

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Foreign Missionaries and the Politico-Cultural Orientations of the Roman Catholic Church, 1910-1970

John N. Schumacher, S.J.

Philippine Studies vol. 38, no. 2 (1990): 151–165

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

Foreign Missionaries and the Politico-Cultural Orientations of the Roman Catholic Church, 1910-70

JOHN N. SCHUMACHER, S.J.

One of the most prominent secondary aspirations of the Revolution was the Filipinization of the Church. In fact, it was from the aspiration of Filipino priests, headed by Fr. Jose Burgos, to supplant the Spanish friars in the parishes, that the nationalist movement of the nineteenth century took its rise. Though the Aglipayan schism and the entrance of American Protestant denominations shook the Church, it survived, much weakened but basically intact. The Roman Catholic church retained the nominal adherence of the immense majority of Filipinos in the twentieth century and thus remained potentially a major force in Philippine society and politics. Yet, in spite of a few partially successful attempts to actualize that potentiality, it was only during the years after Vatican II, which coincided with those of the Marcos regime, that it actually became such a force.¹

I would like to argue here that that failure of the Catholic church to exercise any significant influence on Philippine civil society over such a long period has in large part been a function of the cultural influences dominating the Church during this time. The failure to adapt her educational system to the new order, particularly in regard to the education of the clergy, put the church at a significant distance from the directions in which Filipino society was moving. The model of modernization increasingly adopted by Filipinos as the twentieth

1. The most significant effort to mobilize public opinion and affect legislation was the campaign which resulted in the passage of a bill in 1938 authorizing religious instruction in the public schools during school hours. Though the bill was passed by a large majority in the National Assembly, it was vetoed by Quezon, who promptly exerted pressure to prevent its being resubmitted to the Assembly. See John N. Schumacher, S.J., *Readings in Philippine Church History* (Quezon City: Loyola School of Theology, 1979), pp. 373-78; Martin J. Noone, S.S.C., *The Life and Times of Michael O'Doherty, Archbishop of Manila* (Manila: Historical Conservation Society, 1989), pp. 273-82.

century progressed was culturally American and English-speaking. Spain, to whose culture and language the Church so long remained attached through her missionaries, had no model of modernization, except anticlerical liberalism. Catholic Spain during the first half of the twentieth century offered only a model based on integrist traditionalism. It is not my intention to pass judgment on the spiritual effects of the Church's ministry during this time, as something not accessible to historical methodology, nor to pass judgment on the dedication of Spanish vs. American missionaries, or those of any other nationality. Rather I shall simply seek to show the effects of the dominant politico-cultural attitudes on the relationships between Church and civil society.

FIRST PHASE: WITHDRAWAL AND REDEPLOYMENT: 1903-20

Taft, as is well known, believing that otherwise there would be no peace with the elite on whom the American policy of conciliation depended, made serious efforts to get the Holy See to withdraw all friars. Though unsuccessful in the formal negotiations to obtain this goal, Taft noted, with apparent surprise, in 1904 that not only had the great majority of friars left the country, but the larger part of those who remained had withdrawn from the parishes and were retired in Manila or engaged in education. Even the Jesuits and other nonfriar Spanish priests withdrew from the Philippines in considerable numbers.²

It might then seem that the goal of the Filipinization of the Church was substantially achieved. But paradoxically, in many ways it may be said that the opposite was now taking place, or about to take place, as far as the future directions of the Church were concerned. Neither the first American bishops nor their European successors nor, least of all, their Spanish-educated Filipino colleagues made any real effort to Americanize the Philippine church.³ As to the Filipino bishops, apart from the appointment of Jorge Barlin in 1906, who died three years

2. William H. Taft, *The Church and Our Government in the Philippines* (Notre Dame, Ind., [1904]), pp. 34-36, 42. In fact, though refusing Taft a formal withdrawal of the friars, informally the Holy See agreed that no friar would be sent to a parish that was unwilling to receive him. See John N. Schumacher, S.J., "Church and State in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," in H. de la Costa, S.J. and John N. Schumacher, S.J., *Church and State: the Philippine Experience* (Manila: Loyola School of Theology, 1976), pp. 38-39.

3. Apart from the three bishops mentioned, all those appointed to Philippine dioceses before 1916 were Americans with the exception of Bishop Giuseppe Petrelli in Lipa, who was simultaneously acting as chargé d'affaires in the apostolic delegation

later, the first Filipinos were Juan Gorordo for Cebu and Pablo Singzon for the newly-created diocese of Calbayog, both in 1910. These men had been trained, of course, in Spanish times, and if we may judge from a pastoral letter issued by Gorordo in 1916, were thoroughly ill at ease with the new order of things. They looked back nostalgically to an age which had quite unrealistically become romanticized in their minds. After lamenting at length the inroads of Protestantism, Gorordo wrote:

My sorrow is increased when I consider the past glories of the Church. I have seen her once in the past illumined by the splendid sun of one single faith and under the obedience of her legitimate shepherds, marching along joyfully on the path of true civilization and of all legitimate progress. Our country was then beautiful, without stain or defect. All who visited her were enamoured of her beauty, but now she presents a sight which is even repugnant, with that variety of beliefs and diversity of customs, with that multitude of publications of every kind, with those theatres, those moviehouses, those immoral dances, and a thousand other dens of perdition which are found spread throughout the Archipelago. How can I not be pained to see my motherland so deformed?⁴

Whether or not all the bishops held a similar nostalgia for the Spanish past, they could hardly change the direction of the Church in any drastic way. Not only were practically all their existing diocesan priests Spanish-trained in language and in culture, but all the seminaries out of which the new priests would come, were directed and taught by Spaniards and in Spanish. These were the Dominicans at the University of Santo Tomas, the Jesuits at the Seminario de San Francisco Javier (later San Jose), as well as in Vigan, and for a decade in Manila, and the Vincentians, who directed those of Cebu, Jaro, Naga, and after 1913, also Manila.

The seminaries then were the second and the most crucial point at which the Hispanic character of the Philippine church was maintained. In all of these seminaries, apart from Latin, Spanish was the ordinary language, not only of instruction but also of normal conversation in the house and at recreation. Though English was taught in the curriculum, it would appear that little attention was given to it and there was generally little concern shown to learn English well. At least that

and later apostolic delegate. The apostolic prefect of largely non-Christian Palawan was a Spanish Recoleta friar from its creation in 1910. See Miguel A. Bernad, S.J., *The Christianization of the Philippines* (Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild, 1972), pp. 361-63; 1989 *Catholic Directory of the Philippines* (Manila: Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines, 1989), pp. 1077-1124.

4. Juan Bautista Gorordo, *Séptima carta pastoral* [Cebu, 1916], p. 10.

is the conclusion which may be drawn from the report made to Rome by an American Jesuit in 1908. Having lamented the superficial attention given to English at the Ateneo de Manila and the disfavor with which Jesuit authorities looked on the language, he continued:

In the Seminary of St. Xavier [San Francisco Javier], the central seminary of the Islands, almost the same conditions prevail as in the Ateneo. Spanish is the medium of instruction; English is an accessory, and is taught with about the same result as in the Ateneo. The Seminarians are forbidden (for the sake of better discipline) the use of any but the Spanish tongue in their recreation, and applicants for admission are not as a rule accepted unless they be proficient in Spanish, no matter what their moral standing or intellectual attainments may be.

All this is not in accord with the wishes of the Archbishop [Jeremiah J. Harty], for whom the seminary is conducted and who expresses his opinion as plainly as his dependence upon our Spanish Fathers will allow. It is contrary, too, to the evident needs of the seminarians. They should be equipped to cope with the situation as they will find it at the time of their ordination to the priesthood and later. At that time the whole of the younger generation will know English, which even now is in more common use than Spanish. The young priest will meet with American methods of attack upon the Church and might well be schooled in American methods of defense.⁵

This disdain for English in the Jesuit seminary is the more notable from the fact that, unlike the Vincentians and Dominicans, whose personnel were predominantly if not exclusively composed of Spaniards, the Jesuits had a number of priests whose first language was English, as well as several Spaniards who had lived in the U.S. for a number of years and were fluent in English.

Ten years later Irish Archbishop Michael O'Doherty would list in his diary the major difficulties facing the Church:

The people look to America and the English language, yet with the exception of Assumption, St. Scholastica's, La Salle, and St. Theresa's, Catholic education is proudly entrenched behind the bulwark of the Spanish language. . . . The University of the Philippines has 4,000 students and ancient Santo Tomas has only 600. I asked the Rector 'Prelado' to make English the medium of instruction. Answer: This is a Spanish university and such a change would be unpatriotic!⁶

5. James P. Monaghan, S.J., "Memorandum on the Religious Situation in the Philippines," Archives of the Philippine Province of the Society of Jesus (APPSJ), II-3-S/27/1908.

6. Quoted by Noone, *O'Doherty*, p. 111. It may be noted that Assumption was run by French Religious of the Assumption, St. Scholastica by German Missionary Benedictine Sisters, and St. Theresa's by Belgian Missionary Canonesses of St. Augustine. Only the Christian Brothers running De La Salle were predominantly American.

All the available evidence points to the same reasoning having prevailed among the other Catholic institutions, colleges or seminaries.

The seminaries were also important for another reason. In the normal course of things it would be the theologians and canon lawyers of the seminaries whom the bishops would call on for advice in many ecclesiastical matters. Hence Spanish pastoral methods and Spanish views on the proper directions for the Church would continue to prevail even against the instincts of American bishops. This is quite clear in the case of Archbishop O'Doherty, though he was Irish rather than American. Despite his convictions that American ways were what was needed in the Philippine church and desired by Filipinos, he often felt himself constrained to follow his Spanish advisers.⁷

Other religious congregations had been brought from northern Europe between 1905 and 1908—the Irish Redemptorists, Dutch and Belgian Scheut Fathers (CICM), the German Divine Word Missionaries (SVD), and the Dutch Missionaries of the Sacred Heart (MSC) and Mill Hill Missionaries (MHM). The CICMs and SVDs devoted themselves primarily to the non-Christian peoples of the Cordillera and of Abra, while the Sacred Heart and the Mill Hill Missionaries worked in the priestless, though Christian, provinces of Surigao and Antique respectively. They were thus largely isolated from Filipino priests, who scarcely existed in their territories. Though they laid the foundations for the Catholic future in these regions, they had little influence on the direction of the Philippine church as a whole, except for the few from each congregation who held one or other parishes in Manila. Though generally they knew or made efforts to acquire English, they were also faced with the problem, not only of learning the vernacular languages of their regions, but also of learning Spanish, in which most ecclesiastical documents were published, and through which they had to communicate with the other priests with whom they worked.⁸

One may say then, that with the exception of the few Manila schools mentioned by Archbishop O'Doherty in the passage quoted, the institutional church in 1920 remained essentially Spanish in language, culture, and outlook—its hierarchy, clergy, principal religious orders, and the larger part of its educational system. On the parish level, of course, the priests spoke the local vernacular to their flocks, at least to the extent that they had any personal contact with them in parishes of enormous size. But on the national level, and even on the

7. Ibid., pp. 147–48, 161, etc.

8. Schumacher, *Readings*, pp. 341–42, 402.

municipal level, the clergy and their institutions could hope to exercise little influence.

Moreover, even in the parishes, the young people who had been educated in the English-language public schools and used the language fluently, could have little respect for the Filipino clergy, who seemed largely irrelevant figures from the traditional past. Even catechetical instruction in the public schools, which enrolled the immense majority of Filipinos, was largely nonexistent, due to the inability of the Filipino priests to speak English. A sympathetic American priest expressed their plight as late as 1924:

The Public Schools are to be found everywhere . . . If a certain number of parents of the school children sign a petition, permission will be granted to the priest to come to the Public School and teach Religion for two periods a week. Since the native priests cannot teach in English (this being a requisite) few priests, very few, enter the Public Schools for the above purpose. The consequence is that these children are growing up real pagans. . . All of them, both young and old, have very little respect for their native priests, and the reason is that, as they say, their priests are not well educated, and do not speak English.⁹

To perceive the full significance of this situation in the Church, one must compare the results of over two decades of English-language teaching in the public schools. Apart from the surely significant, though not statistically measurable, Americanizing atmosphere which had been created by these institutions, we have statistics on the percentage of Filipinos who took the civil-service examinations in Spanish or in English. In 1901 only two Filipinos took the examinations in English, as against 1,078 in Spanish. The number of English examinees exceeded those in Spanish as early as 1906, and by 1913 there were 6,901 applying to be examined in English as against a mere 769 in Spanish. Spanish was clearly dying out among the younger generation.¹⁰

Given the potential upward social and economic mobility which the civil service then still represented in Philippine society, not only representing the growing middle class but often offering access, especially through politics, to higher levels of society, it is clear that the Church was no longer in significant contact with a large part of

9. APPSJ, V-20-Ap/6/1924, John J. Monahan, S.J., to Father Provincial [Lawrence J. Kelly, S.J.], 6 April 1924.

10. Statistics from Onofre D. Corpuz, *The Bureaucracy in the Philippines* ([Manila]: Institute of Public Administration, University of the Philippines, 1957), p. 182. The disparity between Spanish and English continued to grow at an accelerating rate in succeeding years.

the influentials in Philippine society, from school teachers to high school and college graduates, to the innovating sectors of business, to the new politicians.

SECOND PHASE: AMERICANIZATION OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

The decade of the 1920s was to see several significant changes within the Church, especially as far as its schools were concerned.

One of these was the final adoption of English as the language of instruction in Catholic schools. With the replacement of Spanish by English, first in the Ateneo de Manila before 1921, and finally in the last bastion of *Hispanidad* at the University of Santo Tomas in 1923, the process was complete, as far as language was concerned.¹¹ The fact that higher education under Catholic auspices was now possible in English was at least a first step toward the integration of the Church into Philippine society.

A fact of even wider significance, inasmuch as it involved not only the language of instruction but also the model of education, was the coming of American Jesuits in 1921 to replace the Spanish Jesuits at the Ateneo de Manila. Though its immediate effect was on the Ateneo, where the educational process was quickly revamped on the model of American Jesuit schools, apparently with the enthusiastic approval of both students and parents and in accord with the general aspirations of Filipinos of that day, there were further long-range effects on the Church as a whole.¹²

New styles in education were accompanied by new styles in popular religiosity, an area of even more far-reaching consequences. Nick Joaquin has caught the flavor of the change in his description of San Ignacio Church in Intramuros, closely connected with the adjacent Ateneo.

San Ignacio in Intramuros before the war was the "modern" church for Manileños. You minded your religious manners there where no one walked

11. Though English had had a place in the Ateneo de Manila from early in the century, even if with the obstacles mentioned in n. 5 above, it can only with certainty be said to have become the general medium of instruction with the American Jesuits in 1921. It does seem to have been adopted some time before that, but the Ateneo Archives give no clear evidence on the point. For the University of Santo Tomas, see Fidel Villaruel, O.P., *Contribución de la Universidad de Santo Tomás al Desarrollo de la Literatura Hispano filipina* (Manila: Universidad de Santo Tomás 1974), p. 12.

12. James J. Meany, S.J., "Ateneo," *Philippine Studies* 4 (1956): 160-63; Jose S. Arcilla, S.J., "Ateneo de Manila: Problems and Policies, 1859-1939," *Philippine Studies* 32 (1984): 394-98.

on their knees or prayed aloud with arms outstretched. It was a church of no processions, no miraculous ikons, no pilgrim crowds. The worship was, you might say, in American—a thrilling novelty in the 1920s, when Filipinos were just beginning to pray the *Our Father* instead of the *Padre Nuestro*, to confess in English, and to prefer the American-Jesuit style in sermons. No florid religiosities; just plain man-to-man talk: “muscular Christianity.” . . .¹³

In the 1920s this was elite popular religiosity, corresponding to the tastes of the American-educated, whether at Ateneo or La Salle, or other English-speaking institutions of learning. It did not then prevail in the majority of churches, but it would increasingly become the devotional style of the parishes by the 1950s, corresponding to the spread of the educational model with which it was first associated.

These changes of the 1920s, however, immediately affected only the Catholic schools for lay women and men. The education of the Filipino clergy, on the contrary, continued in the same directions as before, thus further widening the gap not only with the wider society, but between the clergy and the laity within the Church itself. There were only a few exceptions and these were not in the most important institutions. When in 1925 the German and American SVDs took over the Vigan seminary from the Jesuits, they continued as the language of instruction the English which had been introduced shortly before by the American Jesuits. They were the only seminary to do so.

For, in spite of the presence of American Jesuits at the Ateneo, the independent Jesuit seminary of San Jose, as well as the closely related Jesuit novitiate, continued to be Spanish in language and discipline. A number of American Jesuits of the Ateneo, after a few years of experience, wrote strong letters to the American provincial in New York, insisting on the impossibility of Filipino boys educated at the American-run Ateneo becoming novices in the Spanish-run novitiate. The issue was language first of all, but also the cultural baggage of Spanish piety so totally in opposition to the way of thinking of modern Filipinos.

Even allowing for a certain amount of American cultural bias, the indictment was formidable, particularly since it came from men who were to become key figures in the Society of Jesus or the hierarchy. One of the more moderate writers, extending his considerations beyond the problem of Filipino Jesuit vocations, expounded the wider problem of the cultural abyss between people and priests.

13. Nick Joaquin, *Almanac for Manileños* (Manila: Mr & Ms Publications, 1979), p. 194.

A very good young fellow, a law-school graduate, recently said to me: "Father, there is not a single seminary in the P.I. where a boy educated in public schools can enter. For they are all conducted in Spanish." And these public schools educate ninety per cent of the boys. And I might have added to him the other difficulty, of how unfit these young priests, educated in Spanish and with Spanish customs, how unfit they are to go out among the people, so large a percentage of whom are educated in the American public schools. Dr. Cesar Guerrero [later bishop of San Fernando, Pam-panga], one of the most prominent young priests in the country, . . . summed it up recently in a conversation: "We have a Hispanicized clergy in an Americanized country." It would be the height of folly, of course, to throw off all of these Spanish customs, many of which are so deeply inbred in the life of the people. But on the other hand, must we not make some concession to the widespread Americanization?¹⁴

Only in 1932 were the two institutions placed under American rectors and English made the dominant language. The effect was soon to be seen. In the Jesuit novitiate where there had been few novices and almost no Ateneo de Manila graduates for many years, almost immediately a considerable number of Ateneo graduates entered. The total number entering was to reach nineteen by 1941, with a steadily increasing proportion of Ateneans.¹⁵ It was obvious that the Spanish language, and even more, Spanish cultural ideas on religious life were totally unacceptable to young men from the public schools, as well as the American-style Catholic schools. The only other religious congregations to admit more than an occasional Filipino to the priesthood during the 1930s were the SVDs and the MSCs, both in English-language seminaries.¹⁶

Though there is no clear date when the diocesan major seminaries run by the Dominicans and Vincentians adopted English as their effective medium of communication, it became generalized by the 1950s, though some lagged behind others. Several factors brought this about. An early one was the fact that once the Catholic schools were

14. APPSJ, III-35, letter of George J. Willmann, S.J., to Father Provincial [Lawrence J. Kelly, S.J.], 11 April 1925.

15. John N. Schumacher, S.J., "Early Filipino Jesuits, 1593-1930," *Philippine Studies* 29 (1981): 303-4. For the factors which delayed any change in the Hispanic orientation of San Jose Seminary and the Jesuit novitiate until 1932, see *ibid.*, pp. 298-302.

16. For the SVDs, see "Why Did We Not Do This Much Earlier!," trans. and ed. Frederick Scharpf, S.V.D., *Ilocos Review* 7-8 (1975-76): 80-83. The MSCs sent their candidates to San Jose Seminary and then to the Netherlands for novitiate. See Generoso T. Sabio, M.S.C., "The Mission Work of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart (MSC) in Surigao from 1908 until 1939," M.A. thesis, Loyola School of Theology, Ateneo de Manila University, 1980, pp. 187-89.

all conducted in English, it was inevitable that few of the boys entering the seminary would have any command of Spanish.¹⁷ Moreover, during the 1940s and 1950s a number of the bishops founded new minor seminaries under the direction of Filipino diocesan priests, in which English was the language used. Though a few major seminaries enforced the prior learning of Spanish for some years, it was soon seen as impractical, if nothing else. A further factor was the move in the 1950s to obtain government recognition for the seminary courses, a decision which necessarily entailed the use of English for instruction. Finally, there was the terrible massacre of so many Spanish religious by the Japanese in 1945. The Vincentians, who lost eighteen men to Japanese brutality, in addition to some less violent deaths (over one-fourth of their personnel) were all but decided to turn their seminaries over to American or Australian Vincentians, but the Filipino bishops indicated their desire that the Spaniards should stay on. The Filipino Vincentian historians of their congregation, Fathers de la Goza and Cavanna, have seen this as a mistake. In spite of efforts to actively stimulate Filipino vocations for the congregation and to send young Spanish missionaries to the U.S. for their studies, by the time that the congregation was Filipinized in the mid-1970s, the Vincentians had had to leave all their seminaries, with the partial exception of Cebu, handing them over to the diocesan clergy.¹⁸

Though with the adoption of English in the seminaries the direction of the future education of priests was established, this did not mean that the whole institutional structure of the Church had correspondingly changed. Older priests, and most especially the bishops, still maintained to a greater or less extent not only the Spanish language as their preferred medium, but a Hispanic cultural outlook as well. The minor, but significant signs of change were very gradual in coming. When the moribund Catholic newspaper *La Defensa* failed in 1935, it was replaced by an English-language newspaper, the *Philippines Commonweal*. But in publications for the clergy, Spanish continued to be dominant, or even exclusive. It was only in 1950 that the *Catholic Directory of the Philippines* finally appeared in English. As late as 1961, the *Boletín Eclesiástico de Filipinas*, the official publication for the clergy, was still publishing sermon outlines as well as the news section in Spanish. Other official documents appeared either in

17. I have been told by Filipino diocesan priests who began their seminary studies in that period that they had to take a year or two to learn Spanish before they could begin their actual seminary studies.

18. Rolando de la Goza, C.M., and Jesus Ma. Cavanna, C.M., *Vincentians in the Philippines, 1862-1962* (Manila, 1985), pp. 373-403.

Spanish or in English, depending on the bishop by whom they were issued.

But perhaps the most flagrant failure to recognize the changing times occurred during the Marian Year of 1954, when Pius XII addressed hundreds of thousands of Filipinos assembled in the Luneta for the closing rites. When the Pope began to speak, however, the sigh of disappointment that rose from the crowd was clearly audible. Although the Pope was fluent in English as well as Spanish, he delivered his address in Spanish, a language dear to the Bishops and church officials who had drafted it for him, but largely unintelligible to the Filipino Catholic people.¹⁹

And yet the image of the Philippines as a Spanish-speaking country took much longer to erase in the Vatican. Again in 1956, when the Pope addressed the National Eucharistic Congress, though he gave the first half of his speech in English, the last half was in Spanish. Moreover, it was largely devoted to exhorting the Filipino people to be grateful to Spain, again clearly emanating from Hispanophile circles in the Philippine church.²⁰ As late as the 1960s papal nuncios who scarcely knew English were assigned to the Philippines. The reason, as I was told by one of them, was that in the Vatican Secretariat of State, the Philippines was then still grouped with the Hispanic-American countries.

LANGUAGE AND POLITICAL CULTURE

In the contemporary discussions over the use of English or Filipino in education, the question of language as a factor in creating an American-oriented colonial mentality is often raised. That there is some connection is obvious; the extent of it is much less clear. Obviously a fluency in English does not necessarily lead to an esteem for American democratic practices, or even for any kind of democracy, to cite only the example of the Marcoses.

The examples already adduced in this article give some evidence that not only the Spanish language was in question, but a whole cultural outlook which affected religious attitudes and practice, and indeed, political attitudes as well. As early as 1916, Quezon had

19. "Radiomensaje de Su Santidad Pío XII Escuchado en la Clausura del II Congreso Mariano," *Boletín Eclesiástico* 29 (1955): 14-17. The other principal ecclesiastical speakers all spoke in Spanish, not only the Spanish papal legate, Cardinal Fernando Quiroga y Palacios, but also Cardinal Rufino J. Santos of Manila. Only President Ramon Magsaysay spoke in English (*ibid.*, pp. 21-34).

20. "Mensaje de S.S. el Papa Pío XII al Segundo Congreso Eucarístico Nacional de Filipinas," *Boletín Eclesiástico* 31 (1957): 77-80.

acutely, if somewhat tendentiously, pointed it out. Though he himself had been totally educated in Spanish, he had set himself to learn English with considerable fluency when Resident Commissioner in Washington. In an interview with an American Protestant newspaper in 1917 he gave his views on the benefits of the American occupation and of the Protestantism it had brought with it.

With the American occupation, there came a separation of church and state, which has been one of the chief blessings following the driving out of the Spaniards. Foreign missionaries of Protestant denominations entered the country and were free to spread their broader outlook among the very people who had felt the oppression of a state church. . . .

The Protestants teach that Christian brotherhood leads to heaven. The Catholics, that brotherhood with those outside the church leads to hell. Thus the Catholic church in the Philippines is the sworn enemy of democracy.²¹

No doubt the fact that through an agreement with American Masons he had just become first Filipino Grand Master of Masonry and that he was speaking for an American Protestant audience influenced what Quezon had to say. In substance it certainly expressed what more than a few Filipinos felt.²² There can be little doubt that Spanish religious, and those Filipinos influenced by their way of thinking, summed up their rejection of the American-introduced form of government by their repudiation of separation of church and state. This rejection continued even into the 1950s, long after the Filipino people had made that form of government and its separation of church and state clearly their own by incorporating it into their constitution.

The refusal to recognize the public schools was a key element in this. Archbishop O'Doherty repeatedly lamented the attacks made on the public school system, as did the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Giuseppe Petrelli, as late as the mid-1920s, urging that, instead, efforts be made to use the law providing opportunities for at least limited religious instruction.²³ The Spanish religious congregations as the principal force striving to maintain the Spanish language in the Philippines, caused it to represent as well the religious culture identified with Spain, and even the political attitudes which Spanish Catholicism supported, denying all religious pluralism and demanding recognition that the Philippines was a "Catholic country."

21. *Manila Times*, 4 November 1917, quoting the *Christian Herald*.

22. For the agreement between the Filipino and American Masons and Quezon's election to the post of Grand Master, see Teodoro M. Kalaw, *Philippine Masonry*, trans. Frederic M. Stevens and Antonio Amechazurra (Manila, 1956), pp. 191-97.

23. Noone, *O'Doherty*, pp. 103, 147, 167.

Numerous incidents served to demonstrate this entangling of the linguistic, the cultural, the religious, and the political. When the Jesuit Father General decided in 1921 to send the Spanish Jesuits in the Philippines to India and to replace them with American Jesuits, the Spanish consul published articles in Manila asserting that "their coming to Manila was designed to destroy the Spanish language and culture in the Islands."²⁴ As late as the mid-1950s a Spanish Dominican would assert:

The Philippines remains and is still a country of an immense Catholic majority. Only that tolerant and compassionate Catholicism permits that there be heard from time to time the voice of some irrelevant Protestant when he wants this majority to be ignored and all to be treated equally. Or rather he [the Protestant] wishes that the Catholic Church should be considered as non-existent, in spite of the much boasted-about doctrine of democracy, which pretends to satisfy the desires of the people, Catholic as we see in its majority, even when out of excessive fear or for some other reason it refrains from making its rights prevail and making them be implemented by those whose duty it is . . .²⁵

It would be simplistic to see such incidents as instances of Spaniard vs. American. Rather, there was beneath it all a religious view of the world which was peculiarly Spanish, finding its roots in the long history of "Catholic Spain." An Australian Jesuit, sent to the Philippines in 1937 for a canonical visitation of the Jesuit Philippine Mission, perhaps best summed up the matter in his report to the Jesuit General when he said:

The religious of these Islands can be divided into two classes; namely, the religious of Spanish origin and all others. The latter, though they take their origin from various nations, for the most part speak English. These two classes are separated however, not only by language but by customs, traditions, culture, political views, missionary methods. . . .²⁶

In the postwar period, at least after 1950, the young Filipino clergy were less and less of the Hispanic model. This may be attributed to several factors. First of all, the fact that even those who entered the seminary for high school had come from the modern educational system at some point, whether in Catholic or public schools. Secondly, the influence of the non-Spanish religious orders and the seminaries run by them was slowly but perceptibly increasing among the

24. Ibid., p. 149.

25. F. Ortega, O.P., "El II Congreso Mariano Nacional," *Boletín Eclesiástico* 29 (1955): 61.

26. APPSJ, IV-705, Joannes Fahy, S.J., "Summarium visitationis Missionis Philippinae," 17 January 1937.

diocesan clergy. Thirdly, not to speak of other factors, was the fact that the Spanish orders themselves were sending their young men to the United States, England, and Australia to learn English. But in fact these Spanish religious educated in a different culture came to the Philippines with more than the English language.²⁷ Finally, the number of Filipinos, though still small, was growing in the old Spanish orders. Coming, as they did, from a changed postwar Filipino culture, they were gradually changing the character of the older orders themselves.

It was on the level of the bishops that change took place most slowly. Naturally, they tended to be older, to have had their seminary formation before the war in that Hispanic cultural milieu. But in a pre-Vatican II strongly hierarchical church, with bishops making policy and decisions practically on their own, such policies and decisions were often quite out of contact with the ways of thinking of the ordinary Filipino, of whatever class.

Two areas may be mentioned briefly to indicate the point—the attitude toward social action, and the church-state conflicts of the 1950s. Church social action in the 1930s was almost entirely the work of American and Filipino Jesuits and laymen working with them. In the postwar period, these were joined by other non-Spanish religious congregations and young diocesan clergy.²⁸ Though the Catholic Welfare Organization, the official agency of the bishops, did indeed issue a progressive pastoral letter on Philippine social injustices over the signature of Cebu Archbishop Gabriel Reyes, it was in effect repudiated by most of the other bishops, and never received official promulgation in the *Boletín Eclesiástico*.²⁹ The real attitude prevailing among most bishops was made clear when in 1956 they condemned the strike against the University of Santo Tomas by the Catholic-inspired Federation of Free Workers, not on the grounds of the strike demands being unjust, but because the strike was against an ecclesiastical institution and the union refused to leave the final decision to ecclesiastical authority.³⁰ Secular society and its institutions had no value in their eyes.

Without entering into the rights and wrongs of the various conflicts that erupted between the hierarchy and the government in the

27. De la Goza and Cavanna, *Vincentians*, pp. 376–77.

28. Wilfredo Fabros, *The Church and its Social Involvement in the Philippines, 1930–1972* (Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1988), pp. 17–28, 31–50.

29. *Ibid.*, pp. 50–51.

30. Fabros, pp. 66–72. It should be noted that one of the protagonists, Fr. Walter Hogan, S.J., adviser of the Federation of Free Workers, put the blame on the Papal Nuncio, Archbishop Egidio Vagnozzi. However, the bishops gave their signatures, wherever the initiative may have come from.

1950s—the Palma biography of Rizal, Teodoro Agoncillo's *Revolt of the Masses*, the Rizal law, etc.—since there were various personal, political, and ideological vested interests involved in all of them, we may see a pattern in the response of the hierarchy.³¹ Fundamentally it was for the bishops to denounce, and to expect that all loyal Catholics would back them up in putting pressure on the government to suppress the offending proposal. Though many Catholics supported their bishops out of loyalty, not all saw the issues as major problems, and not a few found themselves in a quandary as to whether the Church was opposed to Filipino nationalism. Others found the issues to be narrowly ecclesiastical. In other words, they were the bishops' issues, and had not arisen out of the concerns of the Catholic people. This somewhat oversimplifies, of course, but expresses a key point. On the other hand, when the bishops spoke out against Marcos decrees forbidding strikes in the 1970s, or when they denounced arbitrary detention and torture, or protested the stealing of elections, they were voicing the concerns of their people and received their support.

CONCLUSION

A whole new mentality was at work. Of course the sea-change in the Catholic theology of secular realities wrought in the intervening years by Vatican II, especially in its Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, had a part. But the teaching of Vatican II would have remained unheard, as it did in fact by a small minority of bishops, had not the hierarchy as a whole previously come into closer contact with their people, and come to share with them a politico-cultural outlook which was no longer Spanish or American but Filipino.

31. The contention of the hierarchy in the case of Palma's and Agoncillo's book was against the publication at government expense of patently anti-Catholic books. In the case of the Rizal law, it was the imposition by law on all students of books prohibited to Catholics, in the hierarchy's opinion. Though in present perspective one may well judge the efforts of the bishops to have been obscurantist, the motives of those behind each of these laws can equally be judged to have been in large part anti-Catholic or at least anticlerical, or inspired by a desire for political revenge.