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Recent Historical Writing on the Philippines Abroad

A previous survey dealt with foreign periodical literature on Philippine history up to early 1960. However, as was noted then, the time-lag in receiving some European publications meant that some of these were not available after early 1959, and, in fact, some continue to be a year or more behind. The present article will continue the survey, while calling attention to some earlier articles previously missed. As in the previous survey, coverage will be limited to articles published in journals outside the Philippines, whether by Filipino or foreign historians, and will take in the period from the Spanish occupation of the Philippines in the sixteenth century up to the outbreak of World War II.

An indication of the growing interest in the history of the countries of Southeast Asia, as well as of their mutual relations, is the Journal of South-east Asian History founded in 1960 and published in Singapore. In a recent issue, Professor Onofre Corpuz discusses various concepts and attitudes guiding or influencing contemporary Filipino historians in their work. First among these is a consciousness of the predominantly indigenous element in Filipino culture, which modified,

often very profoundly, colonial cultural innovations. This he applies briefly to Hispanic Christianity, to American efforts to set up local government, and, more at length, to the establishment of an American colonial bureaucracy.

The latter involved a conflict between law and ethics (taken here in the sense of traditions and social customs which govern personal and private relations). With the estrangement of the people from government in the closing years of the Spanish regime, ethical norms were relatively strengthened, to compensate for the lack of confidence in the rule of law. When, later, the American system of “rational bureaucracy” attempted to bring about a close and reciprocal relation of people to government, the ethical or personal rather than the legal norms continued to be operative also in public affairs, as is clear from the history of Philippine political parties. Thus the prevalence of graft and corruption is essentially a “carry-over of behaviours and values which had been the Filipino’s appropriate and natural response to objective historical circumstances, into a time, the present, when those behaviours and values have become socially dysfunctional.”

A second attitude or concept is the present character of Filipino nationalism. Examined historically, it was the necessary creation of a community with which the Filipino could identify himself in the face of the decadence of the Spanish political community. It has further been modified by the moderation of American colonialism, which co-opted Filipino leadership into the colonial regime.

Finally the relation of the Philippines to the rest of Southeast Asia is considered in the historical factors which differentiate the Philippines from its neighbors, and hinder its integration into a Southeast Asian community.

Though somewhat loosely organized, the article offers some good examples of the relevance of some of the conceptual structures of the social scientist to the work of the historian.

The fascination which the story of the galleon trade continues to have, even for non-historians, is demonstrated in a
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semi-popular article in *The Geographical Magazine.* After briefly sketching the series of attempts following Magellan to find a return route from the Philippines up to the successful voyage of Urdaneta in a ship sent back by Legazpi, the article gives the highlights of the galleon trade which followed this route for the next two and a half centuries. The principal value of the article to the historian is the reproduction of a number of seventeenth and eighteenth century maps, charts, and pictures of galleons, from the collections of the British Museum and the National Maritime Museum.

In the matter of the honor of discovering the return route, however, Charles Nowell has proposed a rival to Urdaneta. Through an analysis of the account written by Alonso de Arellano, one of Legazpi’s captains who deserted him, he shows that it is very probable that Arellano, with his pilot Lope Martín, first stopped in the Philippines, and then returned to Mexico, discovering and making use of the return route some time before Urdaneta.

The introductory volume of Pierre Chaunu’s study of the Spanish trade in the Pacific based on Manila, intended as the complement of his monumental twelve volumes on the Spanish Atlantic trade, was commended in this review some time ago as one of the most important recent books on Philippine history. In an interesting article, Chaunu discusses the methods he used in these two studies, and argues in favor of an integration of “statistical history” with the history of events, so as to provide a structural account of the past. A mere accessory use of the social sciences by the historian, he says, cannot be meaningful for studying structural frameworks of


5 See the review by Nicholas P. Cushner, S.J. in *Philippine Studies** IX (October 1961), 689-690, of Pierre Chaunu, *Les Philippines et le Pacifique des Iberiques (XVIe, XVIIe, XVIIIe Siècles).*

the society of the pre-statistical centuries prior to the nineteenth.

In another article, taking as his point of departure C. R. Boxer's study of the trade of Portuguese Macao with Japan in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Chaunu tries to show "the solidarities and particular modalities of two destinies apparently opposed, that of the Portuguese in Macao, and that of the Spaniards in Manila." These solidarities flow from the identity of structures in both cases, (though with certain differences), springing from the temporary creation of a vast economic network which embraced Manila and Macao and sections of Japan and China, and which was prolonged even to the other side of the world. Just as Manila's life revolved around the galleon trade with New Spain, acting as intermediary between China and Mexico, and thus indirectly with Europe, so Macao was the intermediary between Japan and China, and of both the latter with Europe, Manila through the Pacific, Macao through the Indian Ocean. Both colonies were founded after the first wave of Iberian expansion was over (around 1540), and both inaugurated a new wave of expansion, this time primarily not territorial but economic, within the interior of a sector of the world economy. After the closing of Japan to the Portuguese in 1637 and the rupture of Spanish-Portuguese relations in 1642, both Manila and Macao suffered economic collapse—from which Macao did not recover. This marks the disappearance of the first "Pacific of the Iberians". Only after a new reconstruction of the world economic system would Manila re-emerge. Both Manila and Macao owed their prosperity to their position of intermediary between opposing monetary structures. Both economies were tied reciprocally to their

---

functions as missionary centers, but of missions different in method and orientation.

Chaunu endeavors to mark off various steps and turning-points in the history of these years of the Iberian Pacific space, signaling or suggesting the interaction of various events, and the inter-relations of missionary activity and economic cycles. At the same time, following the line of his previous works, he tries to connect the Pacific cycles with those of the Atlantic, so as to construct a world economic rhythm. Whether one accepts all of Chaunu's conclusions — and many are rather suggestions or attempts to pose problems — his whole approach is fruitful in insights and pointers towards further investigation.

In her book *Arquitectura española de Manila* Maria Lourdes Díaz-Trechuelo reproduced an eighteenth-century plan of Manila drawn by Antonio Fernández de Roxas. In a further article, she studies the career of Fernández de Roxas as galleon pilot, *ecomendero*, military and civil official in Manila, and designated *adelantado* of the Palaos. Comparing this plan of Manila with two others of the period, also reproduced here, she shows its superiority for giving us a knowledge of eighteenth-century Manila.

Inasmuch as the Philippines then depended ecclesiastically as well as civilly on Mexico, Bishop Domingo Salazar was invited to take part in the Third Mexican Council in 1584. Salazar did not attend, but sent a lengthy letter to the Archbishop of Mexico, detailing his complaints and problems for the action of the bishops at the Council. The document, pub-

---

*8 Reviewed in *PHILIPPINE STUDIES* VIII (1960), 656-659, by Fernando Zobel de Ayala.


Another article of the same author which I was unable to consult is "Las fortificaciones de Manila en la Edad Moderna." *REVISTA DE HISTORIA MILITAR* (Madrid) V (1961), 27-46. This article contains plans of the city of Manila and its fortifications at various times from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century.
lished by Ernest Burrus, S.J.,10 gives a graphic picture of conditions in the Philippines at the time, as seen by Salazar. The bishop complains bitterly about the encroachments of the State on ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the multitudinous abuses against Filipinos by the encomenderos. The jurisdictional disputes between Church and State which were to be so prominent a feature of the real patronato are clearly outlined here in the early colonial days, as each of them tended to absorb the functions of the other. It is significant, however, that the strong influence of ecclesiastical authorities in the affairs of the colony was almost entirely exercised in defense of the Filipinos against the oppression of civil authorities. Salazar bases this jurisdiction of the Church on the missionary nature of the Philippine colony. This view of Spanish colonization in the Philippines, it should be remarked, tended to promote the welfare of the Filipino people; but the failure to recognize its anachronism in the nineteenth century was a major factor in the anti-friar character of the Propaganda movement.

No profound knowledge of Philippine history is needed to be aware that the religious principles on which Spanish colonization in the Philippines was professedly based were not always operative. But that they frequently did exercise great influence, much more than in Spanish America, seems clear. An interesting illustration of this is an article on a concrete application of the Christian philosophy regarding the conditions necessary to justify war.11 In 1592 Governor Dasmariñas proposed to put an end to raids from Zambales on the peaceful Filipino Christian villages, and asked the opinions of the four religious orders on the justice of such a punitive expedition. Drawing on documentation from the Archivo de Indias, the author summarizes the opinions given to Dasmariñas. All of them, though agreeing to the justice of the war, laid careful limitations on how it might be waged, so as to protect the rights of the innocent.

In his study of the episcopal succession in the Philippines, Professor Domingo Abella has established that no native Filipino was ever elevated to the episcopacy during the Spanish regime. One of the objections urged against his position has been the use of the Spanish word *natural*, ordinarily construed to mean *native*, with reference to certain bishops. By a study of the usage of the word in various Philippine documents of the period, Abella shows clearly that at least in the Philippines the word was not always equivalent to *indígena*. At times it was likewise used of *criollos*, which is what the bishops were who are sometimes asserted to have been members of the native clergy.

Much work still needs to be done on the history of the religious orders in the Philippines. A number of articles on the Augustinians have appeared, chiefly in the *Archivo Agustíniano*, published in Valladolid. Father Isacio Rodríguez has published in installments an extensive bibliography of works dealing with the mission history of the Augustinian Order as a whole. Though not limited to the Philippines, a large proportion of the titles concern the work of the Augustinians in this country. Based largely on the *Ensayo de una biblioteca iberoamericana*, this work corrects and brings up to date the latter. Titles of more significance are usually annotated, though some of these critical judgments seem open to dispute.

12 See the references to Professor Abella's work on the subject in our previous survey, *Philippine Studies* IX (1961), 111, n. 35.


Another article concerned with the Philippine episcopacy is Joaquín Meade, "Semblanza del ilustre señor don Manuel Antonio Rojo del Río Lafuente y Vieyra, arzobispo de Manila, gobernador y capitán general de las islas Filipinas, mexicano ilustre que propuso la fundación del Real Colegio de Abogados de la ciudad de México (1708-1764)," *Memorias de la Academia Mexicana de la Historia* XIX (1960), 125-164. However, the article has nothing new on Archbishop Rojo's eventful term in Manila, but is concerned rather with his earlier years in Mexico.

Looking forward to the fourth centenary of the coming of the first Augustinians to the Philippines in 1565, Father Manuel Merino has begun publication in installments of a history of the Philippine Province of the Order. Though the sections thus far published are somewhat apologetic in tone and discursive in style, the work is welcome, as there has been no full-length history of the Philippine Augustinians since the works of Gaspar de San Agustin and his continuator Casimiro Díaz. The history is largely based on early chronicles and unedited material from the Archivo de Indias, but it is unfortunate that at times such secondary sources as Zamora, Marín y Morales, and Retana are used.

In the first two centuries of Spanish colonization the various religious orders sent commissaries to the different houses of their respective orders in Spain to recruit volunteers for the missions in the Philippines. Owing to various difficulties, chiefly the opposition of superiors in Spain who did not wish to allow too many of their subjects to leave, a missionary college was founded by the Augustinians in Valladolid in the middle of the eighteenth century. The young men who were here educated for the priesthood bound themselves to go to the Philippines on the completion of their training. This college later became a model for similar institutions of the other orders, and only these missionary colleges were exempted when the anti-clerical government suppressed all religious orders for men in the Peninsula in 1836. On the second centenary of the college of Valladolid, a special number of its publication, Archivo agustiniano, was devoted to the history of the college. Though most of the articles are devoted to its internal life and the vicissitudes which attended its founding in Spain, there are in some of them points of interest to the historian of the Philippines because of the close relation of the college to Augustinian work in the Philippines. The final article of F.  

16 The special number is entitled: “Número extraordinario dedicado al Real Colegio-Seminarío de Valladolid en su II centenario,” ARCHIVO AGUSTINIANO LIII (Mayo-Diciembre 1959). Articles which may have some interest for Philippine history are: M. Merino, O.S.A.,
Casado is especially pertinent\textsuperscript{17}, being mostly a sketch of Augustinian activity in the Philippines. Of interest is the section on missionary work among the non-Christian peoples of northern Luzon, where new missions were being founded right up to the end of the Spanish regime.\textsuperscript{18}

A more specific article on this work in northern Luzon is an article, somewhat hagiographical in tone, on an Augustinian missionary of the early nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{19} In an appendix to this account, the author reproduces from the archive of the college of Valladolid the project drawn up in the 1890's by the Augustinians for a vicariate-apostolic in Abra, and plans for new missions among the non-Christian peoples of northern Luzon. Owing to the outbreak of the Revolution, the project, though already approved, was not carried into effect. It is offered as a proof that, contrary to accusations made in the past, the Augustinians continued their missionary spirit in the Philippines right up to the end of the Spanish regime.

Father Castro Seoane continues his cataloguing of the missionaries who went from Spain to the Indies and to the Philippines in the sixteenth century, with an indication of the royal favors they received.\textsuperscript{20} The recent articles have all dealt

\textsuperscript{17} F. Casado, O.S.A., "Bosquejo de la labor misionera del Real Colegio de Agustinos de Valladolid," (pp. 233-281).

\textsuperscript{18} Casado's article and the one of M. Merino cited in note 16 form the substance of the article of Maximo Mateos, O.S.A., "El Colegio Agustiniano de Valladolid, centro de acción misionera," MISSIONALIA HISPANICA XVII (1960), 249-277; XVIII (1961), 5-65. Some documents are also included.

\textsuperscript{19} Teófilo Aparicio, O.S.A., "El apostol de Abra (Fray Bernardo Lago, 1786-1839)," ARCHIVO AGUSTINIANO LI (1957), 163-192.

with the expeditions of Franciscans, completing the list to
the end of the sixteenth century. A large proportion of the
missionaries listed for these years were destined for the Philip-
pines.\textsuperscript{21}

An article on the policy of early Jesuit missionaries with
regard to the use of Philippine languages, though emphasizing
the Jesuit part of the story, deals largely with a policy adopted
mon to all the early missionaries.\textsuperscript{22} Though this policy adopted
the use of the Philippine languages, various specifically Chris-
tian concepts were kept in the original Spanish, as they remain
today.

A memorial of Bishop Casimiro Herrero, written at the
request of Governor-General Primo de Rivera in 1882, analyzes
the difficult relations which existed between the friar parish
priests and many of the Spanish officials in the Philippines.\textsuperscript{23}
The document is of interest, since this fact—as the present
writer has repeatedly seen noted in confidential official cor-
respondence in the Spanish archives—was a major one in the
growth of anti-friar sentiment in the late nineteenth century.
There were numerous Spaniards who encouraged this anti-
friar feeling for their own ends, some perhaps just ones, others
certainly not.

\textsuperscript{21} An article on the Franciscans, Mariano Rubio, O.F.M., “Tomas
de hábito y profesiones de la Provincia de San Gregorio Magno de
Filipinas (1583-1736),” MISSIO NALIA HISPANICA XVIII (1961), 211-250,
273-350, has already been reviewed in its book form in PHILIPPINE
STUDIES X (1962), 506.

\textsuperscript{22} Nicholas P. Cushner, S.J., “A Note on Jesuits, Linguistics and
the Philippine Missions,” NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FUR MISSIONSWISSENS-
CHAFT (NOUVELLE REVUE DE SCIENCE MISSIONAIRE) XIX (1963), 116-
121.

\textsuperscript{23} Teófilo Aparicio, O.S.A., “Informe sobre el estado de las Islas
Filipinas, por el Ilmo. Sr. D. Fr. Casimiro Herrero, Obispo de Nueva

In an appendix the editor of the above document offers a “Docu-
mento inédito sobre la masonería en Filipinas, por Otegano Díaz”,
taken from a copy found in the Archives of Valladolid. As a matter
of fact, this is the report of Olegario Díaz, published by Retana in
the third volume of ARCHIVO DEL BIBLIOFILO FILIPINO. The copy used
here, moreover, is a bad one, with numerous errors of transcription.
Nor can this impassioned diatribe of Díaz be accorded the high
historical value here claimed for it.
An article on the "friar problem" of the nineteenth century very rightly stresses the complex nature of the anti-friar movement which formed so large a part of the Propaganda campaign. That there were abuses the author considers hardly doubtful, but neither these nor the question of the haciendas owned by the friars were the major cause of the opposition by the Filipinos of the Propaganda, even though they naturally tended to emphasize and exaggerate these abuses. The main sources of the opposition were, however, political rather than religious. Often perhaps against their will, but none the less actually, the friar parish priests held such political power that Filipinos who had become conscious of their political rights had no choice but to oppose them. At the same time such factors as the opposition of the Filipino secular clergy, that of Spanish Liberals and Republicans, the tendency of many of the friars to oppose contacts with progressive ideas of Europe in their belief that thus they would safeguard the faith of the people—all these factors played a part in directing so large a part of the efforts of the Propagandists into an anti-friar campaign.

Though it would seem that some of Pilapil's points need further documentation and analysis, and there is perhaps a tendency to under-play the existence of real abuses, it seems to this writer that his principal point is certainly correct and documented—namely that the Propaganda campaign was primarily political and nationalistic, not religious, and the complementary factors were many and complex. To say that the growth of Filipino nationalism in the latter half of the nineteenth century was solely, or even primarily concerned with freeing the Filipino people from friar oppression is to over-simplify to the point of completely falsifying the coming to birth of the Filipino nation.

The centenary year of Rizal's birth brought forth a number of articles in various foreign journals on the life of Rizal. As might be expected, however, being articles for an occasion, and written for a non-Filipino audience, it may be said in gen-

---

eral that they add nothing to our knowledge of Rizal, though most of them are competent portrayals by Filipinos for foreign readers unacquainted with Rizal. The Mexican historian Leopoldo Zea, however, in a paper originally submitted to the International Rizal Congress in Manila, makes an interesting comparison of Rizal with the heroes of Latin-American independence, seeing him as part of the ideals which inspired them. Like them, he sought from Spain the liberty and human dignity Spain had taught her colonies to value, but then denied them. Like the Latin-American liberators, Rizal thought that political emancipation through revolution was inopportune, until emancipation should have taken place in the minds of his people, though in both cases, circumstances forced the political emancipation to be attempted before this prerequisite could be achieved.

Paolo E. Coletta continues his study of the acquisition of the Philippines by the United States with an analysis of the part McKinley had in being this about, and the reasons which motivated him. Having started the process by ordering the occupation of Manila when the destruction of the Spanish fleet would have been sufficient to satisfy American war aims, McKinley then chose expansionist peace commissioners, and finally changed his instructions from a demand for Luzon to a demand for the entire Philippines. The motives

---

26 Leopoldo Zea, "José Rizal y el pensamiento latino-americano," CUADERNOS AMERICANOS (México) XXI (1962) 194-204.

27 Paolo E. Coletta, "McKinley, the Peace Negotiations, and the Acquisition of the Philippines," PACIFIC HISTORICAL REVIEW XXX (November 1961), 341-350.
working this change in McKinley were many: commercial advantage, his concept of "religious duty", the danger of other powers taking over the country, the difficulties of administering a protectorate. All these contributed, but it was the popular enthusiasm for annexation he found on his midwestern tour of October 1898 which solidified his decision, though he himself tended to shift the responsibility to destiny, Providence, the march of events. Though he insisted on playing the role of emancipator, he demanded prior recognition of United States sovereignty, thus violating the American principle of consent of the governed.

Though not contradicting Coletta, Thomas McCormick approaches the question from a somewhat different angle. The primary reason for the acquisition of the American island possessions—Hawaii, Wake, Guam, as well as the Philippines—was not their economic value nor Manifest Destiny. Rather it was their value as means to establish coaling and naval stations for a secure trade route which would enable Americans to penetrate or even control the China market. Actions of various European powers in China in 1897-1898 pointing towards partition influenced McKinley's decision to occupy the Philippines so as to safeguard the Open Door in China.

The various ways that Americans looked upon the acquisition of the Philippines also influenced the views put forward as to how the Philippines should be governed. An article based on the papers of Taft and Secretary of War Elihu Root describes the conflict in 1900-1901 between Taft, as head of the Second Philippine Commission, and Major General Arthur MacArthur, commander of the U.S. Army in the Philippines.

---


The article of Thomas R. McHale, "American Colonial Policy toward the Philippines," JOURNAL OF SOUTH-EAST ASIAN HISTORY III (March 1962), 24-43, is substantially the same, with a few minor changes, as his article in PHILIPPINE STUDIES IX (January 1961), 47-71.

Taft was anxious to establish civil government with Filipino participation, while MacArthur (although, unlike many other American military officers, he tried to win Filipino friendship) believed in a continuance of military rule. The question was finally solved by the Spooner amendment of 1901, which gave Congressional sanction to the setting-up of a civil government. The author sees the basic source of divergence between the two men in their different outlook on the Philippines: MacArthur thought of it in strategical and tactical terms; Taft, though refusing to consider the independence question, was interested in preparing Filipinos for self-government.

One of the major problems of the American regime after the end of the Philippine-American War and the establishment of civil government was the pacification of the Moro country. Donald Smythe, using the papers of General John J. Pershing, recounts his activity in disarming the Moros of Jolo in 1911.30 Through Pershing's patience and tact, combined with a judicious show of force, the task was accomplished with a minimum of bloodshed.

David Sturtevant, using the Joseph R. Hayden papers, sketches the origins of the Sakdalistas under Benigno Ramos, and their abortive uprising of May 1935.31 The author sees the significance of the movement in its organization of long-standing peasant discontent. Though it failed because of political miscalculation, bitterness, and the personal ambition of Ramos, it laid the foundations for further radical agrarian movements, culminating in the Hukbalahap, which profited from Ramos' mistakes.

Just as a variety of factors had brought about American annexation in 1898, so were there various forces at work in the granting of independence to the Philippines, not least of which was the economic. In an article based largely on the Quezon papers, Theodore Friend studies the role of the sugar


industry in the independence question in the 1930's. The American sugar lobby, in its desire to eliminate free entry of Philippine sugar into the United States, was an active supporter of Philippine independence from 1930 on. The large sugar centrals in the Philippines had been expanding rapidly during the years before the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Bill was obtained by the Osmeña-Roxas mission in 1932, each hoping to get the best possible percentage of the quota expected to be assigned Philippine sugar with independence. The result was that the total Philippine sugar production in 1932 was far in excess of the quota the Osmeña mission could obtain. When Quezon then decided to fight the acceptance of the bill by the legislature, in order to block the political victory to be gained by his rivals, the sugar industry backed him in the hope of obtaining a raise in the quota fixed by the Hare-Hawes-Cutting bill. The final result, as far as the Philippine sugar quota was concerned, was little different from what Osmeña-Roxas had obtained, but Quezon had won for himself credit for his own independence bill, the Tydings-McDuffie Act. Though the sugar industry was forced to cut back production, various other factors considerably mitigated the severe crisis which had been feared.

Looking over the articles on the Spanish period in particular, one quickly notes that though these articles are concerned with the Philippines and its history, they are, for the most part, treating the history of the Spaniards in the Philippines, and there is very little concerning the Filipino people. Naturally, all this Spanish activity, or the American activity later on, had its effects on the Filipinos, and is an essential part of Philippine history. Nor would I in any way wish to imply that there was no real history of the Filipino people during the colonial period. But the history of the Filipino people themselves is receiving very little attention abroad, even though the materials for such a study are there in the archives. Of course, these materials are not so easily dug out, since the chronicles and official accounts have always been more con-

cerned with the history of official Philippines, which was, during this period, Spanish, but the materials are there, in the Archivo de Indias, to name only one. Of course, scholars in the Philippines have done somewhat more on the history of Filipino society. But with so much of the materials for an internal history in foreign, especially Spanish, archives, it is to be hoped that foreign historians too may give more attention to the history of the Filipino people themselves.

JOHN N. SCHUMACHER