ANDREW PAGAN, known as Ondy to many of his friends, is a third-year history major who enjoys Modern Southeast Asian History, especially that of the Philippines, the politics and cultures of Contemporary China and Japan, and theories of power, colonialism, nationalism, masculinity, and narrativity. When not thinking about Imagined Communities or critiquing Eurocentrism, he enjoys eating Thai food, spending time with friends, hiking, traveling, and embarking on spontaneous adventures. This year, he served as a group leader for Cal

Poly's Week of Welcome Program, Vice President of Cal Poly's chapter of Phi Alpha Theta, a National History Honors Society, and as a member of EPIC Christian Fellowship's CORE leadership team. Upon graduation, Andrew hopes to share the wonders of World History and passive voice-free writing with high school students.

**FROM THE DARKNESS TO THE FAMILY: EVOLVING
ORIENTALIST REPRESENTATIONS OF THE KATIPUNAN IN
EURO-AMERICAN TRAVEL LITERATURE, 1899-1917**

Andrew Pagan

Introduction

On July 7, 1892, news of the deportation of Philippine patriot Jose Rizal to the southern city of Dapitan motivated a group of lower class individuals to create the Katipunan. Although primarily political, this revolutionary society embraced Catholicism, attracting members from the lower classes. The formation of the group marked a shift in Philippine revolutionary politics. No longer would the wealthy and educated Ilustrado class petition for political and economic reform from Spain. Rather, the Katipunan called on persons from all socio-economic strata to participate in an uprising against Spanish colonial rule. In the Philippines, many revere the Katipunan, but outside of the region, more varied views of the organization exist. In the early twentieth century, European and American travelers penned firsthand accounts of the Philippines, describing various aspects of Filipino life, culture, and history. Strangely enough, travelogue portrayals of the organization changed between 1899 and 1917. Early unsympathetic characterizations of the Katipunan as a secretive and shadowy group eventually gave way to descriptions of the society's trials under the Spanish. This essay explores the reasons behind varying

characterizations of the Katipunan in this time period. I suggest that American and European portrayals of the Katipunan from 1899-1917 evolved over time to justify changing American colonial policies in the Philippines; early twentieth century descriptions of the group as shadowy or menacing validated American conduct during the Philippine-American War, while later representations of the organization as a victim of Spanish cruelty legitimized supposedly benevolent U.S. governance in the region.

This paper examines European and American travelogues written between 1899 and 1917. Depending exclusively on these documents has advantages and disadvantages. Written by foreign travelers, these accounts provide first-hand descriptions of cultural practices that governmental organizations or Southeast Asians may not have considered worth adding to the historical record. Unfortunately, travelogue writings only contain “Western” perceptions of Southeast Asia, which suffer from biases against Asian individuals and cultural practices. Consequently, these accounts bear little value in the construction of a balanced history of Southeast Asia. This noted, by dissecting the biases of Euro-American travelogues, this paper reveals Euro-American prejudices towards the Philippines, and how their perceptions shaped and legitimated colonial practices, thereby transcending the limitations of such accounts.

In its analysis of European and American travelogues, this paper draws its theoretical direction from the contributions of various scholars, many of whom write within the field of postcolonial theory. For instance, it borrows of Marc Bloch’s idea that consistent half-truths within historical documents function as a “mirror of the collective consciousness.”¹ Additionally, this essay inherits much of its theoretical direction from Edward Said, who argues that Euro-American discourses focusing on the Orient define foreign cultures in Western terms, ultimately functioning to exoticize “the other” and justify Occidental imperialism in the East.² Mary Louise Pratt contends that travel and exploration writing produced European perception of “the rest of the world,” in the process encoding and legitimating imperialist enterprises.³ Extending on Pratt and Said’s argument, Han Mui Ling claims that European travel writing concerning Singapore proved instrumental in the European characterization of

¹ Marc Bloch, *The Historians Craft* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1953), 106.

² Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 3.

³ Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 5.

the Asian nation, and that both description and definition of the region served to substantiate British colonial governance.⁴ This work also draws upon Homi K. Bhabha's theory that representations of colonized peoples must undergo constant modification, since they usually stem from the transforming needs and desires of the West.⁵ Finally, this article owes much to Julie A. Tuason's suggestion that changes in *National Geographic* reporting on the Philippines from 1898-1908 reflect the evolution of American rationalizations for colonial rule in the region.⁶

The existing historiography of the Katipunan focuses on the group's relationship with the Philippine people. This essay relies on the work of the Filipino historian Teodoro Agoncillo, who challenges historians whom label the Katipunan an elitist or marginalized organization, contending that the group's leaders originated from the middle and lower classes, representing the will of many of the Philippine people.⁷ Additionally, this paper draws from the historical writing of Reynaldo Clemena Ileto, who suggests that folk religious traditions and cultural values underscored and motivated popular revolutionary movements in the Philippines.⁸ Ileto argues that the Katipunan succeeded in large part not because of the spread of Western values or Ilustrado literature in the Philippines, but due to their tendency to relate their political struggle to religious ideals embraced by the masses.⁹ My thesis departs from the strategies of the dominant Katipunan historiography. Instead of analyzing the perspective of the populace towards the Katipunan, I examine European and American perceptions towards the group in order to understand how such viewpoints contributed to colonial rule in the Philippines.

⁴ Han Mui Ling, "From Travelogues to Guidebooks: Imagining Colonial Singapore, 1819-1940," *Sojourn* 18 (2003): 254.

⁵ Homi K. Bhabha, *Nation and Narration* (London: Routledge, 1990), 294.

⁶ Julie A. Tuason, "The Ideology of Empire in National Geographic Magazines Coverage of the Philippines, 1898-1908," *Geographical Review* 58, no. 1 (1999): 35.

⁷ Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *The Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1956), 315.

⁸ Reynaldo C. Ileto, *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910* (Manila: Ateneo De Manila University Press, 1979), 7, 10.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 79.

European Conquest and Impact in Southeast Asia and the Philippines

European imperialism in sixteenth-century Southeast Asia marked the beginning of a period of increased Western influence in the region. From the fifteenth to the seventeenth century, the world experienced what historian Anthony Reid termed “The Age of Commerce,” which included a period of trade and political centralization along the Southeast Asian mainland.¹⁰ In the fifteenth century European financial interest in Southeast Asia led to the eastern region’s transformation into a highly successful zone of trade.¹¹ Additionally, the possibility of converting foreign peoples to Christianity and nationalist sentiments contributed to a Western presence within Southeast Asia.¹² In 1511, seeking greater financial gain and tiring of the limitations of trade, the Portuguese obtained control of the port of Malacca, thereby committing the first act of European imperialism in Southeast Asia. In the nineteenth century, a combination of demands for new raw materials (such as rubber and tin), centralization among the mainland Southeast Asian kingdoms, and the development of more efficient modes of transportation led to the colonization of almost all of mainland Southeast Asia.¹³

In 1571, the Spanish established their colonial headquarters for the Philippines at Manila.¹⁴ Spanish control over the islands grew slowly and never covered the whole region; both the country’s highland sections and southern Muslim areas never came under Spanish rule.¹⁵ Despite this, Spanish colonization of the Philippines did create an organized nation where only a group of disunited islands had previously existed.¹⁶ Additionally, contact with Europeans led many of the residents of the Philippines to adopt a form of Catholicism that blended Christian beliefs with animist indigenous traditions.¹⁷ Throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, native dissatisfaction

¹⁰ Anthony Reid, *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce: 1450-1680* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 1.

¹¹ Norman G. Owen, *The Emergence of Modern Southeast Asia*. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2005), 45.

¹² Nicholas Tarling, *Imperialism in Southeast Asia* (London: Routledge, 2004), 26.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 39-43.

¹⁴ Milton Osborne, *Southeast Asia, An Introductory History*, 6th ed. (St. Leonard’s, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1995), 78.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 78.

¹⁶ Owen, *The Emergence of Modern*, 181.

¹⁷ John Leddy Phelan, *The Hispanization of the Philippines* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1959), 101-105.

with the economic and social policies of the colonial Spanish government spread throughout the Philippines, leading to a revolution against the imperial power in 1896.¹⁸ Many Americans took notice of this, and their desire to expand the U.S. frontier coupled with a thirst for wealth led the Western power to initiate the Spanish-American War.¹⁹ At the conclusion of the war in 1898, the United States entered into a colonial relationship with the Philippines that would not cease until after WWII.²⁰

The Highest and Most Respectable Society: History, Composition, Religion

Meaningful examination of European perceptions of the Katipunan requires a sufficient understanding of the movement. For this reason, this paper now turns to a brief overview of the organization. As previously mentioned, on July 7, 1892, a handful of lower class Filipinos, including the workers Andres Bonifacio and Deodato Arellano, founded the Katipunan in response to increasing Spanish repression and the exile of Jose Rizal to the southern Philippines. The society, more formally known as Kataastaasan Kagalang-galang na Katipunan ng mga Anak ng Bayan (The Highest and Most Respectable Society of the Sons of the People), vowed to establish an independent Philippines, defend the poor and repressed, and unite all Filipinos.²¹ On August 26, 1896, fighting broke out between the Spanish government and the Katipunan.²² As the armed struggle against the Spanish continued, the Katipunan split into two opposing groups: the Magdiwan, who supported Bonifacio, and the Magdalo, who backed the popular general Emilio Aguinaldo.²³ Conflict between the two factions resulted in the death of Bonifacio, after which Aguinaldo sided with the American government in their attempt to colonize and control the Philippine Islands.²⁴

The composition and religion of the Katipunan prove crucial to the examination of its representation in Euro-American travelogues. The Katipunan drew both its leadership and membership from the middle and lower classes; Andres Bonifacio himself worked as a laborer.²⁵ By the beginning of 1897,

¹⁸ 18 Owen, *The Emergence of Modern* 150-156.

¹⁹ Stuart Creighton Miller, "Compadre Colonialism," *The Wilson Quarterly* 10, no. 3 (1976): 93.

²⁰ Owen, *The Emergence of Modern* 289.

²¹ Agoncillo, *The Revolt of the Masses* 46.

²² Gregorio F. Zaide, *History of the Katipunan* (Manila: Loyal Press), 112.

²³ *Ibid.*, 113.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 142.

²⁵ Agoncillo, *The Revolt of the Masses*, 46.

the organization lay claim to anywhere between 190,000 and 400,000 members, most of whom did not come from positions of wealth or power.²⁶ The Katipunan's mass appeal stemmed not only from their political objectives, but also from their ability to articulate their values to the Philippine populace through references to folk cultural values and religious practices.²⁷ For the common Filipino, the experience of Holy Week shaped the style of brotherhood and strategies of organization during the late Spanish and early American colonial periods. The *Pasyon*, a narration of Christ's death and resurrection, provided peasants with a meaningful model to follow when envisioning the transition from colonial oppression to revolutionary independence.²⁸ Katipunan initiation rituals discussed in Euro-American travelogues borrow symbolism from the *Pasyon*. A Katipunan recruit's passage from the first stage of the initiation ritual, which occurred while wearing a blindfold (a phase of darkness), to the next, in which he encountered a single oil lamp (a phase of light), references Christ's death and resurrection.²⁹ The final act of an individual's induction into the Katipunan, the blood oath, represented the mixing together of the society member's inner character, or "loob," in order to establish a state of moral and spiritual unity.³⁰

Imagining the Katipunan: Violence from the Shadows, 1899-1901

During the first few years of American rule in the Philippines, from approximately 1899-1901, representation of the Katipunan in Euro-American travel accounts ranged from the mildly unfriendly to the blatantly pejorative. Additionally, many of these works stressed the mysterious and secretive nature of the society, and oftentimes accused the group's leaders of misleading their followers. Whether condemning the Katipunan as a vast organization of evil power or merely noting its shadowy character, European and American travelogues from this period ultimately functioned to frame the organization as distinctly separate from and unrepresentative of the majority of the Philippine people. In its historical context, this perspective validated false American

²⁶ Zaide, *History of the Katipunan*, 52.

²⁷ Iletto, *Pasyon and Revolution*, 10.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 11.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 91.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 176.

perceptions of pro-independence freedom fighters during the official years of the Philippine-American War.

In the early period of American rule in the Philippines, European and American travel writings used language and descriptions of Katipunan initiation rituals to highlight the secret nature of the Katipunan. While this focus does not contradict fact, its prominence and the scant attention paid to the revolutionary, patriotic, or religious qualities of the group warrant examination. Ramon Reyes Lala, in his 1899 account of the Philippines, refers to the Katipunan as “secret,”³¹ while a travelogue by Joseph Earle Stevens, also written in 1899, typecasts the group as “mysterious.”³² A 1902 account by Henry Codman Potter characterizes the group as a “secret society,”³³ while an academic article from 1901 refers to the Katipunan as “a secret organization appealing to native ignorance and prejudice.”³⁴ Michael Shoemaker describes the “blood brotherhood” mark of the Katipunan extensively, making the organization seem both bizarre and barbarous.³⁵ L.W.V. Kennon provides even more detail regarding Katipunan rituals. He calls the Katipunan initiation “solemn and terrifying,” mentioning the presence of a human skull, a loaded revolver, and a short sword in a dimly lit room.³⁶

These characterizations of the Katipunan did not simply arise out of European or American fascinations with the enigmatic, but out of a need to see the society as such to justify American policy in the region. From 1899 to 1902, the United States officially waged war against Philippine forces seeking independence in what the American government termed “The Philippine Insurrection.”³⁷ The term “insurrection” implied that anti-American forces consisted of “rebels rebelling against legitimate authority” who “enjoyed little

³¹ Ramon Reyes Lala, *The Philippine Islands* (New York: Continental Publishing Company, 1899), 170.

³² Joseph Earle Stevens, *Yesterdays in the Philippines* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1899), 19.

³³ Henry Codman Potter, *The East of To-day and To-morrow* (New York: The Century Co., 1902), 61.

³⁴ L.W.V. Kennon, “The Katipunan of the Philippines,” *The North American Review* 173, No. 537 (1901): 208.

³⁵ Michael M. Shoemaker, *Quaint Corners of Ancient Empires* (New York: Putnam, 1899), 169.

³⁶ L.W.V. Kennon, “The Katipunan of the Philippines,” 210.

³⁷ Stanley Karnow, *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines* (New York: Random House, 1989), 140.

popular support.”³⁸ Justification of U.S. presence in the Philippines hinged upon the notion that the common Filipino gladly welcomed American rule, and any dissenters came from a small and aberrant portion of the population.³⁹ In reality, the Philippine-American War engaged a huge portion of the Philippine population, resulting in 200,000 deaths, most of them Filipino civilians.⁴⁰ European and American travelogue writers ignored the religious significance of Katipunan initiation rites, interpreting their rituals as a sign of mysteriousness. By subverting the Katipunan’s symbolic references to the *Pasyon* of Christ into displays of secrecy, travelogues marginalized the organization, suggesting that the majority of Filipinos do not share its revolutionary goals. In this manner, Euro-American travel accounts supported wartime justifications of the American colonial government.

Euro-American travelogues did not only contain strange emphases, but also outright errors, particularly in regard to the Katipunan’s leadership. Kennon refers to the Katipunan as a group “appealing to native ignorance and racial prejudice.”⁴¹ Even more inaccurately, Michael Shoemaker argues that “the richest and most educated Filipinos” along with “a few native priests” led the patriotic organization.⁴² The scholarship of Teodoro Agoncillo disproves such notions; the majority of the Katipunan’s membership emerged from the lower classes.⁴³ These inaccuracies deserve not merely acknowledgement, but also further study, as they can act as a “mirror” of Western biases and ideologies.⁴⁴ Rationalizing American imperialism in the Philippines depended upon a view of the average Filipino as receptive to U.S. rule. By falsely typecasting the pro-independence leaders of the Katipunan as elitist or deceptive, travelogue

³⁸ Kenton J. Clymer, “Protestant Missionaries and American Colonialism in the Philippines, 1899-1916: Attitudes, Perceptions, Involvement,” in *Reappraising an Empire: New Perspectives on Philippine-American History*, ed. Peter W. Stanley (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), 126.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ For a particularly compelling discussion of the American colonial government’s treatment of the Filipino dead, as well as how the creation of categories such as “insurgent” led to the erasure of wartime violence and the promotion of imperial rule based upon “benevolent assimilation” see Vicente Rafael, *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History* (Durham: Duke University Press), 19-51.

⁴¹ Kennon, “The Katipunan of the Philippines,” 208

⁴² Shoemaker, *Quaint Corners of Ancient Empires*, 170

⁴³ Agoncillo, *The Revolt of the Masses*, 46.

⁴⁴ Bloch, *The Historians Craft*, 106.

writers imagined them as entirely separate from the majority of the Filipino population. This act parallels American wartime rhetoric describing a Filipino people friendly towards U.S. dominion, validating colonialism and repression of anti-American forces during the Philippine-American War.

A few travelogue writers go further than picturing the Katipunan as secretive, bizarre, or led by elites; they present the society as a violent and menacing organization. For instance, Shoemaker accuses the Katipunan of attempting to “slaughter all Spaniards” and “massacre all Americans.”⁴⁵ He then goes so far as to refer to the group as the “Brotherhood of Human Bloodhounds,” assigning an almost bestial quality to its members.⁴⁶ In another text, Frederic Henry Read calls the Katipunan “a terrible secret society” even suggesting that they borrowed their name (abbreviated as K.K.K.) “from the murderous brotherhood of the Klu-Klux-Klan.”⁴⁷ Perhaps the most telling representation of the Katipunan as violent exists in Kennon’s article, where the author provides anecdotes (of questionable reliability) featuring Katipunan members burying a man alive, shooting an Ilocano and seven of his friends, and cutting up three women and an old man with swords.⁴⁸

Harsh characterizations of the Katipunan justified America’s colonial presence in the Philippines. During the Philippine-American War, many Americans thought Filipino forces consisted mainly of cruel bandits and thieves who sought not political independence and civil rights, but power and wealth.⁴⁹ Picturing the Katipunan as a violent society connected to both bloodhounds and the Klu-Klux-Klan legitimates this perspective. By supposing that pro-independence organizations like the Katipunan held responsibility for acts of violence not only against Spaniards and Americans, but also against their own people, travelogues created a moral imperative for U.S. opposition to Filipino revolutionary forces. Together, travelogue portrayals of the Katipunan as secretive, elitist, or violent confirmed American opinions towards the Philippine-American war, ultimately sanctioning U.S. rule in the region.

⁴⁵ Shoemaker, *Quaint Corners of Ancient Empires*, 169.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Frederic Henry Read Sawyer, *The Inhabitants of the Philippines* (London: S. Low, Marston and Company, 1900), 82.

⁴⁸ Kennon, “The Katipunan of the Philippines,” 217.

⁴⁹ Clymer, “Protestant Missionaries,” 126.

The Brotherhood Joins the Family: 1902-1917

Travel accounts written after the official end of the Spanish-American War in 1902 illustrate a substantial shift in Euro-American perception of the Katipunan. These accounts no longer characterize the society in a negative light. Rather, they take a sympathetic view of the organization, characterizing it as one that suffered under the cruelty of Spanish rule. Oftentimes, European and American descriptions of the Oriental “other” seem ambivalent since they must constantly revise themselves in order to adapt to the changing political and economic needs of the West.⁵⁰ Changes in travelogue depiction of the Katipunan highlight the need to aid America’s “little brown brothers” in the Philippines, a concept that dominated rhetoric justifying American rule in the region. Instead of actually describing the Katipunan, travel account discourse from 1902-1917 emphasized the cruelty of Spanish rule in the region, and the ensuing need of all Filipinos for American aid and direction.

A 1904 travelogue written by Homer C. Stuntz provides a moving example of a new way of viewing the Katipunan. Stuntz recalls the torture of a suspected member of the Katipunan by a Spanish priest, and subsequently points out that thousands underwent similar treatment.⁵¹ In his account, a Spanish Friar tricks a young Filipino man into coming to his house and has him flogged until he faints from blood loss. Upon awakening, the Friar orders him hung from the building’s rafters by his thumbs. The Filipino prisoner does not escape until he feigns death, leaping from a second story window and fleeing to a nearby village in the mountains. Both before and after this story, Stuntz reminds readers that tragedies like this took place without any sort of trial.⁵²

Another anecdote, contained in four of the travelogues this article examines, further illustrates changing European and American perceptions of Spanish rule. In one version of this story, Spanish soldiers captured over a hundred men and imprisoned them within Fort Santiago. In order to keep river water outside of the prison, a Spanish sergeant threw a rug over the building’s one ventilating shaft, leading over 70 of the men within the prison to die of

⁵⁰ Bhabha, *Nation and Narration*, 294.

⁵¹ Homer Clyde Stuntz, *The Philippines and the Far East* (New York: Jennings and Pye; Eaton and Mains, 1904), 124-125.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 125.

suffocation.⁵³ The particulars of this story vary in different travelogues, but its main themes: the neglect and uncaring of the Spaniards coupled with the chance deaths of numerous Filipinos, stay constant. The prevalence of this tale in American travelogues points to colonial government's perception of the Spanish as irresponsible and even violent rulers.

Post Philippine-American War travel accounts often juxtapose the bravery of the Katipunan with shortcomings of the Spanish, a strong contrast with earlier Euro-American travelogues. One 1905 document calls the Spanish ignorant for characterizing the Katipunan as Masonic.⁵⁴ A 1917 work goes even further, referring to the Spanish as "stupid" in their perception of the Katipunan as a "danger to all Europeans."⁵⁵ A text from 1906, composed by the Englishwoman Campbell Dauncey, praises the Katipunan, noting that they fought to honor Jose Rizal's memory, completing his work by turning the "Spaniards and their dreadful priests out of the island."⁵⁶ In another 1906 travelogue, John Foreman credits the Katipunan with allowing the Philippine masses to express their discontent towards the Spanish Church and government.⁵⁷ Later, in 1907, a travelogue writer speaks of the Katipunan and Emilio Aguinaldo in heroic terms, praising their bravery and patriotism in a battle against cruel Spanish troops.⁵⁸

Nineteenth century transformations in travelogue treatment of the Katipunan supported U.S. presence in the Philippines. Around 1905, official U.S. government rhetoric justifying colonialism in Asia had eschewed focus on economic opportunity in order to focus solely upon the moral responsibility of the United States to care for their "little brown brothers" in the Philippines.⁵⁹ Travel accounts framing the Katipunan as both victims and brave opponents of the Spanish, instead of as secretive and upper class murderers, support claims of "benevolent assimilation" by painting Americans as either the liberator of

⁵³ John F.R.G.S. Foreman, *The Philippine Islands; a Political, Geographical, Ethnographical, Social, and Commercial History of the Philippine Archipelago, Embracing the Whole Period of Spanish Rule, With and Account of the Succeeding American Insular Government* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1906), 366.

⁵⁴ James A. LeRoy, *Philippine Life in Town and Country* (New York: Putnam, 1905), 158.

⁵⁵ Austin Craig, *The Former Philippines Thru Foreign Eyes* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1917), 351.

⁵⁶ Campbell Dauncey, *An Englishwoman in the Philippines* (London: Murray, 1906), 26.

⁵⁷ Foreman, *The Philippine Islands*, 364.

⁵⁸ George Waldo Brown, *The Pearl of the Orient: The Philippine Islands* (Boston: D. Estes and Co, 1900), 129.

⁵⁹ Tuason, "The Ideology of Empire," 45.

the Filipino people from Spanish cruelty, or partners in a war against a common foe. The American colonial government in the Philippines consistently promoted such portrayals.⁶⁰ In using Katipunan centered narratives to describe the cruelty of the Spanish government, European and American travel writers do not simply use portrayals of the Philippines (the Orient) to establish Occidental superiority.⁶¹ Rather, Euro-American travelogues define the Katipunan as victims, thereby defining the Spanish as irresponsible rulers, and in turn defining the Americans as capable and benevolent colonial masters. In doing so, these travel accounts established American's supposed moral responsibility to control the Philippines.

Conclusion

From 1899-1917, Euro-American travelogue representation of the Katipunan transformed to justify changing American colonial policies in the Philippines. From 1899-1901, during the years of the Philippine-American War, European and American travelogue writers consistently framed the group as mysterious, led by the elite, or violent in order to support negative American perceptions of Filipino freedom fighters. Later, after the war ended and the U.S. government promoted a policy of "benevolent assimilation" in the Philippines, travel account depictions of the Katipunan had little to do with actually describing the organization; rather, they vilified Spanish colonialism and expressed the need for U.S. aid in the Philippines. Regardless of their specificities, Euro-American portrayals of the Katipunan always served to justify American rule in the Philippines, revealing the flexibility and utility of imperialist attitudes towards their colonial possessions. As observed in the case of U.S.-Philippine relations, Orientalist imaginings of foreign peoples rarely represent a homogenous and unchanging style of thought, but an ideology adaptable to various situations.

⁶⁰ Ito, "Philippine Wars and the Politics of Memory," *Positions: East Asian Cultures Critique* 13, No. 1(2005): 222.

⁶¹ Said, *Orientalism*, 3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agoncillo, Teodoro A. *The Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1979.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Bloch, Marc. *The Historians Craft*. New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1953.
- Brown, George W. *The Pearl of the Orient: The Philippine Islands*. Boston: D. Estes and Co, 1900.
- Clymer, Kenton J. "Protestant Missionaries and American Colonialism in the Philippines, 1899-1916: Attitudes, Perceptions, Involvement." In *Reappraising an Empire: New Perspectives on Philippine-American History*, edited by Peter W. Stanley, 143-170. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Craig, Austin. *The Former Philippines Thru Foreign Eyes*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1917.
- Dauncey, Campbell. *An Englishman in the Philippines*. London: Murray, 1906.
- Foreman, John F.R.G.S. *The Philippine Islands; a Political, Geographical, Ethnographical, Social, and Commercial History of the Philippine Archipelago, Embracing the Whole Period of Spanish Rule, With and Account of the Succeeding American Insular Government*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- Han, Mui Ling. "From Travelogues to Guidebooks: Imagining Colonial Singapore, 1819-1940." *Sojourn* 18, (2003): 257-278.
- Ileto, Reynaldo C. *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910*. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1979.
- _____. "Philippine Wars and the Politics of Memory." *Positions: East Asian Cultures Critique* 13, No. 1(2005): 215-234.
- Karnow, Stanley. *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines*. New York: Random House, 1989.
- Kennon, L.W.V. "The Katipunan of the Philippines." *The North American Review* 173, No. 537 (1901): 208-220.

- Lala, Ramon R. *The Philippine Islands*. New York: Continental Publishing Company, 1899.
- LeRoy, James A. *Philippine Life in Town and Country*. New York: Putnam, 1905.
- Miller, Stuart C. "Compadre Colonialism." *The Wilson Quarterly* 10, no. 3 (1976): 92-105.
- Osborne, Milton. *Southeast Asia, An Introductory History*, 6th ed. St. Leonard's, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1995.
- Owen, Norman G. *The Emergence of Modern Southeast Asia*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2005.
- Phelan, John Leddy. *The Hispanization of the Philippines*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1959.
- Potter, Henry C. *The East of To-day and To-morrow*. New York: The Century Co., 1902.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Rafael, Vicente. *White Love and Other Events In Filipino History*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2000.
- Reid, Anthony. *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce: 1450-1680*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Sawyer, Frederic H.R. *The Inhabitants of the Philippines*. London: S. Low, Marston and Company, 1900.
- Shoemaker, Michael M. *Quaint Corners of Ancient Empires: Southern India, Burma, and Manila*. New York: Putnam, 1899.
- Stevens, Joseph E. *Yesterdays in the Philippines*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Stuntz, Homer C. *The Philippines and the Far East*. New York: Jennings and Pye; Eaton and Mains, 1904.

Tarling, Nicholas. *Imperialism in Southeast Asia: A Fleeting, Passing Phase*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Tuason, Julie A. "The Ideology of Empire in National Geographic Magazines Coverage of the Philippines, 1898-1908." *Geographical Review* 58, no. 1 (1999): 34-53.

Zaide, Gregorio F. *History of the Katipunan*. Manila: Loyal Press, 1939.