiative in solving the problems of administration. Should conditions in the future require their taking over the reins of administration they were more than ready to exercise political leadership.

This was to be sooner than they themselves expected. For the turmoil in the home country caused the colonial government to just continue antiquated laws and institutions no longer adapted to the changed conditions thus leading to the dissatisfaction of the masses.

Thus the tobacco monopoly while it brought the needed revenue to the colonial government made extremely difficult the condition of the tobacco farmer who was required to raise an exorbitant amount of tobacco but was compelled to sell his produce at the price fixed by the government. They were paid with trea-

³² *Ibid.*, p. 186.

sure vouchers which they could not encash except at a discount. At the same time not being allowed to produce by themselves the necessities of life, they had to purchase these prime commodities at exorbitant prices. The tobacco monopoly thus had outlived its usefulness, causing lawlessness, poverty and mass migration from the tobacco regions. The colonial government must have realized this for it abolished the tobacco monopoly in 1882 — one century after its initiation — but then the harm had been done.

Then there was the problem of the migrant laborer. The development of the sugar industry in Negros required the crossing over of laborers from Iloilo. But antiquated laws made this difficult, since permission was granted only after the signature of the *cabeza*, *gobernadorcillo* and parish priest had been obtained. So most laborers chose to leave without notifying the *cabeza de barangay* who was in turn punished for not being able to give the exemption money corresponding to the disappearing worker. Even the *passport* system which was devised to give the *cabeza* knowledge of where his men were bound for, failed, since in most cases the laborers left without any passport.

Worst of all was the case of the discharged or deserting soldier. For it was from this class that most of the robbers (*tulisanes*) came from. And this was due to the system of obliging all the *Indio* natives of a district to serve eight years and then discharging them with neither a pension nor the knowledge of any peaceable calling nor with much inclination to work.

But since the tenure of office of the colonial officials were quite short because of the frequent cabinet crises in the mother country no definitive solutions were forthcoming to the foregoing problems. But as Fr. de la Costa points:

“few Spaniards saw in these problems any indication of social dissent, much less of revolutionary upheaval. The lower-class Filipinos despite occasional outbursts of fury, seemed still to be in general what he had always been: “teachable, obedient, industrious, loyal to King and country” and accepting the domination of the white man as part of the immutable order of things”.³³

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 194

Thus in 1844 in Batangas, a French traveller tried to rouse some peasants to an awareness of the rights of Man and the citizen but to no avail. Even the native and mestizo elite, the moneyed class, seemed to be more interested in gracious living than in social reform.

But this condition was not to last for long. Education had given rise to an intellectual elite who becoming acquainted with liberal ideas would be vocal in expressing the grievances of the people and the need of social reform.

1765-1863. Another hundred years. The Seven Years' War had as its aftermath the decline of the galleon trade, and thus led the colonial government to re-examine its economic policy. The tobacco monopoly was the start of an agricultural revolution which included the cultivation of the friar lands hitherto devoted to pasture.

In the meantime the influence of the Encyclopedists of France led Charles III to expel the Jesuits in Spain. The order extended to the Jesuits in the Philippines. This however did not solve the problem of the control of the parishes by the religious orders. Archbishop Sancho's policy of giving the parishes to native priests who had not been properly screened or given the requisite training proved a remedy worse than the disease.

The excessive power of the regular clergy was partly due to the incompetence and corruption of the civil officials. And the colonial maladministration was mainly due to the many wars that plagued Spain in the latter half of the 18th Century. One effect of Spain's involvement in the European wars was the well-nigh independent status of the Muslim South. During this period the Moro piratical raids on the Visayas continued, but were contained partially by the method devised by the friars of fast *barangayanes* giving chase to the Moro *pancos*.

The interest of other European powers to have trading stations in Maguindanao and Sulu at last aroused the colonial government to effect the definitive conquest of these territories which was effected by Governor Urbiztondo in 1851 whereby Sulu and its dependencies became an integral part *de facto* and not only *de jure* of the Philippines.

Meanwhile Napoleon's invasion of Spain in 1808 led not only to the guerilla war of the Spanish partisans but to the proclamation of the Cadiz constitution which extended the Rights of Man to Spanish subjects everywhere. This was interpreted by the Latin-American colonies to mean self-government. Revolution in Mexico led to its declaration of independence in 1821 with General Itúrbide as Emperor. The 'defeat' of Itúrbide found a counterpart in the Philippines in the conspiracy of Novales, which was however suppressed. This conspiracy put the colonial government on guard causing it to suppress all associations of natives, creoles and mestizos.

The revolution in Mexico led to the complete collapse of the galleon trade. In 1822 the Cortes, to make up for this loss of revenue, granted foreign firms the right of residence in the Islands and in 1829 the right to engage in agricultural and manufacturing enterprises. These foreign firms stimulated commercial agriculture through crop loans furnished by merchant banks. Through the main thrust of economic development was in agriculture, there were also some manufacturing ventures. Even native cottages flourished especially after the abolition of the *INDULTO DE COMERCIO*. The net result of all this economic development was the rise of a money economy and of the middle class. This also resulted in the increase of the duties of the *gobernadorcillo* who was a member of the *principalia*. These upper-class Filipinos were thus having leadership thrust upon them. This native political elite was soon supplemented by a native intellectual elite whose main staple of thought were liberal ideas.

The liberalism that flourished in Spain and which was imported from France was anti-clerical. This anti-clerical liberalism was exported to the Philippines by 'liberal' colonial officials themselves, by newly arrived army officers who even in the home country used to insult the religious with impunity. These Spaniards communicated their anti-clerical views to the Filipinos with whom they came in contact. Little did they realize that by influencing the Filipinos to lose respect for the friars they were not only undermining the conservative Church but also the Liberal State.

PART IV 1864-1899

CHALLENGE: The Spread of Liberal Ideas

RESPONSE: Censorship

Liberalism need not be anti-clerical, but Liberalism obviously is for 'freedom' or 'liberty' however understood or misunderstood. Remember Madame Roland's cry during the French Revolution: 'O Liberty how many crimes are committed in thy name'. To ban Liberal ideas from contaminating the Filipinos, a board of censors was set up by the colonial government composed of ecclesiastical and civil officials with power to confiscate any book coming to the Islands which it considered not only dangerous to Faith and Morals but the established political order.

Ours is not a brief in favor of censorship as such. But it might be worthwhile discussing the *raison d'être* of imposing censorship. Censorship is usually defined as the official restriction of any public expression believed to threaten the government authority or the moral and social order. Incidentally censorship was not invented by the Church as so many erroneously believe. It had already been practised in Greece and Rome. What is interesting to note is the following statement in the Columbia Encyclopedia: "National governments have censored the press on political grounds, but in many countries censorship has ceased save on *moral grounds or during war*".³⁴ What does this mean but that the State considers the undermining of morality to be as serious as the undermining of political authority during wartime?. If so, then the Church which everyone will admit is more committed than the State to the upholding of *morality* has more reason than the State to censor books against morals. As to books against the Faith, to expect the Church to tolerate them, is like expecting the State to tolerate seditious literature. It is in this light that one must see why the Church used to publish an Index of Forbidden books.

The reason for this Index has never been put more eloquently than by Cardinal Merry del Val who says:

³⁴ *Columbia Encyclopedia*, Columbia University Press, 1946, p. 322.

"Impious and unclean literature is written sometimes with great charm of style; frequently it deals with subjects that excite lascivious passion or flatter spiritual pride; always too with specious arguments and quibbling of every kind, it aims at giving a lasting impression in the heart and mind of the incautious reader. It is therefore only *natural* that the Church, like a provident Mother, should with timely prohibitions warn the *faithful* lest they press their lips to deceitful cups of poison. Not, forsooth, from any fear of the light of Truth does the Church forbid certain books to be read, but on account rather of the zeal of God animating Her, which does not tolerate the loss of a single soul . . . taught too, by *age-long experience* that man, fallen from an original state of grace, is strongly prone to evil and is consequently in the need of protection and defense. How necessary moreover for the common weal is the suppression of evil literature and how perfectly it coincides with sane liberty, has been demonstrated, particularly in these latter times, by the example even of the most civilized governments, which, for the enforcement of law and order, have had recourse with a rigour unknown to the Church, even to prohibition of the publication of certain works":³⁵

The spread of pornography in the name of 'liberty' (or is it really license) with all its attendant evils in modern times is a testimony to the wisdom of the Church in prohibiting certain works that cater to the baser passions of man and degrade the human personality. The Church therefore was not guilty of inconsistency in banning her followers to read books against Faith and Morals, even during the Spanish regime. Rather it was the State, one that claimed to be liberal, that was inconsistent in banning the influx of liberal ideas. In short, the trouble was that the Spanish liberals spread "the pernicious ideas of freedom and independence among their Filipino friends and then were vastly surprised when they took them seriously"³⁶

Why did the educated Filipinos take seriously liberal ideas? Because they had been trained in the liberal arts by the Spaniards themselves, and even etymologically liberal education means the

³⁵ Index of Forbidden Books, Introduction.

³⁶ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 215.

education of free men. As Robert Maynard Hutchins, erstwhile President of the University of Chicago puts it:

“The aim of liberal education is human excellence, both private and public (for man is a political animal). Its object is the excellence of man as man and man as citizen. It regards man as an end, not as a means; and it regards the end of life and not the means to it. For this reason it is the education of free men”.³⁷

And if we remember that Catholicism regards man as a person and therefore as an end in himself and not as a means for others (this being also the reason why it is against slavery) and that it concerns itself with the last end of man and of life, we can understand why Catholic education has always emphasized the liberal arts and a liberal education.

The liberal education received by the Filipinos since the second half of the 17th C. culminated in the University education received by would-be doctors and lawyers and priests. Why this concentration on these three professions? Aside from the facts that widespread instruction in the positive sciences e.g. physics, chemistry, etc., was not yet in vogue at that time anywhere in Europe, Spanish education both at home and in the colonies, emphasized the development of man as man. Now man is a composite of a body and a rational soul. The physician was there to minister to man's body; the priest to minister to man's soul. Since man is also a political animal, and justice, as Aristotle points out, is that indispensable means for attaining the end of the State, which is the happiness of the body politic, there must be also a profession committed to Justice, and this is precisely Law. Whatever the shortcomings of Spanish colonial education, one thing it did not suffer from: It was not ignorant (as most modern education seems to be) of the end of education which is linked to the end of life and which must necessarily take into consideration the nature of man.

³⁷ *Great Books of the Western World*, Vol. I. *The Great Conversation*. Robert Maynard Hutchins Editor, Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 1952 p. 3.

CHALLENGE: Education for Democracy

RESPONSE: Religion and Philosophy

Perhaps this is the place to study the educational system of the Philippines during the Spanish regime. Among the criticisms lodged by Agoncillo are the following: (1) the narrowness of its policies and the obvious slant of the various curricula towards religion (2) secondary and higher education hardly touched the more important subjects in the sciences (3) It was only in 1863 that at least one primary school for boys and another for girls was established. (4) Only after 1863 did the government open university education to the native resulting in the emergence of an indigenous intelligentsia class."³⁸

The impression Agoncillo wants to convey is that Spanish education was far behind that of other European powers in the 19th C. However a comparative study of the British educational system shows that it was not so. As we read in the NEW UNIVERSITY LIBRARY:

"The emergence of a *national* system of education such as exists in Great Britain today is of comparatively *recent* origin. Indeed the British system of education was established by the Education Act of 1870 which provided elementary schools in areas where the efforts of voluntary agencies were insufficient to provide popular education."³⁹

The foregoing implies that public schools run by the State of Britain was not even national in scope but only supplementary to private education. Furthermore 1870 is seven years behind 1863 when the public school system was established by Spain in the Islands. Indeed it was only the Fisher Act of 1918 which first gave legislative form to the concept of 'a *national* system of public education in Britain'.

Regarding the place of Science in the curriculum, we read:

"The granting of a charter to Mason's College, (Birmingham, England) not only began an educational ferment, in

³⁸ Agoncillo and Guerrero, M., *History of the Filipino People*, pp. 109-110.

³⁹ The New University Library Vol. 5. The Caxton Publishing Co. Ltd., *History of Education in Britain*, pp. 89 and 90.

which scientists claimed a place in the sum for science besides the classics theology. Now Birmingham University grew out of the Mason Scientific College which was founded by Sir Josiah Mason in 1880. In 1897 this was incorporated under the title of Mason University College and in 1900 was granted its royal charter".⁴⁰

From the foregoing it is clear that science education had its start in Britain only in the 1880's nor did it become widespread except in the 20th C. Science education in the Islands as shown by the graduates of Pharmacy in the University of Santo Tomas must have begun around the same date if not earlier.

Furthermore, Agoncillo objects to the emphasis given to Religion during the Spanish regime. Aside from the fact that the primary objective of Spanish colonization was the Christianization of the Islands, religion and philosophy are, if we are to believe Mortimer Adler, the only rational basis for the claiming of human rights, which even according to the American Declaration of Independence are God-given and not State-given. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their *Creator* with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness". In what discipline do we study about *Creation* if not in *Religion*? As to all men being equal, Chesterton has this pregnant observation: "All men are equal as pennies are equal, because the only value in any of them is that they bear the image of the King". In short, the true basis of equality is that all men are created to the image and likeness of God. As to fraternity, the only rational basis for claiming the brotherhood of men is the Fatherhood of God. And where do we come to know that God is our Father except in Religion? As to liberty, its basis is man's rationality and this presupposes our being made to the image of God. All the truths that underly democracy are studied precisely in Religion. This is perhaps the reason why Mortimer Adler points out that positivist professors (i.e. those professors who emphasize the Positive Sciences at the expense of Religion and Philosophy) are the real foes of democracy.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

Overemphasis on scientific and vocational education (or should we say instruction,) which is necessarily specialized will foster neither democracy nor civic spirit. As Robert M. Hutchins asks:

"Will the study of *occupations* in all their contexts, help us to achieve that *intellectual independence* which democratic citizenship requires? Is it not a fact that we are now so wrapped up in our occupations and special interests of our own occupational groups that we are almost at the *pre-tyrannical* stage described by Vico, the stage where everybody is so concerned with his own special interests that nobody looks after the common good? Is not the study of occupations the way to hasten the disintegration of such community as still remains, through emphasizing our individuality at the expense of our common humanity?"⁴¹

And we may add: Is this not the reason why the most advanced technical schools in the United States e.g. a Massachusetts Institute of Technology, are emphasizing cultural as well as scientific subjects? Those who want to know the importance of liberal education such as was given during the Spanish regime will do well to read the first volume of the Great Books of the Western World entitled "THE GREAT CONVERSATION".

The best proof that the University education during the Spanish times was excellent is the admission of Agoncillo himself that it give rise to a native intelligentsia. Can we really fault an educational system that could produce such intellectuals as Rizal, del Pilar, Lopez Jaena, and Mabini to mention only a few?

CHALLENGE: Equality of the Regular and Secular Clergy

RESPONSE: Execution of Gomez, Burgos and Zamora

We have seen that the University education during the Spanish times culminated in the professions of Medicine, Law and Holy Orders. It was inevitable that these professionals, knowing as they did the rights of man and of the citizen and the duties of government officials, should lead the movement for social and political reform. Especially the clergy, for as Governor Primo de Rivera would later note: "they are the persons who may be con-

⁴¹ Hutchins, Robert M., *The Great Conversation*, Vol. I. *Great Books of the Western World*, Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 1952 p. 14-215.

sidered the most cultured among the natives", but alas "persons on whom we (ie. the authorities) impose duties while denying them the rights which we taught them they possess. This anomalous state of affairs ought to be studied".⁴²

But before a solution could be found, most in accord with *justice* but at the same time less dangerous and inconvenient, there occurred an incident, the Cavite mutiny of 1872, in which the most distinguished colonial-born clerics played a part. Did Gomez, Burgos and Zamora really play a part in the mutiny of 1872? A less prejudiced witness than the Governor-General, the British consul in Manila reported to his foreign office in London that:

"As we are unacquainted with the charges brought against the clergy, and others who have been arrested and know nothing of the judicial proceedings against them, we are unable to discover the part played by them in the late disturbances, the origin of the same must therefore for the present be more or less hidden in obscurity".⁴³

Perhaps the 'crime' of Father Burgos was simply his suggestion that the Peninsular priests who had just recently come from Spain should be coadjutors until they learned enough of the language to be understood by the natives and his recommendation of two native priests to the vacant parishes of Nagcarlan and Orion which the ecclesiastical authorities considered a usurpation of their own authority. Or perhaps it was his vehement defense of the native clergy in season and out of season for in his letter to Don Patricio de la Escosura, a royal commissioner sent to the Philippines in 1873, he said:

"I have always held that since we are all equal in God's sight, the Filipinos deserve better treatment in the Church, though always in conformity with their merits. Any injustice due to them touches me to the quick",⁴⁴

That Gom-bur-za were not directly involved in the Cavite mutiny is most probable, since this was the result of Governor Izquierdo's repeal of the exemption from tribute and forced labor that Filipino workers in the arsenal and navy-yard of Cavite had

⁴² De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 223

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 179

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

been enjoying. Their innocence is confirmed by Archbishop Meliton Martinez's refusal to unfrock the three priests as requested by Governor Izquierdo.

The fact that the trial was made behind closed doors and that by a military tribunal headed by a Colonel Muscoso who had been recently dismissed from his post as Governor of the Marianas and that the punishment was carried out within 24 hours after the notification of the sentence tend to show that there was a conspiracy on the part of the authorities to liquidate the three Filipino priests.

The execution of Fathers Burgos, Gomez and Zamora on February 17, 1872 gave birth to the nationalism of the greatest figure in the Propaganda Movement, Jose Rizal, who in a letter to a friend in 1889 wrote:

"Had it not been for 1872, Rizal would have been a Jesuit and instead of writing NOLI ME TANGERE, he would have written the contrary. Child though I was then, my imagination was awakened and I vowed to dedicate myself to avenge some day such victims..."⁴⁵

Regarding Nationalism, Agoncillo asserts that it may well be that nationalism among the Filipinos emerged on that fateful morning of Feb. 17, 1872. If that were so, would it be accurate to consider Lapu-Lapu, Diego Silang, to mention only a few, as nationalists? They were of course patriots in the sense of lovers of their clan, tribe or province or whatever was the largest aggrupation they belonged to. But definitely not nationalists by the very criterion of those who further claim that 'nationalism is a child of the French Revolution' and exported by the colonial powers to the rest of the world.⁴⁶

CHALLENGE: The Propaganda Movement

RESPONSE: Non-continuity and non-implementation of Reforms

The aim of the Propaganda Movement was, in the words of Graciano Lopez-Jaena:

⁴⁵ Agoncillo and Guerrero, M., *History of the Filipino People*, p. 137-138.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

"To combat reaction, to stop all retrogressive steps, to extol and adopt liberal ideas; to defend progress; in a word, to be a propagandist, above all, of democratic ideas in order to make these supreme in all nations here and across the seas. With regards to the Philippines, we shall pay particular attention to the defense of her democratic right..."⁴⁷

What were these democratic rights advocated by the propagandists? These are spelled out in more detail by Marcelo H. del Pilar as (1) freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly (2) widespread social and political freedom (3) equality before the law (4) active participation in the affairs of government.⁴⁸

Most, if not all, of the propagandists were anti-friar, influenced as they were by the anti-clerical views of Spanish liberalism. Jaena, for example, asserts that "that nation of eight million souls should not be the exclusive preserve of theocracy and traditionalism". Theocracy is of course taken here in the loose sense of the rule of sacerdotal or priestly class. This assumption is made more explicit by del Pilar in his article: LA SOBERANIA MONACAL EN FILIPINAS. According to del Pilar, the system that the friars had evolved so skillfully was to play the people against the government and vice-versa.

"To frighten the government with the rebelliousness of the country and to frighten the country with the despotism of the government."⁴⁹

Del Pilar's claim implies that both the rebelliousness of the people and the despotism of the government were not really facts but only fictions conjured up by the friars but unfortunately believed by the people on the one hand and the government or the governor-generals on the other. But if the people were not actually rebellious, how can most of our historians claim that there was a rebellion every 4 or 5 years during the Spanish times? And if the government were not really despotic, how can the same historians generalize that the governor-generals, with very few exceptions exercised despotic rule? Indeed how could they have

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

been despotic when it is asserted at the same time that they were overruled by the friars who were the real sovereigns of the country?

The truth seems to be that only few of the governor-generals tended to be despotic and the ones who had the courage to stand up to them were the religious. And in this they were simply following the example of their predecessors in European history—a Thomas a Becket who dared Henry II, a Bishop Fisher who confronted Henry VIII etc. No wonder Karl Barth could say that Theology and the Church are the only bulwarks against the Totalitarian State.

As to many 'revolts' during the Spanish times, perhaps what Rizal opined was so much nearer the truth. Our national hero says:

"All the little insurrections that have hitherto occurred in the Philippines have been the work of a few fanatics or mutinous officers who have had to cajole or deceive or exploit their followers to achieve their ends. And so they failed, all of them. Not one of these insurrections had the people behind it; not one sprang from a whole race's need; not one was fought for the rights of man or the claims of justice. This being so, they left no lasting impression on the memory of the people. On the contrary, once the people's wounds had healed and it recognized itself to be the victim of deceit, it applauded the fall of those who had perturbed its peaceful existence. But suppose a movement were to arise from the people itself with the miseries of the people as its motive power... What then?"⁵⁰

And Rizal adds that if the complaints and demands of the Filipino people are always to meet with the invariable NO recommended by the vested interests, that batten on the depressed conditions of the masses.

Were these vested interests chiefly the friars? We have seen that in the beginning of the 19th C, according to Zuñiga, it was the 'inquilinos' rather than the friars themselves who were 'profiteering' from the rents of the friars lands and that according

⁵⁰ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 228.

to Comyn, the friars stood in need of all they earned to discharge their duties and obligations. Was it not the mestizo and native oligarchs who (engaging in lending money at usurious interests) had effected the change of the native independent farmer to a landless tenant? Could the friars have changed so much in the following 50 years as to be the ones who battered on the depressed conditions of the masses? Possible, but not probable. That is why even Agoncillo in discussing the 19th C. economy of the Philippines says the following:

“Foreign merchants provided short-term loans for still unharvested crops to crop growers. This was a practice which the *Chinese traders and wealthy natives* also used to their advantage. They gave loans to small cultivators at usurious rates. Many of the latter could not pay their debts so that their lands eventually passed into the hands of the money lenders. They were, however allowed to remain in the farms as *kasamas* or share croppers. As a result, a new form of peonage developed in the Philippines, under which system the worst aspects of landlord-tenant relationships flourished.”⁵¹

This is an admission that confirms Comyn's observation at the turn of the 19th C. that it was not the friars but the Chinese traders and wealthy natives and mestizos who lending money at usurious rates of interest introduced the infamous kasama-system in the colony.

This is not to say that all the friars were guiltless. In all classes of people there are good and bad specimens. No doubt in the religious orders there were priests like Fathers Damaso and Salvi. Some like Lopez-Jaena's Fray Botod may have been 'fat, ignorant, abusive and immoral'. We who are neither priests nor religious cannot appreciate the intellectual and emotional dilemmas faced by those who have donned the cassock. This has been admirably put by the great Dominican preacher Lacordaire, to cite but one. Says this outstanding preacher: "The religious must have a heart *warm* enough for *charity* but one *cold* enough for *chastity*". If we are scandalized by the actions of friars and other religious who fail to practise what they preach, it is be-

⁵¹ Agoncillo, T., *History of the Filipino People*, p. 105.

cause we instinctively recognize the greatness of the ideals that have been betrayed. For as the dictum goes, the corruption of the best is the worst. Is this also the reason why Nietzsche who was rabidly anti-Christian had to admit that 'The Church is a nobler institution than the State'?

All our historians agree that the members of the Propaganda Movement were for radical reform rather than revolution. Indeed del Pilar wrote as late as 1894:

"It is true that the aims of a peaceful propaganda are the same as those of a separatist insurrection, namely, the rule of law and the elimination of social inequalities. But it is also true that if propaganda is effective, then a war of independence becomes unnecessary; and because unnecessary, unlikely... If legal propaganda is able... to bring about measures to prevent arbitrary government and harmonize the principle of authority with the rights of the subject, is it likely that the cry of revolt will awaken an answering echo in the Philippines? Who will want to gamble on the uncertain issue of a war of independence if under Spanish rule, he can live freely, peacefully and with dignity?"⁵²

If the members of the Propaganda Movement were not after independence, what were they after? Del Pilar summed it up in one crisp sentence:

"We are asking for assimilation; we demand that these Islands be Hispanized."⁵³

Or as the Masons put it in one of their platforms:

"We want our country declared a Spanish province, with all the rights and obligations... In a word, we want reforms, reforms..."⁵⁴

To this challenge of instituting radical reforms in the Islands, did Spain turn a totally deaf ear? Not if we believe Rizal who said:

⁵² De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 229.

⁵³ Agoncillo, T., *op. cit.*, p. 147.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

"If therefore the sound and statesmanlike reforms proposed by our ministers of state do not find able and resolute officials in the colonies to translate them into action; if the reforms began by one administration are not loyally continued by those which the frequent cabinet crises call forth to succeed it . . .⁵⁵

Was Rizal thinking of the liberal regime of Governor de la Torre being followed by the reactionary one of Governor Izquierdo? Anyhow Rizal's statements seem to imply that the mother country proposed sound reforms for the Philippines but that the frequent cabinet crises in Spain itself prevented both their continuation and implementation in the colony.

All our historians are agreed that the members of the Propaganda Movement were for the assimilation of the Philippines into Spain. What some of them are likely to forget is that assimilation means "the making similar" and that this was precisely the vision of Philip II who wanted the countries colonized to become NEW SPAINS.

That assimilation would not mean the total elimination of individual characteristics nor the absence of certain degree of political autonomy was well put by the Dominican historian Juan Fernando thus.

"The view is sometimes put forward that colonies are like the younger sons of a large family who have not yet come of age, but who in the natural course of events free themselves from parental control when they reach a certain stage of maturity . . . Let there be less freedom to do wrong, more freedom to do right; let there be honor unsullied; generous self-sacrifice, purity of manners, religion, virtue, and Christian morality, and we dare to affirm without the slightest hesitation that the evil hour will never strike for any colonial people when it will deem itself happier or less miserable if emancipated from the nation that brought it civilization and Christianity . . . Quite the contrary, as the ties between colonies and their respective mother countries become progressively closer, their way of life, their social structure and even their racial characteristics will merge in such a way that they

⁵⁵ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 228.

will form one people. And if this fusion is reinforced by wise laws and by a prudent policy designed to entwine the interests of the colony with those of the mother country, we shall see the diminution and even the extinction of the natural aspiration of a people to live its own life within the narrow confines of its own territory. Its place will be taken by a broader and more potent ideal: that of one nation, one fatherland embracing in itself all regional differences."⁵⁶

There were then some Spaniards who were as much for assimilation as some Filipinos. Unhappily there were Spaniards who believed that the Filipinos belonged to an inferior race, that they could never come of age, that they could never graduate from being subjects to being citizens. Since their views prevailed in the 19th C, the assimilation was doomed. And the only alternative to assimilation could be nothing else than independence.

CHALLENGE: National Revolution

RESPONSE: Pacification and Changing of Governors General

Del Pilar had asked:

"Who will want to gamble on the uncertain issue of a war of independence if under Spanish rule he can live freely, peacefully and with dignity?"⁵⁷

A warehouse worker dared to make that gamble because he believed the time for peaceful propaganda was over. His name was Andres Bonifacio, a self-educated man among whose readings were Hugo's *LES MISERABLES* and a book on the French Revolution.

Bonifacio did not rush to revolution right away. True indeed that the news of Rizal's deportation to Dapitan caused Bonifacio and his friends to form the association called *Kataastaasan Kagalang-galang na Katipunan nang mga Anak nang Bayan*, or *KATIPUNAN* for short, whose political objective was to work for the separation of the Philippines from Spain. Yet Bonifacio wanted to know Rizal's opinion regarding an armed struggle and sent for that purpose Dr. Pio Valenzuela to Dapitan. Appraised of Rizal's opinion that a revolution was useless unless the rebels had

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 216-217

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 229.

sufficient arms, Bonifacio admitted that it would be fatal for the Philippines to start an uprising right away. There are those who would question Rizal's position as our national hero since for these Rizal opted for reform, while Bonifacio was the one who led the Revolution. But the answer is given by Bonifacio himself in the above incident which clearly shows that Bonifacio himself considered Rizal as 'the first among peers' of those who worked for freedom

Premature discovery of the Katipunan however followed by mass arrest of its members being relayed to Bonifacio, the latter summoned the leaders of the society to a general assembly to be held at Balintawak on August 24, 1896. However the deciphering of the Katipunan code by the Spanish authorities caused the rebels to go to Pugadlawin where Bonifacio asked his men whether they were prepared to fight to the bitter end. Since the acclamation was almost unanimous, Bonifacio said:

"That being the case, bring out your cedula and tear them to pieces to symbolize our determination to take up arms!"⁵⁸

Why did Bonifacio opt for revolution rather than reform however radical? Because he had come to the conclusion that prosperity for the Filipinos was impossible under Spain. This is clear from his article in the clandestine paper *KALAYAAN* where-in he charged the Spaniards with the violation of contract.

"The contract between Spain and the Philippines was sealed in the Blood Compact between King Sikatuna and Legaspi, who represented the King of Spain. What were the terms of this contract? On the part of the Spaniards to guide us (the Filipinos) on the paths of wisdom and increased prosperity; on the part of the Filipinos to supply the wants of the race of Legaspi."

Bonifacio held that the Spaniards had not kept their part of the agreement.

"Our munificence they have rewarded with treachery and far from guiding us on the path of knowledge have blinded

⁵⁸ Agoncillo, T., *op. cit.*, p. 196.

us. ... Therefore, O my countrymen! Let us consecrate all our strength to the good cause, with absolute and unshakeable faith in its success and in the ultimate prosperity, so anxiously desired by us, of the land of our birth."⁵⁹

Kalayaan! Freedom! Liberty! What did the leaders of the Katipunan understand by this term? Emilio Jacinto spells it out for us in his *LIWANAG AT DILIM* or *LIGHT AND DARKNESS*:

"The liberty of a man is the reason for his being; to think and act as he pleases if they do not run counter to the rights of others ... From liberty which is man's very being follows equality ... All men are equal for their being is one ... Who will have the temerity to say that his being is superior to that of his fellow-man? ... From equality will follow democracy ... We have seen that all are equal and the pre-eminence of the rulers come not from their own being for they are the equal of all. Therefore any authority in order to be genuine and reasonable, must come only from the people and their true representatives. In other words, the being of the ruler must not be recognized as above and beyond that of the public. If the ruler is obeyed and recognized, it is because of the authority vested in him by the people, that is, as coming from the collective authority of each of the people."⁶⁰

To the eloquent call to arms of Bonifacio and the closely-reasoned argument of Jacinto for Liberty was added the economic crisis which rallied the peasantry to the Katipunan. Isabelo de los Reyes describes it as follows:

"One of the principal causes of the present revolution is the land question. This is shown by the fact that practically the only provinces that have taken up arms are those where there are friar estates. During the past decade the country has been suffering a business recession that has deteriorated these last years. To this must be added the fact that in June and July 1896 thick swarms of locusts completely ruined the rice fields. Farmers faced a future that was bleak indeed. They already groaned under the hard yoke of the friar hacenderos, who,

⁵⁹ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 232.

⁶⁰ Agoncillo, T., *op. cit.*, pp. 188-189.

far from remitting even a part of the ground rent in consideration of the low prices, the locust plague and the drought, steadily increased it, and so the peasants, driven to desperation, swelled the ranks of revolution."⁶¹

If the claims of de los Reyes are true, many changes indeed had taken place since the turn of the country. For as we have seen around 1800, Zuñiga had reported that the friars were forbidden to raise the ground rent and that this prohibition resulted in the *inquilinos* taking unfair advantage of the friar-owners by subleasing the friar lands at much higher rates to wealthy sub-leasees. Again if de los Reyes is right that the only provinces that took up arms against Spain were those where there were friar estates, since the provinces that took up arms were limited to 8 provinces as shown by the rays of the Katipunan flag, the friar estates were limited to these eight provinces. If so, this undermines the claim that most of the lands that had been held in encomienda by *lay* Spaniards gradually came into the possession of the *friars*. For we must remember that the encomiendas were widespread throughout Luzon and the Visayas. In the second place, what was entrusted in the encomienda was not land (property) but jurisdiction over the natives of a certain region. This is indirectly admitted by Agoncillo when he says that the abuses perpetrated by the encomenderos (in the collection of tribute?) contributed to the abolition of the system and its replacement by a system of provincial government. This amounts to saying that the jurisdiction over a certain territory or region passed over from the individual encomendero to the officials of the province e.g. the *alcalde mayor*. Now it is very unlikely that the *alcalde mayor* would pass his jurisdiction to the friars, since the civil and religious officials often did not see eye to eye.

But how, one will say, did the religious corporations acquire such big landed estates? One explanation we have already mentioned is that the friars lands were till the advent of commercial agriculture in the late 18th C devoted to pastures and grazing lands which have to support the many members of a religious order which have necessarily to be extensive. Add to this the fact that as in Latin America the religious orders were beneficiaries of

⁶¹ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 234.

contributions from the crown, from dowries of nuns and friars on entering convents and monasteries, and from legacies and bequests of rich spinsters and wealthy childless couples who belonged to the Third Orders of these religious corporations.

Anyhow that Isabelo de los Reyes had some misgivings about imputing total blame to the friars is evidenced when he added that in all justice to the friar superiors they cannot be aware of what the lay brothers are up to. But the fact remains that the tenants' lot was not a happy one. If by lay brothers are meant members of the Third Order, the friars will not be even guilty of command responsibility, for the friar superiors could have direct control only over religious brothers.

De los Reyes' misgivings of imputing the blame to the friars is shared perhaps grudgingly by Agoncillo himself if we read his comments on the Kalamba estate case, historically famous, because it involved the family of our national hero, Dr. Jose Rizal. Here is what Agoncillo, who cannot be accused of partiality for the friars, opines.

"In 1888, the tenants of the Kalamba estate, chafing under rising land rentals, intimidation, threats of ejection, deception in land surveys and the abuse of the lay managers of the estate, took their grievances to court, but as expected lost their case against the Dominicans who owned the whole town of Kalamba as well as the agricultural lands around it."⁶²

Many are the accusations included in this passage, none of which is documented. Be that as it may, one may underscore the admission that the abuses were committed by the lay managers who may have been the ones also guilty of intimidation, threat of ejection, etc., mentioned by Agoncillo, especially if we remember similar maneuverings by the 'inquilinos' at the turn of the century as recorded by Zuñiga.

But why should Rizal be so much against the friars if he had no personal grievance against them? One reason is that he had

⁶² Agoncillo, T., *op. cit.*, p. 124.

at one time in his life become a Mason. The following excerpts regarding Freemasonry in the Encyclopedia Britannica are well worth mulling over. 1) 'Though often mistaken for such, Freemasonry is not a Christian institution!' 2) In practice, some lodges have been charged with prejudice against Jews, Catholics and non-whites' 3) 'Some authorities believe that the growth of the Freemasonry movement was influenced by Druze rituals'. 4) What is more to our purpose is the fact that "Generally, in Latin countries, Freemasonry has attracted free thinkers and anti-clericals."⁶³ No wonder Rizal, while still a Mason, was anti-clerical. We said, while still a Mason, because there is reason to believe that Rizal retracted from Masonry before his death.

But to go back to the response of the colonial government to the national revolution. This may perhaps be best appreciated against the background of the main events that occurred during that period.

26th. August 1896. Bonifacio raises the cry of revolt at Pugad-Lawin.

31st. October 1896. Aguinaldo's manifesto and call to arms.

9th. November 1896. Ricarte repulses the forces of General Blanco at Noveleta.

11th November 1896. Aguinaldo recaptures the powder magazine at Binacayan.

(As a result of these two victories, the two local councils *Magdalo* and *Magdiwang*, constitute themselves provincial ones.)

30th. December 1896. Rizal is condemned and shot to death at Bagumbayan. The revolution spreads.

17th. February 1897. Brilliant defense along Zapote River led by Edilberto Evangelista, an engineer, against a big army of General Polavieja.

13th. March 1897. Meeting at Tejeros to elect a central government to take charge of the direction of the Revolution. Bonifacio refuses to recognize the results of the Tejeros assembly.

⁶³ Encyclopedia Britannica, Article on *Freemasonry*.

- 15th. April 1897. Camilo de Polavieja resigns as Governor-General and is replaced by Fernando Primo de Rivera.
- 6th. May 1897. Bonifacio is found guilty and sentenced to death by a court-martial. Aguinaldo commutes sentence to solitary confinement for an indefinite period. Aguinaldo withdraws pardon under pressure of his principal officers and on the 10th of May 1897, Bonifacio and his brother are executed.
- 17th. May 1897. Primo de Rivera recaptures Cavite forcing Aguinaldo and his men to retreat to Batangas.
- 10th of June 1897. Aguinaldo slips through the Spanish cordon and passing through Morong, Malapad na Bato, San Juan del Monte and Montalban proceeds to Biak-na-Bato, where he establishes his headquarters.
- 18th. November 1897. First document of the Truce of Biak-na-Bato signed by Pedro A. Paterno as representative of the revolutionists and by Primo de Rivera for the Spanish government.
- 14th. December 1897. Second document 'the Programme' signed.
- 15th. December 1897. Third and last document providing for (1) Aguinaldo and his companions going into voluntary exile (2) Primo de Rivera would pay ₱800,000 to rebels on three installments (3) Additional sum of ₱900,000 to families of non-combatant Filipinos who had suffered during armed conflict.
- Both parties seemed to have acted in bad faith. Primo de Rivera wanted the revolutionary leaders out of the country, for once in a foreign land under the constant surveillance of Spanish consulates, they would have great difficulty in organizing an expedition to return to the Islands.
- Plan of revolutionary leaders was to use the money to purchase arms with which they would return to the Islands as soon as they had the opportunity.
- 10th. April 1898. Primo de Rivera is replaced by General Basilio Agustin as Governor.
- 24th. April 1898. War between the United States and Spain resulting from differences over Cuba.

- 1st. May 1898. Dewey entered Manila Bay and destroyed the Spanish fleet at anchor. Suggested to Aguinaldo to renew hostilities against the Spaniards
- 12th. June 1898. A revolutionary government at Kawit formally declares the independence of the Philippines from Spain.
- 13th. August 1898. American expeditionary force takes Manila after a token resistance by the Spanish garrison.
- 10th. December 1898. Spain cedes the Philippines to the United States in the treaty of Paris. The U.S. agrees to pay Spain \$20,000,000
- 20th. January 1899. The Malolos Constitution for the Philippine Republic is enacted by a constituent assembly.

Since the foregoing events are all well-known and have been amply discussed by competent historians just a few comments are necessary. Whoever was right, the split between Aguinaldo and Bonifacio was simply disastrous for the Revolutionary cause. While Bonifacio may have been justified in protesting against the 'irregular' election at Tejeros, the document he drafted at Naci definitely posed a danger to the unity required for the success of the Revolution. The killing of Bonifacio was tragic for it hastened the collapse of the insurrection in Cavite because many from Manila, Laguna and Batangas who had come to fight for that province went home in disgust.

But to come back to the response of Spain to the national revolution in the Philippines. As we have seen three governor-generals succeeded one another from the time Bonifacio raised the cry of Pugad-Lawin to the Treaty of Paris which ended the Spanish regime in the Philippines. Governor Polavieja could not contain the Filipino forces and so asked to be replaced. Primo de Rivera who had been a former governor-general succeeded him and had some successes in the field. He was however more interested in a policy of attraction and issued several decrees extending pardon to all those who would lay down their arms. Though some rebels took advantage of the decree, Aguinaldo and his men continued fighting and even proclaimed the Biyak-na-Bato Republic.

A little time after this Aguinaldo issued a proclamation wherein he listed several demands whereby he would be willing to return to the Spanish fold. Not long after the truce of Biyak-na-Bato was signed. Due to a change of administration in the home country, Primo de Rivera was replaced by Governor Basilio Agustin, to whose credit it must be said that he tried to follow Primo de Rivera's policy of pacification. This policy however came to naught because of the outbreak of the war between Spain and the United States. Admiral Dewey who had destroyed the Spanish fleet at Manila Bay induced Aguinaldo to continue the hostilities against Spain. This Aguinaldo did on the alleged statement of Dewey that the United States did not need colonies and that the independence of the Philippines would be recognized after the war. The non-fulfillment of this promise (which Dewey denied on the ground that he did not and could not make a commitment which would bind the U.S. government) was surely one of the causes of the outbreak of hostilities between the Philippines and the United States.

CHALLENGE: Independence and Freedom

RESPONSE: Education and Internal Revolution

For the few months between the proclamation of independence on June 12th 1898 and the outbreak of hostilities between the Filipino and American forces on February 4, 1899, the Philippines or at least a large part of it was free and independent. Unfortunately some abused their new-found freedom. In Cagayan Valley especially, the revolutionary troops maltreated not only Spanish prisoners but also Filipino civilians. These troops had evidently forgotten the warning of Apolinario Mabini, the foremost statesman of the First Republic, who had said:

"Many are those who talk of freedom without knowing what it means. Many believe that once they have gained freedom they may do what they please, good or bad. This is a great error. One is free to do good, never to do evil. Freedom must always be in harmony with reason and the dictates of an upright and honest conscience. The thief is not free when he steals for he allows himself to be dragged by evil desires... If instead of using freedom we abuse it, we shall not only not make progress, but we shall be in a worse state than we were before. Not only that; if we really mean to reconstruct our society on firm foundations, then we must make a

radical reform not only of our institutions, but of our own ways of thinking and acting. Our revolution must not only be external but internal".⁶⁴

Before Mabini, Rizal had advocated the same revolution of the spirit. For he had said

"If Filipinos wanted to enjoy the privileges of freedom, they had to learn how to carry its responsibilities. They had to learn how to work together, how to adopt a common plan and carry it to effect".⁶⁵ To this end Rizal had founded the LIGA FILIPINA.

The internal revolution advocated by Rizal and Mabini, the revolution of the spirit, would necessarily entail education of the mind and heart. It is to the credit of the Revolutionary leaders of the First Filipino Republic that they realized the indispensability of education as shown by their stressing that "one of the first cares of the Republic must be to provide for the education of the next generation by means of a system of public schools".⁶⁶ Two Americans, who went on an extended tour of the regions under the first Republic in 1898 reported that

"throughout the island (of Luzon) a thirst for knowledge is manifested and an extravagant respect for those who possess it. I have seen a private citizen in a town in the interior exercise a more powerful influence than all the native officials over the minds of the inhabitants, simply because he was known to have been educated in the best schools of Manila and was regarded for that reason as a superior man. The heroes of these people are not the heroes of war, but of science and invention... the American best known being Mr. Edison".⁶⁷

Education was indispensable especially as the Revolutionary leaders intended the Government of the Republic to be popular, representative, alternating and responsible, in short a government by the people. That the Filipinos were capable of self-government was the impression gotten by an American war correspondent in the Philippines in 1899 who noted that

"In the West Indies the greater number of offices and official positions were filled by Spaniards either

⁶⁴ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 243.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 231.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 244.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 244.

native-born or from the Peninsula. In the Philippines the percentage of available Spaniards for minor positions was vastly less than that shown in the West Indian colonies. The result was that while the more prominent and more profitable offices in the Philippines were filled by Spaniards, many of the minor offices were filled by Filipinos. Therefore, when the Filipino party assumed the government for those districts which the Spaniards evacuated, the Filipinos had a system of government in which the Filipinos held most of the positions already established for their purposes. It was but necessary to change its head and its name. Instead of being dominated by the agents of Alfonso XIII, por la gracia de Dios, Rey Catolico de España, the same machinery was set in motion and controlled first by the dictatorial government and then by the Philippine Revolutionary government under the Constitution proclaimed on June 23, 1898".⁶⁸

This report by a foreigner besides being a direct tribute to the Filipinos' capacity for democratic self-government must be considered an indirect tribute to those Spaniards who from way back in the 16th century allowed the natives to hold the reins of government at least on the local level and later on the town level including the post of *gobernadorcillo*. And if we remember right, it was the Synod of Manila (1582-1586), under the leadership of Domingo Salazar O.P., who suggested to the colonial government to

"authorize in the larger and more settled towns native magistrates elected by the natives themselves, who shall have charge of public peace and order and the hearing of ordinary cases".⁶⁸

It would seem then that it was not the United States but Spain that first taught us democratic self-government, if by this is meant representative government where the officials are elected by the people themselves.

To those who might object that these town councils were not really representative bodies, the observations of the Latin-American philosopher Salvador de Madariaga might prove enlightening. What he says of Latin America is even truer of the Philippines where, as was observed by the above-mentioned war corres-

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 244

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

pendent, there were fewer Spaniards than in Latin America. Madariaga says:

"When the Spanish rule in the Indies is described as centralistic, what is meant is that there were no representative institutions. But even this is true only in the light of Anglo-Saxon habits and should be carefully qualified. There were in the Indies two representative institutions: the CABILDOS and the CONSULADOS. The cabildos were to a considerable extent aristocratic bodies in that a number of the magistrates purchased their mandate from the Crown, or held them as a privilege granted to a family. But there are a number of points to bear in mind. The first is that in *every* country in those days a considerable number of so-called representative mandates were also infeudated in certain families. Even to this day, the son succeeds the father and the wife the husband in not a few British constituencies. The second point is that this patrimonial aspect which representative bodies tended to take on did not make the cabildos any less representative. Precisely because of it, the cabildos reflected better the social structure of the society they were meant to govern, a structure founded on aristocracy and ownership of land. The chief point to remember is that the cabildos, powerful as they were, almost independent in law and practically independent in fact, embodied the local spirit and were manned by local men with local roots and interests".⁷⁰

If any difference obtained between the self-government found in Latin America and that in the Philippines, that of the latter would seem to be more democratic, since that in Latin America had a patrimonial aspect whereas in the Philippines the magistrates were elected by the people themselves. But the Filipinos were not the members of a national Parliament, one might object. So what? The Parliament of England that beheaded Charles I was not elected by the people but by the rich landed gentry. That is why Belloc points out that the result of the Great Rebellion led by Oliver Cromwell was not the triumph of democracy but of an oligarchy or as this great author prefers to call it, a PLUTO-CRACY.

⁷⁰ Madariaga, Salvador de, *Self-Government of Sorts in Latin America, Yesterday and Today*, ed. by John Rothchild, Bantam Pathfinder Edition, 1978, p. 93.

1863-1898

The last 35 years of the Spanish regime in the Philippines saw the spreading of liberal ideas throughout the country. Unfortunately the colonial government's response was censorship. But repression, whether of ideas or associations, worsened matters. Indeed some Spaniards realized that as the Filipinos advanced in material prosperity and cultural maturity, the desire for social reform and political autonomy was inevitable. This was especially so because the liberal education imparted in the Universities in the Islands was productive of intellectuals who knew the rights of men and of citizens and therefore clamored for equality between Filipinos and Spaniards.

The challenge of equality was especially acute in the case of the regular and secular clergy, since the secular clergy was 'the most cultured' group among the natives even according to Governor Primo de Rivera. Unfortunately the response of the colonial government to the demand of equality was the execution of Burgos, Gomez and Zamora. The execution of these three priests probably was the cause of nationalism among the Filipinos as a whole, but certainly in the case of Dr. Jose Rizal who was to become the most outstanding leader of the Propaganda Movement.

To the challenge of the Propaganda Movement proximately for radical reforms and ultimately for the assimilation of the Philippines as a province of Spain, unfortunately the response was the non-implementation of reforms initiated in the mother country by the colonial officials, and this was due to the constant change of the officials themselves because of frequent cabinet crises in the home government.

The failure of the Propaganda Movement was, according to Agoncillo, partly due to lack of funds to support the needed publications and partly due to the petty jealousies that obtained among the propagandists. And assimilation being doomed, the only alternative was independence.

To the challenge of the Revolution initiated by Bonifacio and continued by Aguinaldo, the response of Governor Primo de Rivera was to launch a spirited campaign in the field, and at the same time to grant pardon to those rebels willing to give up their arms and surrender to the government. This approach was partly successful resulting in the Truce of Biyak-na-Bato. This truce how-

ever failed because of mutual suspicion, not to say bad faith on both sides. And also the outbreak of the Spanish-American war. The result was the resurgence of revolution and the proclamation of the first Filipino republic on June 12, 1898. The Republic however was short-lived as Spain ceded the Philippines to the United States in the Treaty of Paris on December 10, 1898. Soon hostilities broke out between the Philippines and the United States on February 4, 1899. The war continued for two more years till the capture of Aguinaldo at Palanan on March 23, 1901, resulting in the establishment of American sovereignty over the Islands.

EPILOGUE

We have finished our 'Toynbee' outline of Philippine history during the Spanish regime. The question was whether Toynbee was justified in considering the Philippines *lucky* in having a Spanish chapter in its history.

In judging the Spanish regime in the Philippines an observation of Ortega y Gasset in his famous "LA REBELION DE LAS MASAS" would be helpful. This famous philosopher of culture says:

"In them (i.e. in doctrinaires like Guizot and Royer-Collard) lingers actively the best rationalist tradition whereby a man commits himself to search for ABSOLUTES; but as different from the *anemic rationalism* of the *encyclopedists and revolutionaries* who find the absolute in metaphysical abstractions (*abstracciones bon marché*), these discover the 'historical' as the true absolute... These doctrinaires despised the 'rights of man' because these are metaphysical absolutes, abstractions and unrealities... The true rights are those which are absolutely here, because they have been appearing and consolidating themselves in history: such are the 'liberties', 'legitimacy', 'magistracy', the 'potentialities' (capacities)"⁷¹

⁷¹ Ortega y Gasset, *La Rebelión de las Masas*, Revista de Occidente, 1957, p. 22.

"Perdura en ellos activa la mejor tradición racionalista en que el hombre se compromete consigo mismo a buscar cosas absolutas; pero a diferencia del racionalismo linfático de enciclopedistas y revolucionarios que encuentran lo absoluto en abstracciones *bon marché*, descubren ellos lo histórico como el verdadero absoluto. Los doctrinarios despreciaban los 'derechos del hombre' porque son absolutos 'metafísicos', abstracciones e irrealidades. Los verdaderos derechos son los que absolutamente están ahí, porque han ido apareciendo y consolidándose en la historia: tales son las 'libertades', la 'legitimidad', la 'magistratura', las 'capacidades'".

Even if one does not agree with Ortega y Gasset's view that metaphysical, unlike historical absolutes, are mere abstractions, still his stance is right that political realities must be judged not only in reference to abstract ideas and ideals but also in the light of the concrete and particular circumstances in which they occur. Applied to our problem this means that we must judge the historical response of a civilization, a nation or a government in the light of the challenge to which it is the response. To criticize the response without knowing the challenge is like criticizing an answer without knowing the question to which it is the answer.

Take feudalism for example. If we are to believe H. C. Davis:

"the very defects of the feudal system are, however, the best proof that it was the natural and inevitable product of social evolution. A legal theory so complex, so repugnant to the best traditions both of Roman and barbarian government, could not have obtained general recognition, as part of the natural order of things, unless it had grown up by degrees, unless it had been the outcome of older usages and institutions. A form of social organization so cumbrous and so dangerous could hardly have survived for centuries unless it had solved difficulties of unusual urgency and magnitude".⁷²

In short, considered in the abstract, feudalism had many shortcomings, but taking into account the main challenge of those times, which was according to Toynbee the external challenge of the barbarian invasions and the *anarchy* consequent to these, feudalism turns out to be a good, if not the best response of Western civilization.

Take Mercantilism as another instance. Some historians idolize nationalism but at the same time deprecate mercantilism which historically considered is self-contradictory. For how can there be nationalism if there are no nations? But mercantilism was in the 17th Century (indeed up to the end of the 18th Century) only the economic counterpart of the emergent modern nation states. England, France, Spain believed that the best means to increase the power of their respective nation-states, was

⁷² Davies, H. C., *Medieval Europe*, p. 94

to increase national wealth through the exploration and colonization of new territories.

A third example would be the Spanish Inquisition, which some condemn outright without even knowing why it was established in the first place. They do not see that it was the response of the newly-united Spanish state to the challenge of the *Conversos*, those Jews who pretending to be converted to Christianity were secretly in league with the Mohammedans to undermine the recently won unity of Spain. If we are to believe Ortega y Gazzet, every historical form has two aspects: in the hour of its coming to be and in the hour of its passing away

“We may” he says “without reflecting at all condemn slavery without adverting to the marvellous advance it signified when it was invented. Because before its inception, what was simply done was to kill the conquered people. He was a great benefactor of mankind who first thought of the idea that instead of killing the prisoners it was better to conserve their lives and take advantage of their labor.”⁷³

We may not agree exactly with Ortega y Gazzet's view of slavery, but the point he wants to stress is that every human institution must be viewed from this double perspective, otherwise we do not understand the same. What has happened in the case of the Inquisition is that most historians only see its abuse, and not its use; the aspect when it is about to be gone and not the aspect when it came and naturally enough see only its “dirty back, its horror, its stupidity and its insufficiency”.

It is important therefore to know the challenge to which the response is being made. To criticize Spain for example in not adopting *laissez faire* in the 15th and 16th Century, when *laissez-faire* was the suitable response only after the Revolutions of the 18th and 19th Centuries is, we hold, a case of reading history backwards. Not to commit this error is, we believe, one of the reasons why Toynbee emphasized the challenge-response formula in interpreting historical events.

⁷³ Ortega y Gazzet, *op. cit.*, pp. 278.

“... solemos, sin mas reflexión, maldecir de la esclavitud, no advirtiendo el maravilloso adelanto que representó cuando fue inventada. Porque antes lo que se hacía era matar a todos los vencidos. Fue un genio bienhechor de la humanidad el primero que ideó, en vez de matar a los prisioneros, conservaes la vida y aprovechar su labor”.

Judged in the light of the challenges that the Spanish colonial government had to meet, its responses were in the main satisfactory, not to say the best under the circumstances. Thus we pointed out that to effect colonization with the minimum of bloodshed, the response was pacification; to link tribute with justice, the response was the *encomienda* etc. Take the case of the response of 'pacification'. This was so successful that E. B. Gaylord say:

"The work of Legaspi during the next seven years entitles him to a place among the greatest of colonial pioneers. In fact he has no rival... In the light then of impartial history raised above race prejudice and religious prepossessions, after a comparison with the early years of the Spanish conquest of America or with the early years of the Spanish conquest of America or with the first generation or two of the English settlements the *conversion* and *civilization* of the Philippines in the forty years following Legaspi's arrival must be pronounced and achievement without a parallel in history.⁷⁴

Indeed the stark contrast between the British and Spanish policies of dealing with the conquered natures has not been put better than by B. John, F.S.C., who pointed out that

"the British system in America favored the extinction of the native red Indians. 'The only good Indian is a dead Indian' they said, and acted accordingly. They gave nothing to the native but took all he had. British policy has been the same in Australia which has been built up for the white to the advantage of the natives. British policy in India has led to wars and wars in which native blood flowed because of the superior military equipment of Britain. The British attitude always was 'The colonies exist for the benefit of the Mother Country!' The French suppressed the natives, the Dutch even today in the Dutch East Indies forbade the natives to learn the Dutch language or to rise above a condition of virtual slavery. The Spanish, on the other hand, had as one of their chief objectives the conversion of the natives; the imparting to the natives of the *Christian civilization* which has been the boast of all the countries of Europe. The mildness and beneficences of Spanish colonization is best proved by the fact that in all of Spain's old colonies — Mexico, South America, the West Indies, and the Philip-

⁷⁴ E. B. Gaylord, *General Introduction* to 'The Philippine Islands, 1494-1898', BLAIR-ROBERTSON (55 vols.).

pires — the descendants of the aborigines still live and still are for the most part Catholic. The British, the Dutch and the French cannot say as much”.⁷⁵

To those who would opine that the difference in treatment was due to the two sets of American ‘natives’ upon whom the British and Spanish respectively stumbled: that whom the English Protestant exterminated being incorrigibly militant savages, whereas the subjects of the Aztecs and the Indians whom the Spanish Catholics spared, were a numerous and peaceful peasantry with a relatively high culture, Toynbee points out that French Catholics fraternized with those incorrigibly militant savages which the English Protestants killed. Toynbee concludes that the difference is due “to some *moral difference* between the two sets of colonizers rather than by social differences between the several sets of ‘Natives’ they respectively encountered”.⁷⁶

Indeed Toynbee goes further to explain the difference as ultimately due to the racial superiority attitude of the British. Thus he says:

“The race-feeling... springs naturally from the *religious* background of those Western people who are of Protestant persuasion... The race-feeling engendered by the English Protestant version of our Western culture became the determining factor in the development of race-feeling in our Western society as a whole. This has been a *misfortune for Mankind*, for the Protestant temper and attitude and conduct in regard to Race... is inspired largely by the Old Testament. Between this Protestant method of conversion by extermination and the methods of the Jesuit missionaries in Canada and Paraguay there is indeed a great gulf fixed”.⁷⁷

Of course the implementation was imperfect. But implementation always falls short of the aims of the policy makers. And in the case of the Philippines this was due among other things to the distance between the colony and the mother country such that reforms initiated in Spain could be communicated to the Islands only after months to say the least. Remember e.g. that Spain and England were already at war in Europe and yet the colonial government did not know about it till the British forces were

⁷⁵ B. John, F.S.C., as quoted by Jesus M. CAVANNA Y MANSO, C.M., *Rizal and the Philippines of his Days*, Manila, 1957, p. 52.

⁷⁶ Toynbee, Arnold, *A Study of History*, London 1954, Vol. I., p. 212.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 211 and 214.

already attacking the outskirts of Manila. Credit must however be given to Spain for wanting justice done, for trying to right a wrong, however belatedly. Remember Saavedra carrying Cortes' letter of apology for the rude conduct of Magellan's men towards the Cebuanos. What a case of *noblesse oblige* considering that Spain was A, if not THE, superpower of those times.

But back to Toynbee. His criterion for judging the Philippines to be lucky in having a Spanish chapter in its history is that Spain was representative of elements complementary to those of the United States in Western Christian civilization. So the fundamental question one must ask is: What elements of this civilization did Spain contribute to the Islands? No doubt Christianity was one of these. A columnist in a daily paper once asked: Why should we be grateful to Spain for having brought us Christianity? Christianity made us a single nation. 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 people of different races. And this is most evident in the Philippines where prior to the coming of the Spaniards, even according to our anti-Hispanist historians, the country was fragmented by intense tribal rivalries.

For another, it was the missionaries basing themselves on the Christian principle of the fundamental equality of all men because all are made to the image of God, who effected, as we have seen, the abolition of slavery in the Islands. In this connection I am surprised that while Lincoln is hailed in history as the Great Emancipator because he set free the slaves in the 1860's, nobody gives that epithet to Philip II although the latter decreed the freeing of all slaves in the Philippines in the 1590's. This brings to mind the following observation of Gilbert K. Chesterton:

"Many have given long histories of the laborious slowness with which the idea of justice to the aborigines, to Red Indians or such races, has advanced step by step with the progress of modern humanitarian ideas. In such a history Penn, the great Quaker, appears like a primeval founder and father of the republic; and he was undoubtedly very early in the field — in the Puritan field. But Las Casas, the Apostle of the Indians, actually sailed in a ship with Christopher Columbus. It would be difficult to be earlier than that in the American field. He spent

his life pleading for the rights of the savages; but he did it at a time when nobody in the north would listen to such a story about a saint of Spain. In this and many other examples, I believe that the real history of the Catholic pioneer has been the same: to be FIRST and to be FORGOTTEN".⁷⁸

We can indeed, as Chesterton says, multiply examples. There is Vitoria antedating Grotius in the field of international law; Vives (not to say Roger Bacon) antedating Francis Bacon in the field of science, etc.

Our outline also stressed the fact that Spain, even from the mere fact of building many towns throughout Luzon and the Visayas, contributed to the growth, not to say, the rise of civilization. True enough that Muslim civilization also obtained here but it was confined to Maguindanao and Sulu and in isolated trading posts like Manila in Luzon and Cebu in the Visayas. And Muslim regimes in these places were up to the 18th century feudal in character. In contrast we have shown that Spain right from the beginning of her colonization transformed us from a feudal society to a modern nation, modern from the economic as well as the political point of view.

What other element of Western civilization did Spain contribute to the Philippines? The civilization of Western Europe is admitted by all to be the offspring of Graeco-Roman civilization. And what did Graeco-Roman civilization contribute to mankind? This is summarized in the crisp phrase: "Greek Philosophy and Roman Law". Incidentally for those who have high praise for Western civilization but at the same time have a tendency to downgrade its religious character, this statement of Toynbee might come as a surprise:

"Western civilization was born out of the chrysalis of the Christian Church, itself a creative work of the Roman proletariat".⁷⁹

(Toynbee is of course prescinding here from the supernatural character of Christianity).

⁷⁸ Chesterton Gilbert K., *The Thing*, Unicorn Books, 1939, *The Early Bird in History*, p. 94.

⁷⁹ Toynbee, Arnold, as paraphrased by William H. Dray, *Philosophy of History*, p. 88.

Anyhow our main interest is on how Spain transmitted Greek philosophy to us. Mainly through her system of education. The latter is described in some detail by de la Costa thus:

"The course of studies in the two Universities (Dominican and Jesuit) followed the European pattern. The young boy, having learned his first letters studied 'grammar' that is, Latin grammar and the Latin classics, with a smattering of Greek. Through the study of the standard classical texts (Virgil, Horace, Cicero, Homer, Demosthenes) he learned much of what is today distributed among many courses: literature, history, government, economics, sociology, even good manners, 'Grammar' then, sometimes called the 'humanities' correspond to our high school and the first two years of college. The next stage was 'arts' also called 'philosophy' because that was what it was: the study of Philosophy with Aristotle and St. Thomas as the principal texts. It should be noted, however, that *philosophy then included the natural sciences* and mathematics. At the end of the course, which corresponds to the last two years of our college, the student was graduated a Bachelor of Arts. Candidates for the priesthood however went on to study theology (divinity in countries of English speech), while future lawyers took up both civil and canon law".⁸⁰

Notice from the foregoing some salient characteristics of this Spanish, nay Europe education. (1) the study is done through reading the great books or classics. (2) the approach is interdisciplinary. From one and the same text one learned literature, history, government etc. Regarding the first, Robert M. Hutchins points out that

"until lately the West has regarded it as self-evident that the road to education lay through great books. No man was educated unless he was acquainted with the masterpieces of that tradition... The Editors (i.e. of the Great Books) do not believe that any of the social and political changes that have taken place in the last 50 years, or any that now seems imminent, have invalidated or can invalidate the tradition or make it irrelevant for modern men. On the contrary, they are convinced that the West needs to recapture and reemphasize and bring to bear upon its present problems the wisdom that lies in

⁸⁰ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 85.

the works of its greatest thinkers and in the discussions that they have carried on".⁸¹

As to the interdisciplinary approach that leads to a synthetic view of life and the world, all leading colleges and universities in the world are recovering this at present. Or at the least they are emphasizing the cultural as well as scientific subject in their curriculum. Admiral Rickover e.g. in recruiting men for his atomic submarine preferred those who had taken such out-of-the-way subjects like Sanskrit or Greek to the men who had limited themselves to purely engineering subjects. Perhaps it was he who opined that 'an engineer who is *only* an engineer is *not* a good engineer'.

We have always been impressed by the fact that when a foreigner leaves our shores, we do not say to him: "Remember that we were once a part of the Shri-Vishaya or the Madjapahit empires", but we do say: "Remember us as the only Christian nation in the Far East and the showcase of Democracy in Asia". To me this amounts to Filipinos considering as their most precious heritage from the past, Christianity and Democracy.

Christianity we undoubtedly owe to Spain. How about Democracy? Since democracy, like liberty, has had a career of shifting meanings, it is all-important to know what meaning is being attached to the term 'democracy' when used by any writer. Etymologically, democracy is the 'rule of the people'. But different meanings have been attached to the phrase 'the people'. Thus in Greek democracy, the slaves were not included as part of the people. But all *free* (liber) men participated in the administration. That is why Aristotle says: 'the basis of a democratic state is liberty... and one principle of liberty is for all (i.e. citizens) to rule and to be ruled in turn, ... and every citizen... must have equality... and since democracy is the rule of the many... and the many are poor... in a *democracy*, the poor have more power than the rich...'."82

However especially in modern times, the notion of democracy as the rule of the people has been "associated with the doctrine of popular sovereignty which makes the political com-

⁸¹ Hutchins Robert M., *Great Books of the Western World*, Vol. I. *The Great Conversation*. Preface, XI.

⁸² Aristotle, *Politics*, Book IV, ch. 4. 16-17.

munity as such the basis and origin of political authority".⁸³ Did Spain in the 16th and 17th century believe in popular sovereignty? This is most probable because the most prominent theologian of the time, Francisco Suarez, (1548-1617) a younger contemporary of Philip II (1527-1598), taught that earthly power is properly held by the body of men. His teaching was so opposed to the divine right of kings that James I of England (who first formulated explicitly the doctrine of the divine right) was so enraged that he had Suarez' *DE DEFENSIONE FIDEI* burnt by the hangman. This political doctrine, based on the Catholic doctrine of the equality before God of all men, is a basis of subsequent Catholic teachings on democracy. Of course, as we have already shown, St. Thomas even before Suarez had already explicitly held the doctrine of popular sovereignty. That it was not Philip II of Spain but James I of England who opposed Suarez's doctrine on popular sovereignty is very revealing as to which states believed in democracy and which not.

In the development of the democratic tradition especially in modern times, this has been accompanied by "the elaboration of safeguards for the rights of man to assure that government actually functions for the people and not merely for one group of men".⁸⁴ Did the Hapsburg monarchs of Spain believe in the rights of man? The prominence they gave to *THE LAW OF THE INDIES* is sufficient evidence that they believed in the rights of the indios, of the conquered peoples. As to their belief in equality this is evident from their opposition to slavery.

In this connection it is interesting to read in Vol. II of the Great Books series in Chapter 16, the following:

"The republicans of the 18th century, in their doctrine of popular sovereignty and equal rights, understood citizenship in terms of equality of status and conceived liberty in terms of a man's having a voice in his own government... But generally neither the ancients nor the 18th century republicans understood *liberty and equality for ALL men* to require the abolition of slavery...".⁸⁵

⁸³ *Great Books of the Western World*, Vol. 2, *The Great Ideas. A Synoptic*, p. 303.

⁸⁴ *Great Books of the Western World*, Vol. 2, p. 303.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 305.

Shall we say then that Philip II, who issued a royal decree abolishing slavery in the Islands, was in this sense a better democrat than the 18th century republicans?

Again,

“there is one other condition of equality which the status of citizenship demands. This is equality of educational opportunity... Quantitatively, this means a system of education as universal as the franchise... Qualitatively, this (democratic education) means liberal education rather than vocational training”.⁸⁶

Now it is true that universal education on the national scale was not present in the Islands before 1862, but as we have already shown neither was it present in England or in any other European country in the world. Compulsory universal education is, we believe, a phenomenon of the 20th century. Regarding the qualitative aspect of democratic education, we have already seen that during the Spanish regime the emphasis was on liberal education rather than mere vocational training, and therefore was conducive to the fostering of the democratic attitude.

“Universal schooling by itself is not sufficient for this purpose (i.e. fostering democracy). Democracy also needs what Mills calls ‘the school of public spirit’.... By engaging in civic activities, a man (in the words of Mills is made to feel himself one of the public, and whatever is for their benefit is to be for his benefit... The moral part of the instruction afforded by the participation of the private citizen, if even rarely in public functions results in a man’s being able to weigh interests not his own; to be guided in case of conflicting claims, by another rule than his private partialities; to apply, at every turn, principles and maxims, which have for their existence, the common good”.⁸⁷

Seen in the foregoing light, the so-called forced labor during the Spanish times does not appear as bad as commonly pictured. Another name for ‘forced labor’ was ‘statute labor’ in which the natives were required by law to work 40 days a year (later reduced to 15) in enterprises involving the common good: the building of roads, bridges, the town halls, the church etc... In short, statute labor involved civic activities in which a person was made to feel himself one of the public and to realize that what

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 306.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 306.

was for the common good was also for his own private benefit. Indeed modern nations are turning in a way to statute labor; only they call it 'national service'. But whatever the name, it is calculated to foster the democratic spirit in the sense of everyone working for the common good.

The objection might be raised that statute labor was limited to the natives. The probable reason was the classification of the inhabitants of the Islands into 3 types:

(a) Those who were citizens in the strict sense and therefore directly or indirectly participated in ruling the country and therefore were by that very fact already contributing to the common good. Thus the civic officials and the religious were exempt from both tribute and statute labor because they were directly working for the public welfare either by directly administering public affairs or doing apostolic and evangelic work.

(b) The natives who helped in the administration, who were subjects but performed partially the tasks of citizenship in the Aristotelean sense of participating in public affairs (*gobernadorcillos*, *cabezas de baranggay* etc.), were also exempt from statute labor.

(c) the natives who were subjects but not citizens (even partially) were the ones required to perform statute labor as their contribution to the common good. Even they could be exempt however on the payment of a fee, since this meant revenue which helped the government perform its functions.

That there may have been Spaniards who did not contribute to the common good goes without saying. But the presupposition of statute labor was that ALL Spaniards were supposed to participate in 'ruling' the country, of acting at the least (in Bishop Salazar's phrase) as the advocates, tutors and protectors of the natives.

We do not mean of course to defend the injustices to which the natives were subjected in the implementation of forced labor. But it behooves a historian that he understand the *raison d'être* of a law or institution and the circumstances under which it arose in order to be able to offer an impartial criticism of the same. The objection to statute labor that is valid is that like some other institutions during the Spanish regime it was *unduly prolonged* — continued under conditions when it was no longer applicable. And

this we have explained in certain parts of our Outline as due to the Spanish authorities changing in Toynbeeian language, from being a creative to a merely dominant minority.

Leading political scientists, ancient or modern, like Aristotle, Mills, Montesquieu, hold that "the constitution and laws should be adapted in such a manner to the people for whom they are framed".⁸⁸ It is to the credit of Spain that she did this with regard to the Philippines. This indeed is the significance of the formula "Obedezco pero no cumplo". Because of the great distance between Spain and the Philippines and the incapacity of the King or his ministers to know the applicability or inapplicability of a certain colonial legislation to existing conditions, the governor-general was given the power to suspend the implementation of any royal order if in his opinion, the conditions did not warrant its implementation in the Islands.

"In our modern minds democracy is inseparably connected with constitutional government".⁸⁹ But constitutional government is one essentially characterized by the supremacy of law. Now we have seen that the Hapsburg Spanish kings instituted as checks to a strong executive (the potential despot) the Royal Audiencia to insure the prevalence of the law, i.e. justice and the Clergy to insure the observance of the higher law of Charity. In this sense, the Spanish colonial government was democratic. That some members of the Royal Audiencia or of the Clergy failed to do their duties is no argument against the system, for we have at present representatives who instead of working for the people as they are supposed to do work for themselves and even have the audacity to say: What are we in power for? And yet we call our system one of representative government.

From the foregoing discussion it should be quite clear that both Spain and the Philippines from the 16th to the 19th century enjoyed a kind of government that had many democratic features. But how can this be, you will say, when Spain was an empire? Is there any essential incompatibility between an empire and a democracy? Not necessarily, for as the great Pericles, who praised the democracy of Athens and at the same time celebrated the might of her empire, pointed out: "It is only the Athenians, who fearless of consequences, confer their benefits not from cal-

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 303.

ulation of expediency, but in the confidence of liberality".⁹⁰ Stated otherwise, it depends on whether the colonizing country in a spirit of selfishness exploits the conquered people or shares what is best in her own civilization with the colony in a spirit of liberality. Judged by this criterion, Spain turns out to be a good, if not the best of colonizing powers.

For what did Spain under Philip II and succeeding Hapsburg monarchs consider her most precious possession? It was Christianity, the Catholic Faith, and it was this that she primarily shared with her colonies including the Philippines. That is why we affirmed that Spanish colonization was colonization in the most idealistic sense of that term.

In this connection compare Spanish with British or Dutch colonization. Did Britain share the best in her civilization, let us say, her parliamentary system of government with India? Far from it! Perhaps the best was her industrial spirit, for Britain was the first to undergo the Industrial Revolution. Did Britain foster the industries of her colonies? Again, far from it. Nehru complains that

they (i.e. the British) tried to make India a purely agricultural country producing raw materials for her industries. To prevent factories growing up in India, they actually put a duty on machinery entering India. Having got on top (i.e. in industry), they could afford to talk of laissez-faire. As a matter of fact, they were not merely indifferent. They actually discouraged certain industries, especially the cotton industry of Bombay and Ahmedabad. Almost every country puts duties on some foreign goods, either to protect its own industries or raise money. But the British in India did a very unusual and remarkable thing. They put the duty on Indian goods themselves. This cotton excise duty was continued in spite of great agitation till recent years. . . . In this way, modern industry grew slowly in India, despite the government. The richer classes in India cried out more and more for industrial development. It was only as late, I think, as 1905 that the government created a Department of Commerce, but even so, little was done by it till the World War came".⁹¹

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 310.

⁹¹ Nehru, Jawaharlal, *Glimpses of World History*, The John Day Co., New York, 1939, p. 432.

Some of our historians complain that Spain continued with her mercantilistic policies other European countries had already turned to laissez-faire. If one aspect of Mercantilism was that the colonies should supply the mother country with raw materials and not compete in manufacture, it is clear from Nehru's complaint that Britain continued her mercantilistic policy in India well into the beginnings of the twentieth century. Again did Spain exploit the natural resources of the Philippines like the Dutch in Indonesia for her own benefit? One cannot claim this and at the same time claim that agriculture and other industries (up to the time of Governor Basco) were neglected by the Spaniards in favor of the overseas commerce with Acapulco.

It might be commented that colonization as such whether Spanish, French, Portuguese, Dutch or English is undesirable and the fact that Spanish colonization was better than that of the Dutch or English only makes it the lesser of two evils. But this is debatable to say the least. A colonization which changes a country from the primitive, savage or barbaric state to one of civilization is surely desirable and the participation in a higher state of civilization likewise, with the added proviso of course that immoral means are not used to effect the same. We should therefore be grateful to Spain if for nothing else than changing our feudal society into a modern nation, in incorporating us into the mainstream of Western European civilization, which whether a historian likes to admit it or not, is the basis of modern *world* civilization.

World civilization is unthinkable without prolonged contact between the Eastern and Western parts of the world, and this was effected through the great explorations and discoveries of the 15th and 16th centuries and the colonizations that followed thereafter. As Ortega y Gazzet puts it:

"in the time of Miltiades, the Mediterranean world ignored the existence of the world of the Far East.... but since the 16th century humanity has entered into a gigantic process of unification that in our days has reached its insuperable limit. Now no sector of humanity lives apart... there are no islands of humanity".⁹²

Indeed it was Magellan's little ship *Victoria* that first circumnavigated the globe thus making possible future interactions be-

⁹² Ortega y Gazzet, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

tween East and West and laying the foundations for the formation of 'one world'.

I really cannot understand then why some of our historians are allergic to considering Magellan as the discoverer of the Philippines, especially as he was the one responsible for the Philippines entering the stage of world history. If they mean by discovery of the Philippines the discovery of the land (i.e. the soil), then, of course, not Magellan but the aborigines of our country discovered the Philippines. If by the discovery of our country is meant the discovery of its people, the MAJOR inhabitants of the country that came to be known as the Philippines, then it cannot have been the Malays for that would amount to saying that we discovered ourselves. Unless of course we mean that the Indonesians discovered the Negrillos and the Malays in turn discovered the Indonesians. That leaves the Chinese with whom we have had presumably trade relations as far back as 982 A.D. But it is admitted by all that the Chinese came primarily for trade and commerce and not to share their culture with us. As de la Costa points out:

"The Chinese immigrant remained a STRANGER; a man who chattered with you in the market place, but otherwise spoke his own tongue, kept his own counsel and worshipped his own gods. Even to his fellow Orientals he was the inscrutable Oriental; and because inscrutable, feared a little, suspected always and occasionally massacred".⁹³

Until a document surfaces that will show that some Emperor or other intended to make the Philippines a New China, very few will be convinced that the Chinese were the discoverers of the Philippines. And even if it were true, as claimed, that a Chinese Emperor by name Yung Lo (1402-1424) tried to claim sovereignty over Luzon, it will still be an Asian or Eastern country dominating another Asian country and therefore not productive of world-civilization which as already indicated needs prolonged interaction between East and West.

From all the foregoing it is clear why most historians rightly acknowledge Magellan as the discoverer of the Philippines. If we consider the 15th and 16th centuries as the Age of the *Great*

⁹³ De la Costa, *Readings*, p. 485.

Discoveries, it is precisely because these discoveries made the West consciously cognizant of the East and vice-versa. It is because of these discoveries that East has met West and the West the East, giving the lie to Kipling's dictum that 'never the twain shall meet'.

Perhaps there is no better way of concluding this short dissertation than by quoting a Latin American writer who says:

"The Roman and Spanish empires probably were the only two that truly *acted as civilizing forces*. That is, they were the only colonial empires that, when they were forced to withdraw, left their colonies in a situation identical with that prevailing in the mother country. When the hour of independence struck for Spanish America, the colonies were not very different from Spain; their social structure and administration were identical with those in the Peninsula...".⁹⁴

We should not wonder at this considering that ASSIMILATION was the dream of the Hapsburg monarchs of Spain. They wanted to make of their colonies New Spains. Although the Philippines like the Latin American countries did not become provinces of Spain (Assimilation as understood by the Propagandists), we may say that there was cultural assimilation. To those who would doubt this, all that we need to remember is that the Philippines were for a long long time a dependency of Mexico and the observation of Toynbee that the Philippines are a Latin-American nation that has drifted to the Pacific.

DR. PEDRO GABRIEL
University of Sto. Tomas
Manila

⁹⁴ Alba, Victor, *Creoles and Caudillos in Latin America. Yesterday and Today*, edited by John Rothchild, p. 135.