The Report Committee for Kristie Patricia Flannery
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:

Loyalty, Disobedience, and the Myth of the Black Legend in the Philippines during the Seven Years War

APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor:

Jorge Cañizares Esguerra

Susan Deans-Smith

Loyalty, Disobedience, and the Myth of the Black Legend in the Philippines during the Seven Years War

by

Kristie Patricia Flannery

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2013

Abstract

Loyalty, Disobedience, and the Myth of the Black Legend in the Philippines during the Seven Years War

Kristie Patricia Flannery, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2013

Supervisor: Jorge Cañizares Esguerra

This paper interrogates the nature of loyalty and disloyalty to Spain in the Philippines during the British occupation of Manila in 1762-1764. It examines the identity and motivations of the thousands of soldiers who joined Simón de Anda's army that mobilized against the British invaders, as well the Indigenous people who rose up in rebellion in the provinces to the north of Manila during this period, in order to preserve Spanish colonial rule. It also considers the nature of infidelity to Spain in the occupied Philippines. This paper argues that, in a large part due to the cohesiveness of Catholicism among converted Indians, the Spanish empire in the Philippines proved remarkably resilient under the pressure of invasion and occupation. The Black Legend blinded the British to the complexities of the real balance of power in in Manila and the Philippines during the Seven Years War

Table of Contents

List of Illustrations

INTRODUCTION

Manila And The Philippines In The Mid-Eighteenth Century

Manila in the middle of the eighteenth century was a bustling, multi-ethnic port city that was at once the colonial capital of the Spanish Philippines and the principal entrepôt of the lucrative trade between the Spanish empire and China. Manila's diverse population included Spanish and American-born colonial officials and their families, friars who travelled to Manila from the Iberian Peninsula and Spain's American colonies to save souls, and soldiers recruited from Spain and New Spain (present-day Mexico), many of whom were convicts. European and American-born Spaniards were always a minority in Manila: a 1779 census reported that their numbers reached only 1580.[1] In contrast, in 1762 approximately 7000 Chinese lived in the Parián, the Chinese quarter of Manila located outside of the walled Spanish enclave of Intramurous.[2]

"Negros" or blacks were conspicuous residents of Manila. This colonial classification encompassed a diverse body Africans and their descendants, as well as dark-skinned people indigenous to the Indian Continent, including Malabars and Bengalis. Many blacks were enslaved.[3] It is less well known that Armenian merchants and sailors who dominated the Madras-Manila trade were increasingly common in Manila as the eighteenth century progressed.[4] English, Irish, and French middlemen also carved out livings in this Pacific port city, despite the fact that their presence in the Philippines violated imperial law.

To date, historical and ethnographic studies of Indigenous people in the Philippines under Spanish rule have focused on rural areas beyond Manila, obscuring the

---

[1] Maria Fernanda Garcia de los Arcos, "Grupos Ethnicos y Clases Sociales en las Filipinas de Finales del Siglo XVIII," *Archipel* 57 (1999): 66.

[2] Salvador P. Escoto, "Expulsion of the Chinese And Readmission To The Philippines: 1764-1779," *Philippine Studies* 47, no. 1 (1999): 70.

[3] Déborah Oropeza Keresey, "La Esclavitud Asiática En El Virreinato De La Nueva España, 1565-1673," *Historia Mexicana* 61, (2011): 23.

[4] Bhaswati Bhattacharya, "Making money at the blessed place of Manila: Armenians in the Madras–Manila Trade in the Eighteenth Century," *Journal of Global History* 3, no. 1 (2008): 1-20.

fact that "Indios" or Indians inhabited the city and its hinterland.[5] Indians worked as domestic servants in convents and the private homes of wealthy Manileños, and Indian tributary workers comprised the bulk of the labor force employed in the construction and refitting of the huge galleons in the naval yards at Cavite. As in other colonial capitals in the Spanish Empire, mestizos, the racially mixed progeny of multi-ethnic Manila, comprised the majority this city's urban population. The 1779 census counted 14407 "mestizos de Sangley" (those descended from Chinese and Indians) in the colonial capital, and 2628 "mestizos de Español" (the offspring of Indian and Spanish unions).[6]

How did the colonial government assert authority over this diverse and largely transient urban population? Spain's grasp on the Philippines in the mid-eighteenth century seems all the more tenuous when we recognize that colonial government officials as well the Crown regarded the Chinese presence in the Manila as a serious threat to Spanish control of the city.[7] Moreover, the military and spiritual conquest of the Philippines beyond Manila remained incomplete two centuries after the "Hispanization" of the Philippines commenced. The reach of the imperial power beyond Manila was limited to a military network of twenty-seven presidios or forts scattered across the Philippines, and a religious network of evangelical missions overseen by the Augustinians, Dominicans, Franciscans and Jesuits, which extended unevenly across the archipelago.[8] By the 1760s the Spanish had not succeeded in "reducing" all of the Indigenous people even in the large island of Luzon, where Manila was located. The

---

[5] John Leddy Phelan, *The Hispanization Of The Philippines: Spanish Aims And Filipino Responses, 1565-1700* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1959); James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1985); James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

[6] Garcia de los Arcos, "Grupos Ethnicos," 66.

[7] Juan Gil, *Los Chinos En Manila, Siglos XVI Y XVII* (Macau: Centro Científico e Cultural de Macau, 2011); O.P Santamaria, "The Chinese Parian (El Parian de los Sangleyes)" in *The Chinese in the Philippines, 1570-1770*, edited by Alfonso Felix, Jr. (Manila: the Historial Conservation Society, 1966), 67-118.

[8] Phelan, *The Hispanization of the Philippines,* 49-51. The Dominicans were responsible for converting the Chinese diaspora in Manila as well as Indigenous people in the Pangasinan and Cagayan provinces to Catholicism. The Augustinians were concentrated in Pampanga and Ilocos. The Franciscans dominated the Bikol-speaking Camarines. A combination of Augustinians and Jesuits worked in the Bisayan Islands. In the eighteenth century the Jesuits established missions in the Sultanate of Sulu.

Igorots who inhabited the Gran Cordillera Central in northern Luzon remained defiantly pagan, and the majority of the "Moros" in Sulu Zone (in the very South of the Philippines archipelago) were unwilling to convert from Islam to Christianity.[9] In spite of this, Spanish rule in the Philippines survived the Age of Revolution, which saw colonial polities in the Americas sever ties with the Empire, and endured until 1898.

What constituted the foundation of fidelity to Spain in the Philippines, the colony that was separated by such extreme distances from centers of imperial power in New Spain and the Iberian Peninsula? This paper makes a contribution to answering this important question by exploring the responses of the people living in the Philippines to the British invasion and occupation of Manila in 1762-1764. It is prefaced on the assumption that examining a colonial city under the stress of an invasion reveals much about its social organization and the glue that holds that colonial society together.

The British Invasion and Occupation of Manila, 1762-1764

On 24 September 1762 a combined British Royal Navy and East India Company fleet of fifteen tall ships sailed into Manila Bay with the intention of seizing the city. The appearance of the flotilla flying British colors caught Manileños by surprise; although Spain entered the Seven Years War against Britain in January of 1762, no one in the Philippines anticipated that Britain would attack 'the Pearl of the Orient'.

British warships pounded the fortified walls of Intramurous with heavy cannon shot for several days before a force of over 1700 fighting men disembarked from their vessels and marched on Manila. The diverse British army incorporated 610 Sepoys, who were natives of the Indian Subcontinent employed as soldiers of the East India Company, as well as 314 prisoners of war, the majority of whom were French captives taken at Pondicherry. It also comprised the Royal Navy's 79th Regiment consisting of 567 men, many of whom would have been Englishmen and perhaps Americans pressed into

[9] William Henry Scott, *The Discovery of the Igorots: Spanish Contacts with the Pagans of Northern Luzon* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1974), 107-137; Nicholas Tarling, *Sulu and Sabah: A Study of the British Policy Towards the Philippines and North Borneo from the Late Eighteenth Century* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1978).

service, as well as two artillery units. In addition to these fighting men, the Royal Navy and East India Company brought 100 Lascars to Manila. The Lascars, also natives of the Indian Subcontinent, were expected to undertake "the labor of war", which included transporting weapons, ammunitions and victuals from ship to shore to battle-field, digging trenches, and burying the dead.[10]

When the British attack on Manila began, the Spanish defence force stationed in the colonial capital consisted of only 556 regular soldiers and eighty mestizo artillerymen.[11] Within a week the Spanish colonial government succeeded in mobilising as many as 5000 Indians and mestizos from surrounding provinces to defend Manila.[12] Yet these reinforcements arrived in the capital too late to defend the city. Manila fell to the British on 3 October 1762 after ten days of shelling and shooting and struggle. On this date the Archbishop and interim Governor of Manila, Manuel Rojo del Rio y Vieyra, surrendered the city to the British. The East India Company installed the Madras-born Briton Dawsonne Drake as the first British Governor of Manila. Drake, along with four other East India Company officers, formed the Manila Council that ruled city for the duration of the British occupation of the city. The Treaty of Paris that formally ended the Seven Years War returned Manila to the Spanish in 1764.

But before Rojo surrendered to Manila to the British, Simón de Anda y Salazar, a junior *oidor* or judge of the Audiencia of Manila, declared himself Governor of the Philippines and promptly established an alternative colonial capital in the pueblo of Bulucan, 90 miles north of Manila. From here the Governor-in-exile led a military campaign that attempted to destabilize the enemy's grip on Manila. Anda and his rebel army continued to engage the invaders in full-blown battles and smaller-scale clashes typical of guerrilla warfare until news of the peace treaty arrived in Manila. Ultimately

---

[10] Nicholas Tracy, *Manila Ransomed: The British Assault on Manila in the Seven Years War* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press 1995),17; Elena Andrea Schneider, "The Occupation of Havana: War, Trade and Slavery in Eighteenth Century Cuba." PhD diss., (Princeton University, 2011), 208-209.
[11] Salvador P. Escoto, "The Administration Of Simon De Anda Y Salazar, Governor-General Of The Philippines, 1770-1776" PhD diss. (Loyola University, 1973), 6.
[12] Shirley Fish, *When Britain Ruled The Philippines 1762-1764* (Bloomington Indiana: 1st Books, 2003), 122.

Anda's resistance succeeded in prohibiting the expansion of the British stronghold beyond Intramuros and Cavite.

Contemporary accounts of the British occupation of Manila indicate that between 7000 and 10000 men fought in Anda's army in 1762-1764. Who were these men? And why did they fight to restore Manila and the Philippines to Spanish control? The answers to these questions are a lacuna in existing studies of the British occupation of Manila and the Seven Years War. The historiography of the British occupation of Manila is divided into two distinct and conflicting interpretations of this historical event. On the one hand, the Anglo historiography, decidedly oriented towards a popular rather than a scholarly audience, consistently understates the extent of resistance to the British invasion. One historian remarked that Britain's conquest of Manila "seemed to affirm Britain's essential invincibility".[13] Instead of probing the problem of Anda's army, the Anglo narrative emphasizes desertions from Spanish forces and the extent to which people in the Philippines were willing to cooperate with the British invaders.[14] This version of events is undeniably stained by 'the Black Legend' that conceives of the Spanish Empire as particularly depraved, detested by imperial subjects, and in a long period of decline after 1700.[15] On the other hand, the Spanish historiography celebrates Simón de Anda's heroic efforts, while denigrating both Archbishop Rojo, who is portrayed as a weak old man who folded easily before the British, and the Chinese, who are characterized as traitors to the King of Spain and the Catholic Church.[16] Indigenous people are marginalized and their agency denied in both the Anglo and Spanish interpretations of the occupation.

---

[13] Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years War and the Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001), 516-517.

[14] Tracy, *Manila Ransomed;* Fish, *When Britain Ruled the Philippines*.

[15] Matthew Restall, "The Decline and Fall of the Spanish Empire Restall," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 64, no. 1, (2007): 183-194.

[16] Antonio Molina, *Historia de Filipinas* (Madrid : Ediciones Cultura Hispánica del Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericana, 1984); Carlos Vila Miranda, "Toma de Manila Por Los Ingleses En 1762," *Anuario de Estudios Atlánticos 53* (2007): 167-220.

Manila has received little attention in broader studies of the Seven Years War. This is largely a consequence of this scholarship's traditional focus upon the North American theatre of war, which in turn has resulted from conceiving of this conflict as a prelude to the American Revolution.[17] The tendency to play down Spain's involvement in this conflict has also shaped the literature's neglect of Manila. For example, in his recent study of the "Global Seven Years War", Daniel Baugh described this a conflict between Great Britain and France, "the two most advanced monarchies of Europe." [18]

The role of Indigenous people in the North American front of the Seven Years War has received significant attention from historians in recent years. Thanks to the work of Fred Anderson, historians can appreciate why in 1760s "a man born a Catawba, reared as a Seneca, acting as a spokesman for the Iroquois Confederacy in the Ohio Country, chose to smash open the skull of a Frenchman."[19] We have a comparatively very limited understanding of why a Pampangan born in Bulucan marched to Manila and shot at Britons in red coats with his deadly bow and arrow, or why the mestizo born in Mexico, convicted of a petty crimes and sentenced to serve out an extended term of military service in the far-away Philippines, risked his life to preserve Spain's Pacific Empire. This paper aims to fill this knowledge gap. In doing so we enrich our understanding of the history of the Philippines and the greater Spanish Empire, as well as the Seven Year War.

This paper is divided into two parts. Part One puts Anda's rebel army under the microscope for the first time. It demonstrates that a diverse array of people who converged in the Philippines during the Seven Years War joined the army of the Governor-in-exile and fought to return the Manila to Spanish rule, including significant numbers of European deserters from the British forces joined Anda's army. I argue that these soldiers were masterless men whom the Manila Council and Anda alike were obliged to bargain with in order to obtain their labor. I then present evidence that

---

[17] Anderson, *Crucible of War,* 12.
[18] Daniel Baugh, *The Global Seven Years War, 1754-1763: Britain and France in a Great Power Contest* (Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited, 2011), 1.
[19] Anderson, *Crucible of War,* 12.

Mexican soldiers, who were mostly convicts, were also soldiers in Anda's army, challenging the view that these men were inherently disobedient subjects.

Indians formed the overwhelming majority of Anda's army. The final section of Part One explores the motivations behind Indian participation in the Spanish resistance. Many different Indigenous peoples populated the more than 7000 islands that comprised the Philippines archipelago in the mid eighteenth century. The fact that six major languages were spoken in the Island of Luzon (Tagalog, Ilokos, Bikol, Pangasinan, Pampangan and Ibang) gives some indication of the diversity of Indigenous peoples who inhabited the region most affected by the Seven Years War.[20] The majority of the indigenous people who fought in Anda's army were Pampangans. Tagalogs were also prominent in the resistance. The evidence presented in this paper strongly suggests that these Indians' strong Catholic faith and relationships with regular clergyman who spoke their languages strongly influenced their loyalty to Spain throughout 1762-1764. The Pampangans' traditional role as allies of Spain and Indian Conquistadores, also premised on a shared Catholic faith, further reinforced their readiness to confront not only the British invaders, but also other Indigenous groups who rose in rebellion against the Spanish after Manila fell to the British.

Part Two of this paper examines the actions of those imperial subjects who were disloyal to Spain during the British occupation. This section begins by examining the armed indigenous uprisings led respectively by Diego Silang in the Ilocos province in the northwest of Luzon, and by Juan de la Cruz Palaris in Pangasinan province, situated immediately south of Ilocos. I show that these mass anti-colonial rebellions were ultimately put down by axillary armies of loyal Pampangans, as well as local indigenous peoples mobilized by Augustinian and Dominican priests in the provinces where the rebellions occurred. Therefore, rather than revealing the inherent weaknesses of Spanish colonial rule in the Philippines, the effective suppression of these rebellions attested to the resilience of the Spanish empire under attack from multiple enemies founded on Catholicism as a cohesive force.

---

[20] Phelan, *The Hispanization of the Philippines,* 17-18, 180.

The next section of Part Two briefly demonstrates that the Sultan of Sulu, who was being held captive in Manila when the British invaded the city, eagerly welcomed the British as liberators. The response of the Sultan to the British invasion allowed the British to entertain fantasies of "annexation by consent" in Manila. The British error was to assume that other colonized peoples were also exploited by the Spaniards and awaiting liberation as the Sultan of Sulu was. The final section of Part Two examines the Chinese response to the occupation. I argue that widespread Chinese collaboration with the British revealed the inability of missionaries to cement devotion in a population that did not buy into Catholicism. Yet I also show that many Chinese exploited the British assumption of their infidelity to Spain to act as spies for Anda's army, or to simply take advantage of the invasion to enrich themselves. Ultimately, the Black Legend blinded the British to the complexities of the real balance of power in Manila and the greater Philippines.

The Black Legend is a strong theme in this paper. I suggest that the Black Legend shaped the British strategy of invasion and occupation as well as subsequent interpretations of this historical episode. Elena Andrea Schneider's recent doctoral dissertation has demonstrated that the ideology of 'empire by invitation' influenced British strategy in the invasion and occupation of Havana, where the invaders anticipated that city's large population of enslaved and free Africans and Afro-descendants would eagerly unite with British forces, guaranteeing a British victory.[21] This ideology also infused the invasion of Manila. British Royal Navy and East India Company assumed that Indians in the Philippines, oppressed as they were by Spanish colonial rule, would enthusiastically welcome the arrival of the invader-liberators. Yet this romantic scenario did not come to pass either in the Caribbean or in the Pacific.

This paper engages with various British and Spanish primary sources concerning the British occupation of Manila. I draw heavily upon the records of the Manila Council's meeting proceedings and various items of correspondence covering the period 6 January to 29 December 1763 that are contained in two published volumes of the

[21] Schneider, *The Occupation of Havana,* 119.

Manila Consultations.[22] I read the *Manila Consultations* both along the grain in order to understand the attitudes and experiences of the leaders of the occupying forces who produced this account, as well as against the grain to gain insight into the motivations of those loyal and disobedient subjects of the Spanish Crown who appear in the record as collaborators and enemies of the British. It also refers to documents published in Volume 49 of Blair and Robertson's famous collection *The Philippine Islands*, as well as Eduardo Navarro's annotated *Documentos Indispensables Para La Verdadera Historia De Filipinas* - the most important published collection of Spanish documents relating to the British occupation of Manila.[23] Finally, this paper utilizes recently digitized sources from the Filipinas section of the Archivo General de Indias in Seville, Spain. All of the primary sources that informed this study are published in edited collections of documents, or are available in their complete, original form as digitized sources online.

---

[22] Records of Fort St. George. *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol 5*. Madras: Superintendent, Government Press, 1940); Records of Fort St. George *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol 6*. Madras: Superintendent, Government Press, 1940).

[23] Anon. "Documents For The History Of The Invasion And War With The English In Filipinas, 1762-1764" in *The Philippine Islands Vol. 49,* ed. Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson (Cleveland, Ohio: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1908) 132-175; Agustín Maria; Castro y Amuedo, "Relación Sucinta, Clara Y Veridica De La Toma De Manila Por La Escuadra Inglesa, Escrita Por El P. Fr. Agustín Maria De Castro Y Amuedo, Natural De Villa De Bañeza, Agustino Calzado. Año De 1770," in *Documentos Indispensables Para La Verdadera Historica de Filipinas: 1762-1763*, edited by P. Eduardo Navarro, (Madrid: Imprenta del Asilo del Huérfanos, 1908) 46-92.

Illustration One: Map of the Philippines[24]

[24] "Philippines map blank", *Wikimedia Commons*, accessed on April 28 2013, http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Philippines-map-blank.png.

PART ONE: FIDELITY

Anda's Multi-Ethnic Army

The Anglo historiography of the British occupation of Manila has emphasized that desertion was a problem for both the invading British force as well as Anda's rebel army.[25] Under what conditions did soldiers desert? Records of the Manila Consultations reveal that British and Spanish military leaders recognized the agency of fighting men and attempted to woo them over to their respective sides of the inter-imperial conflict. They British Royal Navy and East India Company could not assume the loyalty of the French prisoners of war, pressed Englishmen, Sepoys and Lascars they had enlisted. Naval and Company leaders agreed that offering financial rewards to the men in their service would help to prevent desertions. In March 1763 the Manila Council increased the pay that "Soldiers, Sepoys and Lascars" received. The Council also granted European soldiers a generous daily ration of alcohol, and the Sepoys and Lascars an additional dollar per month.[26] Although it was common for soldiers serving in the Atlantic theatre of war to fight for years in arrears, the Manila Council went to great lengths to ensure that their fighting men were promptly paid their increased wages because "the consequence that may attend the non-payment of the troops may be very fatal."

British Captains feared that their forces would flock to Anda's rebel army despite these pay increases. On 25 May 1763, Lieutenant Captain Hancks sent an urgent message "to all the Gentlemen Officers Sergeants Corporals and Privates" at the Fort at Pasig, warning them of an impending attack by "500 good Spanish Soldiers with the French Company consisting of fifty Men, 6000 Pampangoes, and thirty Malabars, and six

---

[25] Tracy, *Manila Ransomed;* 15, 17, 32-38, 87-88.
[26] *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol 5*., 70-71, 74; 164-5.

pieces of Cannon."[27] Hancks was not as concerned about the sheer size of the approaching enemy army as he was about the possibility that soldiers in the British service would be tempted to defect to the Spanish resistance. The Black Legend held no sway over the motley crew of fighting men who had been mobilized under the Union Jack in Manila.

"All the English Soldiers now in Pasig may depend on great Encouragement in the Spanish Service", wrote Hancks.[28] The Captain elaborated that Anda's army was inviting enemy soldiers to defect and "deliver up the Garrison Guns [and] ammunition" to the resistance. Those who did so were promised a monetary prize of "fifteen dollars as a present from the Governor", to be paid "after the Garrison is delivered up to the Spaniards". The Spanish also guaranteed defectors would not be forcibly pressed into Anda's army, as was the custom of war. Defectors were promised to be given the choice of remaining in the Philippines and joining Anda's army, for which they would be handsomely compensated with double the wages they received in the English Service, or going to " New Spain or any other place that you think proper".

Such bargaining suggests that, to a considerable extent, the British occupation of Manila turned soldiers into masterless people.[29] As the British and the Spanish were desperate for bodies, ordinary soldiers could determine the price at which they would sell their labor. This view of soldiers was again demonstrated when the Manila Council offered a reward of 5000 dollars to any person who would capture and deliver up Simón de Anda to the British.[30] In response, Anda offered an award of double the price on his head, or 10000 dollars, to anyone who would hand over, dead or alive, the British Governor of Manila or the members of the Manila Council.[31] Although no person ever claimed these rewards, the fact that they were offered at all reveals that Simon de Anda

---

[27] "*Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol 5*., 129-130.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Isaac Curtis "Masterless People: Maroons, Pirates and Commoners." in *The Caribbean: A History Of The Region And Its Peoples*, eds. Stephan Palmié and Francisco A. Scarano (Chicago: Univeristy of Chicago Press, 2011): 149-162.
[30] *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol 5*, 15.
[31] *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol 5*,130-131.

and the Manila Council perceived the soldiers from all nations who converged in Manila and its hinterland in 1762-1764 as men with whom they were obliged to negotiate.

We do not know how many fighting men took the generous Spanish offer Captain Hancks described, but it is clear that many soldiers defected from British units to Anda's forces during the period of Occupation. French prisoners of war deserted from British ranks en masse as soon as Royal Navy and East India Company fleet arrived in Manila.[32] English soldiers also defected to Anda's army. Correspondence between the Governor of the Philippines and the Council of the Indies in Spain reveals that a unit of English soldiers who had joined Anda's army during the occupation were posted in the Fort of Santiago in Manila in 1765, after the British Royal Navy and East India Company had withdrawn from the city. We only know about these Englishmen because Spanish officers discovered the English artillery captain Mariano José Bustos Lent, had tried to rouse his countrymen to rebel and capture the Fort. He had planned to shoot canon into the Royal Palace, the Cathedral, and the garrisons. Before the mutiny could come to fruition, the Spanish General formed a council of war that convicted the would-be mutineers of being protestants, and sentenced them to perpetual banishment from "these dominions."[33]

Fighting men were not completely free. Military discipline imposed a very real constraint upon soldiers' agency throughout the Seven Years War, including in Manila. The Manila Council offered rewards of 200 dollars to soldiers and other persons who correctly identified "any person or persons… inciting men from their fidelity."[34] Punishments for deserting were extreme during peacetime. After 1740, men who deserted from the Spanish military in the Philippines and were subsequently caught were forced to endure the physical punishment known as "the running of the bats" six times

---

[32] Tracy, *Manila Ransomed;* 15, 17.

[33] AGI FILIPINAS, 335. L.17, The Real Cédula clearly identifies "Mariano José Bustos Lent" is being "de nación inglés, uno de los muchos desertores colocados de oficiales". It is possible that his name was Hispanicized in this document. The Council of the Indies was furious that the Governor would be so irresponsible as to entrust the Fort of Santiago to foreigners, and for having punished them so leniently for a crime so grave.

[34] *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol 5*., 70-71.

(where the deserter ran naked through a tunnel of soldiers who beat him with "baquetas" or thin rods of iron or wood bearing metal tips as he passed), as well as four years in the galleys.[35] Deserters from the British Royal Navy generally sentenced by courts martial to be whipped.[36]

In wartime, the punishment for desertion was death. In August 1763 Francisco de la Cruz, whom the British described as "a Malay", was captured by the British and accused of encouraging two Sepoys to defect to Anda's army. De la Cruz had promised the Sepoys that if they went with him to Pampanga, they would give paid 1000 dollars, as well as allowance of 100 dollars per month. In light of the "frequent Desertions, and the Town and Suburbs swarming with these Seducers", the Manila Council determined that it was necessary to make an example of de la Cruz.[37] They sentenced him to be

> carried through the suburbs of Santa Cruz… causing his crime to be published at the Corner of every street, until he reaches Quiapo, and that he there be hanged within sight of the Post, to deter others from following his example.[38]

Bim Naique Subadar, the Sepoy who testified against de la Cruz, was granted a reward of twenty-five dollars and "a handsome sword of the value of 100 dollars" for his loyalty to the British Crown and the East India Company. Both of these prizes were "publically presented to the Subadar on the Parade, before all the troops in the Name of the Honourable Company, as a mark of their Approbation of his Conduct, and their confidence in his fidelity."[39]

Guatchinangoes were another group of fighting men who were represented in Anda's rebel army. "Guatchinangoes" was the Spanish term that British used to refer to mestizo soldiers from New Spain during the seven years war in Manila. Several hundred of these soldiers would have been present in colonial capital and the wider Philippines in

---

35 AGI Filipinas, 447, N.28.
36 Marcus Eder, *Crime and Punishment in the Royal Navy of the Seven Years War, 1755-1763* (Aldershot, Hampshire, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004), 102.
37 *Manilha Consultations, 1763* Vol 6, 175.
38 *Manilha Consultations, 1763* Vol 6, 175.
39 *Manilha Consultations, 1763* Vol 6, 174-175.

when the British invaded Manila. Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the colony relied on aid from the Viceroyalty of New Spain in the form of an annual allotment of silver and soldiers.

Recent studies by Stephanie Mawson and Eva Mehl have demonstrated that the majority of the soldiers who were sent to the Philippines from the Iberian Peninsula and America were *forzados* or convicts who had been sentenced to complete terms of penal servitude on the frontier of the Spanish Empire.[40] Eighteenth century forzados had typically been convicted of property crimes, such as highway robbery, or were "vagabonds, idlers and other men of 'evil dispositions' who were deemed unsuitable for integration into society in New Spain".[41] Mawson and Mehl have emphasized the forzado system was essentially utilitarian program of "social cleansing" in New Spain, that simultaneously functioned to reform criminals, and supply the Philippines with much-needed supply of labor. Mawson's work has drawn attention to the problems inherent in employing criminals to regulate the social order in Manila. She has argued that in the seventeenth century, forzados

> were engaged in an almost constant mutiny against the system that judicially relegated them to forced labor. Return migration, violence, disobedience and mutiny were constant and persistent problems associated with every phase of the forzado system.[42]

Neither Mawson nor Mehl have interrogated the actions and experiences of the forzados during the British occupation of Manila: the Seven Years War falls outside of the timeframe of their respective studies. Nonetheless, their research would lead us to assume that these disorderly convicts who were known to desert ranks whenever an opportunity to do so arose would not have been enthusiastic recruits to Anda's army.

---

[40] Stephanie Mawson, "Unruly Plebeians and the Forzado System: Convict Transportation between New Spain and the Philippines during the Seventeenth Century," *Revista de Indias* (Forthcoming 2013); Eva Mehl, "The Spanish Empire And The Pacific World: Mexican 'Vagrants, Idlers, And Troublemakers' In The Philippines, 1765-1821," PhD diss., University of California, Davis, 2011. ProQuest (3482252).
[41] Mawson, "Unruly Plebeians and the Forzado System", 7.
[42] Mawson, ""Unruly Plebeians" 21.

Yet the Manila Consultations do not suggest that forzados or flocked to the British in significant numbers.[43] On the contrary, this source presents compelling evidence that Spanish and Mexican forzados fought against the British in Anda's army. "Guachinagoes" frequently appear on the Manila's Council's lists of prisoners of war taken in battle. For example, in January 1763, the British captured "one Guachinangoe", along with "one French deserter, one Spaniard… and Indians".[44] Captain Sleigh estimated that the enemy forces who defended his attack on the town of Matolos located forty kilometres north of Manila on 22 January 1763 numbered "400 men" and included "three Padres [Catholic priests], the Alcalde [local mayor], a great many Guachinangoes with an officer with them and two Frenchmen."[45]

It is fascinating that Admiral Cornish ordered "331 Guatchinangoe Prisoners" to be placed on board a East India Company ship and sent to Madras during the occupation.[46] There is frustratingly little written about these prisoners in the Manila Consultations. Several historians have remarked on this shipload of Mexicans who were transported to Madras, yet none have discovered their fate. The only other large group that the British and East India Company transported from Manila to Madras were French deserters; the soldier-hungry British were forced to remove almost 200 French fighting men from the theatre of war after so many deserted to Anda's rebel army.[47] On this basis we might safely assume that the Mexican convict soldiers too were committed to fighting to preserve Spanish rule in the Philippines, and could not be persuaded to come over the British.

This evidence challenges our assumptions about forzados; despite their "cultures of disobedience and criminality", most of these men seemingly proved loyal in the face

---

[43] *Manilha Consultations, 1763*, *Vol 5,* 90. The Manila Consultations identify only "three Rogues" as defectors to the British force; "James of Joseph Fizara, a rogue who has been much employed as a spy", and "John Ignatio Partitio and John Demerando, rogues." It is probable that these three men were forzados, as the English used the term 'rogue' referred to people of low class, often those who were mixed-race like the Mexican mestizos.

[44] Ibid, 7.

[45] [45] Ibid., 20.

[46] Ibid., 61.

[47] Ibid., 69.

of crisis.[48] Why did the forzados support Anda's campaign against the British? It is possible that a common Catholic faith united these soldiers behind Anda in the face of a protestant enemy. It is also likely forzados chose to fight with the Spanish as opposed to the British simply because waging war with Anda was more lucrative than waging war against him. The *Filipino* galleon arrived in the Philippines from New Spain by mid-1763. The British failed to take this prize, and by mid 1763, Anda succeeded in smuggling all the Galleon's silver to his military camp. The possession of this treasure would have allowed Anda to generously remunerate his soldiers.[49]

Faith and Fidelity

Indians constituted the overwhelming majority of fighting men in Anda's army. Members of the British Manila Council were initially convinced that they could persuade the Indians living in and around Manila that the new British colonial government was their friend. The invaders believed that the Indians had suffered great abuses under Spanish rule, and would readily welcome the British as liberators. One of the Council's first moves was to prepare and distribute manifestos written in Spanish and Tagalog promising Indians who swore alliance to King George III that they would "be treated in every respect as his Britannic Majesty's Subjects", and freed from servitude and the burden of tribute which the Spanish government had imposed. The Council also assured the Indians that they would be permitted to continue to live as Catholics as they had done under Spanish rule.[50]

Yet such olive branches generally failed to achieve the desired results. The introduction to this paper indicated that the actions of Indians in and around Manila disrupted the romantic Anglo conception of empire by invitation in the very early stages of the occupation, when Indian soldiers were mobilized in the thousands to defend

---

[48] Stephanie Mawson, "Unruly Plebeians and the Forzado System", 5.
[49] *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol 6*, 79; Fr. José Victoria and Fr. Manuel Rebollo, "Documento Inédito," in *Documentos Indispensables Para La Verdadera Historica de Filipinas: 1762-1763*, edited by P. Eduardo Navarro (Madrid: Imprenta del Asilo del Huérfanos, 1908), 31.
[50] *Manilha Consultations, 1763, Vol 5*, 9.

Manila against the initial British siege of the city. Thousands of Indigenous fighting men continued to resist the British occupation after the city had fallen. In January 1763 the British Engineer William Stevenson insisted that troops serving in the British and East India Company service required protection from the "treachery of the Indian Inhabitants who are very numerous… their fidelity [can]not much to be depended on."[51]

Why were so many Indigenous people willing to fight for Spain? Evidence from British and Spanish sources strongly suggests that Indians' Catholic faith and relationships with the regular clergy proved a solid foundation of their fidelity to Spain. Simón de Anda strongly believed that the colony's priests possessed the power to persuade their flocks to fight the protestant invaders. In a letter to Archbishop Rojo dated 8 October 1763, the Governor-in-exile stated that "the natives venerate their parish priests, ministers, and missionaries" with "respect and love". Anda argued that the Indians' devotion to the colony's religious leaders, combined with the religious leaders' "greater knowledge of the nature, customs, and civilization of the natives, can maintain them and incite them to the defense of the country against the English Enemy."[52]

The Manila Consultations demonstrate that many priests did just as Anda expected them; friars dissuaded their Indigenous flocks from assisting the British cause in any way, and actively encouraged them to participate the Spanish resistance. Significantly, the majority of the regular clergy could communicate with the Indians in their native languages. Since 1603 every missionary in the Philippines were required to "know the language of the indios whom he should instruct".[53] Fluency in indigenous languages made it easier for priests to convince Indigenous people to fight for Anda.

In May 1763 Backhouse arrested several priests whom he and his men had caught red-handed supporting Anda's rebel army. Backhouse informed the Manila Council that he was initially persuaded by Padre Montero's apparent readiness to cooperate with the

---

[51] *Manilha Consultations, 1763* Vol 5., 1-2.

[52] Anon. "Documents for the history of the invasion and war with the English in Filipinas, 1762-1764" (excerpts) in Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands* Vol. 49, 133. The original bound copy of manuscripts in the Ayer Collection, Newberry Library.

[53] Vicente Rafael, C*ontracting Colonialism: Translation And Christian Conversion In Tagalog Society Under Early Spanish Rule* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), 18-19.

British when they marched into Lipa, the pueblo where Montero was Prior in the south of Luzon. The Priest "made a show of service, by promises and some other appearances."[54] Yet Backhouse soon learned that Padre Montero was a "false trumpet." Montero enthusiastically discouraged his parishioners from providing the British with intelligence that would aid their war with Anda, had had allegedly threatened to cut out the tongues of traitors. Montero also had gunpowder concealed in a chest in the convent where he resided, which Backhouse assumed was to supply the resistance. In December British forces arrested Padre Esteban for "endeavoring to seduce a man to desertion".[55] The Council decided to spare the priest's life to avoid "greatly irritating the minds of the people". The death penalty – the standard punishment for this offense, was "mitigated to a fine of forty dollars and six months imprisonment."[56]

Significantly, these Priests were not only whispering words of encouragement into their parishioners' ears. Regular clergymen, particularly the Augustinians and Dominicans, promoted the active participation of Indians in the resistance by actively participating Anda themselves. Dominican friars took up shovels and to dig trenches around Anda's stronghold in Bulucan.[57] Padre Juan de la Conception acted as a courier on behalf of Anda, transporting peace treaties between the rebel army leader and the Manila Council.[58] Augustinians transported rifles and lead to make bullets to the rebel army.[59] The Manila Council observed that "The Augustine Friars" had even "appeared in Arms, contrary to their ecclesiastical functions thereby occasioning the effusion of much Human Blood."[60] Surely Catholic Indians were more willing to fight with Anda when they could do so alongside their priests.

---

[54] *Manilha Consultations, 1763*, *Vol 5*., 135-6.
[55] *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol. 5,* 1-2; *Manilha Consultations, 1763* Vol. *6,* 216-217.
[56] *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol. 6*, 224.
[57] *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol. 5,* 30.
[58] Ibid.,192.
[59] Fr. Agustín Maria de Castro y Amuedo, "Relación Sucinta, Clara y Veridica De La Toma de Manila Por la escuadra Inglesa, Escrita Por Wl P. Fr. Agustín Maria De Castro Y Amuedo, Natural De Villa De Bañeza, Agustino Calzado. Año De 1770," in *Documentos Indispensables Para La Verdadera Historica de Filipinas: 1762-1763*, edited by P. Eduardo Navarro (Madrid: Imprenta del Asilo del Huérfanos, 1908),70.
[60] *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol. 5,*102.

The British Royal Navy and the East India Company recognized the role the influence that the clergy had over the Indians in Anda's army. In January 1763 the British Admiral Cornish informed the Manila Council that "the Friars take every occasion to increase the trouble against us". To limit the problems this section of Manila society could cause the British, he proposed that "the Clergy (the secular excepted) should secured and embarked on board the Squadron"; i.e. the Royal Navy ship that served as a floating prison during the occupation.[61] Captain Thomas Backhouse concurred; he told the Council that the religious leaders "are the most Diabolical Enemies in the Country, Tyrants and Devils that stick at no length of wickedness cruelty and oppression."[62] Such vitriolic hatred of the colony's religious leaders developed in response to evidence of these men's very active support of the resistance.

British attacks on churches and convents may have also swayed the decision of many devout Indians to fight with Anda against the British. In January 1763, the Manila Council ordered Captain Jeremiah Sleigh to prevent his men from "despoiling the churches of any of their images, ornaments, or sacred vessels". They reasoned that removing these objects "might be looked upon as a violation of the Articles of the Capitulation and greatly irritate the Inhabitants against us."[63] Yet inventories of the goods that soldiers appropriated from churches and convents reveal that such orders were ignored. The Council's aims of nurturing friendly relations with the Indians fundamentally contradicted the private objectives of the fighting men enlisted in their service who strove to seize prizes and enrich themselves. The "Inventory of Treasure and Other Articles in the Padres House or Convent of Tagey Taken By Captains Backhouse, Mure, and Lieutenant Lloyd" compiled in December 1763 demonstrates that British officers regarded the contents of religious buildings as fair spoils of war.[64] This list suggests that the invaders stole all of the silver and gold that they could find from this Augustinian Convent. In addition to large sums of money (a total of 931 dollars and four

[61] Ibid., 17.
[62] Ibid., 138.
[63] Ibid., 11.
[64] Ibid., 3.

reals) and "thirteen small bits of gold coin", the invaders stole "one pair of shoe and knee buckles", as well as finger rings and rosary beads. They also removed objects used in the celebration of the Catholic mass, including "two silver crosses", "two chalices", and "a small bell".

The sacking of a church in the pueblo of Guadalupe provides insight into the religiosity of many indigenous people in the occupied Philippines, and the extent to which the British sacking of their churches impacted upon this community. After Captain Backhouse and his men appropriated "One Malay virgin and black Jesus" from the Augustinian Convent at the Guadalupe, the Manila Council insisted that this icon be given back.[65] This devotional image must have been revered by the local community, as Backhouse reported that the people of Guadalupe welcomed its return with an elaborate celebration. He wrote that "In the Evening of the 28th [of March]… the Virgin Mary of Guadeloupe was carried away in great state and procession, she was accompanied by a thousand people at least in canoes and boats finely decorated". Backhouse himself "accompanied our Holy Mother till I saw her safe Lodged in the Church without Arms or attendance"; he was confident that the ceremonial return of the virgin "had good effect, & numbers of the Malays men women came to Pasig the same night to return thanks for the Honor I had done and the Confidence I had placed in them."[66]

Churches and convents were not the only buildings to be pillaged and destroyed by the invaders. The British also stole and damaged the private property that belonged to Indigenous families and communities, which may have also motivated to support Anda's army. The Manila Consultations show that British forces frequently stole cattle from Indian villages.[67] Furthermore, the British pursued something of a scorched earth policy in the smaller towns and agricultural region surrounding Manila, burning villages to the ground to eliminate places where the enemy could hide or congregate. Even those villagers who pledged allegiance to the British were not protected from such attacks.

---

[65] Ibid., 3-4.
[66] Ibid., 77-78.
[67] Ibid., 134.

Captain Backhouse complained to the Council of Manila when the village of Guadeloupe was pillaged and burned, despite the fact that its inhabitants had "acknowledged themselves subjects to the King of Great Britain" and presented no threat to the British occupation. Backhouse pointed out that the villagers were unarmed, and their "Bamboo Houses… are no Places of defense and of course cannot be any ways detrimental to" the British invasion.[68] As Backhouse quite poetically observed, "War in her mildest dress is too severe where the innocent fall in her way". The Manila Consultations suggest that British violence against Indians was the norm, rather than an anomaly, in 1762-1764. Surely this contributed to the willingness of Indians to cooperate with the Spanish to defeat the British.

Indian Conquistadors

Comprehending the response of Indians to the British occupation requires recognizing that Indians were not a homogenous group in the Philippines. Distinguishing groups of loyal Indians enhances our understanding of their fidelity to Spain under the pressure of occupation. It was the Pampangans who proved to be the Spanish empire's staunchest allies during the British occupation of Manila. In 1762 Anda elected to establish is government in exile at the Pampangan pueblo of Bulacan because of its people's loyalty to the Spanish crown.[69] In 1765 the King of Spain issued a Real Cédula that acknowledged the "outstanding services of the Indians of the Pampanga Province" during the British invasion of Manila.[70] It emphasized the decisive role three Pampangans had played in military confrontations with the British "while all the officers of the Plaza, the Regiment of Infantry, and the Principal Artillery unit were left prisoners of war." In recognition of "the valor with which they confronted the enemy, and the gusto with which not a few of them scarified their lives", the Real Cédula granted village status and a coat of arms to the pueblo of Bacolor, thirty-five miles north of Manila, and made this town the capital of the province of Pampanga.

---

[68] Ibid., 162-163.
[69] AGI, Filipinas,388,N.51.
[70] AGI, Filipinas,335,L.17.

The Pampangans not only mobilized against the British in 1762-1764. During this period they also supported the Spanish crown to put down the large Indigenous uprisings that emerged in other Provinces after Manila had fallen. While these rebellions will be discussed in more depth below, it is noteworthy that the Pampangan soldier Miguel Bicus killed David Silang, the leader of the Indigenous rebellion in the Ilocos Province. Subsequently the King of Spain decreed that Bicus and his sons would be free from the obligation of tribute. The rewards that the monarch granted to his loyal vassals in the aftermath of the British occupation of the Manila brings to light the networks of patronage that made the Spanish Empire in the Philippines resilient while under attack. However, if we dig deeper into the historical record before 1762, we see that the Spanish-Pampangan alliance was long-standing arrangement.[71]

The Pamangan-Spanish alliance dates back to at least 1594 when the Pampangans helped the Spanish to defend Manila from the attack of the Chinese pirate Limahong.[72].[73] Pampangans consolidated their status as Indian Conquistadors in the late seventeenth century. In the 1680s, Pampangans were deployed alongside soldiers from the Iberian peninsular and New Spain in the formal 'reduction' of the Marianas, and particularly Guam, the largest island in this group. Many of the Pampangans who accompanied Spanish forces to this chain of volcanic islands on the galleon route between Manila and New Spain were accompanied by their families, as Pampangans were intended to be model Indians that newly colonized religious people were supposed to mimic.[74]

---

[71] AGI Filipinas,335,L.17. Much 20th century Filipino historiography has identified Miguel Bicus or Vicus as a Spanihs mestizo; Anda's letter and the Real Cédula clearly identify him as an indio. See Eufronio Melo Alio, *Political and Cultural History of the Philippines* (1964), 22,25; Another Real Cédula relieved from the payment of tribute for the rest of their lives the field master (Maestro de campo) Pedro Bicbic and his sons, as a reward for their "contributions to the subjugation of the rebels in the province of Pangasinan."

[72] Larkin, *The Pampangans; Colonial Society In A Philippine Province* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1972).22-23.

[73] John Leddy Phelan, *The Hispanization of the Philippines*, 146.

[74] Francis Hezel and Marjorie C. Driver, "From Conquest to Colonization: Spain in the Mariana Islands 1690-1740", *Journal of Pacific History* 23, no.2 (1988)141; AGI, Filipinas,349,L.6. The Crown recognized the loyalty of Pampangan conquistadors in the Marianas. When Andrés de la Cruz, an Indio Principal of the Pampanga nation, died a noble death in the Marianas fighting infidels in the service of his Majesty, a Real Cédula freed de la Cruz's three surviving orphans, Don Ynacio Pagtacotan, Don Julian and Don Juan de la Cruz from the payment of tribute, tributary labor obligations, and other forms of personal servitude. The

In the first half of the eighteenth century Pampangans also collaborated with the Spanish to suppress indigenous uprisings that periodically broke out closer to Manila. For example, in 1721, The Archbishop of Manila and interim governor of Manila Francisco de la Cuesta informed the Council of the Indies that Pampangan soldiers were deployed alongside Spanish troops to put down uprisings in four Indian pueblos.[75] By 1739 Pampangan soldiers were fully integrated into the Pacific presidio network. At some Presidios, Pampangans accounted for fifty per cent or more of all soldiers deployed there; the Cuyo Fort in the Calamianes islands, which served to defend against the attacks of Islamic Moro pirates, as well as the fort of San Francisco Javier in Yligan, were manned entirely by Pampangans.[76] It is true that the Philippines was chronically lacking in soldiers from Spain and New Spain throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Nonetheless, these statistics demonstrate that military leaders placed a great deal of faith in their Indian allies, entrusting them with forts and cannons; the core components of Spain's system of imperial defense in the archipelago.

What was the foundation of this longstanding alliance between the Pampangans and the Spanish? John Leddy Phelan has argued that in the seventeenth century, this coalition was a rational response to the geopolitical environment the Pampangans and Spanish inhabited; the Pampangans benefited from the protection Spaniards provided against the "fierce sambals who periodically terrorized the fertile valley" in the first half of the seventeenth century."[77] While not ruling out the strategic military benefits of this

---

orphans were also awarded the insignia of a medal of silver above gold adorned with effigies of the Queen Doña Maria Luisa.

75 AGI, Filipinas,133,N.11

76 Fish, *When Britain Ruled the Philippines*, 93-96. Valdes Tamon's 1739 report on the state of Spanish fortification in the Philippines is perhaps the most important evidence of a strong alliance between the Pampangans and the Spanish prior to the British occupation of Manila. Valdes' report reveals that hundreds of Pampangans were employed as soldiers in the Pacific presidio network. In some locations Pampangans accounted for fifty per cent or more of all soldiers deployed there. For example, Pampangans represented half of the eighteen men posted at the Fort of Santiago in Yutagud, and seven of the eleven soldiers posted at the Fortress of San Pablo, both situated in the northern Cagayan province. Tamon's report also revealed that the Fort of Cuyo in the Calamianes islands, which served to defend against the attacks of Islamic moro pirates, as well as the fort of San Francisco Javier in Yligan, were manned entirely by Pampangans.

77 Phelan, *The Hispanization of the Philippines*.

alliance, I suggest that the Pampangan-Spanish alliance was also based on a common Catholic faith. The Pampangans were the among the first Indigenous converts to Catholicism in the Philippines. In the eighteenth century Pampangans trained as priests in the Seminary of St Clement. In 1903 Pampanga had more churches than any other province in the Philippines.[78] The reduction of the Marianas was a spiritual as much as a military conquest, and it is probable that the Indian conquistadors who participated in this campaign were inspired by a religious mission to convert pagans to Catholicism.[79] It is possible that the Pampangans who fought in Anda's rebel army were convinced of the merits of the mission to eradicate Protestants from their homeland.

The role that the Pampangans played as Indian Conquistadores was not unusual in the Spanish Empire, although it has not been widely recognized in histories of the British Occupation of Manila or histories of the Spanish Empire. Recent studies of Indian Conquistadors have drawn our attention to the role that Spain's indigenous allies played in the conquest of the New World. Reflecting trends in the historiography of the Spanish Empire more broadly, this scholarship has so far focused on the conquest of the viceroyalty of New Spain and Central America in the sixteenth and early seventeen centuries. The Philippines have not been completely excluded from these studies; Yanna Yannakakis, as well as Michel Oudika and Matthew Restall, have shown that Tlaxcalans travelled to the Philippines as soldiers and model Indians in the early seventeenth century.[80] The role of Indian allies indigenous to the Philippines playing the role of Indian conquistadors has previously been excluded from this literature.

---

[78] Larkin, *The Pampangans*, 13, 58-59.
[79] Hezel and Driver, *From Conquest to Colonization*.
[80] Yanna Yannakakis, *The Art of Being In-Between* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008), 201; Michael R. Oudika and Matthew Restall, "Mesoamerican conquistadors in the sixteenth century" in *Indian Conquistadors: Indigenous Allies in the Conquest of Mesoamerica*, edited by Laura E. Matthew and Michel Roudick (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007) 37.

PART TWO: DISOBEDIENCE

Disloyal Indians

The Manila Council believed that Indigenous people were throwing off "the Spanish yoke" when two large-scale Indian rebellions broke out in the island of Luzon in late 1762. Diego Silang led an armed uprising in the Ilocos province in the northwest of Luzon. Juan de la Cruz Palaris headed the revolt in Pangasinan province, situated immediately south of Ilocos. These rebellions were not minority movements. Thousands of indigenous people mobilized behind Silang and Palaris between 1762 and 1764.

These rebellions were fundamentally anti-colonial in character. Fernando Palanco has demonstrated that, from the outset, the Silang rebellion primarily aimed to free Ilocanos from tribute and personal service. These were the first demands Silang asserted when he appeared on 14 December 1762 with a mob of 2000 armed Indians at the residence of the Spanish Alcalde in Vigan, the capital of the Ilocos Province. Silang and his supporters also demanded the removal of the Alcalde from office.[81] In attacking tribute and forced labor, those who rose up in rebellion were attacking the very foundation of the relationship between the Spanish Crown and indigenous imperial subjects in the Philippines. They also rejected the authority of the Alcalde who represented the power of the Governor of the Philippines in his jurisdiction.

David Routledge has shown that the Silang rebellion was also committed to removing the existing *Principalia* or class of ruling indigenous and mestizo elites in Ilocos from power. Routledge argues that this was part of the rebellion's anti-colonial agenda. Silang's attack on the Principalia constituted an attack on the Spanish colonial regime in the Philippines, as the hierarchical organization of the Republic of Indians in was an integral part the colonial social order.[82] This Indigenous ruling class facilitated the exploitation of Indians; the responsibilities of hereditary and Spanish-appointed

---

[81] Fernando Palanco, "Diego Silang's Revolt: A New Approach", *Philippine Studies* Vol. 50, No. 4 (2002), 512-537.

[82] David Routledge, *Diego Silang and the Origins of Philippine Nationalism* (Quezon City: Philippine Center for Advanced Studies, University of the Philippines System, 1979).

community and city leaders included collecting tribute from Indians, which they and their sons were not obliged to pay, and organizing gangs of Indians to undertake forced labor when this was requested by the Crown, from which the *Principalia* were also exempt. In contesting the legitimacy and authority of this group, the Silang rebellions contested the structure of Spanish colonialism in the Philippines.[83]

The Palaris rebellion began in the town of Binalatongan pueblo in the Pangasinan province also in late 1762 when the Indians resident here refused to pay the annual tribute and demanded earlier tribute payments be reimbursed. Local priests initially agreed that they payment of tribute could be suspended while the British occupied Manila, however the leader of the rebellion Palaris then demanded that all Spaniards abandon the Province, including Spanish priests. Most missionaries were subsequently forced to flee the province after the rebels set fire to churches and convents.[84] The objective of ridding Pangasinan of all Spaniards and the clergy renders this uprising explicitly anti-colonial. From Binlatongan the Palaris rebellion spread to many pueblos and cities in Pangasinan. At its peak in December 1763, a mob of 10,000 Indians assembled in San Carlos and insisted their demands be met. The mob set fire to the Dominican church and convent here, underscoring the anti-clergy agenda of the rebellion.[85]

What role did the British play in these rebellions? Diego Silang manipulated inter-imperial rivalries to further the interests of the Ilocanos he represented. In 1763 Silang wrote to Anda, declaring that his objective of removing the corrupt Principalia from power did not undermine his loyalty to the crown, and his commitment to defeat the

---

[83] In the mid-eighteenth century every Indian was required to belong to a barangay; a political unit which consisted of an average of thirty families, and headed by a hereditary leader known as a *cabeza de barangay*. There were 6000 barangays in the Philippines in 1768. Multiple barangays came to together in pueblos ruled by *gobernadorcillos* – which literally translates to "little governors". John Leddy Phelan has suggested that Indians exerted significant influence on the election of *gobernadorcillos* even though these were formally appointed by Spaniards. *Cabezas de barangay* and *gobernadorcillos* formed the *Principalia* or indigenous ruling class, FN Phelan; The *Principalia* also incorproated other elite Indians exempted from tribute, such as the cantores who sang in church services across the archipelago. D.R.M. Irving, Colonial Counterpoint: Music in Early-Modern Manila (Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 35.

[84] Arcilla, "The Pangasinan Uprising, 1762-1765," *Philippines Historical Review*, no. 4 (1971): 38.

[85] Ibid., 41.

British.[86] He simultaneously pursued an alliance with the British Manila Council.[87] In May 1763 Silang wrote to a letter to the invaders in which he recognized King George III "as my king and master" on the premise that Illocanos would be released from tribute, and allowed to continue to practice their religion. Silang was a shrewd negotiator. His letter to the Manila Council was accompanied by a gift of "twelve loaves of sugar, twelve baskets of Calamy, and 200 cakes or balls of Chocolate", which demonstrated the genuineness of the rebel's promises and the tangible benefits that would accrue to the British from an Illocano alliance.[88] Silang pointed out that "paddy, wheat, cattle, good coco, wine, sugar, onions, garlic, fowl, horses, cotton, [and] a kind of liquor called bassia…and other useful effects" were plentiful in his province, inferring these could be traded for weapons and manpower.

It is significant that Silang's negotiation strategy included flattering the British notion of empire by invitation. He sang the song the invaders wanted to hear about the "poor Indians…. who continually suffer from the Spaniards' Damages, losses and affronts."[89] This reveals that the British discourse of the black legend was disseminated throughout the Philippines during the occupation of Manila, and readily appropriated by indigenous peoples to further their own ends.

The British promptly accepted Silang's offer. This delivered allies in the north of the country, much needed victuals, as well as the possibility of raiding Augustinian convents in Illocos. Soon after receiving Silang's letter and gift, the Manila Council dispatched a detachment of twenty Europeans and thirty Seapoys with arms and ammunition to Illocos under the command of lieutenant Russell to support Silang against Anda's troops who had been mobilized to put down the rebellion.[90]

There is no evidence that the Palaris or other leaders of the Pangasinan rebellion ever reached out to the British as Silang did, although the British certainly attempted to

---

[86] Routledge, *Diego Silang*, 21.
[87] *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol. 5,* 102.
[88] "Paddy" refers to rough or unhusked rice, 'Calamy' most likely refers to an aromatic plant.
[89] *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol. 5,* 102.
[90] Ibid.

forge an alliance with the Pangasinans. When the Manila Council "received advice that the Province of Pangasinan had revolted from Senor Anda" in March 1763, it promptly resolved to dispatch

> a letter to the Governor and Chiefs of the province, offering them our Friendship and Protection, promising to assist them as much as in our Power and to secure them the free exercise of their religion with an open commerce.[91]

In the absence of a response, another letter was issued to Pangasinan leaders in May 1763. The British proposed,

> If you will continue to oppose these evil Designs of the *Malecontents* we will enter into an Alliance with you and when our ships which are shortly expected arrive we will send you such an assistance as with toops of your Province and IIIocos will enable us (with Gods Blessing) to crush Mr. Anda and his faction. You shall enjoy every liberty you can hope or expect.[92]

We do not know if any leaders of the uprising in Pangasinan ever received this correspondence. If the disloyal Indians did receive petitions from the English, it seems they chose to ignore them. The thousands of tributaries who rose up against the Spanish in Pangasianan were not desirous of liberation by the British.

It may come as no surprise to readers that the regular clergy did not support these anti-colonial rebellions. But what is important is that the clergy played a decisive role in their suppression. Silang remarked that the Augustinians "have pursued us as if we were wild boars, [and] neither has our submission, nor laying down our arms and crying for mercy availed us in the least for a further security."[93] When the Pampangan Pedro Becbec slay Silang sometime in early June of 1763, he did so with the blessing of the Bishop Fray Bernado de Ustáriz. After the rebellion in Illocos did not end with Silang's death, the Augustinians raised an army of Indigenous soldiers estimated to have been between 8000 and 9000 strong that continued to engage in battles and skirmishes against the rebels led by Gabriela Estrada, Silang's widow. The rebellion was finally put down

---

[91] Ibid., 76.

[92] Ibid., 133.

[93] *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol. 5*, 97-99, 102; Routledge, *Diego Silang* 128-129; Recognizing the friars as enemies, Silang and his followers rounded up the Augustinians from Vigan, the provincial capital of Ilocos, and held them in a convent at the more remote pueblo of Narvacan. Silang suggested to the British that they take the Augustinians to Manila as prisoners.

when Estrada was captured and hanged alongside more than ninety rebels in late September 1763.[94]

Similarly the Dominicans were crucial in putting down the Palaris uprising. In February 1763, Fray Pedro Ire attempted to mediate a general pardon of the Pangasinan rebels on Anda's behalf. He urged the Pangasinans to be obedient and loyal to royal authority, because "God commands it".[95] Fray Andrés Meléndez, the priest at Lingayen, the capital of Pangasinan, refused to minister to his parish until they agreed to accept a Spanish Alcalde and put an end to their support for Palaris. The Dominicans also took it upon themselves to gather 4000 pledges from Indians in Pangasinan to fight with Anda's forces against the rebels once the former entered the province.[96] The Dominicans contributed to the erosion of support for Palaris' rebellion which effectively ended in early 1764, long before Palaris was finally captured and executed in 1765.

It is tempting to read the Silang and Palaris rebellion as symptoms of a weakened Spanish empire, and the tenuous grip that Spain held over its Pacific poessions. These rebellions were undoubtedly anti-colonial in their objectives. Yet an appreciation of the way in which the regular clergy and flocks of loyal Indians organized to suffocate these challenges to Spanish rule ultimately demonstrated the strength and durability of this institution.

Throwing off the Spanish Yoke

If there was one person who truly welcomed the British into Manila as liberators it was the Sultan of Sulu and Sabah A'zim-ud-Din, who exemplified the perfect victim of cruel, Spanish imperialism that informed the British invasion and occupation of Manila. The Sultan and his son Mohammed Israel were being held prisoners of the Spanish in Manila when the city fell to the British, and they eagerly welcomed the British as

---

[94] Palanco, "Diego Silang's Revolt", 529-532.

[95] Arcilla, "The Pangasinan Uprising, 1762-1765", 47.

[96] Arcilla, "The Pangasinan Uprising, 1762-1765", 38-39; M. R. P. Fr Joaquin Fonseca, *Historia de los PP. Dominicos En Las Islas Filipinas Y En Sus Misiones Del Japon, China, Tung-kin Y Formosa* (Madrid: Orden Del M. R. P. Provincial, 1871) 675.

liberators. The British Naval Officer Alexander Dalrymple declared that these men, "tired of Spanish Control, threw of their yoke, and put themselves under our Protection."[97]

Friendly relations between the Sultan and the British had been in the making for some time before the occupation began. While in captivity in Manila, the Sultan managed to maintain correspondence with the Sulu Sultanate and British agents. In November 1761 the Sultan even signed a trade treaty with his brother, the Sultan Bantilan, and the East India Company.

During the British occupation of Manila, A'zim-ud-Din and his son entered into a mutual defence and trade treaty with the East India Company. The treaty granted the Company the right to "erect Forts or Factories" in Jolo, the capital of the Sulu province, and its dependent territories.[98] The Company soon escorted the Sultan and Mohammed Israel to Jolo as they had requested. To kick-start a healthy trading relationship between the two parties, the Company also "advanced to Prince Israel the sum of 1,000 Dollars" that he was to repay "in the goods of his Country". Although it falls outside of the parameters of this study, it is noteworthy that the Sultan's relationship with the British continued through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[99]

The Chinese

What role did the Chinese play in the British occupation of Manila? In the aftermath of the occupation, all Chinese were condemned for collaborating with the British. In June 1764 Simon de Anda wrote a letter to King Charles III that accused the

---

[97] *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol*. 6, 79.

[98] *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol.6*, 71-72.

[99] Tarling, *Sulu and Sabah,* 12-18; Warren, *The Sulu Zone*. The story of A'zim-ud-Din is an intriguing one. In 1749 he converted to Catholicism and adopted a Christian name and title; "Fernado I, Rey Cristiano de Jolo". The Sultan King then moved with this heir to Manila to escape the threat of a violent coup in Jolo, the capital of the Sulu province. A'zim-ud-Din had hoped to negotiate an alliance with the Spanish and use their support to secure his claim to the throne. The Audiencia of Manila initially welcomed this powerful convert to Catholicism and ally into the colonial capital, and promised to use the colony's resources to restore Fernando to his rightful throne. Yet in 1754 colonial authorities intercepted a letter that Fernando had written to the Sultan of Mindanao, accused the pair of being traitors and imprisoned both of them in Manila.

Chinese of being traitors as well as godless heathens, and recommended that all Chinese be expelled from the Philippines. The King accepted Anda's advice and decreed the expulsion of the Chinese on 17 April 1766. It took until June the following year for the decree to arrive in Manila. In addition to the 3000 or more Chinese who fled Manila before expulsion was officially decreed, 2460 Chinese were forcibly removed from the Philippines between 1767 and 1772.[100]

Informed by Anda's analysis of the events of 1762-1764, the Anglo and Spanish historiographies of the British occupation of Manila have argued that the Chinese eagerly supported the British invasion from its earliest stages until the last ship sailing a union jack sailed out of the Bay of Cavite. The 'Chinese as traitors' narrative was consolidated in these historiographical traditions by the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Augustinian priest and historian Joaquín Martínez de Zúñiga wrote in his 1803 *Historia De Las Islas Philipinas* that "from the moment [the British] took possession of Manila, these Chinese gave them every aid and accompanied them in all their expeditions."[101] Fish uncritically reproduced Zúñiga's analysis of the role of the Chinese in the British occupation of Manila in her 2003 study of this event.[102] The reality was far more complex than this.

To be sure, there were many Chinese who aided the British in significant ways. The Manila Consultations leave no doubt that large numbers of Chinese collaborated with the British Navy and the East India Company. Letters from British Army captains indicate that Chinese soldiers were quickly integrated into the multi-ethnic units mobilized to fight against Anda's rebel army. In April 1763 the British Captain Richard Bishop reported that he employed fifty armed Chinese as sentinels in the fort of Cavite.[103] Between 1500 and 2000 Chinese joined the estimated 400 European and 300 "black

---

[100] Salvador P. Escoto "Expulsion of the Chinese and Readmission to the Philippines: 1764-1779", *Philippine Studies* 47, no. 1 (1999): 49, 64.
[101] Joaquín Martínez de Zúñiga, *An Historical View of the Philippine Islands,* trans. John Maver Esq, (London: Black, Parry and Co, 1814) (originally published 1803), 655-668.
[102] Fish, *When Britain Ruled the Philippines,* 160.
[103] *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol. 5,* 79.

Malabar" soldiers who attacked Anda's army at Bulucan.[104] In addition to serving as soldiers, Chinese aided the British as local guides and spies. Expert mariners made it possible for the invaders to navigate the rivers, estuaries and coastline of the Philippines; Captain Backhouse had a Chinese pilot "who behaved like an angel."[105] Chinese guides also helped the invaders traverse overland routes. Agustín Maria de Castro claimed that the spies who assisted the British army to discover Anda's outpost at Bulucan "were all Chinese or mestizos, traitors to the motherland.[106]

Not only did some Chinese serve as important facilitators for the invasion, several non-Chinese helped the invaders' cause by serving as go-betweens for the Chinese and British. Despite the importance of these intermediaries, they have been overlooked in the existing historiography. Diego or James O'Kennedy was the most prominent of these intermediaries.

Originally from Ireland, Diego O'Kennedy had been in Manila since at least 1756.[107] By 1761 the foreigner married Doña Maria Cayetana Esguerra, the daughter of an elite and land-rich Manileño family.[108] But neither his Catholic faith nor family ties assured O'Kennedy's loyalty to Spain. O'Kennedy was one of the first people to declare himself a "obedient humble servant" of the British Manila Council. The Manila Consultations reveal that the Irishman strongly influenced the British decision to incorporate the Chinese into their forces. He persuaded the British that "Chinese instead of Malays [should] be raised into a Troop", arguing that the Chinese were the "properest

---

104 Salvador P. Escoto, "Expulsion of the Chinese", 60. Witnesses testified that 1500 Chinese has attacked Anda's army at Bulucan During the Audiencia of Manila's 1769 investigation into the actions of the Chinese during the British occupation of Manila; Castro y Amuedo "Relación sucinta". In his 1770 account of the British occupation of Manila, the Augustinian missionary Agustín Maria de Castro y Amuedo recorded that "2000 rebel Chinese" participated in this attack on the side of the British.

105 *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol. 5*, 62.

106 Castro y Amuedo "Relación sucinta", *Documentos*, 67.

107 José Torbio Medina, *El Tribunal del Santo Oficio de la Inquisición en las islas Filipinas*, 155. In 1756 O'Kennedy and fellow Irishmen Don Eduado Wogat were called before a comissario of the Spanish Inquisition in the Philippines on suspicion of being freemasons The Dominican Priest and comisario of the Holy Office in the Philippines Fray Antonio Calonge absolved O'Kennedy and Wogat "ad cautelam" for the "good, Christian and catholic disposition that he found in these men".

108 United States Philippine Commission. *Report of the Philippine Commission, Part 1* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1995), 814.

people to be trusted", where as it was likely that the "Malays or Mestezes… may go to the enemy with horse and arms."[109]

The Parián had traditionally had a degree of autonomy from the Spanish colonial Government in Manila. When the British arrived they discovered that this Chinese community had its own Governor, mayors, guards, and other ministers and officials who traditionally oversaw the day-to-day running of the neighborhood. These political leaders also traditionally managed relationships between the Chinese and the Spanish colonial government, including the collection and payment of the tribute or head tax that Manila's Chinese residents were obliged to pay.[110] O'Kennedy evidently had working relationships with leaders of the Parián and understood how this Chinese community was organized. The Irishman's knowledge and networks enabled him to negotiate with the Chinese on behalf of the British, facilitating the contracting of Chinese soldiers and other workers required to undertake the labor of occupation.

O'Kennedy also organized for the Manila Council to purchase a range of goods from Chinese suppliers, including dried fish and sugar.[111] The Manila Consultations indicate that O'Kennedy was paid 1077 silver dollars in December 1763 "for victualing the Spanish prisoners, and sundry other accounts."[112] It seems likely that O'Kennedy's motivations for aiding the British were fundamentally economic. The Irishman was a businessman who made large profits from the British occupation of Manila. O'Kennedy was never punished for his disloyalty as he fled the city at the end of the British occupation.

It is surprising that historians have been reluctant to acknowledge the presence of foreigners like Diego O'Kennedy in Manila. The unlikely Irishman played an important role in sustaining the British occupation. The presence of O'Kennedy and others like him compromised the integrity of Spanish Empire under the weight of invasion. In the past decade historians have embraced the notion of the early-modern Atlantic World as an

---

[109] *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol. 5*, 127-128.
[110] Juan Gil, *Los Chinos en Manila, 249-256*.
[111] *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol. 5*, 81; *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol 6*, 96.
[112] *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol.5,* 244.

especially fluid space were people, including subaltern subjects, moved between porous imperial boundaries with unexpected ease. The Irishman's presence in Manila challenges us to consider the extent to which mobility extended beyond the Atlantic into the Pacific.[113]

The willingness of so many Chinese to cooperate with the British attests to the inability of missionaries to cement devotion in a population that did not in large numbers buy into the evangelical Catholic project of the Dominicans who oversaw the attempted conversion of this community. In addition to their disloyalty to the King of Spain, the main reason that the Chinese were expelled from Manila after 1766 was their collective crime of apostacy - their abandonment or renunciation of their Catholic faith. Chinese treason affirmed for the Council of the Indies that those Chinese who had sought baptism in the Philippines were false converts who ostensibly changed their religion to avoid earlier expulsions, and to enjoy ten years free from the obligation of tribute, a privilege applied to all New Christians in the Philippines.[114]

Despite the important role that many Chinese—and intermediaries such as O'Kennedy—played in facilitating the British occupation of Manila, the Chinese were by no means all enemies of the Spanish. Although Simon de Anda later championed the expulsion of the Chinese from the Philippines, throughout 1763 he refused to take their disloyalty to Spain as a given, even after the fall of Bulucan. In May 1763 public notices signed by Anda in both Castilian and Chinese appeared in the neighbourhood of Santa Cruz. These granted in the name if the Spanish King "a general pardon… for the lives of all such Chinese as still remain and had sided with the English", on the condition that

---

[113] In the late 1980s Marcus Rediker gave rise to the notion of a Atlantic World as an especially fluid space. Kit Candlin's recent work attests to the persistence of this idea. Kit Candlin, *The Last Caribbean Frontier, 1795-1815* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire : Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Marcus Rediker, *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

[114] "When [Governor] Arandia finally expelled all infidel Chinese [in 1751], more than 1,100 asked for baptism". Escoto, "A Supplement to the Expulsion of the Chinese from the Philippines: 1764-1779," *Philippine Studies*, Vol. 48, no. 2 (2000): 209.

they registered their presence, and refrained from taking up arms against Spaniards or assisting the invaders in any other way.[115]

The Manila Consultations reveal that several Chinese and Chinese mestizos were active allies of Anda. British assumptions of Chinese disloyalty to the Spanish Crown enabled them to be effective double-agents for the Governor-in-exile. By mid-1763 British captains began to realise that the "Chinese are employed as spies."[116] In July Captain Backhouse captured the "Chinese mestizo" Juan de la Cruz in possession of an incriminating commission signed by Don Josef Pedro del Busto, a prominent general in Simon de Anda's army, and "list of soldiers… locked in his chest". De la Cruz had allegedly escorted to a village just outside of Manila a group of of ten or twelve Chinese who all had commissions from Anda "to act as Spies upon all occasions." Cruz's cooperation with the Spaniards cost him his life. Backhouse insisted on "hanging this Villain, and every other Commissary that I can catch" in order to discourage other Chinese from working to undermine the British occupation of Manila.

Of course Manila's Chinese population did not have to choose between supporting the Spanish or supporting the British during the occupation. Many Chinese attempted to take advantage of this situation without necessarily supporting either European power. This is revealed by the fact that the tradition of Chinese doctoring specie throughout the long history of Spanish colonial rule in the Philippines continued during the occupation.[117] In December 1763 Captain Backhouse complained that the "greatest part of the small Spanish currency, double, single and half reals, is secreted and hoarded up in the Parian."[118] The Chinese were making significant profits from exchanging Spanish silver coins for Rupees at exchange rates the Captain deemed unfair. Backhouse also accused the Chinese of manufacturing "bad barillas, rupees or dollars"

---

115 *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol. 5*, 131-132.
116 Ibid., 152.
117 Antonio García-Abásolo, "La Audiencia de Manila y los Chinos de Filipinas. Casos de Integracion en el Delito," in *Homenaje a Alberto de la Hera,* eds. José Luis Soberanes Fernández and Rosa Mariá Martínez de Codes (México, UNAM, Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas, 2008) 339-368.
118 *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol. 5*, 232.

which they passed on to soldiers and servants, but "refused to take again the moment after issued from their hands. This truth is very notorious."[119]

The British had in error assumed that the Chinese were exploited by the Spaniards and awaiting emancipation, like the Sultan of Sulu and his son. An inability to trust the Chinese in Manila ultimately led the British to enforce a policy of Chinese segregation, as various Spanish colonial governments had done in the past.[120] On 20 December 1763 the Manila Council "signed a proclamation ordering all the inhabitants of Santa Cruz", most of whom were Chinese and Chinese mestizos, to relocate to the Parián where they could be placed under surveillance.[121]

[119] Ibid.
[120] Santamaria, The Chinese Parian, 67-118.
[121] *The Manhila Consultations 1763 Vol. 5*, 232.

CONCLUSION

The British occupation of Manila in 1762-1764 was undoubtedly a crisis for Spanish colonial rule in the Philippines. The British Royal Navy and East India Company abruptly ended 191 years of unbroken Spanish control of the Manila when their combined force captured the city in late 1762. It is tempting to read the subsequent British occupation of Manila as indicative of Spain's weak grasp on its distant Pacific possessions as many historians have done. As this paper showed, Spain's temporary loss of Manila created an unprecedented opportunity for a range of imperial subjects in the Philippines to contest Spanish authority. Soldiers deserted from Spanish ranks, merchants in Manila collaborated with the invaders, and thousands of Indigenous peasants rose up in rebellion in the provinces north of Manila, demanding the abolition of the tribute system, and in Pangasinan, the expulsion of all Spaniards, including Spanish priests, from their lands.

Yet despite these waves of disobedience, this paper has shown that if we probe beneath the surface of the past, the Spanish empire in the Philippines was remarkably strong under the pressures imposed by the British invasion and occupation of Manila. By placing the rebel army of Simón de Anda under the metaphorical microscope for the first time, I have revealed that those subjects who historians assumed were fundamentally opposed to Spanish colonial rule, and willing to "throw off the Spanish yoke" when an opportunity like a foreign invasion arose, in fact mobilized en masse to support the preservation of the Spanish colonial rule in the Philippines.

The resilience of the Spanish empire in the Philippines in 1762-1764 was underscored by the willingness of thousands of indigenous people, the Pampangans in particular, to become soldiers in Anda's army. These loyal Indians united behind Anda to fight not only the British invaders, but also the rebellious Ilocanos and Pangasinans who they ultimately defeated. The fidelity of so many indigenous people to Spain during the Seven Years War testifies to the role of Catholicism as a cohesive force among

converted Indians. This is confirmed by the absence of a strong Catholic faith among the numerous Chinese who collaborated with the British forces.

Loyalty to Spain in the occupied Philippines contradicts the ideology of the Black Legend that continues to warp the Anglo historiography of the British occupation of Manila. Yet it is important to engage with and historicize this myth rather than erasing it from our interpretations of the past. I have demonstrated that the Black Legend is not merely an invention of historians; this myth profoundly influenced the strategies of invasion and occupation that the British Royal Navy and East India Company put into action by in the Philippines. Ultimately, the Black Legend blinded the British to the complexities of the real balance of power in the Pacific theatre of the Seven Years War.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Archives Consulted

Archivo General de Indias, Spain (AGI)

Printed Primary Sources

Anon. "Documents For The History Of The Invasion And War With The English In Filipinas, 1762-1764" in *The Philippine Islands* Vol 49, edited by Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, 132-175. Cleveland, Ohio: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1908.

Victoria, Fr. José and Fr. Manuel Rebollo. "Documento Inédito." In *Documentos Indispensables Para La Verdadera Historica de Filipinas: 1762-1763*, edited by P. Eduardo Navarro, 11-45. Madrid: Imprenta del Asilo del Huérfanos, 1908.

Castro y Amuedo, Agustín Maria. "Relación Sucinta, Clara Y Veridica De La Toma De Manila Por La Escuadra Inglesa, Escrita Por El P. Fr. Agustín Maria De Castro Y Amuedo, Natural De Villa De Bañeza, Agustino Calzado. Año De 1770." In *Documentos Indispensables Para La Verdadera Historica de Filipinas: 1762-1763*, edited by P. Eduardo Navarro, 46-92. Madrid: Imprenta del Asilo del Huérfanos, 1908.

Records of Fort St. George. *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol 5*. Madras: Superintendent, Government Press, 1940).

_____. *Manilha Consultations, 1763 Vol 6*. Madras: Superintendent, Government Press, 1940).

Victoria, Fr. José and Fr. Manuel Rebollo. "Documento Inédito", In *Documentos Indispensables Para La Verdadera Historica de Filipinas: 1762-1763*, edited by P. Eduardo Navarro, 11-45. Madrid: Imprenta del Asilo del Huérfanos, 1908.

Secondary Sources

Alio, Eufronio Melo. *Political and Cultural History of the Philippines*. Manila: Alip & Brion Publications 1964.

Anderson, Fred. *Crucible of War: The Seven Years War and the Empire in British North America, 1754-1766*. New York: Vintage Books, 2001.

Arcilla, J.S. "The Pangasinan Uprising, 1762-1765." *Philippines Historical Review*, no. 4 (1971): 35-52.

Baugh, Daniel. *The Global Seven Years War, 1754-1763: Britain and France in a Great Power Contest*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited, 2011.

Bhattacharya, Bhaswati. "Making Money At The Blessed Place Of Manila: Armenians in the Madras–Manila Trade in the Eighteenth Century", *Journal of Global History* 3, Issue 1 (2008): 1-20.

Candlin, Kit. *The Last Caribbean Frontier, 1795-1815*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire : Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Curtis, Isaac. "Masterless People: Maroons, Pirates and Commoners." in Stephan Palmié and Francisco A. Scarano (eds) *The Caribbean: A History Of The Region And Its Peoples*. Chicago: Univeristy of Chicago Press, 2011. 149-162.

Doeppers, Daniel F. "The Development of Philippine Cities Before 1900", *The Journal of Asian Studies* 31, no. 4, (1972): 769-792.

Eder, Marcus. *Crime and Punishment in the Royal Navy of the Seven Years War, 1755-1763*. Aldershot, Hampshire, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004.

Escoto, Salvador P. "The Administration Of Simon De Anda y Salazar, Governor-General of the Philippines, 1770-1776" PhD diss., Loyola University, 1973.

Escoto, Salvador P. "Expulsion Of The Chinese and Readmission to the Philippines: 1764-1779", *Philippine Studies*Vol. 47, no. 1 (1999): 48–76

_____. "A Supplement to the Expulsion of the Chinese from the Philippines: 1764-1779", *Philippine Studies*, Vol. 48, no. 2 (2000): 209–234

Fish, Shirley. *When Britain Ruled The Philippines 1762-1764*. Bloomington Indiana: 1st Books, 2003.

Fonseca, M. R. P. Fr Joaquin. *Historia De Los PP. Dominicos En Las Islas Filipinas Y En Sus Misiones Del Japon, China, Tung-kin Y Formosa*. Madrid: Orden Del M. R. P. Provincial, 1871.

García-Abásolo, Antonio. "La Audiencia de Manila Y Los Chinos De Filipinas. Casos de Integracion En El Delito." In *Homenaje a Alberto de la Hera*. Edited by José Luis Soberanes Fernández and Rosa Mariá Martínez de Codes, 339-368. México, UNAM, Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas, 2008.

Garcia De Los Arcos, Maria Fernanda. “Grupos Ethnicos y Clases Sociales en las Filipinas de Finales del Siglo XVIII”, *Archipel* 57 (1999): 55-71.

Gil, Juan, *Los Chinos En Manila, Siglos XVI Y XVII*. Macau: Centro Científico e Cultural de Macau, 2011.

Hezel, Francis and Marjorie C. Driver. “From Conquest To Colonization: Spain In The Mariana Islands 1690-1740.” *Journal of Pacific History* 23, no.2 (1988): 137-155.

Irving, D.R.M. *Colonial Counterpoint: Music in Early-Modern Manila*. Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

José Torbio Medina, *El Tribunal Del Santo Oficio De La Inquisición En Las Islas Filipinas*. Santiago de Chile: Imprenta Elzeviriana, 1899.

Larkin, John A. *The Pampangans; Colonial Society In A Philippine Province* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1972).

Mawson, Stephanie. “Unruly Plebeians And The Forzado System: Convict Transportation Between New Spain And The Philippines During The Seventeenth Century.” *Revista de Indias*, Forthcoming (2013).

Mehl, Eva. “The Spanish Empire And The Pacific World: Mexican 'Vagrants, Idlers, And Troublemakers' In The Philippines, 1765-1821” PhD diss., University of California, Davis, 2011. ProQuest (3482252).

Molina, Antonio. *Historia de Filipinas*. Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica del Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericana, 1984.

Montero y Vidal, José. *Historia General de Filipinas Desde El Descubrimiento de Dichas Islas Hasta Nuestro Días Tomo II*. Madrid: Centro de la Real Acadmeia de la Historia, 1894.

Oropeza Keresey, Déborah. “La Esclavitud Asiática En El Virreinato De La Nueva España, 1565-1673.” *Historia Mexicana* 61, no. 1 (2011): 5-57.

Oudijk, Michel R. and Matthew Restall. “Mesoamerican Conquistadors In The Sixteenth Century.” In *Indian Conquistadors: Indigenous Allies in the Conquest of Mesoamerica*, edited by Laura E. Matthew and Michel Roudick, 28-64. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007.

Palanco, Fernando. “Diego Silang’s Revolt: A New Approach”, *Philippine Studies* 50, no. 4 (2002): 512-537.

Phelan, John Leddy. *The Hispanization Of The Philippines: Spanish Aims and Filipino Responses, 1565-1700*. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1959.

Rafael, Vicente. C*ontracting Colonialism: Translation And Christian Conversion In Tagalog Society Under Early Spanish Rule*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Rediker, Marcus. *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Restall, Matthew. “The Decline and Fall Of The Spanish Empire.” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 64, no. 1, (2007): 183-194.

Routledge. David “The History Of The Philippine Islands In The Late Eighteenth Century: Problems and Prospects”, *Philippine Studies*, vol. 23, no. 1-2 (1975): 36–52

_____ . *Diego Silang and the Origins of Philippine Nationalism*. Quezon City: Philippine Center for Advanced Studies, University of the Philippines System, 1979.

Santamaria, O.P, “The Chinese Parian (El Parian De Los Sangleyes).” In *The Chinese In The Philippines, 1570-1770*. Edited by Alfonso Felix Jr., 67-118. Manila: the Historical Conservation Society, 1966.

Schneider, Elena Andrea. “The Occupation Of Havana: War, Trade and Slavery in Eighteenth Century Cuba.” PhD diss., Princeton University, 2011.

Scott, James C. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms Of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

_____. *Domination and the Arts Of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Scott, William Henry. *The Discovery Of The Igorots: Spanish Contacts with the Pagans of Northern Luzon*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1974.

Tarling, Nicholas. *Sulu And Sabah: A Study Of The British Policy Towards The Philippines and North Borneo from the Late Eighteenth Century*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Tracy, Nicholas. *Manila Ransomed: The British Assault on Manila in the Seven Years War*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press 1995.

United States Philippine Commission. *Report Of The Philippine Commission, Part 1*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1995.

Vila Miranda, Carlos. "Toma de Manila Por Los Ingleses En 1762," *Anuario de Estudios Atlánticos 53* (2007): 167-220.

Warren, James Francis. *The Sulu Zone, 1768-1898: The Dynamics Of External Trade, Slavery And Ethnicity In The Transformation Of A Southeast Asian Maritime State*. Singapore: NUS Press, 1981).

Yannakakis, Yanna. *The Art of Being In-Between*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.

Zúñiga, Joaquín Martínez. *An Historical View of the Philippine Islands*. Translated by John Maver Esq. London: Black, Parry and Co, 1814.