

## PHILIPPINE MASONRY TO 1890

JOHN N. SCHUMACHER, S.J.

THE MASONIC LODGES SERVED AS CENTERS FOR MANY OF the Liberal conspiracies in Spain against clerical and reactionary governments during the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century,<sup>1</sup> and Masonry played a considerable part in the emancipation of the Spanish-American republics.<sup>2</sup> In Cuba, too, Masonic influence was strong in the insurrections of the second half of the nineteenth century.<sup>3</sup> It might be expected then, that in a society far more theocratic in nature than those mentioned — as was the nineteenth century Philippines — that Masonry would play a considerable role in any nationalist movement. This was because of its anti-clerical orientation and because of the opportunity its secrecy allowed for clandestine activity. It is a fact that almost every Filipino nationalist leader of the Propaganda Period was at one time or another a Mason. But the role of Masonry in the nationalist movement and in the Revolution which followed it, has, it seems, frequently been exaggerated and misinterpreted by the friends of Masonry as well as by its enemies. Particularly the writing of the Friars and Jesuits of the Revolutionary period (both published works and private correspondence) are wont to see Masons in every corner.<sup>4</sup> Books have not been lacking,

---

<sup>1</sup> See Antonio Ballesteros y Beretta, *Historia de España y su influencia en la historia universal* (2nd ed.; Barcelona: Salvat, 1943 ff.), X, 183-184; Gerald Brenan, *Spanish Labyrinth* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: University Press, 1950), 206-208. Books such as Eduardo Comín Colomer, *La Masonería en España (Apuntes para una interpretación masónica de la historia patria)* (Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1944) and the annotated edition by Mauricio Carlavilla of Miguel Morayta's *Masonería española. Páginas de su historia* (Madrid: Nos, 1956), are almost psychotic in their monomania for finding Masonry at every turn of Spanish history from the early nineteenth century to the present. In the original edition of Morayta's book, the latter details the part of Masonry in Spanish history until 1868, likewise with exaggeration, but favorably, of course, to Masonry.

<sup>2</sup> Salvador de Madariaga, *The Fall of the Spanish Empire* (N.Y.: Macmillan, 1948), 254-262, 338-339; John Francis Bannon, S.J., and Peter Masten Dunne, S.J., *Latin America: An Historical Survey* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1947), 406, 409.

<sup>3</sup> Luis Martín y de Castro, *La masonería en la Isla de Cuba y los Grandes Orientes de España* (Guantanamo, 1890); Francisco J. Ponte Domínguez, *La masonería en la independencia de Cuba* (Habana, 1954).

<sup>4</sup> The Jesuit correspondence preserved in the Archivo de la Provincia de Tarragona de la Compañía de Jesús (henceforth AT), located in the Colegio de San Francisco de Borja, San Cugat del Vallés (Barcelona), Spain, is full of references to "la gente del mandil," "los trabajos del mallete," "la influencia del triángulo," etc. Some of this reappears in the works of Father Pablo Pastells, S.J., *La masonización de Filipinas. Rizal y su obra* (Barcelona, 1897) and *Misión de la Compañía de Jesús de Filipinas en el siglo XIX* (3 vols.; Barcelona, 1916). Some other works, among many, which attribute almost everything concerned with the Filipino nationalist movement and the Revolution to Masonry are: Eduardo Navarro, O.S.A. *Filipinas: estudios de algunos asuntos de actualidad* (Madrid, 1897); Jose M. del Castillo y Jiménez, *El Katipunan ó el filibusterismo en Filipinas* (Madrid, 1897); Manuel Sastrón, *La insurrección en Filipinas y Guerra Hispano-Americana en el Archipiélago* (Madrid, 1901).

even in recent times, which see the entire last two decades of the nineteenth century in the Philippines, in terms of a Masonic plot, obeying orders from the Supreme Council of Charleston, in order to strip Spain of her last overseas provinces.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, while Masonic works written by Spaniards try to exculpate Masonry from any part in the Philippine Revolution, those by Filipino Masons have often seemed to make Masonry the chief moving force behind the Revolution. There is need, then, of a serious historical study of the real role of Masonry among the Filipino nationalists.

The chief problem in making such an objective study of the role of Masonry has been, of course, the lack of sufficient documentation. The late Teodoro M. Kalaw, himself a past Grand Master of Philippine Masonry, possessed a collection of Masonic documents, on which his book<sup>6</sup> (till now the only available history of Philippine Masonry) seems largely to have been based. However, Kalaw did not give adequate references to his documents in writing his book; in any case, the collection seems to have been destroyed during the past war.<sup>7</sup> In this scarcity of documentation, the discovery of a number of authentic Masonic records from the Filipino lodges—both in Spain and in the Philippines—is of considerable importance. These documents were found among those confiscated from the Spanish lodges by the Spanish Nationalist forces as they occupied Republican territory during the civil war of 1936-1939, and were gathered together by the government agency known as the Delegación Nacional de Servicios Documentales.<sup>8</sup> Undoubtedly, the archive of this body contains extensive documentation on Spanish Masonry, though I was assured that most of it dealt with the twentieth century. Among the records, however, were a few folders containing some scattered Philippine documentation. Though the records are clearly incomplete and somewhat haphazard, they throw considerable light on the early organization of Masonry in the Philippines and on the Filipino lodges in Spain. With the aid of these documents, this article proposes to attempt a new reconstruction of the role of Masonry during the early part of the Propaganda Period, one made, it is hoped, without the intention either of glorifying this role or disparaging it, but merely of establishing the basic facts, as a first step toward an over-all evaluation.

<sup>5</sup> Comín Colomer, *op. cit.*, 275, 284-288, 311, and *passim*; Carlavilla, *op. cit.*, 26, 398, and *passim*. The prototype of these works was Mauricio, *La gran traición* (Barcelona, 1899). Both Comín and Carlavilla are violently anti-semitic also.

<sup>6</sup> Teodoro M. Kalaw, *Philippine Masonry*, trans. and ed. Frederic H. Stevens and Antonio Amechazurra (Manila, 1956). In spite of some valuable information, the book suffers from the way its assertions are documented. For it is frequently difficult to tell whether Kalaw's statements are based on his authentic documents or on other less reliable accounts. Moreover, the book is an edifying history in the worst hagiographical tradition, and includes long excerpts from Masonic exhortations to virtue and considerable pious rhetoric together with its factual material.

<sup>7</sup> Kalaw, *op. cit.*, 221, n. 4.

<sup>8</sup> The Archive of the Delegación (henceforth referred to as ADN) is located in Salamanca. I was able to locate these documents through the kind help of the late Don Luis Sala Balust, Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the Pontifical University of Salamanca, and was permitted to consult the Archive, not yet open to general research, through the kind permission and generous assistance of the Director, Don Pedro Ulibarri. To both men I am grateful.

### Early Masonry in the Philippines

Apart from some vague reports of British Masonic lodges during the occupation of Manila in 1762-1764,<sup>9</sup> the first lodges set up in Manila seem to date from mid-1850's, formed among Spanish army officers in the Philippines, followed by others among the foreign merchants.<sup>10</sup> It is claimed also that sometime before 1872, there were some Filipinos admitted to a lodge in the Pandacan district of Manila, but these apparently were among those exiled in the aftermath of the insurrection of 1872.<sup>11</sup> If any Filipinos did remain in the lodges, they were eliminated in the reorganization which took place under the auspices of the Gran Oriente de España in 1874. The Philippine Masonic lodges remained completely European in their membership until Filipino lodges were introduced in 1891 by Filipino Masons returning from Spain after being initiated there.<sup>12</sup> There is indeed mention of an invitation being extended in 1884 to all *indios* and *mestizos* who "..... knew how to read and write and had a responsible position, provided they loved Spain and had a definite religion."<sup>13</sup> If such an invitation was ever made, which

<sup>9</sup> Kalaw, *op. cit.*, 1.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 9-11. There is some inconsistency in the date given by Kalaw here, and he appears to have used conflicting testimony from different sources. The principal source for this chapter in Kalaw, though he only occasionally cites him, is Nicolás Díaz y Pérez, in the works cited in n. 11. Kalaw also once cites Vital Fité, *Las desdichas de la patria* (Madrid, 1899), but this author's treatment of Masonry is entirely taken from Díaz y Pérez, though rarely crediting him, even when transcribing whole paragraphs. Among the initiates of one of the foreign lodges was Jacobo Zóbel de Zangróniz, whom Kalaw (p. 10) notes as "the first Filipino Mason initiated in the Islands." Zóbel, however, was the son of a German father and a Spanish mother, and though born in the Philippines, had been educated in Germany. As a German by culture, he joined a predominantly German lodge. There is an extensive biographical sketch of Zóbel by E. Hubner, "Jacobo Zóbel de Zangróniz. Eijn Lebensbild aus der jungsten Vergangenheit der philippinischen Inseln," *Deutsche Rundschau* XC (1897), 420-445; XCI (1897), 35-51.

<sup>11</sup> Kalaw, *op. cit.*, 11, apparently in dependence on Francisco-Engracio Vergara [Antonio María Regidor], *La Masonería en Filipinas* (Paris, 1896), 10-13. Nicolás Díaz y Pérez, "La francasonería en Filipinas," *La Epoca* (Madrid) 31 Agosto 1896, however, denies that there were any Filipino Masons before 1884. (This article forms the basis for what is said of Philippine Masonry in the pamphlet by his son, Viriato Díaz-Pérez, *Los Frailes de Filipinas* (Madrid, 1904), 20. Though Nicolás had earlier been prominent in Masonry in Spain, he had been inactive since 1885 and seems to have had no contact with Masonry at the time he wrote "Díaz y Pérez, Nicolás," in Lorenzo Frau Abrines and Rosendo Arús Arderiu, *Diccionario enciclopédico de la Masonería*, 2nd ed. rev., (3 vols.; Buenos Aires, 1947), I, 315. Juan Utor y Fernández, *Masones y ultramontanos* (Manila, 1899) denies that any Masonry existed in the Philippines before 1873, and declares that at least until 1886 no native Filipino was initiated in the Philippines (46, 51-53, 59). Utor had likewise held high positions in Masonry, having brought about the union of various lodges under the Gran Oriente de España in 1875, when he became Gran Maestro Adjunto. ("Utor Fernández, Juan," Frau Arús, II, 851-852. Both Díaz-Pérez' and Utor's pamphlets are anti-Friar polemic tracts and though their authors could well have had considerable knowledge of early Philippine Masonry, both have a number of unreliable or clearly false statements which make it difficult to know to what extent they can be relied on.

<sup>12</sup> Kalaw, *op. cit.*, 11-16, but the story is somewhat confused. Navarro, 239 places the elimination of Filipinos from the lodges somewhat later.

<sup>13</sup> Kalaw, *op. cit.*, 17, summarizing Díaz-Pérez, *op. cit.*, 19. The statement is repeated in "Historia esquemática de la masonería filipina," *Latomia* III (1933), 126; but the article seems to depend on Kalaw's book (in the earlier Spanish edition). *Latomia* was a Masonic publication of Madrid.

is more than doubtful, it received no acceptance except from Jose A. Ramos. Ramos had, however, been initiated in London, and was, moreover, a Spanish *mestizo* married to an English wife.<sup>14</sup> In the extant lists of lodge members from 1884, the only one identifiable as a Filipino is Ramos, affiliated to the lodge *Luz de Oriente*. In 1887 Ramos again appears as one of the founders of the lodge *Constancia* likewise in Manila, in which all members are explicitly noted as Europeans, with the exception of Ramos, denominated "Philippine Spaniard" (*español filipino*).<sup>15</sup> Therefore, with the possible, but unsubstantiated, exception of the short period in the 1870's, it would seem that no pure-blooded Filipinos (*indios*) had been initiated into Masonry before the first Filipino lodges were formed in Spain.

### Early Filipino Masons in Spain

The fact that Masonry in the Philippines had not, at this time, opened its doors to Filipinos, perhaps helps to explain the readiness of Filipino students in Europe to join the Masonic lodges there where the race barrier did not prevent them. The first clear evidence of Filipino participation in Masonry that I have found is the membership of Rafael Del-Pan, a *creole*.<sup>16</sup> whose father—Jose Felipe del Pan—was a long-time prominent Spanish resident of the Philippines and publisher of the Manila newspaper *La Oceanía Española*.<sup>17</sup> The elder del Pan was a member of one of the Masonic lodges of Manila,<sup>18</sup> and this, no doubt, brought the son to be the first of the Filipino student group in Madrid to join Masonry, though it is not clear just when he did so. In April 1886, however, Del-Pan appears—already possessing the eighteenth

<sup>14</sup> Kalaw (*op. cit.*, 17) cites a letter of Morayta of 1916, addressed to himself, asserting that the doors of Masonry were only opened to Filipinos in 1889. For Ramos' initiation in London, see Antonio Regidor, *El pleito de los Filipinos contra los Frailes* (Madrid, 1901), 6. (This pamphlet is a translation by Isabelo de los Reyes of an interview given by Regidor to *The Independent* of New York, February 7, 1901.) Also, E. Arsenio Manuel, *Dictionary of Philippine Biography* (Quezon City, 1955), I, 355, basing himself on Ramos' unpublished memoirs.

<sup>15</sup> ADN, legajo 219-A<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> I refer to Del-Pan as a Filipino, even though he was by blood a Spaniard, since he always seems to have considered himself a Filipino, and associated himself with the other Filipinos involved in the Propaganda movement, while other creoles, like Antonio Regidor, the Azcárragas, etc., though born in the Philippines also, considered themselves primarily Spaniards, and later remained in Europe. At a time of transition like the late 19th century, when the Filipino nation did not yet exist as such, but the idea of Filipino nationality was already evolving, the criterion of self-identification seems to me to be the most useful for distinguishing between Filipinos and Spaniards among those of European blood born in the country.

<sup>17</sup> For biographical details of José Felipe del Pan, who seems always to have concealed his Masonic affiliation, and never exhibited any anti-clericalism, see W. E. Retana, *Aparato bibliográfico de la historia general de Filipinas* (3 vols.; Madrid, 1906), III, No. 4483, 1570. According to Retana, when Rafael succeeded his father as publisher of *La Oceanía Española* a radical change in policy took place, as far as that was then possible in the Philippines.

<sup>18</sup> His name appears as affiliated with the lodge "Lealtad" of the Gran Oriente de España in a list which should be dated from the 1870's, probably 1874, since some of the other lodges on the list are still in process of formation (ADN, legajo 219-A<sup>1</sup>).

degree—as one of the founders of a lodge called “Solidaridad.”<sup>19</sup> Of the other seven founders, two were Peninsular Spaniards, three were Cubans, one a Puerto Rican, and one other Filipino—Ricardo Ayllon.<sup>20</sup> Shortly after the foundation of the lodge *Solidaridad*, two other Filipinos—Evaristo Aguirre and Julio Lorente—<sup>21</sup> also joined; a large proportion of those initiated in succeeding months were either Cubans or Puerto Ricans.<sup>22</sup>

There are several indications that this lodge, largely made up of students from Spain’s overseas provinces, was the work of Miguel Morayta. At least one of the founders—a Puerto Rican named Herminio Diaz—was a member of Morayta’s own lodge, “Hijos del Progreso.” Moreover, Morayta himself is listed as an honorary member of lodge “Solidaridad,” with the title of “Honorary Worshipful Master,” the highest honorary title that that lodge could give. Finally, though founded in April 1886, the lodge had little life until the following September. It seems to have passed through an early crisis when all but two of those members holding higher degrees withdrew, leaving only a handful of new adepts. When, however, the reorganization and *apertura de trabajos* took place the following September, the first invitation to a joint session went to Morayta’s “Hijos del Progreso.”

The surviving records of the lodge indicate that it led a rather languid life. Del-Pan and Aguirre had both withdrawn before the end of 1886; in general, there had been a large turn-over of members. Graciano Lopez Jaena, apparently already initiated a Mason in 1882 in the lodge “Porvenir” but long inactive, affiliated with the lodge “Solidaridad” in April 1887.<sup>23</sup> One

<sup>19</sup> In the charter for the lodge “Solidaridad,” signed by Manuel Becerra as Grand Master of the Gran Oriente de España, and dated March 30, 1886, Alfredo Sánchez-Ossorio is named as Worshipful Master; Modesto Fonseca, Senior Warden; and Antonio Berenguer, Junior Warden. The records of the lodge, however, date its foundation from April 4, 1886, with Sánchez-Ossorio as Worshipful Master, but Berenguer has become Senior Warden, and Del-Pan is listed as Junior Warden, apparently through the withdrawal of Fonseca, whose name does not appear either among the founders or the members of the lodge (ADN, legajo 736, expediente 11).

<sup>20</sup> I have not been able to find any further information on Ricardo Ayllon, who held the eighteenth degree, and who withdrew to return to the Philippines before October 15, 1886, as did Del-Pan. Ayllon’s name does not appear in any other document of the Filipinos in Spain prior to 1886, nor does he appear connected with nationalist activity in any way afterwards.

<sup>21</sup> Aguirre and Lorente were both students at the University of Madrid, and close friends and classmates of Rizal from the Ateneo. Both were active in the Filipino colony during these years, especially in the Filipino newspaper *España en Filipinas*.

<sup>22</sup> Of the thirty-three members initiated or affiliated up till the end of October 1886, ten were Cubans, two Puerto Ricans, four Filipinos, and one was from Martinique. The rest were presumably Peninsular Spaniards, since their place of origin is not usually noted (ADN, legajo 736, expediente 11).

<sup>23</sup> From López Jaena’s documents, as found in these records, it seems that he had joined the lodge “Solidaridad” at its founding on April 5, 1886, but because he lacked the necessary document of withdrawal in good standing (*plancha de quite*) from his former lodge, he did not take the oath and become formally affiliated with “Solidaridad” until April 4, 1887. (“Expediente del h. . Bolívar, prof. . Graciano López, gr. . 3”, *ibid.*) The article on López Jaena in the *Encyclopedia of the Philippines*, ed. Zolito M. Galang; 2nd ed.; III, 241, declares that he was initiated in the lodge “Porvenir” in Madrid in 1882. Though no source is given, it seems that this should be accepted in the absence of any contrary information, and since it fits well with other known facts. In this

month later, however, the majority of members of the lodge, including all the Cubans, voted to join with certain other lodges to form a new lodge: "Luz de Mantua" No. 1. Among them, the only Filipino was Lopez Jaena. With this, the lodge "Solidaridad" apparently ceased to exist until it was revived as an all-Filipino lodge a few years later.<sup>24</sup> Though the Filipinos never formed more than a handful in the early lodge, "Solidaridad," the importance of the episode is the introduction of Masonry among the Filipino colony in Madrid, and even more, the fact that these contacts were established under the aegis of Miguel Morayta, who was to play a significant role in Filipino Masonry for the next thirty years until his death.

### The Lodge "Revolucion"

The first predominantly Filipino lodge, however, was to be founded in Barcelona in April 1889, under the title "Revolucion."<sup>25</sup> The initiative seems to have come from a former Spanish army officer, Celso Mir Deas,<sup>26</sup> who, while in the Philippines, had married a Filipina. Mir Deas was at this time, active in Republican circles in Barcelona, especially as a journalist on the republican newspaper, *El Pueblo Soberano*.<sup>27</sup> The original members of the lodge were Mir, Lopez Jaena, Marcelo H. del Pilar, Mariano Ponce, Jose Ma. Panganiban, Juan Jose Cañarte, and Justo Argudin. These latter two were Cubans; Cañarte had been collaborating with the Filipino newspaper

---

case, of course, López Jaena may have been prior to Del-Pan in joining Masonry.

<sup>24</sup> ADN, leg. 736, exp. 11. Seventeen members are listed as voting for the fusion of the lodges. It is not clear whether these are simply the affirmative votes, or whether they are all that were left in the lodge at this time. To judge from the other records of withdrawals, dismissals, and initiations, it would seem that there was a minority of dissenters, among whom was Lorente. This is confirmed by the fact that Lorente in 1890 would propose the reconstitution of the lodge "Solidaridad" rather than any other, on the grounds that he was a member of it, something he could hardly have said if he had withdrawn prior to the fusion.

<sup>25</sup> The records of the lodge, apparently incomplete, are found in ADN, leg. 620, exp. 14. Though Kalaw (*op. cit.*, 20) gives the date of the charter as April 1, 1889, the meeting to petition affiliation was not held till April 2, so Kalaw is in error.

<sup>26</sup> A letter found in AT from a Barcelona Jesuit, Father Antonio Codo, to the Provincial, Father Juan Ricart, who had recently come from the Philippines, casts light on the origin of the lodge:

"Another reason which has moved me to write to your Reverence is to inform you, as I promised, . . . of the name of that active propagator of Masonry, a former military man in the Philippines, of whom I spoke to your Reverence shortly before leaving here. His name is Celso Mir . . . They have finally founded the lodge of which I spoke to your Reverence with the title of 'La Revolucion'.

"This Celso is a very active collaborator and propagandist who promises money and protection to the uncautious who allow themselves to be initiated; he is trying to revive in this lodge the statutes which have fallen into disuse in the others, of assassinating the traitor who makes known its secrets. For this reason, and because of having roundly refused to sign a certain document which they presented to him, it will be difficult for me to acquire other information from the man who favored me with this."

Though the letter is dated June 23, 1889, it is clear that the lodge had been founded some time before, and planned earlier. For Codo mentions that he had not written about the matter sooner, because he did not consider it important.

<sup>27</sup> From a friend and supporter of the Filipinos, Mir was eventually to become their bitter enemy because of the articles of Antonio Luna in *La Soli-*

*La Solidaridad* for a few issues just before this time.<sup>28</sup> Lopez Jaena was elected Worshipful Master; Argudin, Senior Warden; Mir, Junior Warden; Del Pilar, Orator; and Cañarte, Secretary. Immediately upon its organization, the lodge petitioned Morayta, who had founded the new federation—Gran Oriente Español—a few months earlier, recognizing the Masonic legality of Morayta's federation<sup>29</sup> and petitioning affiliation for the lodge "Revolucion."<sup>30</sup> Just two weeks later, Morayta made a trip from Madrid to Barcelona, where he was honored by the Filipino colony with a banquet. It was at this time that Del Pilar made his first contacts with Morayta, from which would spring a close association and friendship between the two men, with Del Pilar eventually coming to hold a high position in Spanish Masonry, and with Morayta lending his collaboration to the Filipino campaign.

The details of the foundation of the lodge "Revolucion" are not completely clear. The records begin with April 2, 1889, as may be seen from the document cited above. However, though this communication with Morayta may well signalize the beginning of the lodge, it might also merely signify the move of a pre-existing lodge to affiliate with Morayta, who had recently won over various Masonic rivals and succeeded in uniting under himself the Gran Oriente Español. Marcelo del Pilar already appears in the records of April 2 as holding the third degree. Since, as we have seen, it is extremely unlikely that he was initiated before leaving the Philippines, his initiation must have taken place sometime within the three months after his arrival in Barcelona on January 1, 1889. Two possibilities, therefore, present themselves: either Del Pilar had, sometime during those three months, joined another Masonic lodge and, at the beginning of April—together with Lopez Jaena, Mir Deas, and others—had withdrawn from his original lodge to form "Revolucion" and affiliate with Morayta; or perhaps, "Revolucion" had already been formed sometime earlier (between January and April) and that it was only at this time that its records begin to appear among those of the Gran Oriente Español, since it was only then that the already existing lodge would have affiliated with Morayta.

The surviving records of the lodge "Revolucion" for the year 1889 show that most of the Filipinos in Barcelona soon joined the lodge, and that

---

*daridad* satirizing Spanish foibles. He eventually denounced them to the police who raided the house of Ponce in Barcelona in search of subversive literature, in December 1889. *La Solidaridad* published a separate supplement on December 15, 1889, giving the Filipino side of the story. For biographical data on Mir, see Joan Givanel i Mas, *Materials per a la bibliografia de la premsa barcelonesa (1881-1890)* (Barcelona, 1933), 97-98.

<sup>28</sup> *La Solidaridad* I, 5 (15 Abril 1889), 52-53; I, 7 (15 Mayo 1889), 77-78.

<sup>29</sup> In 1888 after a series of schisms and re-combinations following the resignation of Manuel Becerra as Grand Master in 1886, Morayta had been defeated in an election of the new federation. He protested the election and broke with the Gran Oriente Nacional, recently formed. Followed by apparently the larger number of lodges, he then formed the Gran Oriente Español on January 9, 1889. (These facts are taken from a source friendly to Morayta, Frau-Arús, III, 457-459, but the hostile account, favoring the Gran Oriente Nacional, to be found in Martín y de Castro, 89-91, agrees as to the substantial fact.)

<sup>30</sup> The first meeting, the minutes of which accompany the petition (ADN, leg. 620, exp. 14), took place on April 2, 1889, and the petition bears the same date. The meeting was held at Rambla Canaletas, 2, 30, which was the home of Del Pilar, Ponce, and López Jaena at this time, and the publishing office of *La Solidaridad*.

these Filipinos rapidly ascended to the higher degrees of Masonry. In addition to those listed above, other Filipinos who joined during 1889 included Santiago Icasiano, Ariston Bautista, Galicano Apacible, Damaso Ponce, Ramon Imperial, Agustin Blanco, Domingo Marcelo Cortes, and Teodoro Sandico. By August 30, Del Pilar and Mariano Ponce had reached the eighteenth degree; Bautista, the fourteenth. On September 17, Mir Deas, Argudin, Apacible and Panganiban, were proposed for the thirtieth degree; Icasiano, Damaso Ponce, and Imperial, for the eighteenth. Though the records are incomplete, it seems very likely that Del Pilar and Mariano Ponce had likewise reached the thirtieth degree by this time, inasmuch as they had been co-founders with the others proposed for the thirtieth degree, and had begun with them in the same degree. Certainly, by 1890, both men already held the thirtieth degree in the Madrid lodge "Solidaridad," though there is no record among the documents of that lodge of their promotion, indicating that it must have taken place while they were still affiliated with "Revolucion."

When compared with the rate at which men were promoted to higher degrees in other lodges, this rapidity seems rather extraordinary. It could perhaps be attributed to a desire, on the part of Morayta, to build up the new lodges quickly, so as to consolidate the still shaky position of his federation, or possibly also to financial considerations. But, without completely excluding either of these possibilities, it would seem to be the desire of the Filipinos, particularly Del Pilar, to rise to positions in Masonry where they could make use of their Masonic relationships more effectively for their political purposes in the Philippines.<sup>31</sup> Certainly, whatever may have been the motivation of Morayta or of Mir Deas, Del Pilar intended to make use of Masonry in his campaign to destroy the power of the Friars in the Philippines, as will be seen in the following section.

### Masonry and the Filipino Anti-Friar Campaign

Two instances of this use of Masonic influence by Del Pilar may be cited, which give an insight into the strategy he proposed in his campaign for Europe. The first of these was the sponsorship by Del Pilar and his associates of Manrique Alonso Lallave, a renegade Friar from the Philippines who had turned Protestant, and in 1889 returned to Manila to open a Protestant chapel there.<sup>32</sup> Lallave had been a Dominican parish priest of the town of Urdaneta, Pangasinan. He had been one of those who attempted to take advantage of the short-lived decree of Segismundo Moret in 1870, authorizing the exlaustration of Friars in the Philippines. Dismissed from the Dominican Order for this and other grave charges, he had been expelled from

<sup>31</sup> Though there are fees recorded for each advance in degree, they do not seem to be excessive amounts, usually ten or fifteen pesetas for each promotion. In any case, it is likely that Del Pilar would have considered the money well-spent for the political connections thus afforded him. Later Morayta would be charged with having opened Masonry to Filipinos to the detriment of Spain, merely out of pecuniary considerations. There is a certain amount of evidence for this charge with regard to the founding of lodges in the Philippines, but at least at this point the charge does not seem to be substantiated.

<sup>32</sup> The data on Lallave and his activities is taken from the biographical article "Lallave, Manrique Alonso," Frau-Arús, I, 614-615, and from the information contained in the letters of Del Pilar cited below.



the Philippines by the government of General Rafael Izquierdo.<sup>33</sup> On his return to Spain, he had published a diatribe against the Friars, entitled *Los Frailes en Filipinas*<sup>34</sup> in which he accused them of every imaginable crime, and demanded the dissolution of the Orders. The pamphlet is full of the most manifest falsehoods and exaggerations, recklessly giving figures, for example, on the enormous wealth of the Friars, which admittedly had no proof for them at all. But the author was by no means a friend or defender of the rights of the Filipinos. In the light of the sponsorship given by Del Pilar to Lallave's pamphlet and to the man's activities as well, it is interesting to note such passage as the following, in which Lallave denies all ability to Filipinos and insults them in a way worthy of the worst of the detractors of the race combatted by Rizal and others:

... There you will not find that magnificent brilliance of intelligence... nor will you discover there in the works of men the graphic expressions of the power of their will; you will see only lowness, small-mindedness, fear, servilism in execution, poverty of will in every respect, and degradation of the intelligence. That people still lacks poetry; as yet it has not invented a song—rather its songs and its harmonies are the harmonies and the songs of the savages!...<sup>35</sup>

Even worse are his remarks about the Filipinos being "... liars by their very nature....."<sup>36</sup> and his chapter on public morality, where he denies all sense of morality to the entire race, men and women.<sup>37</sup>

Despite all this, Del Pilar now proposes in his campaign to destroy the influence of the Friars in the Philippines, to cooperate with Lallave and other elements in Spanish political life who were sponsoring him, notably the ex-revolutionary, former Grand Master of the Gran Oriente de España, Manuel Becerra, now Overseas Minister in the Liberal Cabinet of Sagasta.<sup>38</sup> The entire term of office of Becerra was a continuous threat to the Church in the Philippines, though few of his projects ever succeeded in winning cabinet approval, even from the anti-clerical government of Sagasta. In an early circular to the Governor-General, he ostentatiously called on the latter to favor the work of the religious orders in the Philippines, but went on to say that he must not forget

... that in the territory of that jurisdiction there are Europeans, Asiatics, and Americans who profess different religions. All these should be respected in their

---

<sup>33</sup> The account of Lallave's dismissal from the Dominicans and expulsion from the Philippines with three companions, parish priests of towns in Pangasinan, is in the Archivo Histórico Nacional in Madrid, Sección de Ultramar, leg. 2223, "Sobre expulsión de las Islas Filipinas de los Religiosos de la Orden de Sto. Domingo, Fr. José Ma. Isla, Fr. Nicolás Manrique Alonso, Fr. Joaquín Palacios y Fr. Remigio Zapico." All had been found guilty by their Order of a number of serious charges. The documents show on the one hand the possibility of serious abuses on the part of Friar parish priests, and on the other hand, the stern measures taken by their Order to expel members who had shown themselves unworthy. It reflects little credit on Del Pilar, however, to have made use of such a man against the Friars.

<sup>34</sup> Manrique Alonso Lallave, *Los frailes en Filipinas* (Madrid, 1872).

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 44. This translation, and subsequent ones, are mine.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 48.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 53-57.

<sup>38</sup> For Becerra's Masonic career, see Frau-Arús, III, 457. His ecclesiastical projects are narrated, and attacked, in Pastells, *Misión*, 176-182.

beliefs and in their worship, as they have been ever since the wise Laws of the Indies were first laid down. . . .<sup>39</sup>

Beneath this seemingly innocuous statement, apparently simply reiterating ordinary Philippine practice, there was a hidden plan. The key to the plan is the phrase "in their worship" which gave an opening for freedom of worship, something never heretofore permitted in the Philippines. Del Pilar, in a letter to Pedro Serrano Laktaw, pointed out that he considered this to be:

... the gravest threat that can be made under current legislation against the theocratic power. Becerra cannot descend to details. The question is whether we know how to develop its potentialities.

He goes on to explain how he proposes to do so:

Under protection of that circular, you have coming to you there in person, in body and soul, your Manrique Lallave, now a Protestant pastor. The government will not be able to prosecute him, since he is protected by the circular. If he succeeds in making proselytes, an exposition will be presented to the government with 300,000 signatures in demand of greater tolerance and even of freedom of worship. This latter is still a remote possibility, but even toleration is already a great step against the monastic power. As to their expulsion, you know already that we cannot hope for this from the government; we have to do it ourselves.<sup>40</sup>

He then counsels Serrano to aid Lallave clandestinely with the assistance of Doroteo Cortes and Jose Ramos. In a letter to Teodoro Sandico a few weeks later, he urges him to work with Serrano in helping Lallave, "... because here you have the unfolding of one of the plans of Becerra . . . ."<sup>41</sup>

In his letter to Doroteo Cortes, contemporaneous with that to Serrano, Del Pilar gives some idea of his relationship to Becerra in this matter.

Senor Manrique Lallave and his companions are going there to carry on some business which they will explain to you. Believing their interests to be antagonistic to those of certain monopolizers of the country, I would wish that, on your part and that of your friends, you would bestow every kind of protection on them, being assured that these gentlemen and the elements on whom they depend, with whom we are in complete understanding, are disposed to render us service in return.<sup>42</sup>

The plan did not prosper, however, since Lallave contracted a fever a few weeks after his arrival in Manila, and after two weeks of sickness, died.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Text in the newspaper *El Día* (Madrid), 19 Enero 1889.

<sup>40</sup> Carmelo [Del Pilar] to P. Ikazama [Pedro Serrano Laktaw], 3 Mayo 1889, *Epistolario de Marcelo H. del Pilar* (2 vols.; Manila, 1955-1958), I, 112. The editor of the *Epistolario* wrongly identifies P. Ikazama as Pedro Icasiano instead of Serrano. To demonstrate that Serrano is the addressee cannot be undertaken here, but has been done in my doctoral dissertation, *The Filipino Nationalists Propaganda Campaign in Spain, 1880-1899*, from Georgetown University, published on microfilm with University Microfilms (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1965), 251-252.

<sup>41</sup> Piping Dilát [Del Pilar] to Teófilo Codisan [Teodoro Sandico], 30 Mayo 1889, *Epistolario*, I, 161.

<sup>42</sup> Marcelo H. del Pilar to Doroteo Cortés, 1 Mayo 1889, *ibid.*, 106.

<sup>43</sup> R. O. Serna [Pedro Serrano] to Marcelo H. del Pilar, 21 Junio 1889, *ibid.*, 178. There is a more detailed account in "Correo de Filipinas," *El Día* (Madrid), 2 Agosto 1889. These two contemporary accounts, both of them from sources hostile to the Friars, make clear that there is absolutely nothing to the charge, often made in later anti-Friar writings, that Lallave was poisoned by the Friars. Rather, he contracted a fever, and died after two weeks.

All this raises the question as to who were "the elements on which they depend," with whom Del Pilar was "in complete understanding," and who were disposed to render him reciprocal services in return for his cooperation with Lallave's anti-Catholic project. Two possible answers offer themselves: a group of Protestants, or one of Masons. The first of these seems highly improbable, since the scattered Protestants in Spain at this time were scarcely in a position to do anything for Del Pilar and his associates that would justify the phrase "disposed to render us service in return." Moreover, it is known that shortly before this time, Lallave, who had been a Presbyterian in Sevilla from 1874 to 1888, was deprived of his pastorate by his church in the latter year, because of accusations made against him, and reduced to such a precarious economic situation that he was scarcely able to support his wife and numerous children. It is hardly likely that his church, even if it were disposed to undertake such a project, would, after having deprived him of his pastorate for alleged bad conduct, have entrusted him with a new mission in the Philippines.<sup>44</sup>

There is, however, a great deal of evidence which points to Lallave's support being Masonic, specifically, from the Gran Oriente Español, headed by Morayta. Lallave had been a very active Mason for many years, had published a number of Masonic works, and was editor of the Masonic journal *Taller* from its foundation. Having first been a member of the lodge "Numantina" of the Gran Oriente Lusitano Unido, he had helped found the Gran Logia Simbolica Independiente Española in 1881, where he was Gran Orador. He had likewise founded the lodge "Numancia," of which he was Worshipful Master. With this background, Lallave was certainly no stranger to Becerra or to Morayta, since he was active in Masonic circles right up to the period in question, and in circles friendly to those of Morayta and Becerra.<sup>45</sup>

In addition to this Masonic affiliation of Lallave, the consideration of a few dates would seem clearly to point to Morayta and the Gran Oriente Español being the sponsor of Lallave. Del Pilar's letter to Serrano and Cortes in favor of Lallave are dated May 1, 1889. On the preceding April 2, the lodge "Revolucion" had petitioned Morayta for affiliation with the Gran Oriente Español.<sup>46</sup> Two weeks later, on April 16, Morayta arrived in Barcelona. During the period of his stay, it is clear from Del Pilar's letters, that the latter had several conferences with Morayta, the details of which he does not divulge, besides the public banquet which the Filipino colony offered.<sup>47</sup> As will be seen below, it is from precisely this time that Morayta showed himself active in behalf of the Filipinos, and that Del Pilar seems to have taken his final decision to go to Madrid and centralize his organization there

<sup>44</sup> For the situation of Protestantism in Spain at this time, see Ballesteros, XII, 97-98. For Lallave's relations with the Presbyterian Church, see Frau-Arús, I, 614-615.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.* The clearest evidence that Lallave must have been closely connected with Morayta is the laudatory article on him, to which reference is here made. For the *Diccionario*, first published by Frau in 1891, is highly biased in favor of Morayta and his associates, so that prominent Masons of other federations, and even the federations themselves, are simply ignored, or even attacked bitterly.

<sup>46</sup> ADN, leg. 620, esp. 14.

<sup>47</sup> Marcelo H. del Pilar to Ka Dato [Deodato Arellano], 17 Abril 1889, *Epistolario*, I, 97; 2 Mayo 1889, *ibid.*, 107-110.

in conjunction with the former. If Morayta proposed to Del Pilar that the Filipino group should aid Lallave, the first opportunity for Del Pilar to recommend that course to his friends in Manila would have been precisely when he did write, at the beginning of May when the next mail boat would have been leaving for the Philippines. As a matter of fact, it is in this same mail that he writes to his brother-in-law, Deodato Arellano, concerning his meeting with Morayta. All this circumstantial evidence is not, perhaps, absolutely conclusive, but the convergence of so many known facts, and the absence of any alternative hypothesis for the sponsoring organization which Del Pilar's letters refer to, give as much certainty as can be expected here.

The other side of this relationship of reciprocal assistance between Masonry and the Filipino nationalists which Del Pilar counted on, may be seen in another project he undertook as a result of the conferences between him and Morayta. At the banquet in honor of Morayta, the Filipinos and their Spanish friends drew up an exposition to the Overseas Minister Becerra, petitioning parliamentary representation for the Philippines, abolition of the censorship, and prohibition of administrative deportation.<sup>48</sup> A few weeks later, Del Pilar wrote to Rizal, who seems to have joined Masonry sometime earlier:<sup>49</sup>

... If you can take advantage of the support of the "Gran Familia," now is the time. For Becerra belongs to it, and besides, this oppressive measure [administrative deportation] affects its prestige and good name, since it is its own members and its friends who are subject to this persecution.<sup>50</sup>

Rizal, however, was unwilling to make use of Masonic influence, since he declared that he did not want "... to owe the tranquility of the Philippines to anyone except the forces of the country itself....."<sup>51</sup> Del Pilar was undismayed, and without communicating anything further to Rizal, began to campaign among other Masonic lodges to obtain their support for a petition to Sagasta, the Prime Minister, and to Becerra—both of them, Masons—against permitting administrative deportation in the Philippines.<sup>52</sup> On July 2, 1889, Lopez Jaena, as Worshipful Master of the lodge "Revolucion" forwarded to Morayta two copies of an exposition making this petition, signed by various lodges not only of the Gran Oriente Español, but also of other "obediences." He asked in an official letter that Morayta see to it that these expositions be placed in the hands of the Ministers to whom they were addressed.

In another confidential, unofficial letter, which accompanied these documents, he offered the activity of the lodge "Revolucion" in securing the cooperation of lodges outside the Gran Oriente Español as a proof of the Ma-

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 103-104.

<sup>49</sup> I hope to treat the complicated and somewhat obscure question of when and where Rizal was initiated into Masonry in a separate article. In any case, he was not a member of either the lodge "Revolucion," or of the lodge "Solidaridad" in the period considered in this article.

<sup>50</sup> To Laong Laan [Rizal], 18 Mayo 1889, *Epistolario*, I, 127.

<sup>51</sup> Felipe [Del Pilar] to Ikazama [Serrano], 27 Junio 1889, *ibid.*, 192.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.* After telling that the exposition was to be presented, Del Pilar continues: "... Los peticionarios no somos nosotros, sino otras entidades sociales... Ese Ramos lo entenderá mejor." The reference to Ramos is intended to convey the information that the "entidades sociales" in question are Masonic lodges. Elsewhere in his effort to use cryptic language, guarding against pos-

sonic zeal of the Filipinos, pointing out that this might well be a first step in bringing more lodges under Morayta's leadership. In return for this service, he asked to be rewarded with the thirtieth degree, without having to make a formal request.<sup>53</sup> In spite of the letter of Lopez Jaena, however, it seems clear from the correspondence of Del Pilar cited above, that it was the latter who was behind the whole move, though undoubtedly the political and Masonic contacts of Lopez Jaena were largely instrumental in making the move possible.<sup>54</sup>

The incident is interesting as an example of what Del Pilar hoped to accomplish through Masonry, and as an indication of the close relationship with Morayta which he was nurturing from this time. However, there is no evidence that anything was actually accomplished by these Masonic petitions as far as achieving their object is concerned. Becerra was already embarked on a program of radical reforms for the Philippines, which was meeting extensive opposition, and though he might well have supported the object of the Filipino petition, he was not in a position to propose more new reforms at this time. Sagasta was not willing to compromise himself at any time for the sake of Becerra's projects, and would scarcely have allowed himself to be led into reforms in the Philippines which many considered likely to weaken Spanish control, simply because of lobbying from Masonic lodges.<sup>55</sup>

After September, the records show an increase of non-Filipino members in the lodge, and a corresponding decrease in Filipino activity, no doubt due to the plans of Del Pilar to transfer operations to Madrid. Sandico, Bautista, Damaso Ponce, and perhaps Apacible, all moved to Madrid about this time, as did Del Pilar, with Mariano Ponce soon to follow. Since Pangiban already had only months to live, all the Filipinos who had shown themselves active in the lodge "Revolucion," with the exception of Lopez Jaena, were now gone. The latter resigned as Worshipful Master at the end of November, and there is no mention of the few remaining Filipino members in the other extant records for the months after November, only of Spaniards and Cubans. The last records of the lodge "Revolucion" date from June 1890.<sup>56</sup>

However, though "Revolucion" ceased to exist as a predominantly Filipino lodge, the associations of the nationalist movement under the leadership of Del Pilar with Spanish Masonry had only begun. Once the reorganization

---

sible opening of the mail by the authorities in Manila, Del Pilar speaks of Masonry as "la familia de Pepe Ramos" (*Epistolario*, I, 186). This use of Ramos' name to designate Masonry is further confirmation that Ramos was the only Filipino initiated into Masonry in Manila at this time.

<sup>53</sup> ADN, leg. 620, exp. 14.

<sup>54</sup> Later, when both López Jaena and Rizal were at odds with Del Pilar, the first would write to the second: "... Yo he sido para ellos, al llegar aquí a España, todo: yo les he hecho algo, yo les he presentado a las sociedades, a los personajes políticos..." (Graciano—Rizal, 15 Octubre 1891, *Epistolario Rizalino* [5 vols.; Manila, 1930-1938], III, 252).

<sup>55</sup> As a matter of fact, the Sagasta ministry never sanctioned Becerra's projects, and when the ministry fell a year and a half later, they were withdrawn by his successor. Even the laudatory article on Sagasta in Frau-Arús (II, 661-662) admits: "... Although an old and tried Freemason, Brother Sagasta took very little part in Masonic affairs..." and though he was persuaded to take the highest post in the Gran Oriente de España in 1876, he resigned it as soon as he had the opportunity to form a cabinet in 1881.

<sup>56</sup> ADN, leg. 620, exp. 14.

in Madrid was underway, a new lodge would be established and the part of Masonry in the activities of the Filipino nationalists would be expanded. But this is another story. The study of the documents for the period up to 1890 has, at least, it is hoped, shed new light on the origins of Philippine Masonry and the course it took until the end of its first phase.