

Antonio Francisco B. de Castro, SJ

Between Madrid and Rome: The Philippine Church in Transition (1898–1902)

The Anti-Friar Character of the Revolution

The anti-friar character of the Philippine Revolution can hardly be disputed, though questions may be raised about its extent and depth. Together with the schism created by the founding Fathers of the Philippine Independent Church (more popularly known as the Aglipayan Church) in 1902, this aspect of the Revolution certainly had the most dramatic effect on the contemporary history of the Church in the Philippines. The history of this anti-friar feeling is rather long and complex. But one can point out with confidence that its origins are to be traced back to the Spaniards themselves, indeed to events happening in Spain.¹ The travails of the Church in Spain partly explain, for example, how it came to pass that, in the second half of the 19th century, there were actually more friars in the colony than in Spain itself!² In any case, Spanish liberal

1 Cf. Lucio Gutiérrez, *Historia de la Iglesia en Filipinas 1565–1900* (Madrid: Editorial MAPFRE, 1992), 269–272.

2 “Las órdenes religiosas contaban con más miembros en Filipinas que en España en la segunda mitad del XIX. Los que decidían hacerse religiosos

disdain for the backwardness of the friar worldview could not help spilling over to the Filipinos themselves, especially those who had the chance to travel to Europe and live in Spain.³ But conditions in the colony also served to highlight the character of the friar orders not only as a conservative force in society but also as a reactionary group. The Augustinians, for example, did not hesitate to oppose the education being made available to Filipinos by the Dominicans in their University of Santo Tomas and Colegio de San Juan de Letrán and by the Jesuits in their Ateneo Municipal de

lo hacían por su afán de ser misioneros en el Oriente. Los jóvenes que asistieron a los colegios eran hombres sonadores, celosos y conscientes de que en Filipinas y en el Oriente podían seguir extendiendo el reino de Jesucristo. En 1858, por ejemplo, los agustinos tenían 188 misioneros en Filipinas y 71 en España. Los recoletos 122 en Filipinas y 89 en España. Los dominicos 127 en las misiones de Filipinas y 89 en España. Los franciscanos 152 fuera y 39 en España . . . Entre 1852 y 1875, pasaron por Filipinas 253 franciscanos y 213 dominicos.” Ibid., 274. Gutiérrez could at least be queried about the possibility that repression of the religious orders in Spain did not automatically mean repression of the same in the colonies, given that the religious orders were seen precisely as instruments of colonial power in these overseas dominions. The religious orders therefore were allowed to keep some of their houses for purposes of forming and educating men for the missions, but it cannot be denied that there was also a politically motivated reason for it.

- 3 The example of Rizal could be taken as paradigmatic. While staying for three years at the Universidad Central de Madrid, Rizal came under the influence of such liberal professors as Miguel Morayta Sagrario (1883–1917), *catedrático* of World History and masonic Grandmaster of the Gran Oriente Español, and Fernando Giner de los Rios, proponent of Krausism, a philosophical movement inspired by the Kantian thought of Karl Christian Friedrich Krause and founded in Spain by Julian Sanz del Rio. Rizal also came to know and befriend the agnostic and anti-Catholic Francisco Pi y Margall, erstwhile president of the short-lived Federal Republic of 1873. Rizal’s travels to Paris, London, Heidelberg, Berlin, and other European cities served to widen his circle of friends and to expose him to then contemporary currents of thought. For a summary of Rizal’s “European Experiment,” cf. Raul J. Bonoan, SJ, *The Rizal-Pastells Correspondence* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1994), 13–17.

Manila.⁴ Their role in the unmasking of the secret society of the Katipunan, which led to the “Cry of Balintawak” and the inevitable but premature outbreak of the first phase of the revolution in late 1896, was not easily forgotten. The friars’ perceived support for or de facto acquiescence in the execution of Rizal did not endear them to the general population. And their intransigent desire to hold on to the parishes continued to exacerbate relations with many members of the native secular clergy.

The Problem of the Friar Haciendas

Perhaps the most persistent cause for antipathy toward the friar orders was the fact that they owned vast tracts of land in the colony. The haciendas, of course, were important sources of revenue much needed for the support and maintenance of the various apostolic works of the friars, and not only in the Islands but elsewhere as well. In the Dominican Provincial’s own words:

The Order of St. Dominic, which is considered as the richest among its companions, has to sustain financially the following: in Spain: colleges/seminaries in Ocaña and Avila where

4 Thus, in 1872 for instance, the Bishop of Nueva Segovia, Juan Aragonés, OSA, had this to say in a letter to Governor Izquierdo: “It is not the seminaries, your Excellency, from which the worst [priests] come, it is from those who study in the University there and the colleges of Letrán and San José. There is a great difference between those who have been educated in Sto. Tomas and [those from] the other colleges. Every student from Manila who returns to the town of his province is a rebel . . . Just look at where those who took part in the past insurrection have studied; I do not know the facts, but without rashness I dare to assert that all or the great majority must have been students of the University, not the seminaries. And if in the province there is any priest stigmatized as being anti-Spanish, it is one of those who have studied in Manila. It is not the seminaries, your Excellency, which are going to lose the Philippines for Spain, it is the University, and many agree that this is the case.” Cf. the letter of Bishop Juan Aragonés, OSA, 7 May 1872, to Governor Rafael Izquierdo, Philippine National Archives, *Patronato*, quoted in John Schumacher, *Readings in Philippine Church History* (Quezon City: Loyola School of Theology, 1987), 255.

presently 200 religious are staying; the procuration general in Madrid which has become a general hospice (for transient and sick missionaries), the college in Madrid for Dominican sisters destined to work in the Philippines, the house in Valencia; in the Philippines: the Convent of Sto. Domingo and the two colleges in Manila: the University of Sto. Tomas and the Colegio de San Juan de Letrán; the Convent of Dominican sisters (also in Manila), the college in Dagupan and four other colleges in Manila, Lingayen, Vigan and Tuguegarao; outside the Philippines: the missions in China, Vietnam, and Formosa [present-day Taiwan]; and the College of via Condotti in Rome, recently incorporated into the Province.⁵

But the estates inserted the friars, with the exception of the Franciscans who were constitutionally barred from owning haciendas, into a network of relationships with the local population and their leaders that embroiled them in disputes and controversies which were, to say the least, hardly conducive to the cause of religion.⁶ The friars, however, turned a blind eye

5 Cf. B.A. del Manzano, OP, *Exposicion*, 60–61, cited in Rolando de la Rosa, OP, *Beginnings of the Filipino Dominicans* (Quezon City: Dominican Province of the Philippines, 1990), 144. Cf. also a Spanish Jesuit's very positive comments on the Dominican haciendas of Biñan and Sta. Rosa in the 1890s: "And what is it employed (i.e., the rental which came from the haciendas)? In attending to the expenses of the University, founded and preserved by them for the good of the Indios, and to support a college of orphans, sons of widows of civil employees or military men, Spanish or Filipino. Could there be property better administered or employed? Is there anybody who can get more and greater utility from the land than the religious communities in the Philippines?" Cf. [Pascual Barrado, SJ], *Relación histórica y estado de las Misiones de la Compañía de Jesús en Filipinas*, 100–101, in Archivo de la Provincia de Tarragona de la Compañía de Jesus (Colegio de San Francisco de Borja, Sant Cugat del Vallés, Barcelona, Spain) [henceforth, APT] cited in Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 258–259.

6 A good example is given when, as early as 1745, "five provinces near Manila erupted in an agrarian revolt which directly expressed Filipino anger with the estates. The basic issues in the revolt were land usurpation by the haciendas

to this anomalous situation and insisted rather on their rights, something which even ecclesiastical law had secured for them.⁷

and the closing of the hacienda's land to common use for pasturage and forage, a right which had been stipulated in the Laws of the Indies and had been the traditional practice in the haciendas." (140) The origin of the revolt was a dispute over the ownership of several thousand hectares of land between the Hacienda of Biñan (Laguna) owned by the Dominicans and the neighboring town of Silang (Cavite). Soon other friar orders were involved in similar disputes: the Augustinian hacienda against the town of San Mateo in Tondo, and the Recollect hacienda in Cavite against the residents of Old Cavite, Bacoor, and Parañaque. "On 30 April the revolt began in earnest. Rebels from Silang and other Cavite towns destroyed the boundary markers placed by the administrator of Biñan and then besieged him and 16 of his tenants in the *casa hacienda*. They were not harmed however The Augustinian Hacienda of Sta. Cruz de Malabon in Cavite was the rebels' next target . . . and the administrator was forced to flee to the Port of Cavite. Such was the pattern repeated throughout the course of the revolt. Residents from the surrounding town would occupy the religious haciendas (the five or six lay-owned estates were not molested), while the tenants looked or occasionally became the object of the rebels' ire" (141) All the quotes here are taken from Dennis M. Roth, "Church Lands in the Agrarian History of the Tagalog Region," in *Philippine Social History: Global Trade and Local Transformations*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Ed. de Jesus (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1982), 131–153.

- 7 In 1897 the Dominican Provincial, obviously tired and exasperated by all the criticism of the friars and their estates, would defend his religious order thus: "The riches of the friars! Their vast estates! Their millions! Let us grant that indeed the orders are rich. Does canon law forbid the religious corporations to possess in common all kinds of temporal goods? . . . Such wealth of the religious orders is a product of the frugality and good administration of three centuries. For, as religious, we have very few needs which the Superior attends to and all of us serve the community in conscience, and not out of personal profit. This wealth is the product of great labor, undiminished by any wasteful loss which could have been incurred through vice and inconstancy of individuals. Our wealth is not from donations, it was acquired (and this can be said of all kinds of possessions of the Dominicans, without exception), not under the title of dominion but under an honest title . . . and this demonstrates that our detractors do not know what they are saying." There is no reason to doubt the honesty and good will of the Dominican Provincial here, but he fails perhaps to appreciate that perceptions of "ill-

Though one can perhaps understand their own situation and the need for revenues from the haciendas to finance their life and their mission, the fact of religious with vows of poverty but owning vast tracts of land was going to be a source of problems. Indeed this was going to be exploited to the full, first by the propagandists, and then by the revolutionaries, in their campaign to discredit the friar orders in the eyes of the general population.⁸

Before taking a closer look at friar ownership of haciendas, several comments may be made regarding the Society of Jesus at this point. The Jesuits in the Philippines escaped in great measure the ire of the propagandists and revolutionaries precisely because they had no large land holdings to boast of after their still quite recent return to the country in the middle of the 19th century. The expulsion of the Jesuits from all Spanish domains in 1768, on this reading, would have to be considered a blessing in disguise. The Jesuits, in pre-expulsion colonial times, used to be the largest owners of haciendas in the Islands. After their expulsion their estates were confiscated by the colonial government and sold to lay Spaniards and Filipinos. They were not to acquire agricultural estates in this same manner anymore after their return to the Islands in 1859, but two of their former estates would revert to ecclesiastical ownership in the 1830s: the Dominicans would gain control of Calamba and Naic. And in 1872, the landed estates of

gotten wealth," erroneous though they may be, nevertheless have very real and, in this case, disastrous consequences, particularly when the object of scrutiny happens to be a religious institution. For the quote above, cf. B.A. del Manzano, *Exposición*, 58–59, cited in de la Rosa, *Filipino Dominicans*, 144.

- 8 See the examples given by Schumacher of anti-friar propaganda in his *Readings in Philippine Church History*, 263–264, with their English translation in Appendix C. Schumacher's comment on 261: "The Filipino nationalist leaders, whether they merely aimed at reforms and greater autonomy, or had actually set their sights on independence, had come to see the friars as the main obstacle to their goals. It was necessary to eliminate them as the main pillars of Spanish rule, hence to destroy their prestige, both with the ordinary Filipino who looked to them for guidance, and with the Spanish government which used them to maintain itself . . ."

Lian and San Pedro Tunasan, originally haciendas belonging to the Colegio de San José administered by the Jesuits in pre-1768 times and then by the Colegio's secular clergy after 1768, came under the administration of the Dominicans when the Colegio was incorporated into the University of Santo Tomas. These last two will revert to the control (not ownership, for both belonged to a foundation that was given to the Society of Jesus to administer in perpetuity) of the Society of Jesus in 1915, a good 17 years after the end of Spanish rule in the Islands. The point in all this is that the Jesuits in the Philippines at the time of the revolution escaped this whole vexatious controversy over the haciendas because they did not own any in Luzon.⁹

It was thus that in 1896, friar ownership of haciendas could be broken down as follows:

1. *Dominicans*, 10 haciendas: Naic (Cavite), Santa Cruz (Cavite), Lian (Batangas), San Pedro Tunasan (Laguna), Biñan (Laguna), Santa Rosa (Laguna), Calamba (Laguna), Pandi (Bulacan), Lolomboy (Bulacan), and Orion (Bulacan);
2. *Augustinians*, seven haciendas: Binagliag (Bulacan), Dampol (Bulacan), Malinta (Bulacan), San Francisco (Cavite), Muntinlupa (Laguna), Tala (Tondo), and Piedad (Tondo);
3. *Recollects*, two haciendas: Imus (Cavite) and San Nicolas (Cavite);

9 Cf. Roth, "Church Lands," n. 2, 149–150. On how the Jesuits came into possession and/or administration of their haciendas in the first place, cf. Horacio de la Costa, *Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581–1768* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), 239–241 for San Pedro de Makati, 274–276 for San Pedro Tunasan, 503 for San Juan Bautista (Lian), and 273 for Jesús de la Peña (Marikina). The Jesuits also owned a ranch in Taytay and other properties in Quiapo and Tondo. The Jesuits and the Dominicans of the University of Santo Tomas will later on be engaged in a bitter controversy over the Lian and San Pedro Tunasan estates once the question of the status of the Colegio de San José foundation was reopened. The decision would in fact come from the Holy See, which felt compelled to intervene and decide the matter. However, as we shall point out later, the Jesuits would go through a series of peasant disturbances once the haciendas of San Jose had been returned to them by papal fiat.

4. *Order of St. John of God* (San Juan de Dios), one hacienda: Buenavista (Bulacan); and
5. *Archdiocese of Manila*, one hacienda: Dinalupihan (Bataan).¹⁰

The size of these haciendas ranged from the relatively small area of 294 hectares to the certainly huge size of 30,000 hectares of the Hacienda Buenavista of the *Fatebenefratelli* of the erstwhile Order of St. John of God (San Juan de Dios).¹¹

The significant factor to note here is that all these estates were to be found near and around Manila; they were the principal areas in which revolutionary fervor burned the brightest. The slow historical evolution of the estates had actually created a middle group of non-cultivating *inquilinos* or tenants who leased land from the friar-owners and then in turn sub-leased it to cultivating tenants. Such an arrangement became hereditary, so that the land was being passed on from generation to generation.¹² Rizal's

10 Cf. Roth, "Church Lands," 131–153. What Dennis Roth wants to present in his essay is "to follow the historical development of the estates (i.e., the friar haciendas) and in doing so to show those conditions which helped to bring an end to Spanish colonialism in the Philippines." Roth's analysis of agrarian unrest may be extended to the post-Spanish period when peasant uprisings in the Philippines finally erupted in various places. Cf. also Nicholas P. Cushner, *Landed Estates in the Colonial Philippines* (New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, 1976). Today, the dream of "land reform" or "agrarian reform" continues to be a vital issue in Philippine socio-political life.

11 This hacienda of the Brothers of San Juan de Dios, otherwise known in Italy as the "Fatebenefratelli," came under the administration of the Archdiocese of Manila when the "Hermanos Hospitalarios de San Juan de Dios" were disbanded in Spain in the latter half of the 19th century. Cf. Roth, "Church Lands," n. 2, 150.

12 The Dominican Provincial in 1897 honestly thought that the situation obtaining in the haciendas was beneficial to the tenants of the religious corporations that owned the estates. Thus: "The administration of our haciendas cannot be more benign and patriarchal: the farms and the lands pass from the fathers to their sons, from generation to generation, in such a way that in practice, they already act as owners of these; and they do not experience the danger of losing such lands, and the consequent harm

family, which held one of the largest land leases (380 hectares),¹³ were *inquilinos* of the Dominicans in the latter's hacienda in Calamba, Laguna.¹⁴ The relevant point to make here, and one that gives the lie to any simplistic Marxist reading of Philippine history, is that part of the rising Filipino elite came from such families as Rizal's. This socio-economic fact, coupled with an

such a loss would bring about, unlike the other native landowners who, through gambling, lawsuits, and other very common causes, mortgage their property, and ultimately lose this in the process." Cf. B.A. del Manzano, OP, *Exposición*, 62, in de la Rosa, *Filipino Dominicans*.

13 Cf. Roth, "Church Lands," 148.

14 In a letter written on 12 October 1892 by the Jesuit Pablo Pastells to Jose Rizal—then in exile in Mindanao—we find the following: "A period of crisis in the days of your youth decided you on your departure for abroad. You left the Philippines with bitterness and personal resentments for reasons and motives I do not wish to pass judgment on nor can do so now. The thorn which pierced your heart affected you so deeply and poisoned your spirit . . ." Cf. Bonoan, *Rizal-Pastells Correspondence*, 126–127. It is probable that the "period of crisis" mentioned in this letter refers to the time when Rizal's family led an attempt to question the Dominican ownership of the Calamba hacienda. Schumacher's comments here are apropos: "In the end General Weyler would use troops to eject those who were refusing payment, because he saw it, not without some reason, as a Filipino challenge to Spanish rule. At the bottom of the problem was the fact that Spain had never established any adequate system of land-titling, much less of accurate surveys of the land. In such a situation it was not difficult for both parties sincerely to believe themselves in the right. The Calamba dispute, however, came to take on for both sides a wider symbolic significance—whether Filipinos could successfully challenge the friars before the courts. The letter of Paciano Rizal to his brother Jose, who was in Madrid bringing the case before the highest court of Spain, indicates the dispute could be settled by compromise, given the lack of clarity as to the total ownership of the hacienda. But as a political issue, it might be necessary to carry the fight to the end. As a matter of fact, both Jose Rizal and General Weyler saw it that way, for the former continued to push the court case in Madrid, refusing all compromise, while the latter made sure that it never came to a decision by using troops to evict the striking tenants, and exiling or imprisoning the leaders." Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 260–261. Schumacher quotes a segment of Paciano Rizal's letter to Jose on page 261.

education which became accessible to the sons of such families and which sharpened their political and national consciousness,¹⁵ created social tensions between the friar orders and their Filipino *inquilinos*.¹⁶ These latter would not hesitate to use their prestige among the “kasamas” and other Filipinos to foment an anti-friar feeling among the wider population. The leaders of the revolution would in fact be most uncompromising in their demand

-
- 15 Schumacher details the role that institutions of higher education in the Philippines played in the conception and development of a Filipino national consciousness. He mentions as recipients of this higher education men like the brothers Rizal, Jose and Paciano, P. Jose Burgos, Gregorio Sanciano, Mariano Alejandrino, Basilio Teodoro, P. Mariano Sevilla, Marcelo del Pilar, Mariano Ponce, Apolinario Mabini, etc. Though these institutions certainly labored under certain glaring deficiencies, not least of which could be the disparity between the generally humanistic studies being provided the students and the theological vision that was presented in such books as Felix Sardá y Salvany's *El liberalismo es pecado*, nevertheless higher education then “was instrumental in the evolution of Filipino nationalism in the nineteenth century and that it did provide competent leaders in that time of radical transition in Philippine society.” (60) Cf. John N. Schumacher, SJ, “Philippine Higher Education and the Origins of Nationalism,” *Philippine Studies* 23 (1975): 53–65.
- 16 Schumacher chooses to speak not so much of “economic causes” but of “economic factors,” i.e., economic “elements which affected in one way or another the process of the Revolution, whether as cause, or simply as facilitating it, or as a condition without which it would not have taken place, at least in the same way.” This conviction allows him to say that it is not only economic oppression “which may impel people to a revolution; economic prosperity too may facilitate the overthrow of the existing regime under certain circumstances.” He singles out two economic factors which contributed to the realization of the revolution: 19th-century economic prosperity and the appreciation of land values in the Tagalog region. Schumacher here clearly wishes to go beyond the Marxist-inspired nationalist historiography dominant in the Philippine academic world which comes close to reducing the revolution to being the effect of economic oppression. Cf. John N. Schumacher, SJ, “Economic Factors in the Revolution,” *Journal of History* (1985–1986): 57–67, reprinted with very slight modifications as Chapter 9 of his *The Making of a Nation: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Filipino Nationalism* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1991), 126–133.

that the friars be expelled from the country.¹⁷ “Americanist” Filipinos, sharing the same sentiment but eager for annexation of the Islands by the United States, would circulate a petition to President McKinley, asking him to expel Archbishop Nozaleda of Manila, a Dominican, and all other friars from the country.¹⁸ And

17 The controversy over the continued presence of the Spanish friars in the country will be heated and vociferous indeed: “El ultimo apartado del articulo primero [i.e., of the Malolos Constitution] que es muy original, tiene antecedentes que merecen ser consignados aquí. Al final de la constitución debían insertarse unas disposiciones transitorias, entre las que figuraba la expulsión del territorio filipino, de todos los frailes Agustinos, Recoletos, Dominicos y Franciscanos” The question will come up whether the Jesuits should be included in this list. Cf. Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (Rome) [henceforth, ARSI], *Phil.* 1001-XIII, 21: 68. A good collection of documents relating to the anti-friar animus then current may be found in Pedro S. de Achútegui, SJ, and Miguel A. Bernad, SJ, *Religious Revolution in the Philippines*, Vol. IV: *The Schism of 1902* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila, 1972), especially the first section which deals with “The Anti-Friar Agitation and the Clamor for Reform,” 8–91.

18 An interesting reaction to this petition was the suspicion expressed by “Un Filipino Prudente” that the signatures gathered for it would instead be used for propaganda purposes, i.e., to demonstrate that Filipinos had come to accept American sovereignty over the Islands: “En ese mismo papel viene un ruego para que se procure obtener el mayor número de firmas, y he aquí el objeto de mi voz de alerta, porque es evidente que el objeto de ese papel no es el echar a los frailes, sino el sumar gran numero de firmantes para patentizar en Estados Unidos la sumisión de los habitantes de estas Islas a la soberanía norte-americana, condición necesaria, según el derecho internacional y la Constitución de los Estados Unidos, para que sea valida la cesión hecha por España en el tratado de Paris.” Cf. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Document 8: 35–36. The next document in this collection basically repeats a telegram from Aguinaldo’s Secretary of the Interior which expresses the same sentiment: “Habiendo entregado al [Gobierno] un papel del papelito que los autonomistas en Manila hicieron circular para recoger firmas con objeto de pedir a McKinley expulsión, frailes, dígame que esto es un ardid de que se valen para desprestigiar nuestra resistencia contra invasión americana, así es que si llegase a esa provincia alguno que va recogiendo firmas distribuyendo dichos papeluchos aprehenderle V. y diga al publico que ese es un embaucador y traidor a la Patria, circule este telegrama por los

the Americans, in negotiations with the Vatican over, among other things, the question of the purchase of the friar haciendas,¹⁹ will attempt to impose the departure of all the Spanish friars from the country as a condition for the purchase itself.²⁰

pueblos de su jurisdicción.” Cf. Document 9: 37–39. Obviously one can glean from these documents a certain struggle between forces of the revolution and sympathizers of the Americans regarding the issue of expulsion of the friars from the country.

- 19 Agreement was finally reached with the Vatican over this question of the purchase of the friar haciendas. The United States government was allowed in 1903 “to purchase these properties for slightly over \$7,000,000.” Cf. Aaron I. Abell et al., *A History of the United States of America* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1951), 425.
- 20 The Vatican will of course reject this condition for several reasons. William Howard Taft, who was tasked with working out the purchase with the Vatican, spelled out the reasons for this rejection: “To this condition the Vatican declined to agree. It was willing to make a definite contract for arbitration, but it declined to agree as one of its terms to withdraw the friars from the islands: first because that was a question of religious discipline which, it did not think, ought to form a term of a commercial contract; secondly, because it did not desire, by such a stipulation, to reflect upon the Spanish religious Orders, and thus give apparent support to the slanders which had been published against the Orders by their enemies; and thirdly, because such an agreement would be offensive to Spain. We, on the part of the United States, under the instructions of the Secretary of War, did not feel authorized to enter into a contract of arbitration with all the uncertainty as to the extent of the obligation assumed, if it did not include as a consideration the withdrawal of the Spanish friars; and accordingly we reverted to the general agreement proposed in the Vatican’s first letter, in which the Church indicated its approval of the purchase of the lands, and the settlement of the other questions by negotiations with an Apostolic Delegate to be sent with full powers to Manila.” Cf. William H. Taft, *The Church and Our Government in the Philippines* (Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, [1904]), 34–36, cited in Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 307. Negotiations were started in 1902, after President Theodore Roosevelt had appointed a commission headed by Taft himself and to which were named as members Bishop Thomas O’Gorman of Sioux Falls and Judge James F. Smith, a Catholic and a member of the Philippine Supreme Court at that time. The topics to be negotiated are to be seen in the opening address of Taft to Pope Leo XIII, a section of which

The Friar Orders and the Parishes: Denouement

This demand for the ouster of the friars from the country would, however, soon become moot and academic. Because of a vocal, deeply rooted though not universal, anti-friar feeling, verified by the cases where some of the friars taken by revolutionary forces were executed,²¹ the great majority of the friars decided to leave the country and to return to Spain or to be assigned to some other country.²²

is quoted in Schumacher's *Philippine Church History*, 306. Taft's own report on the subsequent negotiations in the Philippines to purchase the friar lands are cited on 334–336.

- 21 Cf. Gutiérrez, *Historia de la Iglesia en Filipinas*, 283–285. Cf. also Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 271–272, for the narrative of a particular case which eventually led to the break between Emilio Aguinaldo and Andres Bonifacio, the fall from power of the latter and the consolidation of power in the hands of the former. One erstwhile prisoner among the sons of St. Dominic escaped execution and later gained some international prominence in the field of philosophy and theology: Francisco Marín Sola, OP, who arrived in Manila in 1897 and was imprisoned by the revolutionaries shortly. From the University of Santo Tomas in Manila, he was called to teach at Avila, and then Notre Dame (Indiana, USA), Fribourg (Switzerland), and briefly at the Angelicum in Rome where he crossed theological swords with Garrigou-Lagrange because of his attempt to reconcile the Jesuit and Dominican positions on grace. He later returned to Manila and died there in 1932. For the life of Marín Sola, cf. the “Introducción general” written by E. Sauras and appended to Marín Sola's published work, *La evolución homogénea del dogma católico* (Madrid: Biblioteca de autores cristianos, 1952), 11–26.
- 22 For the relevant sections regarding the individual friar orders in the Philippines during this period, helpful would be the following: 1. Pablo F. Fernández, OP, *Dominicos donde nace el sol. Historia de la Provincia del Santísimo Rosario de Filipinas de la Orden de Predicadores*, 2nd ed. (Barcelona: Talleres Graficos Yuste, 1958), particularly the last section, “Período Séptimo: desde la pérdida de Filipinas hasta el fin de la guerra del Pacífico (1898–1945)”; 2. Manuel Merino, OSA, *Agustinos evangelizadores de Filipinas, 1565–1965* (Madrid: Ediciones Archivo Augustiniano, 1965), and the multi-volume work of Isacio Rodríguez, OSA, *Historia de la Provincia Agustiniiana del Santísimo Nombre de Jesús de Filipinas* (Valladolid-Zamora: Estudio Augustiniano, 1965–1984); 3. Angel Martínez Cuesta, OAR, “Los agustinos recoletos en Filipinas, trescientos setenta y cinco años de presencia ininterrumpida,” in *Missionalia Hispánica*, vol. XXXIX, no.115 (1982): 19–40; and 4. Victor Sanchez, *España en extremo*

There had been attempts to get them to occupy at least some of their parishes again;²³ indeed, there were places where the people themselves asked for the return of their friar *cura párroco*. This was certainly true of those provinces far from the center of revolutionary activity. Thus in the Diocese of Cebu, for example, despite some anti-friar feeling in certain quarters, it was nevertheless possible to re-assign friars to vacant parishes. In a letter written in 1904 to Cardinal Francesco Satolli, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Studies in Rome, Bishop Hendrick of Cebu was able to report that

Among the common people, that is to say, among the faithful Catholics, I have found a determined feeling in many parts of the diocese against the Friars. The revolutionists make the anti-Friar sentiment their war cry, and no doubt this has had some influence in the matter. I have been asked for Friars, on the other hand, by the people of the vacant parishes, and have in every case requested the Friars to take possession of the parishes immediately.²⁴

oriente. Filipinas, China, Japón. Presencia Franciscana, 1578–1978 (Madrid: Cisneros, 1979).

- 23 The first Apostolic Delegate sent by Rome during this transition period, Placide Louis Chapelle, Archbishop of New Orleans, arrived in the Philippines in January 1900; he became a controversial figure almost right away because of the impression created by his close association with the friar orders. His meeting with the four bishops in the country then, all members of the friar orders, came up with a negative assessment of the capacity of the Filipino secular clergy to take responsibility for the life of the Church as a whole under the changed circumstances. The Archbishop of Manila, himself a Dominican, thought that there was “absolute necessity for a European clergy in the Philippines to carry out spiritual functions,” and that the more European clergy there were, “the more abundant the harvest” that could be reaped in the Philippines. Cf. Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 298–308, for a selection of documents relating to this vexed question of the friars’ return to the parishes.
- 24 The bishop also reported good rapport between the native secular clergy and the friars in his diocese: “I have found [the native priests] everywhere friendly

Obviously it was just impossible for all the parishes to be taken over by the native secular clergy, given the insufficiency of their numbers, and for them to insist that absolutely no friar be assigned to any parish would have been the height of irrationality and ecclesial suicide! No bishop who was concerned to conserve the traditional faith among his flock could have ruled out of hand the services that members of the friar orders could furnish his manpower-starved diocese.

Nevertheless the situation had changed radically;²⁵ on the horizon loomed the specter of a schism fueled by strong anti-friar sentiments, a schism that the Vatican did not want to happen. It will be seen much later that it was the steadfastness of the great majority of the Filipino secular clergy in their faith and their adherence to the Roman obedience which would save the country from becoming thoroughly Aglipayan and/or Protestant.

disposed towards the Friars, and I have not up to the present heard from any of the priests a single unfriendly expression toward the Friars, nor have I heard that they have spoken of the Friars disparagingly to the people. On the contrary, I know of several acts of friendship from the native priests to the Friars in cases where the latter have been sent to parishes near them.” Cf. Hendrick Papers, Nazareth College Library, Rochester, NY, folder 1, no. 4, cited in Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 302. In the same year, the new American Bishop of Jaro, Frederick Z. Rooker, given the severe lack of priests then obtaining in Negros Oriental and due to the numerous petitions of the inhabitants themselves, asked the Spanish Recollect missionaries to return to their old parishes. Cf. Roman C. Sagun, “The Religious Situation in Negros Oriental, 1904,” in *Kinaadman XVII* (1995): 1, 87–97.

- 25 A question that cannot be avoided here is this: How is it that we find documents written by Jesuits which confirm a more extreme and widespread anti-friar animus in the country? One Jesuit complained to P. General Luis Martín: “Decir como se dice ‘que solo no los quieren los revolucionarios y los mal llamados filósofos y que el pueblo les adora y venera’ es afirmar una solemne tontería” Strong words indeed! Obviously necessary here would be to study the relationship between the Jesuits and the members of the other religious orders in the Philippines during this period. For the comment above, cf. the letter of P. Francisco Javier Simó, SJ, to P. General Luis Martín, in ARSI, *Phil.1002-1*, 7.

Table 1: Distribution of the total number of canonical parishes (cp) in the Philippines among the religious and secular clergy.

Augustinians (OSA)	204 cp	(27%)
Recollects (OAR)	170 cp	(23%)
Secular Clergy	150 cp	(20%)
Franciscans (OFM)	149 cp	(20%)
Dominicans (OP)	73 cp	(10%)
Total	746 cp	(100%)

To demonstrate just how dramatic the situation was, we show statistics of the five-year period (1898–1903) in table 1.²⁶ Limiting our considerations to the number of clergy in canonical parishes (= “cp”) in all five ecclesiastical districts, i.e., the Archdiocese of Manila and the dioceses of Cebu, Jaro, Vigan (Nueva Segovia), and Camarines (Nueva Caceres), we come up with the following figures enumerated in table 1: 746 canonical parishes divided among the clergy, with the clergy ranked according to the number of parishes under their administration.²⁷

A combined total for all the friar orders would come up to 596 cp or 80% of the grand total of 746 (100%). In the same period there were about 675 Filipino native priests, with only 150 cp given to them for direct administration. The majority therefore of the members of the native secular clergy, ever since that fateful day in 1872 when Burgos and his companions were garroted for treason, continued to labor as coadjutors to the friar *curas párrocos*. This explains in large part why elements of the Filipino clergy belonged to the most vocal group that opposed the restoration of the parishes to the friars:

. . . we humbly beg the Holy See that, for the good of the Church and for public peace, the friars of the four corporations

26 Cf. Appendix III, 715 ff., Antonio F. B. de Castro, SJ, “Jesuits in the Philippines: The Transition from the Spanish to the American Jesuits, 1898–1932,” Pontificia Università Gregoriana. Dissertation, Rome, 2000.

27 The percentage figures have been rounded off.

in the Philippines not be rehabilitated *ad curam animarum* nor for ecclesiastical positions. This is because it is to be feared much that to their unbridled ambition they add their implacable vengeance which they manifested in a categorical way even in the middle of their imprisonment. For this reason they have plotted the unspeakable in order to return to their curacies.²⁸

These words betray not only a conviction about the damaging social and ecclesial consequences of a return by the friars to the parishes, but also a fear that these friars, once returned to the parishes, would use their position and their power to get back at those who had caused them suffering in the years of the revolution.

If we limit the picture to the Archdiocese of Manila with its 219 canonical parishes, the territory within which the revolution first unfolded and produced its most profound expressions, we come up with an even more dramatic picture (see table 2).

A combined total for the friar orders in the Archdiocese of Manila would give them 195 canonical parishes for 89% of the grand total of 219 cp in the premier ecclesiastical district in the country. The situation becomes all the more “ecclesiologically unstable” if one takes into account the fact that there were 198 Filipino priests in the Archdiocese of Manila but that only 24 canonical parishes were given to them for direct administration.

28 “ . . . suplicamos humildemente a la Sede Apostólica que los frailes de las cuatro corporaciones en Filipinas por el bien de la Iglesia y tranquilidad publica, no sean habilitados *ad curam animarum*, ni para los cargos eclesiásticos; porque es muy de temer que a su desenfrenada ambición añadan su implacable venganza, que aun en medio de su prisión la manifestaron de modo terminante; por lo que han intrigado lo indecible a fin de volver a sus curatos.” Exaggerated perhaps, but these words reflect the extent of distrust that members of the native secular clergy had toward the friar orders. Cf. the “Memorial,” written on 29 January 1900, Manila, by members of the Filipino clergy to the newly arrived Apostolic Delegate, in Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Document 11: 46–47. Other texts which demonstrate the same attitudes are to be found in Documents 12, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, and 24.

Table 2: Distribution of all canonical parishes (cp) in the Archdiocese of Manila among the religious and secular clergy.

Augustinians (OSA)	75 cp	(34%)
Recollects (OAR)	59 cp	(27%)
Franciscans (OFM)	47 cp	(22%)
Secular Clergy	24 cp	(11%)
Dominicans (OP)	14 cp	(6%)
Total	219 cp	(100%)

The Revolution, the Spanish-American War, and the subsequent cession of the Philippines to the United States would change all of that. A vociferous anti-friar campaign certainly gave the members of the friar orders the impression that, being Spanish nationals, they were no longer welcome. The revolution would result in the imprisonment of 403 friars by the revolutionaries, including the 16-month detention of the Bishop of Vigan, José Hevía Campomanes; forty friars would be killed.²⁹ The exodus itself of friars from the Islands had already started in 1898,³⁰ well before

29 This situation of friars being detained and imprisoned by the revolutionaries was the most urgent problem that would preoccupy the Nuncio in Madrid and Vatican officials. Efforts would be made to get the Americans to apply pressure on the revolutionaries to release the prisoners. Cf. the relevant documents in Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. III, particularly nos. 6–17, 45–78. In a letter to Cardinal Rampolla, then Secretary of State of the Vatican, dated 8 February 1899 (long after the end of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine-American War just started), Nava di Bontife, Apostolic Nuncio to the Spanish court, would suggest ways of procuring the freedom of the imprisoned friars. Only in December 1899 would all Spanish prisoners, friar and non, be released through a decree signed by Aguinaldo; cf. Document 17, 76–78.

30 The entry for “Jueves 21 de Julio” of ARSI, *Phil.* XIII-21: 20, reports the following: “Unos 22 religiosos Dominicanos han hecho la travesía de Dagupan a Hong Kong en el Vapor mercante ‘Juen-Sang’ constándoles 300 pesos el pasaje de cada uno.” And again, almost a month later, for “Jueves 18 de Agosto”: “Dijese que en un barco de guerra alemán, que sale para Hong Kong, van marchándose religiosos de las distintas Ordenes.” (38) The same report for 9 September (43).

the signing of the Treaty of Paris in December of the same year. From a total of 1,152 friars in 1898, the number of friars dropped to 380 by the end of 1902 (a dramatic 67% fall), and even further down to 246 toward the end of 1903 (a whopping 78% drop).³¹ The consequences, of course, for the day-to-day life of the parishes would be grave and disastrous, making it all the more imperative for the Holy See to send an Apostolic Delegate to investigate the complex problems that came in the wake of the Spanish-American War and the cession of the Islands to the United States and to recommend the requisite solutions to these problems. How this was to be done would prove to be very difficult indeed. Add to this problem of religious personnel that of the widespread destruction to Church property caused by the war, and one gets the impression of a real crisis; American soldiers had burned down many churches and convents, despoiled church property, and occupied church buildings.³² The Church wanted financial indemnification. But

31 Thus, though the efforts of those who wanted to oust the friars from the Philippines did not succeed, other reasons served as well to diminish their numbers in dramatic fashion: "Though the Vatican declined as a term of contract to withdraw the Spanish friars from the Philippines, they have been very largely reduced in number, — indeed, in a much shorter time than that in which we asked the Vatican to stipulate they should be. There were over 1000 friars in the Philippines in 1898; by the first of January, 1904, they had been reduced to 246; and 83 of these were Dominicans who have renounced the right to go into the parishes and have devoted themselves to education. Fifty of the remainder are infirm and unable to do any work, or indeed to leave the islands on account of the danger of the change of climate; so that there are only a few more than 100 available to be sent back to the parishes, and of these many are so engaged in educational work as to make it impracticable for them to act as parish priests. The consequence is that, as there are more than 900 parishes, the question of the intervention of the Spanish friars in the islands as parish priests ceases to be important." Cf. Taft, *Church and Our Government*, 42, quoted in Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 308. This picture, of course, signifies a devastating situation for the Catholic Church in the first decade of the 20th century.

32 Cf. *Catálogo de las reclamaciones que por daños y perjuicios inferidos a la Iglesia Católica de Filipinas presenta al Gobierno de los Estados Unidos de América el*

the internal problems of the Church at the time were complicated by the emergence of two historical forces on the horizon: Protestantism and the Aglipayan Schism.

Protestantism and the “Aglipayan Schism”

Two religious forces emerged from the chaos of the revolution, the Spanish-American War, and the Filipino-American War. The first was a totally new phenomenon, never before known and experienced as an institutional presence during the centuries the Islands were under Spain: Protestantism. The second force was homegrown: the creation of an Iglesia Filipina Independiente, a national church outside the Roman obedience. The challenges posed by these two forces to the Roman Catholic Church in the first three decades of the 20th century were considerable indeed.

Arzobispado de Manila y los Obispos sufragáneos, Manila, 1903. This is a very interesting document indeed, covering 160 pages, a veritable guide on Church property before the Spanish-American War. The book gives information on the occupation of American military forces of churches and conventos, its duration, the effects, etc. The Cathedral of Manila alone demanded \$17,818.42 in indemnification. Communities with burned-down churches report on the loss by providing inventories of Church paraphernalia destroyed. The Augustinians would claim staggering amounts of \$237,000.00 for property destroyed or lost in their convent and the Church of Ntra. Sra. de Guadalupe in San Pedro Makati and \$109,350.00 for their property destroyed by fire in the town of Tambobong, not far from Manila. The Franciscans would claim \$90,9213.00 for property destroyed or damaged when American troops occupied Franciscan property. The Jesuits of the Ateneo de Manila would ask for the relatively small sum of \$7,500.00 for the occupation of the building by American troops and for “los desperfectos causados en lo material del edificio” Several years back, the people of the town of Balangiga demanded the return of the church tower bells that the American troops took and brought to the United States where they now form part of a memorial to American dead in the Spanish-American War and the Philippine-American War. The controversy has remained unresolved; the Americans refuse to return the bells.

The Advent of Protestantism

In the case of Protestantism,³³ we have already alluded to the legitimating role by various Protestant churches in the decision taken by the US government to annex the Philippines in 1898. This is significant in one other sense: for a variety of reasons, American Catholics were generally opposed to the colonial retention of the Islands, although several prominent American Catholic figures, e.g., John Ireland, the Archbishop of St. Paul, were supportive of the American government's policies in the new territories.³⁴ American Protestants, motivated by the "Manifest Destiny" ideology which lay at the core of a theology that was unabashedly "political," on the whole refused to recognize the Philippines as an already established Christian nation which no longer needed to be evangelized by other Christian bodies. Thus the Presbyterian George F. Pentecost, chairman of the standing committee on foreign missions of the Presbyterian General Assembly meeting just three weeks (25 May 1898) after the victory of Dewey in Manila Bay, was hardly equivocal in his words when he called on his fellow Presbyterians to accept the new challenge that was the archipelago:

We cannot be deaf or blind to the startling providence of God which is just now opening up new and unexpected fields for foreign mission work. The peace-speaking guns of Admiral Dewey have opened the gates which henceforth make accessible not less than 8,000,000 of people who have been for 300 years been fettered by bonds almost worse than those of heathenism,

33 We shall be relying primarily on the work of Kenton J. Clymer, *Protestant Missionaries in the Philippines, 1898–1916. An Inquiry into the American Colonial Mentality* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986). Clymer's book is perhaps the most definitive study ever made on the Protestant missionaries who made it to Philippine shores.

34 Cf. Frank T. Reuter, *Catholic Influence on American Colonial Policies 1898–1904* (Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1967), 60–87. We shall deal with this in greater detail in the following pages.

and oppressed by a tyrannical priesthood only equalled in cruelty by the nation whose government has been a blight and blistering curse upon every people over whom her flag has floated, a system of religion almost if not altogether worse than heathenism We cannot ignore the fact that God has given into our hands, that is, into the hands of American Christians, the Philippine Islands, and thus opened a wide door and effectual to their populations, and has, by the very guns of our battleships, summoned us to go up and possess the land.³⁵

Furthermore, the new Protestant missions were to be sent to the Islands not just to convert the inhabitants to “the pure gospel” but also to promote the “American way of life” in all its significant expressions.

There were, of course, dissenting voices, particularly regarding aggressive proselytizing among Catholic Filipinos, but they were few and their effectiveness did not go beyond the confines of a particular church. There was, for example, John A. Staunton, Jr., “founder in 1904 of the famous Episcopalian Sagada mission in the mountains of Luzon.”³⁶ And on various points on the

35 Quote taken from Arthur Judson Brown, *The New Era in the Philippines* (New York: F. H. Revell Co., 1903), 173–174, and cited in Gerald H. Anderson, “Province and Politics behind Protestant Missionary Beginnings,” in *Studies in Philippine Church History*, ed. Gerald Anderson (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), 286. Reflected in these comments of Pentecost is of course the strong anti-Catholic prejudice then widespread in the United States.

36 The sympathies of Staunton, a minister of the Episcopalian Church, were clearly with the “high Anglican” tradition. Thus he “worked closely with the Belgian Fathers stationed in the same area, incorporated as much Catholic ritual into Episcopalian services as was possible, and strongly resented ‘Protestant’ leaning in the Church’s hierarchy. When in Manila he normally attended mass in the Catholic cathedral instead of worshipping in the Episcopalian church. And when the mission board, strapped for funds, proved unable to continue the Sagada mission on the scale that Staunton thought necessary, he attempted to have it turned over altogether to the CICM Fathers. After more than two decades of dedicated service, he returned to the

relationship between the dominant Roman Catholic Church and the Episcopalian Church, Bishop Charles Henry Brent was clear.³⁷ There was to be no active proselytizing among Filipino Catholics; Episcopalian missionary efforts were rather to be directed toward the conversion of the non-Christian tribes, pagan and Muslim, in the Philippine hinterlands of the north and the south.³⁸ But even in the same Episcopalian Church there were missionaries such as Reverend Mercer Johnston, Rector of the prestigious Manila Episcopalian Cathedral, who felt that, given the concrete situation of the Philippine Church, the Episcopalian Church needed to accentuate its protestant roots and try to win converts from the Roman Catholic Church.³⁹

United States where, after a few years, he embraced Roman Catholicism and accepted a position in the philosophy department at Notre Dame University." Cf. Kenton J. Clymer, "The Episcopalian Missionary Encounter with Roman Catholicism in the Philippines, 1901–1916," *Philippine Studies* 28, no. 1 (1980): 87.

- 37 On Brent's thinking in the areas of ecclesiology, missiology, and ecumenism, cf. Michael C. Reilly, "Charles Henry Brent: Philippine Missionary and Ecumenist," *Philippine Studies* 24 (1976): 303–325.
- 38 Brent admitted, for example, that the "measure of Christian belief and practice which the mass of the Filipino people enjoy today is the fruit of the labors of the Spanish friars and Jesuits." Cf. Clymer, "Episcopalian Missionary Encounter," 90. For an account of this fascinating figure, cf. also Alexander C. Zabriskie, *Bishop Brent: Crusader for Christian Unity* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1948). Cf. also Pedro S. de Achútegui, SJ, and Miguel A. Bernad, SJ, "Brent, Herzog, Morayta and Aglipay," *Philippine Studies* 8 (1960): 568–583. An indication of the international renown that Brent enjoyed could be seen in the fact that he was decorated by four countries: Belgium (Order of Leopold), France (Legion of Honor), Great Britain (Companion of the Order of Bath), and the United States (Distinguished Service Medal). He was also the recipient of honorary degrees from no less than 12 universities and colleges: in Divinity from Toronto (1901), Harvard (1913), Yale (1919), Columbia (1920), and Glasgow (1920), and in Laws from Toronto (1924) and New York University (1925). Brent died in Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1927.
- 39 Cf. Clymer, "Episcopalian Missionary Encounter," 88.

Now assumed in this new context would be the principle of the separation of church and state enshrined in the American constitution. The Protestant “invasion” of the Philippines is not to be interpreted in the sense of the Spanish *patronato*; the American constitutional principle promoted the exact opposite: the state was not to establish or promote any religion or religious aggrupation at all. There is here a clear difference in the conception of the relation among civil society, the state, and religion. Nevertheless, the early thrust of Protestant missionary activity had the perhaps not so subtle effect of identifying precisely “the American way of life,” and therefore of everything presumably good and noble, with Protestantism itself. That such a way of life could actually have a Catholic form will take several years to demonstrate to the local population.

Early Protestant activity in the Philippines during the Spanish regime in the 19th century was limited to attempts at smuggling Protestant Bibles into the country.⁴⁰ Efforts to establish a Protestant presence in 1889 proved to be unavailing; the colony seemed to be hermetically sealed from the outside world, at least in terms of religious proselytizing from non-Catholic groups.⁴¹ It was only during the Spanish-American War that some kind of Protestant activity could be undertaken, for American Protestant ministers had accompanied American troops in their campaign to defeat Spain in the Far East. A Methodist minister, the chaplain

40 The American Bible Society tried to clandestinely bring in Bibles into the colony in 1828. Cf. Clymer, *Protestant Missionaries*, 4, citing T. Valentino Sito, “Nineteenth Century Evangelical Beginnings in the Philippines,” in *South East Asian Journal of Theology* 9 (October 1967): 45.

41 Two Spaniards, Nicolas Manrique Lallave, an ex-Dominican, and P. Castells, a businessman, both Protestant ministers, “travelled to the Philippines with the intention of distributing Scriptures in the Spanish and Pangasinan languages.” This attempt proved to be a dismal failure. Cf. Clymer, *Protestant Missionaries*, 4. Cf. also the account of James B. Rodgers, *Forty Years in the Philippines. A History of the Protestant Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America 1899–1939* (New York: Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1940), 13–17.

George C. Stull, claimed to have celebrated “the first distinctive Protestant religious service” in Manila on Sunday, 28 August 1898. And in mid-November, amid great enthusiasm for the new missionary task ahead, the Rev. Charles A. Owen, who seems to have been the first Protestant missionary sent to the Philippines even though this was confirmed later as an irregular appointment, arrived to establish “First Church, Manila.” On 28 February 1899, the Methodist bishop, James M. Thoburn, exercising episcopal jurisdiction over South Asia, and a vigorous champion of the annexation of the former Spanish colony by the US, arrived in Manila to visit the Islands and to explore the opportunities for Protestant missionary work there.⁴² Finally, in April 1901, concerned about possible negative perceptions regarding the various Protestant denominations and the divisions among them, representatives of these Protestant groups met to organize themselves into “The Evangelical Union of the Philippine Islands.” They agreed to call themselves, in contra-position to the Roman Catholic Church seen as an aggregate whole, “The Evangelical Church of the Philippines,” after which was to be appended in parentheses the name of the denomination itself, e.g., “La Iglesia Evangelica de las Islas Filipinas (Methodist Episcopal).” The whole country was then divided into missionary territories among the denominations, with Manila remaining an “open city” for all the Protestant churches:⁴³ the provinces of Bulacan, Pampanga, Tarlac, Zambales, Nueva Ecija, and Pangasinan were assigned to the Methodist Mission; the provinces of Rizal, Cavite, Laguna, Batangas, Camarines del Norte, Camarines del Sur, Albay, and Sorsogon were assigned to the Presbyterian Mission; the

42 Cf. Rodgers, *Forty Years in the Philippines*, 2. Cf. 1–12 of this book for a narrative account of the arrival of the first Protestant missionaries to the Philippines.

43 Cf. *Ibid.*, 163–165, also cited in Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 313–314. In 1903, an estimated .06% of the “civilized” (i.e., “Christian”) population of 6,987,686 was identified as Protestant.

provinces of La Union, Ilocos del Sur, and Ilocos del Norte were given to the United Brethren Mission; the big Visayan island of Panay was left to the Baptists and Presbyterians to divide between them. A year later, other provinces were assigned to the different Protestant missionary bodies: Nueva Vizcaya, Isabela, and Cagayan were assigned to the Methodists; Bontoc, Lepanto, and Abra to the United Brethren; Benguet was to be shared by both Methodists and United Brethren; and the other Visayan islands of Cebu, Samar, Leyte, Bohol, Romblon, and Masbate were to be divided between the Presbyterian and Baptist missionaries. Moved by great evangelical zeal and armed with superior financial and logistical support, the Protestant missionaries spread over the archipelago.

Nevertheless, in 1918, 20 years after the fall of Manila to American military forces, the various Protestant denominations could claim to have converted only about 1.3% of the total Christian population of the Islands,⁴⁴ a clear indication that more than 300 years of Spanish missionary work among the people of the Islands could no longer be reversed and undone. But in the early years of the period in question, this was hardly self-evident, and conflicts between and among the various Church bodies were frequent and heated. The Catholic Church was of course identified as the principal enemy,⁴⁵ but more significant perhaps were splinter groups from the Protestant bodies themselves, with

44 In 1970, after a little over 70 years of work in the Islands, the Protestant churches could claim a membership of only about 3.3% of the total Christian population. There are efforts to study what appears to be a dismal failure of Protestantism to lay claim to Filipino allegiance. This does not, however, reflect on the real influence and political power that many Protestant Filipinos exercised in the country through the decades. The question today of “mega churches” is, however, another matter altogether.

45 Thus Brent would complain bitterly of what he regarded to be Roman Catholic attempts to obstruct Episcopalian efforts to purchase property in Manila, Episcopalian missionary work among the tribal communities in Sagada, Bontoc, and Baguio, and even the construction of an Episcopalian hospital. Cf. Clymer, “Episcopalian Missionary Encounter,” 92.

Filipino Protestant leaders initiating the break for a variety of reasons.⁴⁶ Thus, as early as 1905, the Methodist Church suffered its first internal schism when Manuel Aurora, a local preacher, “organized the *Cristianos Vivos Metodistas*.” In 1906, Agustin de la Rosa was similarly motivated to form a breakaway Presbyterian church. But it was Nicolas Zamora’s efforts in the first decade of American Protestant activity that had a more lasting effect. In 1909, Zamora, the first ordained Filipino Protestant minister—and nephew of Jacinto Zamora, one of the three secular priests garroted by the Spaniard authorities in 1872 for treason—set up the still-extant *La Iglesia Evangelica Metodista en las Islas Filipinas* (IEMELIF). Again in 1911, this time in the province of Cavite, the Rev. Gil Domingo broke away from the Presbyterian Church and set up his *Cristianos Filipinos*, with the support, it was rumored, of Felipe Buencamino and Manuel Quezon themselves. And in 1914, Felix Manalo, erstwhile evangelist of the Seventh Day Adventist Church, founded his *Iglesia ni Kristo* (INK), today the largest homegrown non-Catholic group in the Philippines.⁴⁷ It seems that in all of these examples, one can see not just the seemingly endemic tendency in Protestantism to break up into diverse groups; in the Islands, an important element was the fact of Filipino nationalism itself and the perceived and real grievances against American Protestant leaders who denigrated the Filipinos’ capacity to lead their own congregations.⁴⁸ However, in all of this intramural fighting, Protestant theological and missionary

46 For what follows, cf. Clymer, *Protestant Missionaries*, 114–133.

47 The INK is not considered by many Churches, Catholic and Protestant, to be a Christian Church ever since it upheld that Jesus Christ was only a human being, even if a highly inspired one.

48 “[Methodist missionaries are] smug young men . . . who place their national prejudices above the teachings of Jesus Christ. By word and action they have for years belittled our capabilities even to the extent of repeatedly asserting to our faces that the Filipinos are not fitted to conduct their own churches.” These were the words of Nicolas Zamora, cited in Clymer, *Protestant Missionaries*, 114.

principles continued to hold sway; the Catholic Church continued to be considered the principal antagonist and its members the object of proselytizing efforts.

The “Aglipayan Schism”

The early decades of the 20th century were also characterized by a schism that saw almost a quarter of the Catholic population confusedly alienated from the Roman obedience. Perhaps more than the many Protestant denominations, the schism, because it was a Filipino phenomenon, was the more dangerous one for the Catholic Church in the Islands. It is not our intention to chronicle the events which led to this schism.⁴⁹ But a familiarity with the basic lines which the schism assumed is necessary if we are to understand subsequent Philippine church history.⁵⁰

The origins of the Philippine Independent Church, or the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, are to be traced to the revolution itself and to Philippine nationalism. The whole problem arose from the desire of the leaders of the revolution, particularly Apolinario Mabini, and several members of the native secular clergy sympathetic to the cause of the revolution, most prominently Gregorio Aglipay,⁵¹ to completely excise the native

49 Still the most important and complete work on the subject remains the four volumes by Pedro S. de Achútegui, SJ, and Miguel A. Bernad, SJ, *Religious Revolution in the Philippines* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila), 1960–1972. Volumes III and IV are collections of primary documentary sources related to the “religious revolution” which had Gregorio Aglipay as its chief protagonist.

50 We shall rely for the most part on the summary treatment of Sr. Mary Dorita Clifford, “Iglesia Filipina Independiente: The Revolutionary Church,” in *Studies in Philippine Church History*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), 223–255.

51 Clifford’s summary description of Aglipay: “Gregorio Aglipay Cruz y Labayen (1860–1940) was born in Ilocos Norte. He was a Catholic priest of the archdiocese of Manila serving in Victoria, Tarlac, when he accepted the post of military chaplain from a secular authority and exercised ecclesiastical authority by appointing a vicar general, accepting promotion to military vicar general, issuing pastoral letters, ordering priests to contribute to

clergy, and therefore the people, from the authority of the Spanish friar bishops.⁵² The initial impulse was not to deny the authority of Rome; the aim was simply to create a papally approved hierarchy of Filipino bishops who would exercise authority over a native secular clergy in canonical possession of the parishes.⁵³

The idea of an independent national church, i.e., one that championed “radical departures in doctrine as well as authority,”

the revolution. Cited three times to appear before an ecclesiastical court to answer for his action, he refused to comply and continued to exercise ecclesiastical authority. On April 29, 1899, a declaratory sentence stated that he had incurred excommunication by his actions, and public denunciation followed on May 4, 1899.” Clifford, “Iglesia Filipina Independiente,” n.13, 227. Clifford describes this first phase as “schismatic” and not yet “heretical.” Aglipay, after donning the uniform of a guerrilla fighter, would later surrender to the American military forces.

- 52 In 1898 the bishops were as follows: 1) Archdiocese of Manila: the Dominican Bernardino Nozaleda; 2) Diocese of Nueva Segovia (Vigan): the Dominican José Hevíá Campomanes; 3) Diocese of Nueva Caceres (Naga): the Augustinian Arsenio del Campo y Monasterio (who had left the Islands on board a German ship it seems, thus leaving his diocese vacant); 4) Diocese of Cebu: the Franciscan Martín García y Alcocer (later to be Apostolic Administrator of the Archdiocese of Manila after Nozaleda had left for Spain); and 5) Diocese of Jaro: the Recollect Andrés Ferrero. For quick information on Nozaleda, Hevíá Campomanes, and Ferrero, see the relevant entries in the four-volume work *Diccionario de historia eclesiástica de España* (Madrid: Instituto Enrique Flores, 1972–1975).
- 53 There is a line therefore which runs from the “Secularization controversy” of Pelaez, Burgos and company, to these efforts by some native clergymen to set up a hierarchy of Filipino bishops. Though it must be mentioned that the Filipino secular clergy was clearly motivated by a negative anti-Spanish friar sentiment in their struggle for the secularization and Filipinization of the parishes and ecclesiastical offices, it nevertheless remains true that they were also moved by a profound and positive sentiment as shown by their strong support of the revolution against the Americans, sometimes to the point of taking arms themselves. Cf. John Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy: The Filipino Clergy and the Nationalist Movement, 1850–1903* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1981) for the role of the Filipino clergy in the struggle against the American military forces in the Tagalog region, Cebu, Nueva Caceres, and Jaro.

first reared its head publicly sometime on the first Sunday of February 1901 in Tondo, Manila. In a rally organized by the leaders of the newly founded and officially favored Federal Party, Felipe Buencamino proposed “an independent church free from all foreign control,” with membership in it as a necessary requirement for membership in the Federal Party itself. Taft quickly disavowed the aims of such an enterprise, realizing perhaps just how much such an action would jeopardize the American colonial government’s hold on a country which was still in the process of being “pacified” by alienating its predominantly Catholic population. Besides, it should not have been difficult for Taft, a lawyer and once a judge in the 6th division of the American Appellate Court, to see that such an arrangement would in fact run counter to the American constitutional principle of the separation of church and state. But the idea of a national church had been proposed, and it would take the return to the Islands of a man like Isabelo de los Reyes y Florentina, “journalist, radical, and amateur theologian,” to bring the idea to its successful conclusion.⁵⁴

54 Clifford's account of this fascinating figure, born in Ilocos Sur in 1864 and living to a ripe old age of 74 before his death in 1938: “His outspoken revolutionary writings had brought him into conflict with the Spanish government in 1896, and he was thrown into prison where he addressed a Memorial, violently anti-friar and revolutionary, to the Spanish governor, Primo de Rivera. For this he was transferred to Montjuich prison in Barcelona, where his abject letters to Spanish authorities denied his anti-friar writings. After his release he published *Filipinas ante Europa* (in Madrid), an anticlerical, anti-American newspaper, advocating continued revolution. In 1899, after the Paniqui Assembly of the Filipino priests, he was commissioned to negotiate for the revolutionary government with the Spanish Papal Nuncio for the release of friar prisoners in exchange for *de jure* recognition of the Malolos government and the rights of the native clergy. Having failed to bring this off successfully, he supported a policy of complete break with Rome and an independent church” Cf. Clifford, “Iglesia Filipina Independiente,” 232. For documents related to the Paniqui Assembly of Filipino secular clergy, cf. Achútegui and Bernad, “Constituciones Provisionales de la Iglesia Filipina,” in *Religious Revolution*, Vol. III, Document 31: 112–117.

After a meeting with a group of American Protestant leaders in November 1901⁵⁵ and an ultimatum signed by a group of 17 Ilocano priests sympathetic to the cause of de los Reyes and Aglipay in January 1902 and addressed to the Apostolic Delegate, de los Reyes,⁵⁶ apparently without consulting Aglipay, proclaimed the new Iglesia Filipina Independiente on 3 August 1902. He also named Aglipay “Obispo Maximo” of the schismatic church. Nevertheless, it was not as smooth sailing as expected; Aglipay himself had scruples which are clearly reflected in a manifesto he wrote to the Filipino clergy 13 days after de los Reyes’s unilateral proclamation of the new church; here he continued to deny any schismatic intentions.⁵⁷ But the die was cast and,

55 Cf. the account of Homer Stuntz, *The Philippines and the Far East* (Cincinnati: Jennings and Pye, 1904), 489–490, and cited in Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 318–319. Stuntz, a Methodist minister, reported that the Protestant leaders present wanted assurance that the new independent church would “consider the question of the endorsement of the Word of God, marriage of the clergy, and the abolition of Mariolatry.”

56 Cf. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Document 35: 121–122 for the original Spanish text of this letter addressed to the Apostolic Delegate: “Los sacerdotes Filipinos que suscriben han acordado sostener firmemente los derechos del Clero Filipino para ocupar exclusivamente los Arzobispados, Obispados, Provisoratos, Cabildos, Parroquias y dirección de los Seminarios y demás dignidades eclesiásticas en Filipinas, y en el caso de que el Delegado del Papa atropellase dichos derechos nos separaremos de él, porque nadie tiene obligación de obedecer al que ordene cualquiera injusticia. En este caso formaremos una Iglesia Filipina con los mismos dogmas que la romana, y los que suscriben formarán un concilio que preconice preladados y dicte los decretos necesarios para sostener la nueva disciplina y las buenas costumbres apostólicas.” Aglipay was also recognized as their legitimate leader and executor of the agreement. Almost all of the undersigned would join the schism declared not long after. An English translation of this text is to be found in Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 319.

57 “Y ved aquí, querido hermano, el fundamento del acuerdo de crear la Iglesia Filipina. El objeto que se propone no es, como con intención deliberada se ha propalado, de separarse de la obediencia al Sumo Pontífice, si se atiende nuestro ruego, que no tiene otro fin, si no el que se nos conceda el derecho de que las altas dignidades de la Iglesia recaigan en sacerdotes filipinos”

on 22 September of the same year, he would affix his signature as “Obispo Maximo” to the first of the “Fundamental Epistles,” a declaration of principles of the breakaway church which would clearly indicate not just a schismatic separation from legitimate ecclesiastical authority but also an espousal of doctrine which clearly deviated from Catholic teaching.⁵⁸ And so it happened that, on 1 October 1902, Aglipay and five other designated “bishops” of the new church would affix their signatures to a newly drafted “Constitución de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente” in Manila.⁵⁹ The formal inauguration of the new church finally took place in Manila on 24–25 October, creating the impression in some anti-friar and anti-Catholic quarters that, indeed, the Roman Catholic

Cf. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Document 38: 127–130.

- 58 Cf. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Document 38 : 131–133. A sensitive point obviously was the question of episcopal ordination for Aglipay himself and for all subsequently appointed bishops of the new church. The position taken, however, denies that the episcopate is essential to the priesthood: “Ahora bien, si un reglar puede en caso de necesidad, administrar el ‘primer’ sacramento que es el bautismo, porque un perfecto Sacerdote, en caso también de necesidad, no podrá suplir al Obispo para administrar el ‘sexto’ sacramento, o sea el de orden, orden secundario como hemos probado, no es esencial para el Sacerdocio?” The subsequent history of the Iglesia Filipina Independiente would also be characterized by a split within its own ranks, with one group opting for Unitarianism while the other held on to Trinitarian orthodoxy. Cf. Clifford, “Iglesia Filipina Independiente,” 248 ff.
- 59 “Con el fin de gozar de una Iglesia nacional, independiente de Roma, cual lo han hecho en tiempos pasados, las que hoy son reconocidas como de las naciones mas grandes y civilizadas del mundo, Inglaterra, Alemania, Rusia, Italia, Francia, Grecia, Bélgica y América . . . hemos acordado fundar y de hecho fundamos nuestra Iglesia para la cual establecemos y aprobamos la presente constitución . . .” Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Document 41: 139–141. On the same day, Aglipay wrote a letter which called on the youth of the land “que tienen la debida preparación para ejercer el ministerio espiritual, no deben perder esta hermosa oportunidad de servir al pueblo, que está ansioso de recibirlos . . .” Cf. Document 42: 142–143.

Church had at last reached its long-delayed but well-deserved end for good.⁶⁰

The Iglesia Filipina Independiente, encouraged by crusading Protestant missionaries who were all too eager to break “the solid front of Romish opposition”⁶¹ and supported by anti-

60 Thus *La Democracia*, founded by the now convinced Americanist Trinidad Pardo de Tavera and official organ of the Federal Party, reported the event on Monday, 27 October 1902: “Después de la Misa, el Sr. Aglipay se quitó la casulla y desde el altar pronunció un elocuente sermón, en el que explicó las causas de su separación de Roma, tales son la necesidad de restablecer el verdadero culto de Dios, verdadero y la pureza de su Santa Palabra, y la de sostener la dignidad nacional en las personas de los sacerdotes compatriotas que se ven espoleados y preteridos por los representantes del Vaticano” The announcement was then made that “El lunes, 2 del mes entrante, día de animas, dedicará la Iglesia Filipina Independiente solemnes funerales al eterno descanso de los sacerdotes Burgos, Gómez, Zamora, Prieto, Díaz y Herrera, y al Dr. Rizal, Marcelo H. del Pilar, López Jaena, Numeriano Adriano, Moisés Salvador, F. Villaruel, Teodoro Plata, generales Luna, Hizon, del Pilar y todos los que murieron por la Patria.” And in conclusion: “El Catolicismo Romano habrá visto con ojos de sorpresa suprema los efectos de su política, de su conducta para con los católicos filipinos. El desenlace de aquel movimiento contra el ferro y humillante espolero perpetrado por los frailes, ha comenzado a desarrollarse con la separación de millones de fieles, quizás de toda la grey en este país” Cf. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Document 49: 164–167.

61 Stuntz, *The Philippines and the Far East*, 494–495, cited in Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 329. This encouragement was not of course altogether altruistic: “The Aglipay movement helps us by detaching the tens of thousands of members from a nominal connection with the Church of Rome, leaving them without positive instruction in a more excellent way. Our preachers get a hearing with them, and hundreds of them accept the Word and are saved. These people would never have left the Roman Catholic Church to become Protestants, feeble as was the hold of the old Church upon them; but once outside and hungry for spiritual food, they hear and are saved. Aglipay loosens this fruit from the tree and we gather it. God is thus overruling the shortcomings of the leaders of this revolt against the Romish Church to the spiritual good of many souls.” This strategy is revealing in an indirect way of Protestant attitudes toward Aglipay and the new church. Though there were some who were steadfast supporters of

clerical forces, Masons, and other self-interested enemies of the Catholic Church who saw in the schism a providential opportunity to wean the population away from her presence and influence, began to increase in numbers. Though only a fraction of the more than 600 Filipino secular priests joined the new church, the proportion of the Catholic population that identified itself with Aglipay was probably much higher: an estimated 25% or about 1,500,000 Filipinos were thought to have been affiliated with the new church in 1903.⁶² Questions remain, however, regarding the authenticity of motivations for this supposed transfer of religious allegiance. Identification of the schismatic church with the recent history and goals of the revolution probably accounted for this apparent break with Catholicism.

The great dispute then began about who owned which church building and property. Many parishes were now vacant because of the departure of the friars, and Aglipayan clergy and laity were not slow to claim possession of several such parishes with their church building, convent, chapels, and other properties. In

Aglipay, there were also those who clearly dissociated themselves from him and his movement for various reasons, particularly the nationalist character of the movement and "its reputation for anti-Americanism." One of those who would become disillusioned with Aglipay and the new church, Bishop Brent of the Episcopal Church, would not hesitate to opine that it would be better that "the whole disaffected mass should be reabsorbed into the Roman communion than that it should continue its present course." Cf. Clymer, *Protestant Missionaries*, 114–123, for details; the chapter itself is "The Protestant Missionary Response to Philippine Nationalism: The Ecclesiastical Dimension."

62 Schumacher places the number of Filipino secular clergy who transferred their allegiance to the Iglesia Filipina Independiente at 36 (anywhere between 5% to 6% of the total number of Filipino priests), with a high concentration of these in the Ilocano-speaking regions of northern Luzon. Cf. Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 328. The Aglipayan share of the total Christian population in the Islands will drop progressively as the years pass, so much so that by 1970 only about 4.2% of the total Christian population would declare themselves members of the Aglipayan Church. Cf. Appendix III, de Castro, "Jesuits in the Philippines," 727.

some areas, Aglipayan laity, many of them women, took the lead in occupying parish buildings and driving away Filipino secular priests who refused to join the schism. The dispute therefore was not just over the souls of Filipinos but also over the “rightful ownership” of Church property.⁶³ The situation would become even more heated and bitter when several bishops recalled some

63 This whole problem will be a long-drawn-out affair, particularly in faraway places. In Mindanao, for example, upon the return of several Recollect friars to certain parishes in the District of Misamis, they encountered not just hostility but despoliation of church property. In several cases they were forced out of the church and convento. There were cases of whole towns going over to Aglipayanism (Oroquieta, for example), particularly after the visit of an Aglipayan bishop by the name of Jose Evangelista. The situation in northern Mindanao had become so confused and alarming that the Bishop of Cebu, Thomas A. Hendrick, even made an unannounced visit to several towns there: “En septiembre se presentó en Misamis, sin previo aviso, el obispo de Cebú mons. Tomás A. Hendrik [sic], acompañado del coronel de constabularios o de la policía urbana. Mandaron llamar al presidente municipal, con el que se dirigieron a la iglesia y convento y tomaron posesión de ambos edificios; a continuación hicieron entrega del ara del altar mayor a don Custodio Hynson, presidente del Centro Católico de Misamis y representante del párroco en su ausencia. Visitó también Oroquieta y Jiménez con el mismo propósito de conocer la situación de los pueblos y reclamar la devolución de los edificios y otras pertenencias de la Iglesia.” Cf. José Luis Sáenz Ruiz-Olalde, OAR, *Los agustinos recoletos y la revolución hispano-filipina* (Marcilla: Boletín de la Provincia de San Nicolás de Tolentino), 1998), 406. This is an important book if only because a history of the Recollect friars in the Philippines during this period is hardly known outside of the Order itself. Its importance lies also in its use of archival material to be found in the Recollect archives in Marcilla, Navarra. Nevertheless, as history it remains essentially a history of the Recollects and Recollect perceptions of the revolution and its aftermath; there is no serious attempt to confront Recollect readings of the situation with other, more critical studies. It is also significant that the author chooses to use the phrase “revolución hispano-filipina” instead of the much simpler “revolución filipina”; by this he seems to indicate that the Philippine Revolution was a masonic plot and he therefore subscribes to the conventional friar reading of the revolution. Was not Miguel Morayta, Grand Master of the Gran Oriente Español, after all the president of the *Asociación hispano-filipina* in Spain?

friars and reassigned them to vacant parishes. What complicated matters was the fact that

. . . the Federal Party, founded by Americans and leading anti-clerical Filipinos, and basically hostile to the Church, had been favored by the American government with almost all the provincial and local offices. Hence the municipal governments especially tended to favor the Aglipayans and harass the Catholic Church The abuse of political power was most notable in the case of the possession of churches and conventos. Where the Catholic priest had become Aglipayan, he took the church and convento with him.⁶⁴ In other places, where there was no resident Catholic priest, the Aglipayans frequently took over the church or chapel, sometimes by violence, sometimes with the secret or even open connivance of the municipal officials, who claimed to own all church property. This was particularly the case in the diocese[s] of Cebu and Jaro, where the number of Filipino priests was . . . insufficient with the departure of the friars⁶⁵

64 Thus the Aglipayan newspaper *La Verdad* would quote with approval the instructions given by Taft to local officials on the whole matter of churches and convents: “Por otra parte, si un sacerdote que está en posesión de iglesia abandona el credo católico-romano y conservando la posesión de la propiedad del templo, permite que se use para celebrar allí los servicios y ceremonias de la Iglesia filipina, no correspondería a V. decidir si el proceder de ese sacerdote es contrario a la ley, ni tratar de remediarlo desposeyéndole, porque el cambio que ha tenido lugar no se ha efectuado con perturbación del orden, y el remedio para el mal, si lo hubiere, solo puede hallarse en los tribunales que se han organizado para hacer justicia. Es su deber respetar a la persona que goza de la posesión pacífica y protegerle contra la desposesión violenta, sea cual fuere la opinión que V. abrigue acerca de la legalidad o la justicia por si mismo, porque permitirle tal proceder seria producir tumultos y confusión en el Archipiélago, La cuestión, por lo que a V. y a los presidentes se refiere, no está en la cuestión de la posesión; está en la perturbación del orden.” Cf. “La Justicia y el Gobierno Americano,” in *La Verdad* I, 1 (Manila, 21 January 1903): 14.

65 Schumacher’s words, cf. *Philippine Church History*, 330–333. He further notes that in the Diocese of Jaro alone there were 400 reported cases of church property taken over by the “schismatics.” And in 1908, a Spanish Recollect

Governor Taft attempted to correct the situation by denying that local government officials had the power to pronounce judgment on “rightful ownership” of church property and by leaving decisions on such a matter to the courts.⁶⁶ To the mind of the new Bishop of Cebu, Thomas Hendrick, this was clearly not enough, that in fact it was a gross violation of the provision of the Treaty of Paris which stipulated that it was “the duty of the United States to preserve these properties to the Catholic Church against all others.”⁶⁷ The tide will turn in favor of the Catholic Church only in 1905 when the Philippine Supreme Court, in a

priest, Fr. Victor Baltanas, was murdered precisely because of this contest over church property.

- 66** Taft was a lawyer by profession but he seems to have betrayed in this situation a perhaps culpable ignorance about what church property is all about, something which was clear even in the American legal system. “Taft simply failed to take into full account the historical fact that parish churches, buildings, and like properties of the Church were not vested in the local pastor or his assistants; on the contrary, title was explicitly held by the bishop of the diocese. Thus it was legally impossible for a disaffected pastor or priest to take title to such structures; he had no rights since he merely occupied or used the structures by appointment of his bishop. Similarly, when such structures were abandoned or unused by reason of expulsion of the pastor, as happened frequently during the lengthy hostilities, unilateral seizure by another agency of religion or by government was indefensible in law” There might be reason to believe then that Taft was not above making life difficult for the Catholic Church and her bishops by making decisions which had no basis in law. Cf. Charles L. Higgins, “The Hendrick Papers,” *Philippine Studies* 28 (1980): 432–433.
- 67** Letter of Bishop Thomas Hendrick of Cebu, 28 September 1904, to Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, copy in Hendrick Papers, Nazareth College Library, Rochester, NY, cited in Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 331–332. The bishop had already written as early as March of this same year (1904) to Roosevelt, telling him that “It is necessary for me to recall to you that the United States is not giving anything to the Church. It has agreed to protect and safeguard the ancient rights of Catholics in these Islands. These rights are supposed, taken as facts, in the Treaty of Paris” Cf. Hendrick to Roosevelt, 18 March 1904, Hendrick Papers, no. 8, quoted in Higgins, “The Hendrick Papers,” 431.

landmark decision, ruled against a Filipino Catholic priest-turned-Aglipayan and ordered him to restore the church property, which he and his followers had unilaterally sequestered, to the Catholic Church. But this contest over church property was to contribute to the turmoil of the times and to the woes of the Church in this period of transition. The loss of ecclesiastical infrastructure such as churches and convents would seem to have dealt a terrible blow to the attempts of the Catholic Church to reorganize herself.

The Apostolic Delegate, the Filipino Clergy, and *Quae Mari Sinico*

The religious situation in the country had clearly become intolerable; events were proving to be detrimental to the interests of the Catholic population at the turn of the century. The change in sovereignty left in its wake a whole new set of political structures based on a different set of constitutional principles, something that may be conveniently encapsulated in the political and constitutional doctrine of the separation of church and state. The consequences could be seen, for example, in the setting up of a public school system that wanted, at least ideally, to be religion-free. These could be seen also in the cessation of all governmental funding of missionary efforts which, in the mind of the missionaries, were civilizing efforts also inasmuch as methods of “reductions” were employed. Clearly the religious and civil functions of missionary activity in places like Mindanao could not be separated from one another. Where the wider Church was concerned, this doctrine of course had always proven to be problematic, if not downright scandalous, to Catholic sensibilities in Rome and elsewhere. The Catholic Church in the United States was, by and large, convinced that there were advantages to such a political doctrine for the Church herself. Indeed, there were Catholic ecclesiastical figures who thought that this indeed was the wave of the future. One of the protagonists of the Americanist controversy, the then Rector of the American College in Rome,

Denis J. O'Connell, in a letter written in May 1898 to John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul and leader of the liberal wing in the American Church, did not hesitate to comment on the Spanish-American War in the following terms:

For me this is not simply a question of Cuba But for me it is a question of much more moment: it is the question of two civilizations. It is the question of all that is vile & mean & rotten & cruel & false in Europe against all this [*sic*] is free & noble & open & true & humane in America. When Spain is swept of [*sic*] the seas much of the meanness & narrowness of old Europe goes with it, to be replaced by the freedom and openness of America. This is God's way of developing the world. And all continental Europe feels the war is against itself, and that is why they are all against us, and Rome more than all, because when the prestige of Spain & Italy will have passed away, and when the pivot of the world's political action will no longer be confined within the limits of this continent, then the nonsense of trying to govern the universal Church, from a purely European standpoint and according to exclusively Spanish and Italian methods, will be glaringly evident even to a child. "Now the axe is laid to the root of the tree." Let the wealth of the Convents & Communities in Cuba & the Philippines go: it did nothing for the advancement of religion. No more patching of new pieces on old garments: it serves neither the one nor the other, and the foundations of religion must be laid anew "in spirit and in truth." Begin these anew with the Gospel and with such accessories & Canon Law as the Gospel requires without making paramount the interests of the comfortable-living personages or communities.⁶⁸

68 Letter of Denis J. O'Connell, [Rome] 24 May 1898, to John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul, in the Archives of the Archdiocese of St. Paul, cited in Gerald P. Fogarty, *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy from 1870 to 1965* (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1985), 163.

O'Connell's evaluation of course has more to do with asserting the dawning of Anglo-Saxon prominence in the world and in the Church rather than with the nitty-gritty conditions then obtaining in the Philippines. It was easy for him to say what he did because he was not aware of the concrete circumstances then prevailing in the Philippine Church. As we shall see, the Apostolic Delegate would in fact work to retain the friars in the Islands because of the vacuum that would be created by their expulsion or departure.

Together with this vexatious religious situation, other issues that confronted the Church at the turn of the century ranged across various areas of national life. There was the rise of national and local elites as a potent political force, a fact which in Manila and other major cities was clearly connected not just to an anti-friar animus but sometimes also to an anti-Catholic prejudice. Lay personalities were offering a secular alternative to the *cura párroco* as leader of the community. The introduction of an aggressive Protestantism into the Islands also seemed to augur the end of the religious dominance of Catholicism among the people. And within the Church itself the post-1898 presence of Spanish bishops and the question whether the friars should be allowed to return to their parishes continued to create disaffection and distress among the Filipino secular clergy, giving ammunition to the desire of a minority in 1902 to break away from Rome and to found their own national church. The chain of events from 1898 to the first decade of the 20th century put the Roman Catholic Church into an intolerable situation which demanded swift action and decisive resolution.

The Apostolic Delegate and Proposals for Church Reform

The Islands had to wait for more than a year after the surrender of Spanish Manila to US American forces before the Vatican's first Apostolic Delegate finally made it to the Philippines. He was Placide Louis Chapelle, the sixth Archbishop of New Orleans in

Louisiana, USA.⁶⁹ After settling the affairs of the Church in Cuba and Puerto Rico, he then set out for the Philippines.⁷⁰ His arrival in the Islands was met with great enthusiasm by the Catholic population in general, his long-awaited presence being compared to “el agua de Mayo para el arreglo de muchos asuntos.”⁷¹ The

-
- 69 Chapelle was born in Runes, France, on 28 August 1842. At the age of 17 he migrated to the United States and became a priest of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. After years of ministry in various places, he was named Archbishop of Santa Fe, New Mexico, in 1894. He became Archbishop of New Orleans on 1 December 1897, several months before the outbreak of the Spanish-American War. A year after, he was named Apostolic Delegate to Puerto Rico and Cuba and chargé d'affaires for the Philippines. Chapelle died in New Orleans on 9 August 1905. Cf. the entry for Chapelle in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 3: 453.
- 70 Chapelle's correspondence with Rome during his term as Apostolic Delegate to the Philippines begins with the clear instruction to protect the interests of the Catholic Church in the Islands. Cf. Secretary of State Mariano Cardinal Rampolla, Rome 28 September 1899, to P. L. Chapelle, no. 51877, in SCAAEESS, *Spagna*, Posizione 903–305, Fascicolo 316, pagina 67. Cf. also Antolin V. Uy, SVD, “The Formation of the Native Clergy in the Philippines: The Efforts of the Vatican and the American Factor,” in *Diwa* 22 (May 1997): 2–19. All references to SCAAEESS are thanks to Fr. Antolin Uy, who has done the most extensive research on the subject.
- 71 The phrase is from the Jesuit Francisco Javier Simó's letter to P. General Luis Martin, dated Manila, 10 November 1900 (months after the event therefore), in ARSI, *Phil.* 1002-I, 7. The Jesuits had already come into contact with Chapelle earlier regarding the question of Jesuit property and works in Cuba in the aftermath of the Spanish-American War. In 1898 Chapelle was named Apostolic Delegate in Cuba and Puerto Rico. The General notes that Chapelle “trató bien a nuestros Padres en la Habana, aunque mostrando siempre el empeño de americanizarlo todo y trabajando por que se pusieran en todas partes Obispos americanos.” Of great concern for the General was the desire of the Apostolic Delegate to see the then Jesuit Superior of the Mission of New Orleans, P. William Power, at that time engaged in the task of conserving Jesuit property in Cuba, raised to the dignity of the episcopate. Regarding this affair, cf. *Memorias* II, 735–740. The cold relations between the Spanish Jesuits of the Philippine Mission and the Apostolic Delegate may partly have had their roots in this early encounter in Cuba and Puerto Rico.

Filipino secular clergy, in particular, with expectations running high, were hoping that, in consonance with recent papal pronouncements on the necessity of developing a native clergy in the mission countries, their anomalous situation was finally going to be put right.⁷² They fervently pinned their hopes for Church reform on the Apostolic Delegate.

Chapelle lost no time in setting things in motion. He had to concern himself with the thousand and one details connected with the Church in the transfer of sovereignty from Spanish to American hands. One of his first actions was to prohibit the departure of any ecclesiastic, secular or religious, from the Islands; the alarming exodus of Spanish religious personnel from the Philippines was, in his estimation, not the answer to the

72 The Filipino clergy took inspiration from an encyclical issued by Pope Leo XIII on 24 June 1893, "Ad extremas Orientis oras," *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 25 (1892–1893): 716–721, three years before the Philippine Revolution broke out, which was addressed to the Church in India. In particular, what caught their eye were the provisions in the second half of the document which called for the creation and fostering of a native clergy. In the editors' own summary: "The Pope urged the Portuguese bishops in India to foster the increase of a native clergy. Native priests should not be treated merely as assistants. They should be trained to fill more important posts, including the Episcopate. Citing the example of the Apostles and the authority of St. Francis Xavier, the Pope gave three reasons for the importance of a native clergy: a) Native priests are better attuned culturally to the needs of their own people; b) European priests, no matter how many, will never be able to supply the needs of an expanding Christian population in the Indies; c) If the time should come (which is not impossible, says the Pope) that foreign priests should be expelled from a country, the native priests would still be there to keep the Faith alive." The text of the encyclical printed in *Religious Revolution* is a copy of the Spanish translation in a pamphlet published in Pangasinan in 1899. Cf. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Document 83: 275–280. For the original Latin text, cf. *Acta Leonis XIII*, 13: 190–197; cf. also *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 25 (1892–1893): 716–721. For "Ad extremas Orientis oras" and its significance for India, cf. Carlos Mercês de Melo, SJ, *The Recruitment and Formation of the Native Clergy in India (16th–19th Century): An Historico-Canonical Study* (Lisbon: Agência Geral do Ultramar, 1955), 307–319.

problem facing the Church then and clearly had to be stopped.⁷³ Another urgent concern was preserving the properties of the Church. He must have realized that the new political dispensation meant that the Church could no longer count on state assistance for its apostolic work. Thus, sometime in 1900, he became involved *ex officio* in the whole controversy surrounding the status of the school of pharmacy and medicine which formed part of the University of Santo Tomas run by the Dominicans. This school was funded from the revenues coming from the Colegio de San Jose haciendas. Certain prominent Filipinos had urged the American colonial government to confiscate the Colegio de San Jose properties, alleging that these were now subject to the state after the demise of the Spanish colonial regime. Chapelle would put up a brilliant defense of the “obra pia” nature of the San Jose properties.⁷⁴ The United States did succeed to the rights of the Crown of Spain, but not to the ecclesiastical patronage which was given to the Spanish Crown as a concession by the Holy See:

The chief prerogative belonging to the Spanish Government, to which the United States surely did not succeed, is that of ecclesiastical patronage, which supposes a state or established state. From the first day of the occupation of our new possessions, the President and the military Governments have proclaimed, by word and by action, the separation of Church and State. This evidently implies that the American authorities

73 Cf. P. L. Chapelle, Apostolic Delegate, Manila, 4 January 1900, to all religious superiors, in Archives of the Philippine Province of the Society of Jesus [henceforth, APPSJ] II-6-002.

74 Cf. *Informe de S. E. el Reverend. P. L. Chapelle Delegado Apostólico* ([Manila]: sn, 1900), APPSJ V-19-020. The *Informe* is in English and Spanish. It is perhaps the most brilliant and most concise defense of the Church and her rights given the new political dispensation, making full use of American constitutional principles and jurisprudence and historical examples to prove his case while presenting an accurate summary of the whole concept of the *patronato real* as it was applied in the Philippines.

cannot interfere in religious matters any more here than they can in the United States. I speak of inability advisedly, for such a union would be contrary, not only to the constitution, but to all our traditions and to public opinion. If then the American authorities here are bound to guarantee the free exercise of religion in the spirit and by the methods that are used in the United States, they have none of the prerogatives or duties of the Vice Royal Patron. This Government may not appropriate money for the support of the catholic clergy and worship, or discharge the other obligations of Royal Patronage, and therefore it has no right to interfere in the nominations to ecclesiastical benefices, in the proper collection of church revenues, the administration of ecclesiastical properties as such, and the exercise of episcopal authority Now it would be monstrous, if a Government which cannot recognise the Catholic Church, which declares itself incompetent to fulfill the obligations of an ecclesiastical Patron, would yet attempt to interfere with ecclesiastical matters and enjoy privileges which, even the Catholic Spanish sovereigns used and enjoyed as mere voluntary concessions from the Holy See, on the specified condition that they should recognise the Catholic Church as the State religion and maintain its ministers and worship.⁷⁵

Though the question was going to take a much longer time to resolve, Chapelle's assistance would in fact prove extremely useful for the resolution of such and similar cases. However, as events would continue to unfold, such cases were to prove the easiest for Chapelle to resolve. The most difficult problems were internal to the Church, the most prominent of which had to deal with the

75 Ibid., 40, 42. Chapelle's argumentation will open the way to the recovery by the Jesuits of the Colegio de San Jose foundation from the Dominicans years after. Once the properties were established as by nature "obra pia," the question of the use of the properties in accordance with the original intention of the donor would enable the Jesuits to receive them back.

entire question whether the friars were to be readmitted as parish priests.

Sometime in January 1900, several days after his arrival in Manila, Chapelle called a meeting in which 56 members of the secular clergy participated.⁷⁶ Eight recommendations for Church reform⁷⁷ were submitted to the Apostolic Delegate: 1) the necessity of Filipino bishop coadjutors with the right of succession; 2) the problems connected with the return of the members of the four friar orders to take over the parishes; 3) in case of the lack of Filipino native priests, it was recommended that Jesuits, Vincentians, and other religious congregations take their place; 4) new divisions of the existing parishes into smaller ones in order to facilitate better administration; 5) ecclesiastical magistrates are to be recruited from the ranks of the Filipino clergy; 6) reorganization of the seminaries, to be administered preferably by the Jesuits; 7) necessity of reorganizing several Filipino religious congregations; and 8) the question of financial support and ecclesiastical goods.⁷⁸

On 13 February, it was the turn of the Filipino clergy of the Diocese of Jaro to send their own memorial to Chapelle in Manila. They were at this time involved in a running “battle” with their recently installed bishop, the Recollect Andrés Ferrero, who in their estimation was bent on bringing back the friars to

76 Cf. Chapelle's letter to Secretary of State Cardinal Rampolla, dated 27 April 1900, no. 57245, SCAAEESS, *Spagna*, Fascicolo 331: 3.

77 Cf. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Document 12: 48–49. The position paper that contained the eight recommendations was read by P. Jose Chanco, member of the Cathedral Chapter of Manila. Cf. Uy, “Formation of the Native Clergy,” 17, n. 36.

78 It is clear from this list of recommendations that the Filipino clergy were willing to allow for a period of transition regarding the appointment of Filipinos to the Episcopate, this period being seen in the appointment of Filipino priests as auxiliary bishops with the right of succession. Aglipay will bat for immediate appointments of Filipinos to all the episcopal sees of the country.

the parishes they once used to occupy.⁷⁹ They presented their own evaluation of the ecclesiastical situation and the following points for the consideration of the Apostolic Delegate:⁸⁰ 1) the care of souls (the parishes therefore) must be in the hands of the Filipino secular clergy;⁸¹ 2) the communities of religious in

79 The situation in Jaro was a bitterly contested one; it was obvious that the great majority of the Filipino clergy rejected Ferrero's appointment: "Una vez que los norte-americanos se apoderaron de la isla de Panay, pudo el prelado salir para su diócesis; en 8 de septiembre de 1890 [sic; 1899] saludaba a los diocesanos. Ya no tuvo paz ni reposo el p. Ferrero. Por su condición de fraile y por el consiguiente despido de Agustín de la Peña, sacerdote indígena, que durante dos años y medio había ejercido el gobierno eclesiástico de la diócesis, tropezó mons. Ferrero con la oposición del estamento clerical; tampoco le perdonaron el cubrir parroquias vacantes con religiosos. La lógica y comprensible actuación del obispo, ante la irrupción de protestantes y aglipayanos, exasperó a los nacionalistas. La remoción de dos clérigos indígenas, Miagao y Zaparra, de sus curatos de Jaro levantó una gran polvareda, al instar aquellos a los vecinos influyentes a no recibir a los nombrados por el prelado, amenazándole incluso con cerrar las iglesias y conventos y apoderarse de ellos" The situation in Jaro will regain some measure of peace and tranquility only with the arrival of the American replacement for Ferrero, Frederick J. Rooker. Ferrero would resign from his position in 1902, leave Jaro in October 1903, and depart for Spain on 27 October 1903. For all these, cf. Sáenz Ruiz-Olalde, *Los agustinos recoletos* n. 99, 61, 62.

80 The periodical *El Commercial* published the memorial in four installments with a transcript in APT (now known as Arxiu Històric de la Companyia de Jesús de Catalunya, or Archivum Historicum Societas Iesu Cataloniae, Sant Cugat del Vallés, Barcelona, Spain [AHSIC]), *Fondo Pastells*, vol. CX. For the full text, cf. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Document 71: 233–239.

81 Pope Leo XIII's encyclical, "Ad extremas Orientis oras," is extensively quoted in support of this point: "Llenan el corazón de alegría las paternales y sabias palabras de Su Santidad, que para gloria de Dios rige hoy los destinos de las cristiandades, pero contristan el animo cuando se vuelvan los ojos hacia el cleros de Filipinas. Mientras el espíritu de Su Santidad es la propagación, la ilustración [sic] y la dignificación del clero indígena en las Indias Orientales, en Filipinas se ha considerado siempre como un crimen esa propagación, esa ilustración, y esa dignificación. Su Santidad quiere elevar hasta la

the country therefore must not be given back the parishes;⁸² 3) if there is a lack of Filipino secular priests, then secular priests from other countries may be brought in, but only in a provisional and interim capacity;⁸³ 4) seminaries must be set up in all the

dignidad del episcopado al clero indígena: “iniciarlos -dice- en las cosas sagradas y elevar hasta el mismo episcopado: de otra manera en Filipinas; las comunidades religiosas han tratado de obstruir hasta lo escandaloso la propagación y la ilustración del clero y le han envilecido, reduciendo a los sacerdotes filipinos a la condición de coadjutores en el nombre, y a menos todavía, que no queremos nombrar, en el trato, ahogándoles toda protesta prevalidos los frailes de su influencia cerca de las autoridades.” Ibid., 236. Interesting to note here is the general reverence with which papal pronouncements and the papal person are held, even by those who would be at the forefront in the fight for the recognition of the rights of the native secular clergy.

- 82** It could be that the Commission of the Clergy of the Diocese of Jaro which drafted this letter was not sufficiently aware of the actual situation prevailing in other parts of the country or it deliberately chose to ignore knowledge of this situation for politico-ecclesiastical reasons, but it just was not true that “En primer lugar . . . hay en el país numero suficiente de clérigos para la cura de almas.” Recognizing this possibility, however, the letter goes on to state that “en el caso de no haber suficiente numero de clérigos para ejercer la cura de almas las comunidades religiosas no deben cooperar en el ministerio” for two reasons: “1° porque su presencia en Filipinas, ejerciendo la cura de almas, defraudaría los propósitos de Ntro. Santísimo Padre de nutrir de clérigos indígenas las iglesias a fin de que no se retrajeran de sagrado ministerio los naturales . . .”; and “2° porque con las comunidades religiosas en Filipinas, en vez de abrir a la religión nuevos y mas dilatados horizontes, se la colocaría en los bordes de peligrosísimos precipicios.” Ibid., 236–237.
- 83** The reasons given for this hard-line position should reveal just how grave the distrust of the religious clergy was among the Filipino secular clergy: “La escasez del clero filipino se comprende perfectamente conociendo su condición en Filipinas. Los sacerdotes indígenas, reducidos en su mayor parte a ser coadjutores, cargo que desempeñaban al lado de curas regulares son gran humillación de su doble dignidad de sacerdotes y hombres; dedicados a los oficios gratuitos y mas pesados del ministerio; objetos de desprecio; victimas de infamas calumnias, cuando llegaban a ser inconvenientes a cualquier fin frailuno y cómplices obligados de nefandos

dioceses of the country;⁸⁴ 5) Filipinos from the secular clergy must be raised to episcopal rank and appointed to the dioceses;⁸⁵ 6) an

secretos crimines, han hecho odiosa y humillante su condición alejando del sagrado ministerio a los que, aunque con vocación para ello, no estaban dispuestos al sacrificio de su dignidad.” These lines betray decades-old and deep-seated hurts. *Ibid.*, 238. The question may be raised about whether the Delegate had seen fit to officially recognize this situation and to soothe the wounds that had festered for so long in the psyche of the Filipino secular clergy.

- 84 After quoting once again Leo XIII’s encyclical on the exigency of establishing seminaries in India, the Commission adds: “Y nosotros pedimos que estos seminarios sean dirigidos por sacerdotes filipinos: ‘primero,’ porque hay muy idóneos en la diócesis [Jaro] para este delicado cometido; ‘segundo,’ porque son los que mayor interés pueden tener en que florezca el clero filipino por su numero y por su ilustración; ‘tercero,’ porque de esta manera es como únicamente se puede subsanar, aunque tarde el incalificable crimen de haberse tratado de obstruir siempre la ilustración del clero filipino, aunque inútilmente, porque gracias a Dios y pese a todas las maquinaciones que se han hecho con este fin, el clero filipino posee la ilustración bastante para que no se la pueda en justicia calificar de poco idóneo para cualesquiera dignidades eclesiásticas.” *Ibid.* Not only were they fit to administer the parishes but also equipped to run the seminaries themselves.
- 85 The signatories to the letter aimed for the moon in this provision; they insisted on the preparedness of the Filipino clergy to assume the highest ecclesiastical offices in the country: “Ahora bien; ¿hay en Filipinas sacerdotes dignos de ocupar la gerarquía del episcopado? He aquí uno de los abusos que denunciamos y que consiste en haber mantenido siempre hasta lo increíble a la Santa Sede en la mayor ignorancia respecto del verdadero estado de ilustración del clero filipino, sin duda porque no convenía a los intereses de las comunidades religiosas, que a todo trance querían seguir sosteniéndose en sus lucrativos curatos y demás gerarquías eclesiásticas con la razón de que eran necesarias por la falta de idoneidad del clero filipino, y a este recurso han tenido que apelar, siendo inútiles sus esfuerzos por contener la ilustración del clero. Hay, afortunadamente, en el seno del clero filipino virtuosos y sabios sacerdotes que para gloria de Dios y bien de la Iglesia pueden ocupar la dignidad del episcopado. ¿Puede no haberlos, cuando con las mismas circunstancias que el clero, Filipinas tiene grandes figuras en las artes, hombres eminentes en las ciencias, en jurisprudencia, en medicina, en química; en política; en historia, etc., etc.?” *Ibid.*, 238–239. But certainly in Asia, the Filipino secular clergy was almost unique in the high

institution of higher studies for the degrees of the licentiate and doctorate in Philosophy, Theology, and Canon Law must be set up in the country, “centro que puede ser incorporado a la Universidad, cuando la haya, a fin de corresponder a la legitima tendencia del clero nativo y no malograr sus buenos propósitos.”⁸⁶ Eight days later (21 February), representatives of the Filipino secular clergy of the Archdiocese of Manila submitted to the Apostolic Delegate additional recommendations:⁸⁷ 1) the raising of the Archbishop of Manila to the dignity of the cardinalate; 2) the erection of two archbishoprics, one in the Visayas region (presumably either Cebu or Jaro) and the other in Luzon (Manila); 3) the setting up of a bishopric in every region which had its own distinctive language; and 4) the establishment of a parish for every 4,000 souls

The reactions of the Apostolic Delegate to these recommendations are not known. But they can be gleaned from his own proposals: the seminaries, instead of being given to the Jesuits, may be administered by secular clergy, with teaching personnel to be provided by foreign non-secular priests.

Unfortunately, the initial fund of trust and confidence placed by the Filipino secular clergy on the new Apostolic Delegate did not take long to dissipate.⁸⁸ Chapelle came to be identified with the friar

degree of education and preparedness which characterized their training, a tribute it must be said to Spanish efforts themselves.

- 86** The “memoria” carries the title: “*Que la comisión del clero de la diócesis de Jaro presentó a Mons. L. Chapelle, Delegado Apostólico de S.S. en Manila.*” Ibid., 234. The letter carries the names of two signatories: Crispino Hinolan and Silvestre Apura.
- 87** Ibid., Document 13: 50–51. Two other memorials written by the leaders of the Filipino clergy are to be found in Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV. Both were addressed to the pope himself. The first one, dated 1 April 1900, and the second, dated 18 April 1900, basically continue the lines already demonstrated above. Cf. therefore for these two other memorials, *ibid.*, Documents 18 and 19: 66–76.
- 88** In a letter to P. General, the Jesuit P. Simó presented the following analysis of the problem: “La verdad es que al paso que andan las cosas se tendrá

orders,⁸⁹ and rumors that the Apostolic Delegate wanted to restore the friars to their former parishes traveled fast and wide, creating a lot of dissension among the native clergy.⁹⁰ Chapelle had convened a

que volver sin haber podido hacer nada: podrá dar los informes a S.S. acerca de la iglesia de Filipinas, informes mas o menos completos, mas o menos fundados en la realidad y a esto se tendrá que ceñir por ahora y mas adelante a pesar de todos sus buenos deseos. La gran cuestión de la Iglesia de Filipinas se quedara en pie y con los mismos obstáculos, si Dios no lo remedia por otro lado. El Sr. Delegado Apostólico ha quedado casi inutilizado por completo en su esfera de acción, y esto lo explica todo. Conociendo, como conocía, la lucha del pueblo contra los religiosos, debiera haberse colocado en una posición del todo independiente, accesible a todos indios y no indios para oír todas las reclamaciones y quejas, informándose de la verdadera situación del país por lo que hace a la religión católica, examinando a sangre fría las causas que las han producido, etc. Mas por desgracia no ha sucedido así: se dejo rodear de frailes y mas frailes desde un principio y los indios que lo vieron sacaron las inmediatas consecuencias que fueron 'que el Sr. Delegado estaba vendido a los religiosos'" Cf. ARSI, *Phil.* 1002-1, 7. Cf. also what seems to be a copy of a report on the state of the mission and the relationship between the Jesuits and Chapelle, with a handwritten date on the upper left corner of the first page, in ARSI, *Phil.* 1002-1, 17.

- 89 Probably also because the Apostolic Delegate felt compelled to stop the friar orders from sending their men away from the Philippines; this would have caused grave damage to the work of the Church, given the insufficient number of the secular clergy. However, the identification was clear: "Llegó a Manila en 2 de enero de 1900; desde un principio se identificó el delegado con los religiosos y se mostró receloso con el clero filipino, efecto sin duda de las varias conferencias secretas mantenidas, inmediatamente después de su llegada, con [los obispos]." Cf. Sáenz Ruiz-Olalde, *Los agustinos recoletos*, 60–61.
- 90 On a visit to Dagupan in the northern province of Pangasinan on 24 October 1900, some seven months therefore after his arrival and meeting with the friar bishops, Chapelle came under attack through a printed broadside entitled "Filipinos Alerta" which ended with the curse, "*Maldito el filipino que haga causa común con el fraile!*" Cf. the relevant passages in Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Document 20 (a–b): 77–79. The occasion for the attack was the Bishop of Vigan's censure of D. Adriano Garcés, a Filipino secular priest who was then parish priest of Dagupan, allegedly, among other reasons, for being a schismatic and for disobeying an order from the Bishop (Hevia Campomanes), who was prohibiting his priests

meeting of the friar bishops in the Philippines sometime in January and there it became immediately obvious just how opposed their views were to those of the Filipino secular clergy. In words which recall to mind the negative evaluations of the Filipino clergy in the past, the Archbishop of Manila, Nozaleda, insisted that the Filipino secular clergy was “entirely incapable of fulfilling its sacred ministry faithfully, as it should, for reasons which follow: (a) the unanimous agreement of our predecessors, as well as our own daily experience, makes manifest that the Filipino priest labors under the following grave defects: very great irresponsibility, an uncontrolled propensity for the vices of the flesh, a lack of talent, which prevents his being able to obtain for himself the proper thorough instruction, at least that which a priest of ordinary formation should possess; (b) the total subordination to material interests which possesses the native priests; this subordination so influences them that they sacrifice even their priestly dignity for the prosperity of their families or the enrichment of their own house. From this comes the unbridled avarice of the clergy . . . the factions and rivalries in the towns . . . the priest and his relatives with his assistance, become the owners and possessors of almost all the property of the town; (c)

from buying and reading the booklet by the renegade Augustinian friar, Salvador Pons, *Defensa del Clero secular filipino*. As punishment, the Bishop had ordered his transfer from Dagupan to some out-of-the-way parish. The people of Dagupan had appealed to the Apostolic Delegate, but they were rebuffed. Thus the accusation that Chapelle had allied himself with the friars. For Adriano Garcés's self-defense, cf. his *Impugnación de la censura impuesta por el Ilmo. Y Rmo. Sr. Obispo de Nueva Segovia, Fr. José Hevia Campomanes al Pbro. Sr. D. Adriano Garcés, Cura Párroco de Dagupan* (Manila: Imp. La Democracia, 1900). In the judgment of P. William McKinnon, an American Catholic chaplain attached to Dewey's fleet, Chapelle could no longer be relied on for an effective reform of the Church: “. . . the Delegate is owned by the Friars body and bones. He has one for a secretary, one for an auditor and one for a Chancellor. The result is that everything he does is looked upon with suspicion . . .” Cf. his letter to Archbishop John Ireland, 10 January 1901, quoted in V. Edmund McDevitt, *First California's Chaplain* (Fresno, CA: Academy Library Guild, 1956), 200, and cited in Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 300.

and though this point has always had great importance, in the present circumstances it has even more: that is, if the defense of the Catholic religion were to be left to the native clergy, one would justly fear for the future of religion itself in the Philippines. Heresy has already been sending its apostles to us for some time What will become of the faith? What will become of religion when political peace is established, and enemies are multiplied against Christ and His Church? The defence of Catholic truth requires men distinguished for their great qualities of soul.”⁹¹

It is unclear just how far Chapelle actually shared this rather myopic view of the religious situation of the country. To a certain extent there was nothing much that he could do; he had to work with the situation as he found it while having to maneuver within the boundaries set by the Treaty of Paris and the new parameters set by American constitutional principles such as the separation of church and state. Nevertheless, it was unfortunate that he was not sensitive enough to certain nationalist feelings still running high, particularly among members of the native secular clergy. He gave people reason to think that, on the one hand, he had politically compromised himself by being seen in the company of American military personnel⁹² and,

91 See the account of the event by the secretary of the meeting, Fr. Tomas Lorente, OP, *Acta collationum quas Episcopi Philippinarum habuerunt in civitate de Manila, Praeside Rdm. D. Delegato P. L. Chapelle*, in Archivo de la Provincia del Santísimo Rosario [Archive of the Province of Our Lady of the Most Holy Rosary; henceforth APSR], MSS, HEF, t.10, ff.4–8, cited in Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, 300–301. Among the Spanish friar bishops, obviously the most interesting was Nozaleda himself, not least for the subsequent events that transpired in Spain because of his controversial nomination to the episcopal see of Valencia. Cf. León Ma. Guerrero, “Nozaleda and Pons: Two Spanish Friars in Exodus,” in *Studies in Philippine Church History*, ed. Anderson, 172–202. Guerrero narrates the story of Nozaleda after his return to Spain; the trials he went through may be taken as a barometer of the national sentiment in Spain immediately after Spain’s loss of her overseas possessions.

92 A copy of a clandestine pamphlet, dated 1 November 1900 and entitled “Otro enemigo” and suspiciously carrying the signature of “A.M.D.G.,” which

on the other hand, being identified with the friars and their position on Church reform in the Philippines, thus galvanizing both nationalist Filipinos and members of the Filipino secular clergy into collective action against him. The Apostolic Delegate, in the estimation of the secular clergy, could no longer be counted on to do justice to their legitimate demands in the matter of Church reform. It must be counted a credit to the Filipino secular clergy that no mass defections from the Church took place.

Two Filipino Priests and their Roman Interlude

The Filipino secular clergy set in motion a plan to influence the course of events and the outcome of Church reform

of course is the acronym for the well-known Jesuit slogan (“Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam”), accuses the Apostolic Delegate of the following: “Denuncia al gobierno americano a los filipinos, trata de desacreditar cerca de las autoridades a aquellos filipinos que atacan a los frailes y siembra entre los mismos la desconfianza hacia los americanos queriendo demostrarles que en el fraile hallarán un apoyo.” The pamphlet also denounces him for, among other things, deceiving the American public: “Aquellos americanos de distinción con quienes conferenció en los E. U. antes de su venida a Filipinas, no podrían creer tan odiosa metamorfosis: allá se presentó como un católico prudente y transigente animado de los mas respetables principios de justicia, deseando llegar a Filipinas para meter en cintura a los frailes y defender los intereses del catolicismo y de los filipinos, y al llegar a este suelo, abiertamente y con el mejor cinismo, se pone al frente de la frailería, defiende sus intereses contra los intereses mas sagrados de los filipinos, de su clero y de la misma religión.” It did not help that he was seen accompanied by an American military officer in his effort to resolve a conflict between a diocesan priest and the Dominicans in Dagupan, north of Manila: “Viaja acompañado de un comandante del ejército de los E. U. para hacer creer a los habitantes de Filipinas que lleva un ayudante militar por su categoría oficial, infundiendo así el temor, pero haciendo también creer al pueblo que el gobierno de los E. U. está decidido a apoyar con las armas la acción del Delegado y la restitución de los curatos a los frailes. Ha hecho anunciar en el Diario de los frailes que el General Sr. Smith le llamó a Dagupan y como el tal viaje era con el propósito de destituir a un enemigo de los frailes, contaban estos y el Delegado que el acompañamiento del Mayor y la invitación del General contribuirían para el logro de sus planes.” APPSJ 11-6-007.

by sending their own representatives to Rome.⁹³ Two well-known Filipino secular priests, Salustiano Araullo⁹⁴ and Jose M. Chanco,⁹⁵ were “to provide the Holy Father with accurate

-
- 93 For the documentation of what, in the end, would prove to be an unsuccessful attempt to influence Roman decisions regarding the Philippine Church at the turn of the century through the setting up of a delegation of Filipino secular priest representatives in the Vatican, cf. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Document 22: 83–84 and Appendix Three, 321–345. This documentation was taken from APT (now AHSIC), Fondo Pastells CX, Barcelona. The two priests took the boat from Manila to “Marcella” (Marseilles, France) via Hong Kong, Singapore, etc. Cf. *ibid.*, “Gastos por varios conceptos,” 343–344.
- 94 Salustiano Araullo (sometimes spelled “Araulio”) was the coadjutor of Lipa, Batangas, in 1888 when he was removed from this position allegedly “for taking part in a banquet with leading figures of the Lipa aristocracy in which the religious orders were attacked.” Thereafter he would be identified as belonging to that select group of Filipino clergy “which counts in its ranks pious and learned theologians like Garcia and Sevilla, canonists like Ramirez and Carpio, jurists like the young Paguia, eloquent and erudite orators like Rojas, intellectuals like Araullo, Borja and Manalo, scholars like Ocampo and Samson, moral theologians like Zamora, and patriots like Bartolome, Laza, Trias, Dakanay, Aglipay, Viron, Natividad, Tañag, and others” After his Roman sojourn, he will find himself in Spain and then later become attached permanently to the Italian missionaries of the *Propaganda Fide* in Hong Kong in 1901. For all these details, cf. Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, 44, 76, and 227.
- 95 “Another anti-friar priest was Fr. Jose Chanco who went to Madrid in 1889 to obtain, according to Rizal, a canonry in the Manila cathedral, so that he might not be humiliated again, as he had been in Manila. Chanco secretly joined Rizal’s ‘Indios Bravos.’ He also promised to work secretly in favor of the Propagandists, in exchange for Rizal’s promise to assist him in obtaining a canonry through the Masons Miguel Morayta and Manuel Becerra, then overseas minister. Unfortunately for Chanco, Becerra fell from power not too long afterward. But he apparently remained as a chaplain in Madrid, in close contact with the other Filipinos until 1894. On Becerra’s return to the Overseas Ministry, Chanco received a prebend in the cathedral of Puerto Rico.” Schumacher thinks that it is possible that Chanco contributed pseudonymous articles on Church affairs in the Philippines to *La Solidaridad*. Chanco will end up in Manila with a prebend through the help of Pedro Roxas. Cf. Schumacher, *ibid.*, 44–45, 201, 204–212, 225, 227, 271.

information regarding the Filipino people and the native clergy.” They felt compelled to do this “to offset the powerful lobby of the Spanish friars and others whose voices were being heard at Rome.”⁹⁶ A chronological listing of “Gestiones hechas en pro del Clero Filipino cerca del Vaticano” from 20 June 1900 “until the present” enumerates the activities of the representatives of the Filipino clergy in Rome.⁹⁷ A preparatory attempt to procure information “over the situation” and to contact “influential, skilled and prestigious personnel in the Vatican as well as in the College of Cardinals” was made in late May. On 1 June, a conference was held with the “Decano de los agentes de negocios” of the Vatican in order to map out what they needed to do to achieve their purpose. On 20 June they were granted a private audience with Cardinal Rampolla.⁹⁸ On 3 July, they were finally received “speciali modo” in the Vatican and allowed to present their letter, written in Italian, to Leo XIII. The pope lamented the “iniqui mezzi” by which the US was annexing the Islands, accusing it of a series of horrors: “the germ and poisonous virus of Protestantism, of masonic sectarianism, of impiety . . . of written propaganda and the practice of heretical, absurd and immoral doctrines, with the false glitter of modern culture, of a civilization no longer *plus ultra*, of a liberty never before enjoyed

96 Ibid., 300.

97 It is difficult to stabilize the date of “hasta el presente” more exactly. But it seems to cover the month of July 1900 because hotel expenses listed in Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV: 344, go up to and include 20 July (Naples).

98 Cardinal Mariano Rampolla del Tindaro: b. Polizzi, Sicily, 17 August 1843, d. Rome, 16 December 1913. Rampolla, after a long and brilliant career in diplomatic and curial fields, was named Secretary of State on 1 June 1887 under Leo XIII and held that post until the latter’s death on 20 July 1903. Austrian hostility prevented his being elected to the papacy, but the new pope, Pius X, named him head of the Holy Office and the Pontifical Biblical Commission. For general information on Rampolla, cf. *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 12: 75–76.

and a progress never before tried.”⁹⁹ The main thrust of the letter, however, was to excoriate the false impressions now exercising their influence on “Reverendissimo Signor Delegato” and to denounce the machinations of “Signor Metropolitano.”¹⁰⁰ The pope was then requested to correct the anomalous situation.

It was at Naples that Araullo had conceived a *Plan necesario para la formal y digna representación del Clero Filipino y procuración de todos sus negocios ante la Suprema Corte Vaticana desarrollado por orden de capítulos*. The five chapters of the plan deal with the formation of the “junta” of representatives of the Filipino clergy in Rome, its membership, its mission, its rules, its “plantilla del personal de la junta,” the qualities of those eligible for membership in the junta, etc.¹⁰¹ The duties of the

99 Cf. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV: 335–337. The Americans were accused of bringing into the country, among other things, “il germe e il virus velonoso del protestantesimo, del settarismo massonico, dell’empietà...di propaganda scritta e pratica di dottrine eretiche, assurde e immorali, con l’orpello di coltura moderna, di civiltà non plus ultra, di libertà mai goduta e progresso mai sperimentato.”

100 One can only speculate on the reaction of the pope to the following lines as read to him by these representatives of the Filipino clergy in Rome: “. . . è interessantissima e dolorosissima la prospettiva che con lugubri colori si scorge nel suo fondo, considerato attentamente, sotto il prisma ecclesiastico-sociale, attese le circostanze molto critiche sotto la cui imperiosa azione si vide obbligato, indubbiamente contro il torrente della sua volontà e miglior buona fede a equilibrare con perplessità la sua opinione concreta riguardo alla situazione il Reverendissimo Signor Delegato e degno rappresentante di Vostra Santità; le quali circostanze rendon[o] difficile e sterilizzano l’ardua gestione confidata alla sua perizia e saggia giustificazione.” Reserved for the Archbishop of Manila, the Dominican Nozaleda, were words much harsher and unequivocal: “Le macchinazioni di questo Signore in diverse forme [e] modi, che sono del dominio pubblico, per sviare la opinione a render perplesso il criterio del Reverendissimo Signor Delegato circa la vera situazione e i concetti tanto dal clero secolare, come del regolare . . .” These are clear indications of the discontent of the Filipino secular clergy regarding the way Church reform was being conducted in the country. *Ibid.*

101 The mission of those who would be the representatives of the Filipino clergy is stated in the following manner: “Siendo el verdadero y primordial objetivo de la junta . . . el cooperar prudentemente al Metropolitano y Sufragáneos

“junta” are enumerated as follows: 1) to defend priests, Filipino or European, before their prelate against calumnious accusations; 2) to recall to the attention of the prelate the just position earned meritoriously which correspond[s] to the cleric, in cases of unjust delay; 3) to choose and nominate by a majority of votes a worthy representative-procurator of the Filipino clergy in Rome; 4) to convoke extraordinary assemblies called for by urgent matters; 5) to press and to pass pecuniary responsibility against the representative-procurator and remunerated employees in cases of negligence, desertion, offense, or slowness in the carrying out of their duty; 6) to grant licenses, to replace, relieve, or dismiss any unworthy personnel, “baja acta en que consten escrupulosas informaciones, datos inapelables y gravísimos motivos”; 7) to collect trimestral dues through the Vicars Forane for salaries; 8) monthly to go through the account books duly authorized by the president of the junta.¹⁰² Later appended to this plan was a letter written on 25 July 1900 by P. Jose Ma. Chanco while he was in Marzo; it was a report on how the delegation should conduct its mission in Rome.¹⁰³ The plan itself seems to have been the

en su espinoso cometido, para el mejor servicio de la Iglesia en todas sus manifestaciones de la vida moral y mayor prestigio del clero filipino, particularmente, en defensa de legítimos derechos ante la Suprema Corte Vaticana por medio del designado Representante-Procurador, lógico nos parece, dotarla y revestirla de prerrogativas y siguientes . . .” Cf. *ibid.*, 328.

102 *Ibid.*, 328. Note that the document carries the date of 20 July 1900.

103 It is not clear to which European city or place “Marzo” refers; the editors of *Religious Revolution in the Philippines* think that it could refer to Marseilles, France. Probably the letter was written in Rome itself, in the area where they most probably had lodging: Campo Marzio. In any case, the letter says: “Nosotros que con la abnegación impuesta por el bien común hemos permanecido bastante tiempo en Roma, lo sobrado para calcular exactamente los gastos precisos y apreciar en sus mas mínimos detalles las eventualidades y las circunstancias que constituyen el buen prestigio y forma la aureola de dignificación de un Representante extranjero en aquella localidad ante el núcleo de Eminencias y Noblezas, podemos asegurar, que tal como planeamos y presupuestamos prudencialmente

product of the two priests' dealings with Vatican personnel; their mission necessitated a stable organization and a well-thought-out procedure for conducting business with the Vatican bureaucracy.

Attempts had been made to influence various personages and entities in Rome; among those mentioned were the following: directors of various news organs in the city, the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Religious,¹⁰⁴ secretaries of other curia congregations, the ambassador of Spain to the Holy See, the master of novices of the *Fatebenefratelli* (Order of San Juan de Dios), and the Procurator and agent of the curia Sr. Serpetti. Cardinals approached and consulted were the following: "los Señores Eminentísimos Cardenales Rampolla, Bautelli [Vanutelli], Caselta [Casetta], Vives y Tuto, (Mons.) Angeli, Cretoni, e importantes personas."¹⁰⁵ The assistance of Cardinal Jose Calasanz

será, pues, lo suficiente para enaltecer, tener en firme el buen nombre del Clero Filipino con la ostentación digna del objeto de tan delicada misión, de la respetable colectividad que la representa y de un pueblo siempre reconocido y distinguido por su esplendidez y munificencia características en todas las sociedades, las mas cultas del mundo." Two documents carry, as the place of composition, Barcelona, and as the date of composition, the month of August, signaling perhaps the end of the mission entrusted to Araullo and Chanco, if not the attempt to continue to address the problem of representation of the Filipino clergy in Rome itself. The first document is a letter written to fellow Filipino priests, which serves as a cover letter to the "memoria" itself (Document 89). The second letter, carrying the date 18 August 1900, was written from Barcelona to Cardinal Vives y Tuto. Cf. *ibid.*, Document 88: 323–324; and Document 89: 339–340.

104 An anachronism? The Sacred Congregation of the Religious was created only in 1908 under the curial reform instituted by Pius X; cf. *Sapienti consilio*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 1 (1909), 7–9. Prior to this, there were three curial congregations which dealt with questions regarding the religious clergy: Sacred Congregation for the Discipline of the Religious, Congregation on the State of the Religious, and the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Religious. Cf. Fernando de Lasala Claver, *Storia della curia romana* (Roma: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1992), 109–115.

105 Rinaldo Angeli, secretary of Leo XIII, was not a cardinal. Cardinal Serafino Cretoni was at the time Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences (in

de Llevaneras Vives y Tuto, certainly one of the most powerful figures in the Roman curia at the time,¹⁰⁶ to further the cause of the Filipino clergy, was seen as particularly important.

How successful their efforts were at trying to influence thinking and decision making in the Vatican curia offices can only be gauged by looking at the papal document *Quae Mari Sinico* which attempted to give direction to the future of the Catholic Church in the Philippines. What is significant, however, in this Roman interlude of the two Filipino secular priests was the fact that it took place at all. It certainly gives an insight into what the Filipino clergy as a whole was capable of. It showed that, barring that section which followed Aglipay in his schismatic course, the Filipino clergy presented by and large a united front, particularly in the ecclesiastical sphere. This they showed by the fact that they were able to send two priest representatives from among their ranks to conduct business with Vatican officials. This is significant too for what it presupposes; the great majority of Filipino secular priests did not at all contemplate schism as a prospect which coincided with their own religious and national

1903, Sacred Congregation of Rites). For Vives y Tuto, cf. n.106 below. It is not clear which Vanutelli is referred to; either Serafino or Vincenzo in any case. And "Caselta" most probably refers to Francesco di Paola Casetta.

106 Cf. the letter written by Araullo from Barcelona on 18 August 1900 and addressed to the cardinal himself, Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV: 339–340. It is also most probable that the "Cardenal X" referred to in nos. 7, 8, and 9 on page 342 was Vives y Tuto. The cardinal was born in Llaveneras (Barcelona). On 19 June 1899 he was named to the College of Cardinals; he was only 45 years old at the time. "Desde entonces su vida es una pura consagración a la sede de Pedro en la persona de León XIII primero y luego en la de Pio X. Al poco tiempo era nombrado miembro de las Congregaciones romanas del Santo Oficio, de Obispos y Regulares, de Propaganda Fide, del Indice, de Ritos y de Negocios Eclesiásticos Extraordinarios, así como de la Comisión para la unión de las Iglesias Orientales, la de Estudios Bíblicos y la Preservación de la Fe en Roma" Vives y Tuto in the course of his curial career would be involved in the preparation of the anti-modernist tracts of Pius X, *Lamentabili* and *Pascendi*. Cf. *Diccionario de historia eclesiástica de España* IV: 2782–2783.

sentiments. What was clear was that they recognized themselves as both Catholic and Filipino. Despite their ignorance and discomfort in the face of having to deal with the Vatican bureaucracy, Araullo and Chanco carried out their mission with such audacity and tenacity that showed a capacity for dispassionate thinking and planning; and this certainly revealed just how ready and prepared the Filipino secular clergy was in responding to what can only be defined as a shining moment in their history in the Islands. Almost 30 years after the execution of Gomez, Burgos, and Zamora, and with such capable leaders as Sevilla and Roxas, the Filipino clergy would now play a more decisive role in keeping the country Catholic. One may say that never in history can one find a people, with compelling reasons for breaking away from the Church, remaining nevertheless loyal to the faith of their Church Fathers, a fact which should not fail to be a source of marvel to those whose eyes are trained to see the many fissures in Church history. It is a fact which shows just how deep the Catholic faith and the Catholic Church had taken root among the Filipino clergy and the nation.

Quae Mari Sinico

Chapelle left the Philippines in mid-1901 for the United States and Rome to present his report. Close to two years after Chapelle arrived in Philippine shores, the Papal Constitution *Quae Mari Sinico*, which carried the date 17 September 1902, was finally issued in Rome.¹⁰⁷

107 For the original Latin text, cf. *Acta Leonis XIII*, no. 22:192–207 and *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 35 (1902–1903): 268–277. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, contains a reprint of the copy in *Acta et decreta Concilii Provincialis Manilani I in urbe Manila celebrati anno Domini MDCCCCVII*, Rome, 1910. For the complete Latin text and its various translations, see appendix, this volume, 183–265, for *Constitución apostólica de S. S. el Papa León XIII para las Islas Filipinas en latín, castellano, inglés, tagalo, ilocano y visaya* (Manila: Imprenta del Colegio de Santo Tomas, 1902). Cf. also, in APPSJ 11-3-009.

Promulgated in Manila on 8 December of the same year by the new Apostolic Delegate, Giovanni Battista Guidi, the constitution—meant to reorganize and reform the Church in the Philippines, given the radically changed circumstances—did not quite measure up to the expectations of many, particularly members of the Filipino secular clergy. In the Diocese of Jaro (Iloilo), for example, several Filipino priests wrote to Guidi to register their displeasure and protest. They implored him to prevent the constitution from taking effect in the Islands.¹⁰⁸ Despite this and other negative reactions, it did form the basis for the changes that were to take place in succeeding years.¹⁰⁹ And like many things in the Church, change, though slow in coming, did set the Philippine Church on its future course. Together with the First Provincial Synod of Manila, *Quae Mari Sinico* would serve as the reference point for the Church as she strove to meet new challenges.

First, the constitution authorized the creation of new dioceses in the country.¹¹⁰ The then existing division of the Church into

108 Cf. Achútegui and Bernad, *Religious Revolution*, Vol. IV, Documents 71–76: 233–255. The “Jaro Schism” was not to last long, however.

109 Certainly, the fact that the Aglipayan schism had formally taken place several months before the promulgation of the Apostolic Constitution meant that it formed part of the context within which the constitution was read and either defended or attacked. Just how serious the challenge posed by Aglipay was and how the constitution was defended as a way out of the dangerous situation in which the Church had been placed may be deduced from the reflections of Dr. Mariano Sevilla, himself one of the heroes of the Filipino secular clergy: “. . . se deduce claramente que no es la preterición del clero secular indígena, ni que el Papa desconoce los derechos (legítimas preferencias sobre los demás) de los sacerdotes filipinos, y mucho menos que el Vaticano se halla mal informado en lo referente a los asuntos eclesiásticos de Filipinas, sino la satisfacción de bajos apetitos e insanas ambiciones es la causa real y verdadera del Cisma que, a no dudarlo, arrastrara al país a la degradación y a la mas completa ruina” Cf. Manuel E. Roxas, *Consideraciones sobre la constitución apostólica Quae mari sinico del 17 Septiembre de 1902 seguidas*, with reflections by Dr. Mariano Sevilla, in APPSJ II-3-010.

110 “Attamen dioecesium harum ea est amplitudo, ut ob intervallum quo loca dissociantur atque itinerum difficultatem, vix contingat Episcopis

five ecclesiastical regions was no longer responding to the pastoral and missionary needs of the country.¹¹¹ In this way, the Church hoped that a streamlined territorial division would facilitate the pastoral care of souls and diocesan administration. Second, a native secular clergy must be recruited, educated, and formed; exceptional Filipino priests were to be promoted to higher ecclesiastical offices, although this was to be done in a gradual manner.¹¹² A caveat was expressed, however, about clerical involvement in matters political; men in holy orders were prohibited from engaging in partisan politics, an indication of the still very sensitive role being played by various Filipino secular priests in the nationalist struggle, this time against the

illas nisi summo labore quoquo versus lustrare. Quamobrem suadet necessitas, ut nacti opportunitatem temporum, antiquas Dioeceses arctiori termino definiamus aliasque de integro addamus. Eapropter Manilano Archiepiscopatu ac dioecesis Cebuana, Cacerensi, Neosegoviensi et Jarensi servatis, quatuor insuper adiicimus et instituimus dioeceses, Lipensem videlicet, Tuguegaraoanam, Capizanam et Zamboangensem, universas, ut ceterae, Manilanae Metropoli suffraganeas. In Marianis praeterea Insulis Praefecturam Apostolicam creamus, quae Nobis ac Successoribus Nostris, auctoritate nulla interposita, pareat." Appendix, 186–187.

111 The implementation of this provision of the constitution would, however, be delayed by some eight years. The new dioceses would be Lipa (Batangas), Tuguegarao (Cagayan Valley), Zamboanga (covering the whole island of Mindanao), and, instead of the originally named Capiz (the same island of Panay on which is to be found the Jaro diocese), Calbayog (Samar, Eastern Visayas), with Palawan raised to the status of a prefecture. Cf. the Manila periodical *Libertas*, 5 July 1910, with a copy in APPSJ 11-3-042.

112 "Quoniam experiendo plane compertum est clerum indigenam perutilem ubique esse, curent diligenter Episcopi ut indigenarum Sacerdotum numerus augeri valeat; ita tamen ut illos antea ad pietatem omnem ac disciplinam instituant, idoneosque norint quibus ecclesiastica munia demandentur. Quos vero usus et experientia praestantiores ostenderit, eos ad potiores procuraciones gradatim advocent" Appendix, 188.

colonial regime under the Americans.¹¹³ Certainly, one can see in this prohibition a certain reaction against the overtly political role that Aglipay had played in the revolution and now in the perceived alliance between Aglipay and the Americanist Federal Party. Third, every diocese was exhorted to establish its own seminary, following the lines set by the Council of Trent in the 16th century; selected Filipino seminarians were also to be sent to Rome for proper training and education in the sacred sciences.¹¹⁴ Fourth, a Catholic education must be promoted among the laity and made accessible to them.¹¹⁵ The proliferation of parochial schools would in fact constitute a top priority in the agenda of the dioceses and parishes, given the threat posed by the American colonial regime's efforts to establish a public primary educational system. The Dominican University of Santo Tomas was in fact singled out by the constitution for generous praise and its privileges as a university of pontifical status were confirmed. Fifth, the

113 "Id porro maxime commendatum habeant qui in clero censentur ne abripi se partium studiis unquam sinant. Quamvis enim communi lege sit cautum, ne qui militat Deo se implicet negotiis saecularibus, peculiari tamen modo, ob temporum rerumque adjuncta, hoc in Philippinis insulis ab hominibus Sacri Ordinis devitandum ducimus . . ." *Ibid.*, 188–189.

114 "Quanti faciat Ecclesia adolescentium seminaria qui in cleri spem educantur, perspicere licet ex Tridentinae Synodi decreto, quo ea primum sunt instituta. Oportet idcirco Episcopos omnem operam industriamque impendere, ut domum in sua quisque Dioecesi habeat, in qua tirunculi militiae sacrae à teneris recipiantur, atque ad vitae sanctimoniam et ad minores majoresque disciplinas formentur. Consultius autem erit si adolescentes qui litteris student aliis utantur aedibus; aliis vero juvenes qui litterarum cursu emenso, in philosophiam ac theologiam incumbunt. Utrobique autem alumni perpetuo degant, quoad sacerdotio si meriti quidem fuerint initientur; nulla unquam, nisi ex gravi causa, facultate facta ad suos remeandi . . ." *Ibid.*, 189–190.

115 "Verum non ad ecclesiastica solum Seminaria Episcoporum industrias spectare oportet: adolescentes enim e laicorum ordine, qui scholas alias celebrant, eorum etiam curis et providentiae demandantur. Est igitur Antistitum Sacrorum officium omni ope adniti, ut puerorum animi qui publice litteris imbuuntur, religionis scientia ne careant . . ." *Ibid.*, 191.

constitution insisted very strongly on the need to enforce the rule of cloister for religious; the vexing question of episcopal visitation of parishes run by religious clergy, one that bedevilled the Church in Spanish colonial times, was finally resolved by upholding once and for all the rights of the bishop.¹¹⁶ Sixth, motivated it seems to offset the still-regnant distrust for the religious clergy felt by the Filipino secular priests and to meet possible conflicts in the period ahead, any problems which may arise in the assigning of parishes to priest members of the religious orders were to be referred to the Apostolic Delegate for deliberation and resolution.¹¹⁷ Seventh, missions were to be promoted, with new ones to be started among the various communities; the constitution here clearly recognized that it is not enough for the Church to teach, it is also necessary for her to promote “spiritual exercises” in order to

116 “Praecipimus ut clausurae leges inviolate servant; quapropter teneri omnes volumus decreto illo, quod, editum a Congregatione super Episcopis et Regularibus die XX Julii MDCCXXXI Clemens XII Decessor Noster Litteris Apostolicis ‘Nuper pro parte’ die XXVI Augusti ejusdem anni confirmavit. Clausurae autem ea sit norma iique sint fines, quae Decreto alio edicuntur a S. Congregatione Propagandae Fidei die XXIV Augusti MDCCCLXXX, Pio VI approbante, interposito.” Regarding religious priests holding parishes, the constitution states: “Porro ut dissensionum elementa penitus eradantur in Philippinis etiam insulis observari in posterum volumus Constitutionem ‘Firmandis’ a Benedicto XIV datam VIII id. Novembris MDCCXLIV, itemque aliam ‘Romanos Pontifices’ qua Nos VIII id. Maji MDCCCLXXXI nonnulla controversiarum capita inter Episcopos et Missionarios regulares in Anglia et Scotia definivimus.” *Ibid.*, 192. Schumacher’s comments regarding the papal document mentioned above: “In general, these documents had provided that religious acting as parish priests were subject to the visitation and correction of the bishops. Though not applied to the Philippines at the time of their issuance, because of the *patronato real*, they now ended the age-old controversy on visitation and episcopal jurisdiction.” Schumacher, *Philippine Church History*, n. 7, 323.

117 “Quae Paroeciae curionibus e Religiosis Familiis sint demandandae Episcopi videant, collatis sententiis cum earundem Familiarum Praesidibus. Quod si quaestio de ea re oriatur, nec privatim componi queat, caussa ad Delegatum Apostolicum deferetur.” Appendix, 197.

foster a vigorous faith.¹¹⁸ Eighth, a Provincial Synod, over which the Apostolic Delegate himself will preside, should be convoked as soon as possible, circumstances permitting.¹¹⁹

Given the conditions of the times, the urgency of the problems besetting the Church, the limitations of communications, and the relative isolation of the Philippines from European circles, *Quae Mari Sinico* was perhaps the best solution possible at the moment, and it did provide the general directions for the renewal of the Church in the Islands. The need to reform and reorganize the Philippine Church had become too urgent to be further delayed, given the attempts by Protestant missionaries to whittle away at popular allegiance to the Catholic Church and the inroads being made by the Aglipayans in attracting the Catholic rank and file into their movement.

It cannot be denied, however, that the constitution itself still reflected in some measure and in some aspects a bias that could not be totally extirpated at the time. A first consequence was a further delay in the promotion of unquestionably able

118 “Ad cetera argumenta, quibus Ecclesia magistra opportune cavetur ne fides morumque integritas aliaque ad aeternam animarum salutem pertinentia detrimentum capiant, accedunt equidem summaeque sunt utilitatis spiritualia Exercitia, quaeque vulgo Missiones audiunt. Optandum quapropter omnino est, ut in provinciis singulis singulae saltem condantur domus, octo plus minus Religiosis viris excipiendis, quibus sit unice praestitutum urbes subinde ac pagos lustrare, dictaque modo ratione sacris concionibus populos excolere . . .” *Ibid.*, 192–193.

119 “Sed enim pro hac disciplinae ecclesiasticae instauratione, proque plena Constitutionis hujus Nostrae exequutione, Venerabilem Fratrem Joannem Baptistam Guidi Archiepiscopum Stauroplitanum Delegatum Apostolicum extraordinarium ad Philippinas insulas mittimus, Personam Nostram illic gesturum. Cui propterea opportunas tribuimus facultates; insuper etiam in mandatis dedimus, ut provincialem Synodum quam primum per adiuncta licuerit, indicendam ac celebrandam curet.” *Ibid.*, 193–194. Guidi had just convoked the Provincial Council in 1904 when he died of a heart attack, effectively leaving it postponed. A new Apostolic Delegate arrived in 1905 in the person of the Maltese, Archbishop Ambrose Agius, OSB; a longer preparation will finally see the council convened in 1907.

and meritorious Filipino secular priests to the episcopal office in the Church. What happened was a transfer of ecclesiastical responsibility from the Spanish friar bishops to American ecclesiastics, a move that was probably necessary for various reasons, not least of all the need to present a Catholic face to the American presence in society and government and to dig into American Catholic resources for the funding of various projects now that the *patronato real* was dead in letter if not in spirit. There was most probably also a need for a temporary and transitional “buffer” of foreign but non-Spanish bishops to avoid any more direct clashes between the Spanish religious clergy and the Filipino secular clergy; to retain Spanish bishops over the Filipino secular clergy would have been suicidal for the Church, but to immediately place Filipino bishops over Spanish religious clergy would have discouraged the latter from engaging in much-needed pastoral work in parishes which at the time could not be served by the Filipino secular clergy for lack of personnel.¹²⁰ The times called for, in terms that we would use today, “a healing of memories” Besides, the challenge posed by the Aglipayan

120 On 6 April 1906, P. Tomas Roldan, the Recollect Provincial now based in Spain (leaving in the Philippines a Vice Provincial to govern affairs of their Province of San Nicolas de Tolentino), arrived in Manila to begin his visitation of the Recollects in the Islands. In Jaro, he met Bishop Rooker who praised the work of the Recollects in the following words: “Es preciso, le dijo el prelado, abrir la historia eclesiástica y remontarse hasta el siglo XIII para encontrar ejemplos de caridad tan ardiente como la que están manifestando los recoletos. Están dando una exhibición al mundo, ejerciendo su ministerio en los mismos lugares, donde un día se vieran entre cadenas, y trabajando con tan admirable celo por ganar Dios las almas de los que fueron sus crueles perseguidores. ¡Esto es hermoso, esto es sublime!” These words of Rooker “cayeron sobre su corazón como rocío consolador, que casi le hicieron derramar lagrimas. Sin lugar a dudas, mons. Rooker fue el obispo que mas estimó y admiró los agustinos recoletos, sabiendo valorar en los justo la labor apostólica de los mismos.” Cf. Sáenz Ruiz-Olalde, *Los agustinos recoletos*, 326. There is no doubt at all that much reconciliation between the religious and secular clergy was needed in the Church right after the revolution.

Church made it imperative that Filipino secular priests, who did not share Aglipay's stance and who wanted to remain faithful to Rome, needed to moderate their own position and to accept what seemed to be the best offering that the Vatican could give. On this reading, the fact that two prominent leaders of the Filipino secular clergy thought it necessary to publish a booklet on the Apostolic Constitution is significant; there was obviously a need to convince their fellow Filipino secular priests about the fact that the Holy See—in coming up with positions which at first sight seemed to display a distrust in the preparedness of Filipino priests to take up ecclesiastical offices such as that of bishop right then and there—was nevertheless on the side of Filipino secular clergy.¹²¹ Roxas would therefore emphasize the fact that what the Apostolic Constitution did was in fact assert that the Philippine Church had entered into “the common regime of the Church,” and that to insist on polemics against the friar orders at this point in time was in fact to rail uselessly¹²² against a system that was no longer in force because it had died together with the *patronato real*.¹²³

121 Roxas asserts that “el Clero filipino se encuentra, para el régimen de las cristiandades filipinas, en igual estado que los prohombres filipinos para el régimen político, con grandes capacidades; pero con insuficiente preparación.” He then goes on to say, as if to soften the blow of this observation of “insufficient preparation,” the following: “Esto no quiere decir a nuestro juicio, que la Santa Sede crea inútil, ni sean aprovechables los servicios del benemérito Clero actual filipino, que lleva seis años sosteniendo la fe en el país, en medio de circunstancias tan difíciles, sino que haciendo justicia a sus méritos indiscutibles, le sostendrá y le elevará a aquellos puestos que el bien de la iglesia exija.” Cf. Roxas, *Consideraciones sobre . . . Quae mari sinico*, 11.

122 “Han cesado pues, en nuestro sentir, todas aquellas dolorosas cuestiones sobre Prelacias y Parroquias, que tanto apasionaron los ánimos, no pudiendo ya alegar los religiosos españoles ningún derecho o privilegio para regentar las parroquias, ni patronato que pueda hacer las presentaciones para Prelacias.” *Ibid.*, 8.

123 In words that bear eloquent witness to the clarity of thought and the purity of intention of the best exemplars of the Filipino secular clergy, Roxas has this

What Roxas had seen most clearly—a view which differed from that of many among the elite who considered the friars enemies—was that the real problem besetting the Philippine Church at that time was not the friars themselves *per se* nor the religious orders to which they belonged; the real problem was the *patronato* which had frozen the Church in the Islands within a system that had already outlived its usefulness.¹²⁴

to say: “El Sumo Pontífice, padre de la universal iglesia, con la vista serena y amorosa, que cual águila desde las alturas del Vaticano domina, y escudriña, y conoce el rebaño esparcido por todo el mundo que el Salvador Jesús le confiara en Pedro; el Sumo Pontífice ha visto y examinado las vicisitudes de esta querida porción de sus ovejas, y declara que cesó la manera de ser que tenia en la pasada dominación, que la Iglesia de Filipinas entra bajo el régimen común de la Iglesia; ve que en ese régimen común, los religiosos son un factor importante y muy útil para el bien de las almas, y en este concepto reitera y recuerda que aquí se pongan en vigor las prescripciones que para la gobernación de la Iglesia universal se han prescrito: ya no existen los privilegios de otros tiempos, y sin hacer ninguna distinción del religioso español, del de todas las demás naciones, sin que el dominico sea preferido al cartujo, o al agustino al filipense, encarga cual padre amantísimo la unión de ambos cleros en la caridad de Dios, para que unidos santamente trabajen con eficacia por la salvación de las almas.” No question here about the fidelity of Roxas and Sevilla to the Holy See and their recognition of its authority to resolve issues afflicting the Church in the Philippines. *Ibid.*, 11.

124 The importance of the Apostolic Constitution is thus explained by Roxas in the following manner: “Para hacerse cargo de toda importancia de lo que aquí consigna la Constitución, precisa comprender que el Sumo Pontífice viene a declarar que el cambio verificado en el país Filipino en su soberanía política, haciendo que España y todo lo español, de dominantes y gobernantes, pasaran a la categoría de simples extranjeros, al igual de cualquiera otra nación, sin que les sea lícito tener ninguna ingerencia en la gobernación del país antes dominado; declaró también en lo religioso, que España y los españoles perdieran el Patronato, que les ponía de condiciones de disponer y regir los destinos de la Iglesia de Filipinas: España, el gobierno español, los eclesiásticos españoles, tanto los seculares como los regulares, en lo religioso, han pasado a la categoría de simples extranjeros, y ahora tan solo podrán intervenir en el régimen eclesiástico, del mismo modo que pudieran intervenir los franceses, belgas, etc., sin que puedan ya alegar ningún derecho o privilegio, que todo se fundaba en la dominación española.” Of

This delay in the appointment of worthy Filipino secular priests to episcopal office did not prove to be overly long and interminable, however; Guidi, who had rejected any Spanish candidate as well as an all-American hierarchy in the Philippines, had initially wanted at least two of the five existing bishoprics to go to Filipinos.¹²⁵ Cardinal Rampolla sought the opinion of three of the Spanish bishops who had resigned their sees in the Philippines: Nozaleda (Manila), Arsenio del Campo (Nueva Caceres or Naga), and Hevia Campomanes (Nueva Segovia or Vigan).¹²⁶ It seems that Nozaleda¹²⁷ and Arsenio del Campo had moderated their hard-line view of the Filipino clergy in their response; common to their lists of recommended Filipino bishops were Barlin and Singzon. Hevia Campomanes would remain adamant that no Filipino secular priest was worthy of episcopal dignity.¹²⁸ In 1906,

course, certain habits of mind and behavior required time and effort for their correction; the prejudice against Filipino abilities, extending well into the American period, could not after all be made to disappear automatically by papal fiat. For the quote above, cf. *ibid.*, 7–8.

- 125** Cf. Giovanni Battista Guidi, Apostolic Delegate, Manila, 31 December 1902, to Mariano Cardinal Rampolla, Secretary of State, no. 75917, SCAAEESS, *Spagna*, a. 1902–1903, Posiz. 988, Fasc. 385: 37–38, cited in Uy, “Formation of the Native Clergy,” n. 72, 19. Fr. Uy is the Philippine Church historian who has perhaps made the most extensive research in the Vatican archives on matters pertaining to the relationship between the Church in the Islands, the Nuncio in Madrid, and the Vatican. (See also Uy, in this volume, 89.)
- 126** Cf. Rampolla, Vatican, 28 April 1903, to Nozaleda, Arsenio del Campo and Hevia Campomanes, no. 76870, SCAAEESS, *Spagna*, a. 1903, Posiz. 998, Fasc. 396: 40, cited in *ibid.*, n. 74, 19.
- 127** Nozaleda had recommended Barlin, Pacis, and Singzon; Arsenio del Campo, Barlin, Gorordo, and Singzon. Cf. *ibid.*, nn. 75 and 76, 19.
- 128** Uy says Hevia Campomanes had sent to Rampolla an 11-page report “which was both an apologia for the Spanish religious and a damning testimony against the native clergy.” He translates a quotation from the Vigan bishop’s report: “They [the Filipinos] are not for the priesthood, much less for the episcopacy. All aspire and all believe themselves fit to become bishops,

some four years after the promulgation of *Quae Mari Sinico*, the first Filipino bishop, Jorge Barlin—joining the four American bishops who had taken over from the Spanish friar bishops—finally assumed office as the new Bishop of Nueva Caceres, the Bicol peninsula.¹²⁹ The psychological impact of such an appointment could only have been dramatic; the perception that the Catholic Church was anti-Filipino was broken and therefore rendered unusable as an argument by those who would want to see the Church diminished. What had been happening in the secular political sphere was now happening in the ecclesiastical sphere; Filipinos were occupying positions of great responsibility in Church and society.¹³⁰ And in 1929, 23 years after Barlin was

cardinals, even popes It is necessary to consider the native priests always as *neofitos* in the faith, and it is not prudent to make them bishops, *ne in superbiam elati, in iudicium incidant diaboli*. They are good only as assistants under certain conditions.” Hevia Campomanes, Oviedo, 14 May 1903, to Cardinal Rampolla, no. 77849, SCAAEESS, *Spagna*, a. 1903, Posiz. 998, Fasc. 396: 48–51, in *ibid.*, n. 77, 19.

129 And in 1909, Gorordo would become Bishop of Cebu and, in 1910, Singzon would become the first Bishop of Calbayog.

130 In 1902, the US Congress passed the Philippine Organic Act which provided for the creation of an elective assembly to serve as the lower chamber of a bicameral legislative body, with the Philippine Commission, the members of which were appointed, becoming the higher chamber. In the words of Jacob Gould Schurman, who headed the first Philippine Commission sent to investigate conditions in the country: “I am anxious to see Congress grant the Filipinos representative institutions at once. It is no argument against this policy that even educated Filipinos do not possess our conception of civil liberty or of official responsibility. With such powers, ideas, and sentiments as they have, get them in harness quickly and let them tug and sweat under the burden of national affairs. This is the way men are trained in government. Political aptitudes and political sentiments are the gifts of nature and the acquisition of personal experience; they cannot be donated by one person or nation to another. And if you do not at once take the educated Filipinos into active partnership in the government of the Philippine Islands, your monopoly of power, if it does not alienate and embitter them, may have the still worse effect of tending to discourage and emasculate them. If the Filipinos are to learn to govern themselves in the manner of the really free

named to the episcopate, and on the occasion of the celebration of the First National Eucharistic Congress of the Philippines, of the 11 bishops present, six were Filipinos, two Americans, one Irish, one German, and one Spanish.¹³¹

nations, the sooner they get at it, the better. Passive acquiescence, without partnership, in American government of the Philippines will atrophy their own native capacity for self-government. In that way their dependence would mean their servitude. The beginning of all national, as of all personal, freedom is this: "Son of man, stand upon thy feet!" America cannot endow the Filipinos with liberty, but by permitting them to govern themselves, starting now with representative institutions and gradually enlarging their powers, it can at least put them under conditions favorable to the development of liberty. To give them a good government from above without evoking their own active co-operation, as England has done for the people of India, is to sap and atrophy their own capacity for self-government." Cf. Jacob Gould Schurman, *Philippine Affairs* (New York, 1902), 81-107, cited in Horacio de la Costa, *Readings in Philippine History* (Manila: Bookmark, 1992), 225-228. Thus the First Philippine Assembly was elected in 1907, and Sergio Osmeña became its first Filipino Speaker, while his rival, Manuel L. Quezon of Tayabas, became the first Filipino Resident Commissioner in Washington, DC. In 1916, the US Congress approved the Jones Bill which made of the higher chamber, the Philippine Commission, a Senate whose members would now be elected and no longer appointed. All throughout the American period, political power in the hands of Filipinos would grow, a phenomenon that certainly could not help being noticed in the ecclesiastical sphere.

131 The six Filipino bishops were as follows: 1) Juan Gorordo of Cebu; 2) Alfredo Versoza of Lipa; 3) Cesar Ma. Guerrero of Lingayen; 4) Sofronio Hacbang of Calbayog; 5) Francisco Reyes of Nueva Caceres; and 6) Santiago Sancho of Nueva Segovia. The two American bishops were 1) W. Hinnemann, Auxiliary Bishop of Manila; and 2) James P. McCloskey, Bishop of Jaro. The Irish prelate was M. J. O'Doherty, Archbishop of Manila. The German bishop was Constance Jurgens, Bishop of Tuguegarao. And the only Spanish bishop was none other than the Jesuit, José Clos, Bishop of Zamboanga. Guillermo Piani was then Apostolic Delegate. Also in attendance was the Spanish abbot of the Benedictines, Raimundo Salinas.