

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR

REVIEWED BY: *HA* DATE: *25 MAR 1986*

RDS [ ] or XDS [ ] EXT. DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
TS AUTH. \_\_\_\_\_ REASON(S) \_\_\_\_\_  
ENDORSE EXISTING MARKINGS/ [ ]  
DECLASSIFIED [ ] RELEASABLE [ ]  
RELEASE DENIED [ ]  
PA of FOI EXEMPTIONS \_\_\_\_\_

*R*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

# AIRGRAM

AMR	NAVY	AF
AAA	KUN	FE
NLA	CU	INR
E	P	IO
L	PBO	AID
3		
AGR	COM	FRB
INT	LAD	TAN
7		
YN	XMB	AIR
		5
ARMY	CIA	NAVY
3	16	7
DDO	USIA	NSA
34	10	3
NSC		
6		

NO. \_\_\_\_\_ LIMITED OFFICIAL USE A-56  
HANDLING INDICATOR \_\_\_\_\_

TO : Department of State

FROM : Amembassy Manila

SUBJECT: Claim to Marianas Islands

REF : None

10  
1

FEBRUARY 19, 1972  
Feb. 19, 1972 (7)

SUMMARY: Director of the Philippine National Archives, Dr. Domingo Abella, testified before the Constitutional Convention Committee on National Territory that the Philippines could lay claim to the Marianas Islands, including Guam. Abella argued that the Spanish Government and the Catholic hierarchy had considered the Marianas Islands a sub-province administered from the seat of Spanish power in the Philippines. Thus, the historic identification of the Marianas Islands with the Philippines preceded the arbitrary establishment of the present Philippines boundary by the Treaty of Paris. LMB SUMMARY.

\*\*\*\*\*

In mid-December 1971 Dr. Domingo Abella testified before the Constitutional Convention (ConCon) Committee on National Territory that he had historical evidence that the Marianas Islands, including Guam, could be considered part of Philippine territory. The newspaper accounts gave few details of Dr. Abella's arguments, and not many Filipinos appeared to take the matter seriously although some of the more super-nationalistic members of the ConCon committee expressed views that any territorial claims the Philippines had should be mentioned in the new constitution. A short time later Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Carlos P. Romulo, according to the press, issued orders to his "political affairs" experts to study whether or not

(Continues)

Enclosure: The Marianas as a Dependency of the Philippines During the Spanish Colonial Period, by Dr. Domingo Abella

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE FOR DEPT. USE ONLY

DS-223

POL:EMiller/wa *EM* *EM*  
POL:EM *EM* /In draft OCM:Major Thorpe /in draft

AMB  
DCM  
POL  
POL/R  
USIS  
ECON  
CRU



DECLASSIFIED

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

Page 2 of Manila's A 56

the Philippines could lay claim to the Marianas Islands" because "nothing that involves our territory merits serious study by the Foreign Office."

On February 6, an Embassy officer had a private conversation with Dr. Abella to get a clearer picture of his theory. Dr. Abella explained that when he spoke to the ConCon committee he was expounding his personal views as a historian and that his arguments were based on incontrovertible historical facts. He stressed, however, that he was not an international lawyer and did not attempt to speak on the international legality of the claim. We are forwarding to the Department a copy of Dr. Abella's written arguments that he presented to the Embassy officer.

The gist of his argument is that the arbitrary legal arrangements of the Treaty of Paris could not wipe out historic facts which identified the Marianas Islands with the Philippines. The Philippines had been the seat of Spanish authority in the Pacific, with the Marianas Islands considered a sub-province. The Spanish had used numerous Filipinos in administering and garrisoning the Marianas Islands and there is today Philippine blood in the natives. Additionally, the Catholic Church looked upon the Marianas Islands as an extension of the Philippines by placing them under control of the Bishop of Cebu. Thus, the historical facts underline that the only reason the Marianas Islands are not now part of the Philippines is because of treaty arrangements between Spain and the U.S. (not the Philippines) by which Guam went to the U.S. and the other Marianas Islands were sold by Germany.

COMMENT: Dr. Abella's arguments are not sufficient to persuade the average individual of a legitimate claim to the Marianas Islands, nor do they appear to be of a nature that would be taken seriously in international law circles outside the Philippines. The thought of an expanded national territory is appealing enough to some Filipinos to allow this theory to surface from time to time as a semi-serious proposal.

BYROADE. 

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

DECLASSIFIED

05 418858

A HISTORICAL STUDY OF

317  
Enrol. No. 56

THE MARIANAS AS A  
DEPENDENCY OF THE  
PHILIPPINES DURING THE  
SPANISH COLONIAL PERIOD  
(1521-1898)

PART I-PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Submitted to the

COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL TERRITORY,  
CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION  
(1971)

By

DR. DOMINGO ABELLA  
Director  
NATIONAL ARCHIVES  
(Bureau of Records Management)  
MANILA

001507000

05 418859

DECLASSIFIED

When I was invited by Chairman Quintero of this committee, the invitation made specific mention of my possession of historical information regarding the Marianas Islands and the Carolinas Islands" as the topic on which I was asked to share with you whatever I know, as a historian about it. I felt greatly honored with the invitation, although I must confess I am not an authority on that subject, nor can I claim to be in a position to give you everything that there is to be said or that need to be known about the topic. Nevertheless, I willingly answered the call as a matter of civic and patriotic duty, more than as an "expert" on the subject. For that reason my first impulse was to request Chairman Quintero to invite also others who are my peers in the historical field in an effort to supplement my knowledge with theirs and thus produce a thorough study and consensus of the subject on hand. To that end I submitted a list of names of personages to be invited.

On the first day of the hearing which I attended on December 18, 1971, I expounded my random thoughts and in a preliminary manner the historical facts that I know of the topic. And from the questions propounded by the honorable delegates, I learned what facts in particular needed clarification, what problems require solutions, and what phases of the subject you are most interested in.

I shall attempt to contribute to your knowledge all what I know and to the best of my ability, but if my best is not enough to your complete satisfaction, please allow me to apologize in advance.

In order to provide you with a rounded historical background of the subject under our study let us have a retrospective glance, broadly, at how the European conquerors and colonizers came to establish themselves in our Asian part of the world. This has relevance to the question of the territorial boundaries of the "new nations" that later came into being when the colonial establishments were liquidated.

When the Portuguese rounded the Cape of Good Hope at the southern tip of Africa, they discovered the passage to the Indian Ocean, and sailed north eastward to as far as Calicut in India. This marked the age of European conquests, and colonization in the Orient began. This was followed years later by the discovery by Magellan of the passage which now bears his name at the southern tip of South America connecting the Atlantic with the Pacific. Magellan's crossing of the Pacific westward resulted in the charting of the Oceanic archipelagos, including the Philippines, and the return of the remnants of his expedition to Spain encouraged more and more European adventures to try their luck in the Far East "for the sake of God, gold and glory".

After the Portuguese and the Spaniards came, the Dutch, the British, the Russians, the Germans and the French followed by sailing eastward and westward routes. The Asian mainland was vast, so were the islands which spread over the seas in Southeast Asia and in the Pacific, all of them were ripe for colonization. Each European power staked its claim as its convenience and as circumstances dictated. Mainland boundaries were set by each colonizing power and island groups were equally parcelled among themselves. I don't need to add that this was done without any regard for the natives' ethnic affinities, common traditions, cultural and religious backgrounds. How many times have we heard from our countrymen now travelling for the first time in Malaysia, Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia, and the Marianas that the people of these countries "look like Filipinos, and that many of the words of their spoken languages are similar to ours"?

In this manner it might well be said that demographically, "what God hath joined together, man had put asunder."

x x x x x x x x

DECLASSIFIED

05 418860

12-10-1950

With the short foregoing remark as an introduction to our subject we can now go on to the meat of our discussion in this hearing.

We all know that the present territorial boundary of the Philippines has been established in the Treaty of Paris which concluded the Spanish-American war on December 10, 1898. How were these territorial limitations agreed upon by the two contracting Western powers?

I might be wrong in my opinion that the peace commissioners of the United States had entered the conference room in Paris more equipped as statesmen, internationalists or diplomatists, rather than as historical scholars, or perhaps as sociologists or political scientists. Or were there hidden "reasons of state" kept untold by each group that made them agree on what was finally written in the Treaty?

I came to form this opinion from my reading of Articles II & III of the final document of the Treaty of Paris as signed by the commissioners of Spain and the United States and of the official communications which were coursed from Paris to Madrid (by the Spanish commissioners) and to Washington (by the American commissioners).

In Art. II, which refers to the relinquishment of Porto Rico and Guam by Spain the short provision on the subject (only 32 words) puts on record with reference to the latter as "the island of Guam in the Marianas or Ladrones".

Literally therefore, Spain did not cede the whole archipelago of the Marianas (which includes the islands of Saipan, Tinian, Rota, in addition to Guam). When in truth and in fact Spain had political dominion over all the islands at the time.

a) I am now wondering if Spain had done it on purpose to exclude the other islands from the cession with perhaps some ulterior purpose as later events disclosed.

A similar case happened in connection with the cession of the Philippines wherein certain islands were excluded by Spain and the American delegates got wise to it only a year later (see below).

b) Perhaps it was on account of the fact that it was only on Guam island that the United States raised the American flag on 21 June 1898 as a sign of occupation while the Spanish-American war was going on (see below).

c) The proviso on "the island of Guam in the Marianas or Ladrones" while specific and clear to a legal mind as to its literal meaning, could be equivocal to the mind of a historical scholar who might suspect that the preposition in should have been the conjunction and, knowing that the whole archipelago was a Spanish possession in the same manner as the island of Puerto Rico, which was likewise ceded, included its surrounding islands.

I have therefore a hunch that had the American commissioners been more circumspect in their historical scholarship they might have demanded the cession of the Marianas archipelago and not Guam alone.

As regards Article III which refers to "the cession of the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands" the demarcation of its geographical boundaries has been described in detail to the satisfaction of the American statesmen.

12-10-1950

05 418861

Yet the Spanish scholar-statesmen succeeded in excluding the islands of Cagayan-Sulu and Sibutu from the line of demarcation described in the Treaty to comprehend the islands of the Philippine group which were the subject of cession. However, it appears that when the American government got wise to the illogical delimitation another supplementary treaty to that of Paris had to be concluded in Washington, D.C., ratified and proclaimed (March 23, 1901) for the relinquishment of the said islands by Spain to the U.S. "in consideration of \$100,000.00", which was an additional amount to the \$20,000,000.00 already stipulated in the Treaty of Paris.

The foregoing facts are here brought out in support of what I already said, namely, that the colonial powers, even during the recent past, parcelled among themselves the geographical areas under their control and suzerainty by treaties and agreements, frequently in consideration of sums of money, at their convenience.

In the case of the Cagayan-Sulu and Sibutu islands what were the designs of Spain for laying them outside of the demarcation line which comprehend the "archipelago known as the Philippine islands"? If the supplemental treaty of Washington had not been concluded, our islands might have been today minus the Cagayan-Sulu and Sibutu islands.

If we are to judge from what happened to the other islands of the Marianas group after Guam alone had been relinquished by Spain to the United States, Cagayan-Sulu and Sibutu islands might have become the possession of another European colonial power, perhaps Britain (they being so close to Borneo) or perhaps the Dutch, and could be today a part of Indonesia, just as the other islands of the Marianas group passed successively to German and Japanese rule after the Treaty of Paris.

Spanish accounts, official or private, printed or in manuscript which I came across with in my 20 years of research in the historical field here and abroad all reveal that the Mariana islands were an integral part of the Spanish colony of the "Islas Filipinas". These authorities include such reputable Spanish historians as Fr. Delgado of the Jesuits, Fr. de la Concepcion of the Recollects, Fr. Huerta of the Franciscans, Frs. Puzeta and Bravo of the Augustinians, Fr. Aduarte of the Dominicans and such lay government officials and historians as Murga, Sinibaldo de Mas, Montero y Vidal, Retana, Tabiel de Andrade, etc. These also include the government annual publications during the second half of last century namely, Guia Oficial, Guia de Forasteros, the yearly almanacs, calendarios and the Spanish encyclopedias.

In addition there remain numerous manuscripts which have remained unpublished in the National archives in Manila, in several archival institutions in Spain and in Mexico, consisting of reports of Governors-General and other officials, reports of ecclesiastical authorities and heads of religious corporations, to the thrones and vice-versa; royal orders to colonial officials and ecclesiastics, all of them attesting to the historical fact that the Marianas islands were an appendage of the Spanish onclave in the Philippines. I emphatically say that there can be no historian, Filipino or foreigner, who will dare deny this fact for it is incontrovertible.

An extensive bibliography of titles, published through the centuries in various languages, is hereby presented to the Chairman of the Committee on National Territory, for the guidance of

those who would wish to make a thorough study of the subject. Many of the titles listed therein are available in local libraries, public and private, in addition to those available in the collections of scholars. The list hereby submitted is that of the holdings of the Nieves Flores Government Library of Agaña, Guam, which I obtained in 1959. No doubt the said holdings have been augmented with new acquisition during the last 13 years.

However, for the researcher who does not possess any other language than English I suggest that he should have an immense arsenal of historical information from the well-known Blair & Robertson series of 55 volumes, The Philippine Islands 1493-1898, which is available in local libraries. From that monumental series I hereby submit a list of choice topics, noting the volumes and pages where they can be found and which will help elucidate pertinent questions and problems.

Some newsmen, in reporting about the hearing on December 18, wrote that the historical document about the Marianas had been "dug up" by me supposedly at the archives. The implication is that I have discovered the document in question in the National Archives of which I am the Director. The readers might also be led to believe that my discovery is only of recent vintage.

I wish to correct such insinuations. Neither were my thesis of recent "discovery" nor its supporting documents "dug up" in the National Archives in Manila.

What I did at the hearing was only to expose a fact long known to all historians, past and present. In fact I had written several monographs on Guam and the Marianas several years ago, and gave a lecture in Agaña (capital of Guam) in 1964 to which the public was invited under the auspices of the Chamorro Cultural Assn., on Philippines-Marianas historical link in colonial time. Another talk I gave on that occasion was before the Guam Rotary Club.

Moreover, columnist Alejandro R. Roces of the Manila Chronicle in a recent commentary December 22, 1971 has quoted extensively from one of my studies on the subject published in 1962, 5 years before I became the Director of the National Archives.

Immediately, in 1962 ours was "A Nation Without Archives", according to Prof. Gregorio F. Zaide, (Sunday Times Magazine, Sept, 28, 1958). Until 1967 when a new administration took over, what we had was a bodega of rotting old papers, disorganized, unclassified, uncared for — a veritable king-sized wastebasket ready for the bonfire — run by bureaucrats with many a notion of what an archival institution should be.

All Filipino scholars knew this, so they had to go abroad to search for primary source materials from which to write the history of this country. On the other hand, many a foreign scholar published studies on Philippine history without seeing the need of coming to the Philippines.

For a fact I can say that the documentations that I can submit in support of the thesis under our present study was "dug up" from archives abroad some 15 years before I became the director of the National Archives.

Not one of those documents comes from our National Archives. This is not to say however, that our local archival holdings are devoid of materials pertaining to our subject. Considering the long neglect which for years deteriorated our archival institution, it will take sometime for the cataloguing of an estimated 11 million Spanish manuscripts, which began in earnest in 1967, to be finished and for anyone to know exactly what documents are within our reach in this country. A broad random sorting has rendered 33 bundles of documents of approximately 200 sheets each, all on the Marianas. This is all that the National Archives can offer at the moment.

During the second decade of the 19th century the Spanish overseas empire began to crumble. Indeed it did crumble so fast that by the end of the third decade Spain's colonial dependencies in continental America had seceded from the mother country and had declared their independence.

When the smoke of the fratricidal conflict had cleared, Spain was left with only four insular colonial possessions, two in the Atlantic - Cuba and Puerto Rico - and two in the Pacific - the Marianas and the Philippines.

Before that century ended, Spain's remaining island colonies were to be liquidated also, this time in favor of a new sovereign, the United States of America. As an aftermath of the Spanish-American war of 1898, and as a result of the defeat of Montojo's Spanish Armada at the hands of Commodore Dewey in Manila Bay, the Treaty of Paris was signed on 10 December, 1898, whereby the sovereignty of the said remaining four island groups was transferred to the victor, the U.S.A.

For the stipulations of the Treaty of Paris regarding the Marianas group, see its Art. III.

If we dig into the history of the new nations in the Far East particularly those now existing around our immediate neighborhood, including our own Philippines, we shall soon realize that their geographical boundaries or their limitations were those set by their colonizers from the West. For it was in the Far East that the European powers vied with each other for footholds in expansion of their narrow European territories, both to spread in their increasing population and to exploit the land's uncultivated natural resources and its uneducated manpower. Invasions and occupations came one after another. Antique and antiquated native rulers and dynasties were subjugated either instantly or eventually, by force of arms, politically or economically.

The European masters parceled the land and the ocean among themselves together with the native peoples. Unlike in the New World (the American continent) where a veritable avalanche of European immigrants settled as soon as its existence was made known by Columbus, in the Far East (including the Philippines) the European settlers had always been a small fraction, not more than 10% of the native population.

Although there were some desultory clashes among the European colonizers themselves triggered by overlapping claims, or maybe their land grabbing proclivities, in general it maybe said that the colonies established by each were respected by the others in private preserves.

For administrative purposes the colonial governments subdivided their possessions into provinces or regions, always according



DECLASSIFIED

to geographical consideration, rather than demographical or racial, following a pattern practiced during the previous 2 or 3 centuries in the Americas, and still previous to that, in Europe itself by the Romans.

These geographical parcels which the Europeans delineated for their colonial establishments in East Asia, Southeast Asia, and the Pacific archipelago not so long ago because the blueprint for the "new" nations that have begun to lead independent existence in the present century, upon the abolition of colonial rules.

Because, as already said, the territorial boundaries had been dictated by foreigners in accordance with their convenience and interests without much regard for the racial, cultural or historical background of the peoples under subjections, we now find racial brothers and cousins, with linguistic, historical and even pre-historical affinities set asunder as separate countries and nations. Moreover because they had been alienated from each other for centuries by different colonial rulers, they had ignored their common roots and blood relations. Each had turned its back to the other during the colonial period with their faces turned to the West for inspiration, education, and economic advancement.

As it were, what God hath joined together, the Europeans hath put asunder.

It is only now that we have turned our attention to our next-door neighbors and found out that Indonesians (formerly Dutch East Indians), Sabahans (formerly French Indo-Chinese), Malaysians (formerly British Straits Settlement natives), etc. are, after all our blood brothers and cousins.

Now let us focus our attention to the subject of this short paper. I must be pardoned for the foregoing introductory which I consider pertinent to our subject for a complete grasp of the facts of history which follow hereunder.

As already said at the beginning of this paper the Marianas group was until the end of the Spanish regime in the Philippines, part and parcel of the Spanish possession in this part of the globe. It was administered as a sub-province of the Spanish-Philippine government. Moreover, it was a dependency of the diocese of Cebu.

In my historian's point of view I have a sense that of all other claims that we have laid on to territories that belong or should belong to the Philippines, that on the Marianas, particularly Guam, is the strongest, historically. It is based on 300 years record of possession as it were. For after all, if we should go down and deep into the study of the subject, although the Spaniards discovered that archipelago, it was occupied, explored and peopled by Filipinos. Except for a dozen or so, peninsular Spaniards in key government positions, the rest of the bureaucrats down to the rank and file of the officialdom were either Filipino creoles, mestizos or indios, including the officers and men of the army garrison. These were continually reinforced through the years by indio deportees, political prisoners most of them (activists?) from the provinces who, in one way or another, were troublesome to the Spaniards in their local communities. (Even the Americans did follow this tradition by deporting to Guam at the turn of the century - Aguinaldo's revolutionaries headed by Mabini who would not swear allegiance to the American rule. Many of them died there - Maximiano Nizon being one of them).

DECLASSIFIED

05 418865

Thus, three centuries of Filipino immigration to the Marianas, slowly but surely, had replaced the original Chamorro native islanders with Filipino stock. Early ethnical descriptions of the former available in contemporary records, will show this fact. For one thing, the family names borne by most of those who call themselves Guamanians today, with very few exceptions, indicate their Filipino ancestry.

Moreover, the daily costume worn by the elderly women of the town's folk is definitely Filipino kimona and saya, undoubtedly the wear that was handed down by ancestors from the Philippines, despite the strong inroads of the Western attire. Even the beetlechewing habit which is so widespread among present-day Guamanians is traceable to Philippine bunga and nganga origins. As a matter of fact one may find relatively more women wearing the kimona and saya in the towns than in our own towns and barrios. And it goes without saying that the local language - Chamorro - is richly sprinkled with Filipino words, particularly Pampango!

I had the occasion to interview in 1959 Mr. Jose (Pepo) Cruz, still alive today, a respected citizen of Guam having occupied some prominent position in the territorial government. He is a native-born of Guam, a resident of the town of Talofofo, but traces his ancestry to a Filipino immigrant from Pampanga during the Spanish rule who had stayed in the island and reared a family of Guamanians. My interview with him was about Mabini's exile in Guam. Pepo Cruz, then a young boy having been a "muchacho" of the exiled paralytic from the Philippines (that interview had remained unpublished up to today).

At one time, some years ago, I wrote a comparative study on the historical background of Cuba and the Marianas. I looked at the various aspects of the subject. On the demographic angle, I then said that Cuba's aborigines, the Siboneys, were all but completely absorbed, not to say wiped out by the waves of Spanish immigrants and their imported slave workers from Africa soon after the island's discovery by Columbus. Because of the greater number of the newcomers as compared to the small number of the indio islanders, the demographic feature of the island was completely changed through the centuries so that the Cuban today is either a descendant of the white Spaniards, the African Negro, or the admixture of both races.

Similarly, the Chamorros, the original inhabitants of Guam and the Marianas, being small in number have all been absorbed by the greater number of immigrants, deportees, bureaucrats and soldiers from the Philippines.

DECLASSIFIED  
The Day When The Castilian

Flag Was Lowered In the  
Mariana Islands - As Witnessed By  
A Spanish Missionary

By Francisco Rosano  
Parish Priest of Agaña

On June 21 of this year of 1898 there appeared before the shores of of Agaña 4 American war vessels which brought us the news that war had been declared between Spain and the United States of America last April 21 of which we were completely ignorant.

The vessels carried away on board the governor, D. Juan Marina, the captain of the port, D. Francisco Gutierrez, the army physician, D. Jose Romero Aguilar, the military aide, Captain D. Pedro Duarte, Lieutenant Jose Barrusso, and D. Marcelino Ramos, together with 55 soldiers of the army, all as prisoners, then weighed anchor towards none of us knew where.

The Americans had disarmed the troops who belonged to the corps known as Insular Artillery, setting them free afterwards. Before their departure they gathered all the Spanish flags and raised that of the United States over Fort Sta. Cruz in the port of Apra, saluting it with a volley of 21 cannon shots. After this ceremony they lowered their flag and carried it with them leaving the island at the mercy of the civilian population and of the clergy.

D. Jose Sisto, treasurer of public funds, took charge of the government ad interim. This state of things continued until the arrival of the American boat Pennsylvania which brought back the physician D. Jose Romero Aguilar who told us that Manila had surrendered to the Americans on Aug. 13 after a siege of 3 months and a half, and that in the Philippines there was an insurrection headed by Aguinaldo. The American boat sailed away towards the United States.

On November 22 the boat Ucruso arrived in our shores bringing aboard the Captain of the Fort D. Francisco Garcia Gutierrez who had come to fetch his family and that of the governor D. Juan Marina; all of them left aboard the said boat when this came back from Ponape bringing us the news that the natives of that island had risen up in arms against the Spanish authorities.

Year of 1899

Memorable Day - On this day, 1st of November after the high mass came to the parochial house Father Palomo, D. Francisco Fortusach who was the gobernadorcillo of Agaña, D. Justo de Leon Guerrero, and all the principales of Agaña and of the neighboring districts. Those who could be accommodated in the living hall of the building sat down at my request. Then Father Palomo, in the name of all present, said that the delegates had come to ask for the relief of Señor Sisto from the position of governor inasmuch as this island already belonged to the United States, and no Spaniards should therefore be permitted to govern it.

Coincidentally, Señor Sisto arrived and upon learning of the petition said that all those who were not with him might please step to one side and put down the request in writing. Forthwith, the petitioners walked to the Casa Tribunal (Municipal Hall) where they prepared the document,

# DECLASSIFIED

which was signed by 4 individuals in representation of the others, when Señor Sisto was declared deposed and elected in his place Señor Venancio Roberto, resident of Agaña. As the delegation returned to the parochial house the customary signal was heard announcing the arrival of boats. It referred to the USS Brutus loaded with coal.

Señor Sisto decided to consult the matter with the Commanding Officer of the vessel for an opinion. Thus the following day, which was the second of the month the said Señor Sisto accompanied by the physician Señor Romero went aboard where they found Padre Palomo and Señor Portusach. The Commanding Officer, after hearing the arguments of both parties decided that Señor Sisto should continue as governor all the while that the conflict between Spain and the United States is not resolved with finality.

During the last days of January came another American boat which we expected was bringing the new governor to take charge of the island of Guam, which indeed was correct. Thus on February 1st at about 10:00 a.m. the American flag was hoisted over the Casa Gobierno, as the band brought by the boat played the American national anthem and the cannons fired a 21-gun salute. The priests and Señores Sisto and Romero who had been invited to witness the ceremonies of the flag-raising declined such a courtesy with thanks, alleging that as sons of Spain it was not pleasant for them to take part in such ceremonies. There was a large attendance of Chamorros who felt sad to see that the dominion of their island passed from one nation to another. I personally know many Chamorros who actually shed tears over the separation from the mother country. The Americans were quite prudent in their demonstrations of joy, having omitted on this occasion the hurrahs for the flag which the regulations required on occasions of this nature, and, except for 2 officers who stayed in the plaza, the rest of the troops returned to the boat which was anchored in the bay.

I know of the few Spaniards who witnessed the flag-raising ceremony and they were the fiscal D. Vicente Perez and D. Jose Mañoz a deputy.

On 1st February Commander Taussing took possession of Guam for the American government.

In the afternoon of March 9 there dropped anchor in this port of Apra the boat El Cano bringing aboard his excellency Col. Eugenio Blanca, governor of the island of Saipan, with 270 volunteer soldiers and 60 officers from the province of Pampanga, loyalists to the cause of Spain, some bureaucrats and some families of the volunteers, making a total of some 900 persons among soldiers, women and children, who were bound for Saipan to reside therein. From Apra to Saipan Father Ildefonso Cabanillas, parish priest of Agat, Father Crisogono Oatin, parish priest of Marizo, the present writer, Father Francisco Rosano, parish priest of Agaña, joined the expeditionaries. Once the expedition was installed in Saipan we returned to our respective parishes in Guam.

On March 24 there arrived in Saipan, without making a stop-over in Guam, the boat España with D. Francisco Santisteban, treasurer of public funds on board. The boat likewise brought 2 mail parcels to Saipan for me coming from Spain. Among the letters I found my appointment as parish priest of Saipan with instruction of transferring the Vicariate of Guam to Saipan. Through the same boat orders were received by the parish priests of Marizo and Agat, the only remaining Augustinian fathers, for them to proceed to Manila or directly to Spain at the first available transportation.

DECLASSIFIED

05 418868

Similar orders were received by Father Tomas Cuervas, parish priest of San Isidro de Garapan in Saipan.

Meantime the following events took place in Agaña and its vicinity. The gobernadorcillo of Agaña Joaquin Perez and treasurer Vicente Herrero both residents of Spain, continued in their position while awaiting the American governor.

On 1st February 1899 the boat USS Eannington arrived whose Commanding Officer was E. D. Taussing, took formal possession of the island on that day. In the month of August the new governor of Guam, Captain Picharo P. Leary, arrived and took possession on the 9th of that month. He was relieved by another governor on July of 1900.

In June there arrived the boat Harrison coming from Japan and after stopovers in Saipan and Rota, aboard which came the Commanding Officer of the military forces in Saipan whose name was Antonio Gomez with Sargeant Juan Mendiola who were commissioned to withdraw from Guam everything that pertained to Spain according to the Treaty of Paris.

In the month of October 1899 there arrived in Saipan a Spanish boat with Lt. Col. Aguilar aboard who had been commissioned to relinquish to the Germans all the islands of the north. After a few days there arrived an American boat with the German governor of Saipan, Herr George Fritz. All the Germans left except for the governor who retained the Captain of the Fort and a hospital attendant with him. On October 30 the Spanish boat weighed anchor with all the Macabebes which made the natives of Saipan happy because their departure was like a gift from heaven. The natives of the island had been praying hard for their departure because they suffered much under them.

Aboard the same boat Father Tomas Cuevas sailed for Manila leaving Father Francisco Rosano in his place.

Since the beginning of the German administration the Americans in Saipan were quite jubilant because the Germans showed their high culture and refined education.

(SGD) Francisco Rosano

(NOTE:) The original of this manuscript is found in the Nieves Flores Museum of Agaña, Guam.)

Translated from the original

DOMINGO ABELLA  
Director, National Archives  
Manila

HISTORICAL DATA ON THE MARILANAS FOUND IN  
BLAIR & ROBERTSON SERIES;

(Prepared by Dr. Domingo Abolla)

Number of islands in: 1 (322), 2 (32, 86), 3 (192),  
23 (837, 138), 52 (336);

Included in the Philippine colony: 51 (79);

Resemble one another: 3 (192);

Have communication with Manila: 28 (379);

New island discovered near: 41 (47, 48);

Maps: 23 (135), 29 (169), 33 (92, 320), 36 (50),  
52 (11, 209);

Chart of port in: 51 (9, 67);

Population: 2 (86), 10 (261), 11 (285), 44 (112),  
51 (79, 80), 52 (336);

Status in 1842: 52 (36);

Trade: 6 (139, 140), 23 (138), 34 (317, 318);

Religion - contact with christianity: 6 (140, 141),  
9 (16, 226), 10 (19, 261, 262), 11 (17, 285),  
28 (136, 148, 149, 152, 162, 172, 184, 201, 261,  
274, 277, 279, 314, 345-348), 31 (254), 34 (250),  
37 (16, 253, 256, 267), 38 (84), 39 (131, 132),  
41 (23, 165, 236), 44 (87), 50 (293, 304), 51 (309);

Schools in (1892): 46 (101);

Spanish relations, etc., with: with: 1 (28), 2 (16, 30, 35,  
109, 157, 158, 260, 261, 279), 3 (31, 33, 34, 44,  
129, 168), 4 (21), 9 (226), 12 (49, 50, 233),  
13 (115, 119), 15 (21, 114, 237, 238), 17 (285, 302,  
322), 23 (134, 137, 138, 141, 191), 25 (192, 218),  
29 (15, 168, 200), 33 (16, 95, 321, 322), 34 (21,  
27, 241-254), 35 (44), 36 (51), 37 (237, 291),  
39 (131, 271), 41 (36, 44, 104), 47 (35, 66, 75),  
49 (195, 246), 50 (61, 201), 51 (65, 66, 108),  
52 (31, 88, 89, 314, 336);

Coded to Germany (except Guam 1898): 23 (138), 43 (229),  
52 (336);

Filipinos deported to: 52 (127);

Scientists in: 51 (42).

Various Islands of Group

Acacan, 33 (321, 322);

Dotaba, 2 (86);

Guam, identified, 1 (322), 33 (321);

Name, 38 (248); location, 1 (322), 16 (201),

RELEASED

38 (347, 356); way station, 39 (51); size, 3 (192),  
23 (138), 52 (336); map, 23 (135), 50 (391);

Jesuits in: 28 (172), 37 (267);

Spanish relations with: 1 (28, 321, 322), 2 (109-113,  
197-200), 3 (33, 34, 44, 192), 29 (168, 169),  
38 (248, 261, 263-265), 52 (169, 183);

Policy in Ladrones (Marianas): 34 (21, 22, 249, -254);

Spain conquers them: 52 (336);

Codes them to Germany: 23 (158), 52 (336);

Number of islands in: 1 (322), 2 (32, 86), 3 (192);

Royal lands distributed among Chamorros: 52 (336).

---

Numbers outside parenthesis refer to volume nos.  
while those figures inside parenthesis refer to  
page numbers.

DECLASSIFIED

SENATE

55th Congress  
3rd Session

Doc. No. 62  
Part 1

A TREATY OF PEACE BETWEEN THE UNITED  
STATES AND SPAIN

MESSAGE

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,

TRANSMITTING

A TREATY OF PEACE BETWEEN THE UNITED  
STATES AND SPAIN, SIGNED  
AT THE CITY OF PARIS, ON  
DECEMBER 10, 1898.

January 4, 1899 - Read; treaty read the first  
time and referred to the Committee on Fo-  
reign relations, and, together with the  
message and accompanying papers, ordered  
to be printed in confidence for the use  
of the Senate.

January 11, 1899 - Injunction of secrecy removed.

January 13, 1899 - Ordered printed.

WASHINGTON  
Government Printing Office  
1899

(The Treaty of Peace of Paris -- was concluded  
December 10, 1898; ratification advised by the Senate  
February 6, 1899; ratified by the President February 6,  
1899; ratifications exchanged April 11, 1899; pro-  
claimed April 11, 1899.)

DECLASSIFIED

05 418872



## PROTOCOLS OF THE CONFERENCE AT PARIS.

- (p. 314 to 318) Cambon to Day, Washington, Aug. 29, 1898.  
(4 communications)  
Moore to Cambon, Washington, Aug. 30, 1898.  
Department of State, September 1, 1898.  
Mr. Thiebant to Moore (personal), Washington,  
September 3, 1898.  
Moore to Thiebant (personal), September 5, 1898.  
Cambon to Moore, Washington, September 5, 1898.  
Moore to Cambon, Washington, September 6, 1898.
- 
- (p. 12 to 14) Protocol No. 1 Conference of Oct. 1, 1898. Protocol No. 1 Conferencia de 1<sup>o</sup> de Octubre de 1898.
- 
- (p. 14 to 15) ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 1 (Signed: Emilio de Ojeda)
- 
- (p. 19 to 23) Protocol No. 2 Conference of Oct. 2, 1898. Protocolo No. 2 Conferencia de 2<sup>o</sup> de Octubre de 1898.  
ANNEX 1 TO PROTOCOL No. 2 (Signed: J. B. Moore)  
ANNEX 2 TO PROTOCOL No. 2 (Signed: J. B. Moore)
- 
- (p. 23 to 29) Protocol No. 3 Conference of Oct. 7, 1898.  
ANNEX 1 TO PROTOCOL No. 3 (Signed: Emilio de Ojeda)  
ANNEX 2 TO PROTOCOL No. 3 (Signed: Emilio de Ojeda)
- 
- (p. 30 to 44) Protocol No. 4 Conference of Oct. 11, 1898.  
ANNEX 1 TO PROTOCOL No. 4 (Signed: J. B. Moore)  
ANNEX 2 TO PROTOCOL No. 4 (Signed: Emilio de Ojeda)
-

(p. 44 to  
50)

Protocol No. 5  
Conference of Oct.  
11, 1898

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 5  
(Signed: J. B. Moore)

---

(p. 51 to  
53)

Protocol No. 6  
Conference of Oct.  
17, 1898

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 6  
(Signed: J. B. Moore)

---

(p. 53 to  
58)

Protocol No. 7  
Conference of Oct.  
21, 1898

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 7  
(Signed: Emilio de Ojeda)

---

(p. 58 to  
59)

Protocol No. 8  
Conference of Oct.  
24, 1898

Protocol No. 9  
Conference of Oct.  
26, 1898

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 9  
(Signed: Emilio de Ojeda)

---

(p. 93 to  
107)

Protocol No. 10  
Conference of Oct.  
27, 1898

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 10  
(Signed: J. B. Moore)

---

(p. 107 to  
109)

Protocol No. 11  
Conference of Oct.  
31, 1898

(p. 109 to  
128)

Protocol No. 12  
Conference of Nov.  
4, 1898

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 12  
(Signed: Emilio de Ojeda)

---

(p. 128 to 151) Protocol No. 13  
Conference of Nov.  
9, 1898

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 13  
(Signed: J. B. Moore)

(p. 151 to 196) Protocol No. 14  
Conference of Nov.  
16, 1898

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 14  
(Signed: Emilio de Ojeda)

(p. 196 to 211) Protocol No. 15  
Conference of Nov.  
21, 1898

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 15  
(Signed: J. B. Moore)

(p. 211 to 222) Protocol No. 16  
Conference of Nov.  
28, 1898.

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 16  
(Signed: E. Montero Rios)

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 16  
(Signed: William R. Day)

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 16  
(Signed: E. Montero Rios)

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 16  
(Signed: William R. Day)

(p. 222 to 223) Protocol No. 17  
Conference of Nov.  
30, 1898

(p. 223 to 227) Protocol No. 18  
Conference of Dec.  
2, 1898

(p. 227 to 235) Protocol No. 19  
Conference of Dec.  
5, 1898

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 19  
("The Eight Articles as  
discussed in the Conference"  
(from 1 to 8))

DECLASSIFIED  
DECLASSIFIED

(p. 235 to 249) Protocol No. 20  
Conference of Dec.  
6, 1898

(p. 249 to 260) Protocol No. 21  
Conference of Dec.  
8, 1898

ANNEX TO PROTOCOL No. 21  
(Signed: Emilio de Ojeda)

(p. 260 to 271) Protocol No. 22  
Conference of Dec.  
10, 1898

ANNEX I TO PROTOCOL No. 22  
(Signed: J. B. Moore)

ANNEX 2 - Signed by all of both parties  
(except the secretaries Moore  
and Ojeda)

(The texts of the above Protocols are available in micro-film duplication in the ABELLA COLLECTION, Rizal Library, Ateneo de Manila University.)

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED  
DATE 03/15/2011

SOME PRESS COMMENTS IN THE U.S.  
ABOUT THE \$20,000,000 TENDER FOR  
THE PHILIPPINES

Public Opinion - Volume 25. - July-Dec., 1898, New York.

No. 22 - page 675.

American Affairs.

\$20,000,000 for the Philippines.

November 21 the United States peace commissioners at Paris presented to the Spanish commissioners the following terms, which are, according to news dispatches, in the nature of an ultimatum. There has been little or no press comment on any but the first stipulation. Summarized, our demands are:

That Spain shall cede the entire Philippine archipelago, for which the United States tenders \$20,000,000.

That there shall be a mutual relinquishment of all claims for indemnity, national or personal, subsequent to the outbreak of the last Cuban insurrection.

The United States also declared that it desired to treat the religious freedom of the Caroline Islands as agreed upon between the United States and Spain in 1863.

That one of the Caroline Islands should be ceded for an American naval station.

That cable landing rights should be granted at other places in Spanish jurisdiction, and that Spanish-American treaties heretofore existing should be revived.

New York Journal of Commerce.

When it was first rumored in Europe that the United States would offer money to Spain as one consideration for the surrender of the Philippines, some of the foreign newspapers remarked incredulously that the world would believe the millenium was at hand when a victor offered to buy of the vanquished what territory is desired, and especially so when the territory had been virtually conquered. Germany took both territory and money from France; Russia took both territory and money from Turkey, and Turkey in turn took both territory and money from Greece; or at least demanded them. In spite of European incredulity, this offer of money has been made, and furthermore, it is not unprecedented. Fifty years ago this country utterly defeated Mexico and was in a position to compel the acceptance of any terms it dictated; but in compensation for territorial cessions by Mexico this country agreed to pay \$15,000,000. Spanish sympathizers on the French press may excite themselves over our greed of conquest, but we have shown a degree of moderation unapproached by any other conquering nation, and so unprecedented except in our own history, with little less than derision, we have not, like the barbarians who overwhelmed Rome, and some of their more recent imitators, imposed ransom upon the subjected nation, and in requiring it to give up its sovereignty over some of its possessions we have offered a fair commercial equivalent.

DECLASSIFIED  
DATE 03/15/2011

DECLASSIFIED  
DECLASSIFIED

Chicago Times-Herald (Republican)

The tender of \$20,000,000 is regarded as an act of genuine liberality on the part of the United States, which is in a position to enforce the demands without the payment of any sum. It will relieve Spain of a large share of the Philippine indebtedness, possibly all when her creditors understand that refusal of these terms may result in Spanish repudiation of the entire debt. It is certainly in striking contrast with the attitude of the average victorious nation, which usually exacts the cession of large territory and the payment of a heavy money indemnity besides. The United States instead of asking a money indemnity tenders one; instead of demanding the cession of territory where its armies and navies have not been it demands only the cession of such territory as can not be relinquished without the country proving false to its announced motives of humanity. Not only has it proved true to its pledges in this respect, but it has carried its human purposes so far as to offer financial assistance to its vanquished foe and admit it for a term of years to the trade of the Philippines on equal terms with itself.

New York Press (Republican)

For what is the United States to pay twenty millions to Spain? For Dewey's victory at Manila? For Sampson's off Santiago? For Shafter's in Cuba? Or is it proposed to give the Spaniards these twenty millions for the Philippine group? Why twenty million dollars or twenty cents? The Spaniards do not possess the Philippines. If twenty millions are to be paid to Spain for what she does not possess, how many millions are to be paid to the Philippine insurgents for what they do possess by right of conquest made for freedom? The money given to Spain as a compensation for her loss of the islands must be either a charity or a purchase of a fraudulent title. No one thinks it is a charity. We do not want a defective title, to sustain which will cost millions of money and lives not to be estimated. If we are to buy we must buy from the Filipino. Make no mistake about that.

New York World (Democrat)

As Spain does not possess nor control the Philippine Islands, the most important of which outside of Manila are now in the hands of the insurgent natives, she cannot give us possession. What she is asked to concede is her title--in other words, the right of conquest without Spanish interference. We demand the right to subjugate unmolested a people who have for years fought for their freedom and independence, and who declare, through their leaders, their purpose to continue the struggle. If the cession were granted we should secure by treaty another war, not of freedom but of subjugation. We offer to pay \$20,000,000 to a beaten foe for this worthless title to islands which it will cost \$100,000,000 to conquer and \$50,000,000 a year to govern. This stipulation would endanger the ratification of the treaty.

Providence (R. I.) Journal (Independent)

In paying \$20,000,000 to Spain, or at least in offering to do it, the government has officially manifested the same thoughtfulness as was uppermost in the mind of Captain Philip when he said to his crew after the naval battle at Santiago was won, "Don't cheer. The poor devils are dying."

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED  
DECLASSIFIED

"A surprising act of generosity" is what the London Daily Mail calls the offer of an indemnity, while the London Standard regards the proposal to waive claims for damages as an even greater concession. The London Graphic considers that the "open door" announcement is alone enough to refute the charges of rapacity that have been leveled at this country chiefly from Paris. Other British papers loudly praise the United States for its friendly, almost self-sacrificing, treatment of its beaten foe. To have rescued down-trodden peoples from oppression is to our credit, but to treat the oppressor with fairness and generosity is equally noteworthy.

Boston Post (Independent)

If the American people are to be compelled to buy and pay off something which they don't want, it is at least reasonable to let them know just what they are buying. There is no reason to suppose that the public works at Manila, Iloilo, and perhaps a few other points on the islands are worth anything like \$20,000,000; and if it is not these works that we are buying, what is it? The actual assets which Spain will turn over to the United States for these \$20,000,000 consist in an archipelago over which Spain herself is only nominally sovereign, with a population which Colonel Higginson describes as "8,000,000 of the most unmanageable beings on the face of the earth," and with the privilege of subduing the people and making ourselves masters of the country if we care to spend the money and sacrifice the lives necessary to reach this end. To pay this \$20,000,000 purchase money, American industry must submit to a continuance of the war taxes; American labor, threatened by the incorporation of millions of cheap hand-workers into our population, must sweat under new burdens. Is the bargain worth it?

Cleveland (O.) Plain Dealer (Democrat)

If the Philippines comprise the only asset of value we get out of the war, why should we buy them of Spain? If Germany expected an enormous cash indemnity from France besides taking what provinces she wanted, why should the United States pay a cash indemnity to Spain for a lot of islands of doubtful value to us and for which Spain can not give us a clear title? Which won the late war, the United States or Spain? Which, by the laws of modern war, should pay the cash indemnity?

---

NOTE: Florida, after 300 years of colonial rule, was sold by the Spaniards to the United States in 1819 for \$5,000,000 — DOMINGO ABELLA

DECLASSIFIED  
T R E A T Y  
FOR CESSION OF OUTLYING ISLANDS OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Concluded November 7, 1900; ratification advised by Senate January 22, 1901; ratified by the President January 30, 1901; ratifications exchanged March 23, 1901; proclaimed March 23, 1901.

A R T I C L E

Relinquishment of islands to the United States.

The United States of America and Her Majesty the Queen Regent of Spain, in the name of Her August Son, Don Alfonso XIII, desiring to remove any ground of misunderstanding growing out of the interpretation of Article III of the Treaty of Peace concluded between them at Paris the tenth day of December, one thousand eight hundred and ninety eight whereby Spain cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands and comprehending the Islands lying within certain described lines, and having resolved to conclude a Treaty to accomplish that end, have for that purpose appointed as their respective plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States, John  
Hay, Secretary of State of the United States;

and Her Majesty the Queen Regent of Spain,  
the Duke of Arcos, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister  
Plenipotentiary of Spain to the United States;

who having met in the city of Washington and having exchanged their full powers, which were found to be in due and proper form, have agreed upon the following sole article.

A R T I C L E

Spain relinquishes to the United States all title and claim of title, which she may have had at the time of the conclusion of the Treaty of Peace of Paris, to any and all islands belonging to the Philippine Archipelago, lying outside the lines described in Article III of that Treaty and particularly to the islands of Cagayan Sulu and Sibutu and their dependencies, and agrees that all such islands shall be comprehended in the cession of the Archipelago as fully as if they had been expressly included within those lines.

The United States in consideration of this relinquishment, will pay to Spain the sum of one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) within six months after the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty.

The present Treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by Her Majesty the Queen Regent of Spain, after approval by the Cortes of the Kingdom, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

In faith whereof, we, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty and have hereunto affixed our seals.

DECLASSIFIED

05 418880



DECLASSIFIED

Done in duplicate at the city of Washington, the 7th day of November, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred.

JOHN DAY (Seal)  
ARCOS (Seal)

(From TREATIES, CONVENTIONS, INTERNATIONAL ACTS, PROTOCOLS AND AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND OTHER POWERS, 1776-1909, Compiled by William M. Mallory, Washington (Government Printing Office, 1910), Vol. II, pp. 1661, 1696-1697.)

DECLASSIFIED