

philippine studies

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

The Philippines and Presiden McKinley: In the Days of McKinley

Review Author: Thomas R. McHale

Philippine Studies vol. 13, no. 2 (1965): 401–404

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 30 13:30:20 2008

read and re-read this book. Now that Khrushchev has been removed, the book may be for some an historical account merely of foreign policy difficulties peculiar to a particular communist regime. This, however, seems untrue. The book reveals that there is a great deal in the communist world that is not going to make unity easier as time goes by. There are different dogmas, because that is what the combination of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao and Tito has produced. The book also helps one find answers to questions concerning the nature of world communism, and form plans and policies in one's confrontations with communism.

AUSTIN DOWD

A HANDBOOK ON PHILIPPINE LIFE

POLITICS IN THE PHILIPPINES. By Jean Grossholtz. Boston: Little, Brown, 1964. 293 pp.

Since 1946 there have been very few American works dealing with Philippine life in general. There have been some specialized studies concerning agrarian reform, communist subversion, or the struggle for independence. But aside from the four volume study prepared nearly a decade ago by the Human Relations Area File group at the University of Chicago, there has been no examination of Filipino life in its totality by an American scholar. Professor Jean Grossholtz has written a small but interesting analysis of the history, politics, social and economic life of the Philippines. A student of the Philippines might very well discover nothing startling in this small volume. In fact, he might even find a few historical inaccuracies. But then Professor Grossholtz' book was not meant for the specialist. It was designed to serve the needs of a college course in comparative government. It is part of a series that Little, Brown is bringing out under the editorship of Professors Almond, Coleman and Pye. The only serious limitation in this volume is the lack of a bibliography. The few footnotes, do serve to indicate the sources which were used.

MICHAEL P. ONORATO

THE PHILIPPINES AND PRESIDENT MCKINLEY

IN THE DAYS OF MCKINLEY. By Margaret Leech. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 686 pp.

Southeast Asian historiography, until recent decades, has been dominated by perspectives largely external to the area, and foci related to institutions, events, personages or movements in the metropolitan nations of Europe or America. Philippine history, thus conceived and written, began with their discovery by Magellan and continued in terms of their colonization by the Spanish and their take-over by the Americans after Admiral Dewey's victory in Manila Bay.

Jose Rizal's famous annotation of Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*¹ in the late nineteenth century marks the beginning of a reaction to the external frame of references for Southeast Asian history. Several decades later, the writings of van Leur² and Schrieke³ on Indonesia continued what Rizal had started by "internalizing" both the scope and the treatment of events in their historical writings on Southeast Asia. In more recent years the reaction has gone so far that some writers seek to produce the area's "history" in a highly localized vacuum. The result is pseudo-history which ignores significant external facts which have been relevant, and frequently critical to internal developments in Southeast Asia.

This prologue to Margaret Leech's biography of McKinley seems appropriate because Philippine history at the turn of the century was largely the product of two distinct sets of forces. The first was the domestic developments involving people and events in the Philippines. The second involved internal developments in the American polity and society during the presidency of William McKinley which influenced American decisions regarding the Philippines. To ignore either one or the other is to ignore the realities from which Philippine policy and political development emerged.

Margaret Leech, a former Pulitzer prize winner for history (*Reveille in Washington*), has written a biography of President McKinley and a commentary on his times that is an outstanding contribution to our understanding of the man, his times and his decisions regarding the Philippines. The biography is substantial in size (686 pages), excellent in scholarship and written with a rare literary skill. Extensive research into the public records as well as private papers relating to McKinley is evident on almost every page. The reference section alone runs to 59 pages and forms a valuable addition to Philippine historic bibliography which should not be overlooked, although most of the material is about McKinley rather than written by him. One of the interesting sidelights on McKinley's personality was his extreme cautiousness in committing himself on paper. As Miss Leech writes: "The inner minds of few public men have been so well con-

¹ Antonio de Morga, *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* . . . a notada por Jose Rizal. Paris, 1890.

² An English translation of van Leur's major essays is J. C. van Leur *Indonesian Trade and Society*. The Hague: W. van Hoeve.

³ B. Schrieke, *Indonesian Sociological Studies*. The Hague: W. van Hoeve, 1955. contains essays written in the 1920's.

ceased. He left almost no personal papers. He rarely wrote a private letter".

President McKinley emerges out of Miss Leech's biography as a man serious in demeanor, platitudinous in speech and unimaginative in vision. Neither travel nor reading had broadened his outlook which remained essentially that of a typical small-town politician in its anti-intellectual bias and its high degree of deference to the rich and the powerful in the American business community. McKinley was made by, rather than a maker of, history. His political success was clearly predicated on a capacity to compromise rather than lead, and to identify himself with the social, economic and political mainstream of American life. Miss Leech writes:

McKinley's supreme political talent was his identification with the people. In a time of ferment and transition, Americans longed for a voice of resolute affirmation which would appease their qualms of conscience and assure them that they were noblest, as they were fast becoming the richest people in the world. This was the voice with which McKinley spoke, not only to the wealthy and privileged few, but to the rank and file of Republicans, small manufacturers and merchants, farmers and workingmen. In brain and heart, he was himself the average middle-class American, abounding in optimism, proud of the national efficiency and enterprise, respectful of self-made success, and pious in devotion to the past. It was the faith of the fathers that McKinley invoked in every crisis; and in nothing was he more typical of his countrymen than in his willingness to turn that faith to the cause of material betterment.

McKinley was not a war-monger. He was opposed to war with Spain for a variety of reasons, perhaps not the least of which was the incredibly poor state of the American armed forces at the time. A Yellow Press and a belligerent congress was not to be denied, however, and war was eventually declared on Spain after it had all but agreed to meet every condition of an ultimatum laid down by the United States. Even after war was declared, McKinley appeared to have had scant knowledge of, or preconceived attitudes toward the Philippines. Isolationist by nature, McKinley's decisions on America's relationship with the rest of the world and on establishing an American colonial regime in the Philippines stemmed from immediate pressures and advices rather than any long-term considerations.

Miss Leech adds little to what we already know about events in 1898—but does re-emphasize the importance of poor communications with, and limited background knowledge regarding the Philippines in the United States. Her chapter entitled "America's Destiny in the Pacific" is perhaps the most interesting for Philippine historians. The shifting ideas regarding retention or non-retention of the Philippines during the Paris treaty negotiations is treated with objectivity and with a wide ranging discussion of the basic issues considered relevant at the time. It was in the midst of these negotiations that President McKinley was quoted as saying, half jestfully, half seriously, "If old Dewey had just sailed away when he smashed that Spanish fleet, what a lot of trouble he would have saved us."

Miss Leech's biography of McKinley is a superlative account and evaluation of the man and the political context in which he thought and acted. For an understanding of external developments regarding the Philippines at the turn of the century, and particularly for an understanding of subsequent American policies in the Philippines, this book is a must.

THOMAS R. McHALE

A THEOLOGY OF PROGRESS

MATURING IN CHRIST: Saint Paul's Program for Christian Growth. By George T. Montague, S.M. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1964. x, 244 pp.

Like other well-worn words, progress is a much-abused term; yet in the Anglo-Saxon idiosyncrasy it has stood in good stead for almost anything worthy of emulation in the sense that what is worthy of emulation must be capable of being marshalled to the idea of progress. One might, perhaps, also observe that, to a certain extent, it connotes a few of the more affirmative implications of the existential mood that pervades modern thought, as e.g. the dynamics of movement and the always modern preoccupation with progression towards unification, both, in the realm both of thought and reality.

The various and vibrant textures underlying the idea of progress are excellently brought into focus if one goes back to its ideological and historical moorings. This is what Father G. Montague does for the modern reader. While achieving a re-evaluation of the idea of progress from its specifically Christian background, he straightway engages the reader in his proper and more intense task: an interpretation of the theology of St. Paul from the viewpoint of growth. Aimed at inviting a wider reading public to "concentrate attention on the Apostle's ideas", this book, originally a doctoral dissertation under Father Spicq, O.P., responds on the practical level to the needs of those "who hope for a living, existentialist theology, capable of fully satisfying the deepest aspirations."¹

Starting from the different conceptions of time and history prevalent in pagan antiquity on one hand and among the biblical Hebrews on the other, Father Montague shows that true progress as well as its appreciation can be associated only with the linear notion of time which the Jews cherished as opposed to the cyclic concept of the pre-Christian gentile world. Progress, being closely bound up with

¹ Rudolf Schnackenburg, *New Testament Today* (Herder and Herder, 1963).