QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

1 Compare Rockefeller’s climb to financial fortune with that of Andrew Carnegie, the subject of selection 5. How had both men in their youth showed initiative and the ability to invest wisely? Do you admire them for their energy or condemn them for their ruthlessness in taking advantage of labor and destroying competition?

2 Rockefeller’s control of an industry reduced prices for fuel oil and lighting products such as kerosene. Why then did the federal government conclude that his actions were destructive? Compare Rockefeller’s business and the government’s reaction to it with the present-day court actions against Bill Gates and the claim that Microsoft unfairly destroyed competition. (See selection 31 for a portrait of Gates.)

3 Describe the economic problems that plagued Ida Tarbell’s America when she returned home from Paris. How did the young writers at McClure’s Magazine hope to solve these problems? What was Theodore Roosevelt’s opinion of their efforts?

4 How had the Standard Oil Company affected Tarbell’s life? Do you think that her personal feelings motivated her attack on Rockefeller? What did she discover about the giant oil corporation?

5 What did Rockefeller mean when he discussed “dividends of righteousness” at the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church? Why do you think that Tarbell was so anxious to see him?

6 Once Tarbell’s charges against Rockefeller’s giant oil monopoly became widely known, what did the federal government do in response? Did Rockefeller’s wealth increase or diminish as a result of Tarbell’s claims and the resultant government action? Again, reflect back to selection 5 and compare Rockefeller’s reputation with that of Carnegie when both men were in the twilight of their careers.

9 America’s First Southeast Asian War: The Philippine Insurrection

DAVID R. KOHLER AND JAMES W. WENSYEL

The last quarter of the nineteenth century marked the second age of imperialism, a time when the industrial nations of Europe—Britain, Germany, France, Belgium, and Russia—claimed colonies in Africa and spheres of influence in distant China. The United States, flexing its imperial muscles in the 1890s, was also alive with “aggressive, expansionistic, and jingoistic” sentiments. In 1893, with the help of 150 marines from a United States cruiser, American residents in Hawaii deposed the queen of the islands, set up a provisional government, and clamored for annexation. In 1898, the United States formally annexed Hawaii, thus expanding American territory and interests in the Pacific. In 1898–1899, the United States gained additional Pacific possessions in a controversial war with Spain, by then a second-rate power whose old empire in the Americas had all but disintegrated.

American expansionists, cheered on by a turbulent yellow press, did not cause the war with Spain. But American policymakers and business leaders did use it as a means to extend American economic and political power. The war itself grew out of deplorable conditions in Cuba, caused by decades of Spanish misrule. A series of Cuban revolts and Spanish atrocities, which the American press exaggerated, aroused Americans’ sympathy for the Cubans, whose cause seemed identical to that of the American patriots in 1776. In February 1898, American sentiment turned to outrage when the United States battleship Maine blew up in Havana harbor, killing 260 American sailors.
The cause of the explosion was never established, but American expansionists—among them, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Theodore Roosevelt—blamed Spain and demanded war. Overnight a slogan caught the imagination of the country: “Remember the Maine! To hell with Spain!”

In March, President William McKinley demanded that Spain agree to negotiations that would grant independence to Cuba. Faced with the possibility of a disastrous war in a distant hemisphere, Spain tried to maneuver, declaring an armistice with Cuban insurgents but hedging on Cuban independence. By then, both President McKinley and Congress were prepared for war. When Congress adopted a resolution recognizing Cuban independence, Spain retaliated by declaring war on the United States; the next day, Congress responded in kind.

Less than a week later, the American Asiatic Squadron under Commodore George Dewey won a dazzling victory in Manila Bay in the Spanish-held Philippines. As it turned out, Roosevelt had secured the command for Dewey and had directed him to prepare for action two months before official hostilities commenced. The United States also invaded Cuba, where Theodore Roosevelt gained national fame as colonel of the Rough Riders. After ten weeks of fighting, Spain capitulated, giving up control of Cuba and surrendering Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines to the United States. For Secretary of State John Hay, it had been “a splendid little war.”

Much has been written about the Spanish-American War and the United States empire that emerged from it. Much less is known about an important offshoot of that war—an American military campaign against Philippine insurgents that lasted three years, involved 126,000 United States troops, and resulted in 7,000 American and some 216,000 Filipino casualties. The United States learned a number of hard lessons about fighting against nationalist insurgents in distant Asian jungles, but sixty years later another generation of Americans forgot those lessons when plunging into a similar conflict in Vietnam. In the selection that follows, David R. Kohler, a naval special warfare officer, and James W. Wensel, a retired army officer and the author of several books, narrate American involvement in the Filipino insurrection of 1898–1902, showing how it grew out of the Spanish-American War and the American bid for empire. The authors point out the influence of the Indian wars on American tactics in the Philippines, and they draw several significant parallels between the Philippine conflict and America’s involvement in Vietnam. It was the Philippine conflict that generated strategic hamlets, free-fire zones, and search-and-destroy missions—terms that were later seared into the history of American involvement in Vietnam. As experienced military men, Kohler and Wensel contend that future American leaders should ponder the lessons of the Philippine and Vietnamese conflicts before embarking on similar adventures.

GLOSSARY

INALDO Y FAMY, GENERALISSIMO DON EMILIO Commander of the Filipino nationalists who fought the niards and then the Americans in an effort to achieve ppine independence.

O KNIFE This sharp-edged instrument was the Fil- o revolutionary’s main weapon.

JEY, COMMODORE GEORGE Commander of the Amer- Asiatic Squadron, which sank the Spanish fleet in the

GRAYSON, WILLIAM “WILLIE” WALTER The Philippine insurrection began when he and his fellow soldiers seized Filipino nationalists within their picket line and firing broke out between the American and Filipino camps.

GUERRILLA WARFARE Like the Vietcong and North Vietnamese sixty years later, the Filipinos eschewed conventional, Western-style warfare of pitched battles and dispersed throughout the countryside conducting “hit-and-run operations by small bands.”
ABEBES Filipino mercenaries from the central Luzon of Pampanga who fought for Spain and the United States against their own countrymen.

ARTHUR, GENERAL ARTHUR Assuming command of the United States forces in 1900, he initiated new tactics designed to isolate the Filipino guerrillas from the villages and search-and-destroy operations.

THAYER, ADMIRAL ALFRED THAYER United States naval officer who contended that sea power and overseas bases were the keys to national power; his writings influenced American imperialists such as Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge.

ITT, MAJOR GENERAL WESLEY Commanded the United States Philippine Expeditionary Force, sent to oust Spaniards from the islands.

AYANA, GEORGE Spanish-born philosopher, poet, and educator who observed that those who do not learn from their mistakes are doomed to repeat them.

SMITH, BRIGADIER GENERAL JACOB W. “HELL-ROARING JAKE” Veteran of the Wounded Knee Sioux massacre of 1890; when the insurgents on Samar Island massacred fifty-nine American soldiers, “Hell-Roaring Jake” Smith ordered his men to burn and kill their way across the island in retaliation.

TAFT, WILLIAM HOWARD Headed a United States civilian commission that took over the Philippine colonial government in 1901.

USS MAINE The mysterious sinking of this American battleship was the catalyst of the Spanish-American War.

“WATER CURE” American method of torture devised in retaliation for Filipino acts of terrorism (booby traps and assassination); a bamboo reed was placed in an insurgent’s mouth, and water, often salted or dirty, was poured down his throat until he was so painfully bloated that he talked.

“WHITE MAN’S BURDEN” Racist concept, popular among American imperialists, that whites had a “moral responsibility” to uplift and civilize supposedly inferior dark-skinned people such as the Filipinos.

Guerrilla warfare... jungle terrain... search and destroy missions... benevolent pacification... strategic hamlets... terrorism... shes... free-fire zones... booby traps... support from civilians at home. These words from the national consciousness uncomplimentary images of a war Americans fought and died in long ago in Southeast Asia. But while these may first bring to mind America’s painful experience in Vietnam during the 1960s and 70s, they also describe a much earlier conflict—the Philippine Insurrection—that foreshadowed this and other wars in Asia.

The Philippine-American War of 1898–1902 is our nation’s most obscure and least-understood war. Sometimes called the “Bolo War” because Filipino insurgents’ lethally effective use of razorbolo knives or machetes against the American expeditionary force occupying the islands, it is often viewed as a mere appendage of the one-hundred-day Spanish-American War. But suppressing the guerrilla warfare waged by Philippine nationalists seeking self-rule proved far more difficult, protracted, and costly for American forces than the conventional war with Spain that had preceded it.

America’s campaign to smash the Philippine Insurrection was, ironically, a direct consequence of U.S. efforts to secure independence for other insurrectos halfway around the world in Cuba. On May 1, 1898, less than a week after Congress declared war against Spain, a naval squadron commanded by Commodore George Dewey steamed into Manila Bay to engage the Spanish warships defending that nation’s Pacific possession. In a brief action Dewey achieved a stunning victory, sinking all of the enemy vessels with no significant American losses. Destroying the Spanish fleet, however, did not ensure U.S. possession of the Philippines. An estimated 15,000 Spanish soldiers still occupied Manila and the surrounding region. Those forces would have to be...
President William McKinley had already ordered a Philippine Expeditionary Force of volunteer and regular army infantry, artillery, and cavalry units (nearly seven thousand men), under the command of Major General Wesley Merritt, to "reduce Spanish power in that quarter [Philippine Islands] and give order and security to the islands while in the possession of the United States."

Sent to the Philippines in the summer of 1898, this limited force was committed without fully considering the operation's potential length and cost. American military and government leaders also failed to anticipate the consequences of ignoring the Filipino rebels who, under Generalissimo Don Emilio Aguinaldo y Famy, had been waging a war for independence against Spain for the past two years. And when American insensitivity toward Aguinaldo eventually led to open warfare with the rebels, the American leaders grossly underestimated the determination of the seemingly ill-trained and poorly armed insurgents. They additionally failed to perceive the difficulties involved in conducting military operations in a tropical environment and among a hostile native population, and they did not recognize the burden of fighting at the end of a seven-thousand-mile-long logistics trail.

Asian engagements, the Americans learned for the first time, are costly. The enterprise, so modestly begun, eventually saw more than 126,000 American officers and men deployed to the Philippines. Four times as many soldiers served in this undeclared war in the Pacific as had been sent to the Caribbean during the Spanish-American War. During the three-year conflict, American troops and Filipino insurgents fought in more than 2,800 engagements. American casualties ultimately totaled 4,234 killed and 2,818 wounded, and the insurgents lost about 16,000 men. The civilian population suffered even more; as many as 200,000 Filipinos died from famine, pestilence, or the unfortunate happenstance of being too close to the fighting. The Philippine war cost the United States $600 million before the insurgents were subdued.

The costly experience offered valuable and timeless lessons for America, unfortunately those lessons had to be relearned sixty years later in another war that, despite the modern technology involved, bore surprising parallels to America's first Southeast Asian campaign.

Origins

America's war with Spain, formally declared by the United States on April 25, 1898, had been several years in the making. During that time the American "yellow press," led by Joseph Pulitzer's New York World and William Randolph Hearst's New York Journal, trumpeted reports of heroic Cuban insurrectos revolting against their cruel Spanish rulers. Journalists vividly described harsh measures taken by Spanish officials to quell the Cuban revolution. The sensational accounts, often exaggerated, reminded Americans of their own uphill fight for independence and nourished the feeling that America was destined to intervene so that the Cuban people might also taste freedom.

Furthermore, expansionists suggested that the revolt against a European power, taking place less than one hundred miles from American shores, offered a splendid opportunity to turn the Caribbean into an American sea. Businessmen pointed out that $50 million in American capital was invested in the Cuban sugar and mining industries. Revolutions resulting in burned cane fields jeopardized that investment. As 1898 opened, American relations with Spain quickly declined.

In January 1898 the U.S. battleship Maine was sent to Cuba, ostensibly on a courtesy visit. On February 15 the warship was destroyed by a mysterious explosion while at anchor in Havana harbor, killing 262 of her 350-man crew. The navy's formal inquiry, completed on March 28, suggested that the explosion was due to an external force—a mine.

On March 29, the Spanish government received an ultimatum from Washington, D.C.: Spain's army in Cuba was to lay down its arms while the United States negotiated between the rebels and the Spaniards. The Spanish forces were also told to abolish all reconcentrado
camps (tightly controlled areas, similar to the strategic hamlets later tried in Vietnam, where peasants were re-grouped to deny food and intelligence to insurgents and to promote tighter security). Spain initially rejected the humiliation of surrendering its arms in the field but then capitulated on all points. The Americans were not satisfied.

On April 11, declaring that Spanish responses were inadequate, President McKinley told a joint session of Congress that “I have exhausted every effort to relieve the intolerable condition ... at our doors. I now ask the Congress to empower the president to take measures to secure a full and final termination of hostilities in Cuba, to secure ... the establishment of a stable government, and to use the military and naval forces of the United States ... for these purposes. ...”

Congress adopted the proposed resolution on April 19. Learning this, Spain declared war on the 24th. The following day, the United States responded with its own declaration of war.

The bulk of the American navy quickly gathered on the Atlantic coast. McKinley called for 125,000 volunteers to bolster the less than eighty-thousand-man regular army. His call was quickly oversubscribed; volunteers fought to be the first to land on Cuba’s beaches.

The first major battle of the war, however, was fought not in Cuba but seven thousand miles to the west—in Manila Bay. Dewey’s victory over Spanish Admiral Patricio Montojo y Pasarón (a rather hollow victory as Montojo’s fleet consisted of seven unarmored ships, three of which had wooden hulls and one that had to be towed to the battle area) was wildly acclaimed in America.

American leaders, believing that the Philippines would now fall into America’s grasp like a ripe plum, had to decide what to do with their prize. They could not return the islands to Spain, nor could they allow them to pass to France or Germany, America’s commercial rivals in the Orient. The American press rejected the idea of a British protectorate. And, after four hundred years of despotic Spanish rule in which Filipinos had little or no chance to practice self-governance, native leaders seemed unlikely candidates for managing their own affairs. McKinley faced a grand opportunity for imperialistic expansion that could not be ignored.

The debate sharply divided his cabinet—and the country. American public opinion over acquisition of the Philippines divided into two basic factions: imperialists versus anti-imperialists.

The imperialists, mostly Republicans, included such figures as Theodore Roosevelt (then assistant secretary of the navy), Henry Cabot Lodge (Massachusetts senator), and Albert Beveridge (Indiana senator). These individuals were, for the most part, disciples of Alfred Thayer Mahan, a naval strategist who touted theories of national power and prestige through sea power and acquisition of overseas colonies for trade purposes and naval coaling stations.

The anti-imperialists, staunchly against American annexation of the Philippines, were mainly Democrats. Such men as former presidents Grover Cleveland and Rutherford B. Hayes, steel magnate Andrew Carnegie, William Jennings Bryan, union leader Samuel Gompers, and Mark Twain warned that by taking the Philippines the United States would march the road to ruin earlier traveled by the Roman Empire. Furthermore, they argued, America would be denying Filipinos the right of self-determination guaranteed by our own Constitution. The more practical-minded also pointed out that imperialistic policy would require maintaining an expensive army and navy there.

Racism, though demonstrated in different ways, pervaded the arguments of both sides. Imperialists spoke of the “white man’s burden” and moral responsibility to “uplift the child races everywhere” and to provide “orderly development for the unfortunate and less able races.” They spoke of America’s “civilizing mission” of pacifying Filipinos by “benevolent assimilation” and saw the opening of the overseas frontier much as their forefathers had viewed the western frontier. The “subjugation of the Injun” (wherever he might be found) was a concept
grasped by American youth—the war’s most enthusiastic supporters (in contrast to young America’s opposition to the war in Vietnam many years later).

The anti-imperialists extolled the sacredness of independence and self-determination for the Filipinos. Racism, however, also crept into their argument, for they believed that “protection against race mingling” was a historic American policy that would be reversed by imperialism. To them, annexation of the Philippines would admit “alien, inferior, and mongrel races to our nationality.”

As the debate raged, Dewey continued to hold Manila Bay, and the Philippines seemed to await America’s pleasure. President McKinley would ultimately cast the deciding vote in determining America’s role in that country. McKinley, a genial, rather laid-back, former congressman from Ohio and one-time major in the Union army, remains a rather ambiguous figure during this period. In his Inaugural Address he had affirmed that “We want no wars of conquest; we must avoid the temptation of territorial aggression.” Thereafter, however, he made few comments on pacifism, and, fourteen weeks after becoming president, signed the bill annexing Hawaii.

Speaking of Cuba in December 1897, McKinley said, “I speak not of forcible annexation, for that cannot be thought of. That, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression.” Nevertheless, he constantly pressured Madrid to end Spanish rule in Cuba, leading four months later to America’s war with Spain.

McKinley described experiencing extreme turmoil, soul-searching, and prayer over the Philippine annexation issue until, he declared, one night in a dream the Lord revealed to him that “there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all [the Philippine Islands] and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift, and civilize, and Christianize them.” He apparently didn’t realize that the Philippines had been staunchly Roman Catholic for more than 350 years under Spanish colonialism. Nor could he anticipate the difficulties that, having cast its fortune with the expansionists, America would now face in the Philippines.

**Prosecuting the War**

Meanwhile, in the Philippine Islands, Major General Wesley Merritt’s Philippine Expeditionary Force went about its job. In late June, General Thomas Anderson led an advance party ashore at Cavite. He then established Camp Merritt, visited General Aguinaldo’s rebel forces entrenched around Manila, and made plans for seizing that city once Merritt arrived with the main body of armed forces.

Anderson quickly learned that military operations in the Philippines could be difficult. His soldiers, hastily assembled and dispatched with limited prior training, were poorly disciplined and inadequately equipped. Many still wore woolen uniforms despite the tropical climate. A staff officer described the army’s baptism at Manila: “...the heat was oppressive and the rain kept falling. At times the trenches were filled with two feet of water, and soon the men’s shoes were ruined. Their heavy khaki uniforms were a nuisance; they perspired constantly, the loss of body salts inducing chronic fatigue. Prickly heat broke out, inflamed by scratching and rubbing. Within a week the first cases of dysentery, malaria, cholera, and dengue fever showed up at sick call.”

During his first meeting with Dewey, Anderson remarked that some American leaders were considering annexation of the Philippines. “If the United States intends to hold the Philippine Islands,” Dewey responded, “it will make things awkward, because just a week ago Aguinaldo proclaimed the independence of the Philippine Islands from Spain and seems intent on establishing his own government.”

A Filipino independence movement led by Aguinaldo had been active in the islands since 1896 and, within weeks of Dewey’s victory, Aguinaldo’s revolutionaries controlled most of the archipelago.

Aguinaldo, twenty-nine years old in 1898, had taken over his father’s position as mayor of his hometown of Kawit before becoming a revolutionary. In a minor skirmish with Spanish soldiers, he had rallied the Filipinos to victory. Through his
popularity grew as did his ragtag but determined army. Aguinaldo was slight of build, shy, and soft-spoken, but a strict disciplinarian.

As his rebel force besieged Manila, Aguinaldo declared a formal government for the Philippines with himself as president and generalissimo. He proclaimed his “nation’s” independence and called for Filipinos to rally to his army and to the Americans, declaring that “the Americans . . . extend their protecting mantle to our beloved country . . . When you see the American flag flying, assemble in numbers: they are our redeemers!” But his enthusiasm for the United States later waned.

Merritt put off Aguinaldo’s increasingly strident demands that America recognize his government and guarantee the Filipinos’ independence. Aguinaldo perceived the American general’s attitude as condescending and demeaning.

On August 13, Merritt’s forces occupied Manila almost without firing a shot; in a face-saving maneuver the Spanish defenders had agreed to surrender to the Americans to avoid being captured—and perhaps massacred—by the Filipino insurgents. Merritt’s troops physically blocked Aguinaldo’s rebels, who had spent weeks in the trenches around the city, from participating in the assault. The Filipino general and his followers felt betrayed at being denied a share in the victory.

Further disenchanted, Aguinaldo would later find his revolutionary government unrepresented at the Paris peace talks determining his country’s fate. He would learn that Spain had ceded the Philippines to the United States for $20 million.

Officers at Merritt’s headquarters had little faith in the Filipinos’ ability to govern themselves. “Should our power . . . be withdrawn,” an early report declared, “the Philippines would speedily lapse into anarchy, which would excuse . . . the intervention of other powers and the division of the islands among them.”

Meanwhile, friction between American soldiers and the Filipinos increased. Much of the Americans’ conduct betrayed their racial bias. Soldiers referred to the natives as “niggers” and “gugus,” epithets whose meanings were clear to the Filipinos. In retaliation, the island inhabitants refused to give way on sidewalks and muscled American officers into the streets. Men of the expeditionary force in turn escalated tensions by stopping Filipinos at gun point, searching them without cause, “confiscating” shopkeepers’ goods, and beating those who resisted.

On the night of February 4, 1899, the simmering pot finally boiled over. Private William “Willie” Walter Grayson and several other soldiers of Company D, 1st Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, apprehended a group of armed insurgents within their regimental picket line. Shots were exchanged, and three Filipino insurgentes fell dead. Heavy firing erupted between the two camps.

In the bloody battle that followed, the Filipinos suffered tremendous casualties (an estimated two thousand to five thousand dead, contrasted with fifty-nine Americans killed) and were forced to withdraw. The Philippine Insurrection had begun.

**GUERRILLA WARFARE**

The Americans, hampered by a shortage of troops and the oncoming rainy season, could initially do little more than extend their defensive perimeter beyond Manila and establish a toehold on several islands to the south. By the end of March, however, American forces seized Malolos, the seat of Aguinaldo’s revolutionary government. But Aguinaldo escaped, simply melting into the jungle. In the fall, using conventional methods of warfare, the Americans first struck south, then north of Manila across the central Luzon plain. After hard marching and tough fighting, the expeditionary force occupied northern Luzon, dispersed the rebel army, and barely missed capturing Aguinaldo.

Believing that occupying the remainder of the Philippines would be easy, the Americans wrongly concluded that the war was virtually ended. But when the troops attempted to control the territory they had seized, they found that the Filipino revolutionaries were not defeated but had merely changed strategies.
Abandoning western-style conventional warfare, Aguinaldo had decided to adopt guerrilla tactics. Aguinaldo moved to a secret mountain headquarters at Palanan in northern Luzon, ordering his troops to disperse and avoid pitched battles in favor of hit-and-run operations by small bands. Ambushing parties of Americans and applying terror to coerce support from other Filipinos, the insurrectionists now blended into the countryside, where they enjoyed superior intelligence information, ample supplies, and tight security. The guerrillas moved freely between the scattered American units, cutting telegraph lines, attacking supply trains, and assaulting straggling infantrymen. When the Americans pursued their tormentors, they fell into well planned ambushes. The insurgents’ barbarity and ruthlessness during these attacks were notorious.

The guerrilla tactics helped to offset the inequities that existed between the two armies. The American troops were far better armed, for example, carrying .45-caliber Springfield single-shot rifles, Mausers, and then-modern .30-caliber repeating Krag-Jørgensen rifles. They also had field artillery and machine guns. The revolutionaries, on the other hand, were limited to a miscellaneous assortment of handguns, a few Mauser repeating rifles taken from the Spanish, and antique muzzle-loaders. The sharp-edged bolo knife was the revolutionary’s primary weapon, and he used it well. Probably more American soldiers were hacked to death by bolos than were killed by Mauser bullets.
As would later be the case in Vietnam, the guerrillas had some clear advantages. They knew the terrain, were inured to the climate, and could generally count on a friendly population. As in Vietnam, villages controlled by the insurgents provided havens from which the guerrillas could attack, then fade back into hiding.

Americans soon began to feel that they were under siege in a land of enemies, and their fears were heightened because they never could be sure who among the population was hostile. A seemingly friendly peasant might actually be a murderer. Lieutenant Colonel J. T. Wickham, commanding the 26th Infantry Regiment, recorded that “a large flag of truce enticed officers into ambushes ... Privates Dugan, Hayes, and Tracy were murdered by town authorities ... Private Nolan was tied up by ladies while in a stupor; the insurgents cut his throat ... The body of Corporal Doneley was dug up, burned, and mutilated ... Private O'Hearn, captured by apparently friendly people was tied to a tree, burned over a slow fire, and slashed up ... Lieutenant Max Wagner was assassinated by insurgents disguised in American uniforms.”

As in later guerrilla movements, such terrorism became a standard tactic for the insurgents. Both Filipinos and Americans were their victims. In preying on their countrymen, the guerrillas had a dual purpose: to discourage any Filipinos disposed to cooperate with the Americans, and to demonstrate to people in a particular region that they ruled that area and could destroy inhabitants and villages not supporting the revolution. The most favored terrorist weapon was assassination of local leaders, who were usually executed in a manner (such as beheading or burying alive) calculated to horrify everyone.

By the spring of 1900 the war was going badly for the Americans. Their task forces, sent out to search and destroy, found little and destroyed less.

The monsoon rains, jungle terrain, hostile native population, and a determined guerrilla force made the American soldiers' marches long and miserable. One described a five-week-long infantry operation: “... our troops had been on half rations for two weeks. Wallowing through hip-deep mud, lugging a ten-pound rifle and a belt ... with 200 rounds of ammunition, drenched to the skin and with their feet becoming heavier with mud at every step, the infantry became discouraged. Some men simply cried, others slipped down in the mud and refused to rise. Threats and appeals by the officers were of no avail. Only a promise of food in the next town and the threat that if they remained behind they would be butchered by marauding bands of insurgents forced some to their feet to struggle on.”

News reports of the army’s difficulties began to erode the American public’s support for the war. “To chase barefooted insurgents with water buffalo carts as a wagon train may be simply ridiculous,” charged one correspondent, “but to load volunteers down with 200 rounds of ammunition and one day’s rations, and to put on their heads felt hats used by no other army in the tropics ... to trot these same soldiers in the boiling sun over a country without roads, is positively criminal ... There are over five thousand men in the general hospital.”

Another reported that the American outlook “is blacker now than it has been since the beginning of the war ... the whole population ... sympathizes with the insurgents. The insurgents came to Pasig [a local area whose government cooperated with the Americans] and their first act was to hang the ‘Presidente’ for treason in surrendering to Americans. ‘Presidentes’ do not surrender to us anymore.”

**NEW STRATEGIES**

Early in the war U.S. military commanders had realized that, unlike the American Indians who had been herded onto reservations, eight million Filipinos (many of them hostile) would have to be governed in place. The Americans chose to emphasize pacification through good works rather than by harsh measures, hoping to convince Filipinos that the American colonial government had a sincere interest in their welfare and could be trusted.
As the army expanded its control across the islands, it reorganized local municipal governments and trained Filipinos to take over civil functions in the democratic political structure the Americans planned to establish. American soldiers performed police duties, distributed food, established and taught at schools, and built roads and telegraph lines.

As the war progressed, however, the U.S. commanders saw that the terrorism practiced by Aguinaldo's guerrillas was far more effective in controlling the populace than was their own benevolent approach. Although the Americans did not abandon pacification through good works, it was thereafter subordinated to the "civilize 'em with a Krag" (Krag-Jorgensen rifle) philosophy. From December 1900 onward, captured revolutionaries faced deportation, imprisonment, or execution.

The American army also changed its combat strategy to counter that of its enemy. As in the insurgents' army, the new tactics emphasized mobility and surprise. Breaking into small units—the battalion became the largest maneuver force—the Americans gradually spread over the islands until each of the larger towns was occupied by one or two rifle companies. From these bases American troops began platoon- and company-size operations to pressure local guerrilla bands.

Because of the difficult terrain, limited visibility, and requirement for mobility, artillery now saw limited use except as a defensive weapon. The infantry became the main offensive arm, with mounted riflemen used to pursue the fleeing enemy. Cavalry patrols were so valued for their mobility that American military leaders hired trusted Filipinos as mounted scouts and cavalrymen.

The Americans made other efforts to "Filipinize" the war—letting Asians fight Asians. (A similar tactic had been used in the American Indian campaigns twenty years before; it would resurface in Vietnam sixty years later as "Vietnamization.") In the Philippines the Americans recruited five thousand Macabebes, mercenaries from the central Luzon province of Pampanga, to form the American officered Philippine Scouts. The Macabebes had for centuries fought in native battalions under the Spanish flag—even against their own countrymen when the revolution began in 1896.

Just as a later generation of American soldiers would react to the guerrilla war in Vietnam, American soldiers in the Philippines responded to insurgent terrorism in kind, matching cruelty with cruelty. Such actions vented their frustration at being unable to find and destroy the enemy. An increasing number of Americans viewed all Filipinos as enemies.

"We make everyone get into his house by 7 P.M. and we only tell a man once," Corporal Sam Gillis of the 1st California Volunteer Regiment wrote to his family. "If he refuses, we shoot him. We killed over 300 natives the first night. . . . If they fire a shot from a house, we burn the house and every house near it."

Another infantryman frankly admitted that "with an enemy like this to fight, it is not surprising that the boys should soon adopt 'no quarter' as a motto and fill the blacks full of lead before finding out whether they are friends or enemies."

That attitude should not have been too surprising. The army's campaigns against the Plains Indians were reference points for the generation of Americans that took the Philippines. Many of the senior officers and noncommissioned officers—often veterans of the Indian wars—considered Filipinos to be "as full of treachery as our Arizona Apache." "The country won't be pacified," one soldier told a reporter, "until the niggers are killed off like the Indians." A popular soldiers' refrain, sung to the tune of "Tramp, tramp, tramp, the boys are marching," began, "Damn, damn, damn the Filipinos," and again spoke of "civilizing 'em with a Krag."

Reprisals against civilians by Americans as well as insurgents became common. General Lloyd Wheaton, leading a U.S. offensive southeast of Manila, found his men impaled on the bamboo prongs of booby traps and with throats slit while they slept. After two of his companies were ambushed, Wheaton ordered that every town and village within twelve miles be burned.

The Americans developed their own terrorist methods, many of which would be used in later Southeast
Asian wars. One was torturing suspected guerrillas or insurgent sympathizers to force them to reveal locations of other guerrillas and their supplies. An often-utilized form of persuasion was the “water cure,” placing a bamboo reed in the victim’s mouth and pouring water (some used salt water or dirty water) down his throat, thus painfully distending the victim’s stomach. The subject, allowed to void this, would, under threat of repetition, usually talk freely. Another method of torture, the “rope cure,” consisted of wrapping a rope around the victim’s neck and torso until it formed a sort of girdle. A stick (or Krag rifle), placed between the ropes and twisted, then effectively created a combination of smothering and garrotting.

The anti-imperialist press reported such American brutality in lurid detail. As a result, a number of officers and soldiers were court-martialed for torturing and other cruelties. Their punishments, however, seemed remarkably lenient. Of ten officers tried for “looting, torture, and murder,” three were acquitted; of the seven convicted, five were reprimanded, one was reprimanded and fined $300, and one lost thirty-five places in the army’s seniority list and forfeited half his pay for nine months.

Officers and soldiers, fighting a cruel, determined, and dangerous enemy, could not understand public condemnation of the brutality they felt was necessary to win. They had not experienced such criticism during the Indian wars, where total extermination of the enemy was condoned by the press and the American public, and they failed to grasp the difference now. Press reports, loss of public support, and the soldiers’ feeling of betrayal—features of an insurgent war—would resurface decades later during the Vietnam conflict.

Success

Although U.S. military leaders were frustrated by the guerrillas’ determination on the one hand and by eroding American support for the war on the other, most believed that the insurgents could be subdued. Especially optimistic was General Arthur MacArthur, who in 1900 assumed command of the seventy thousand American troops in the Philippines. MacArthur adopted a strategy like that successfully used by General Zachary Taylor in the Second Seminole War in 1835; he believed that success depended upon the Americans’ ability to isolate the guerrillas from their support in the villages. Thus were born “strategic hamlets,” “free-fire zones,” and “search and destroy” missions, concepts the American army would revive decades later in Vietnam.

MacArthur strengthened the more than five hundred small strong points held by Americans throughout the Philippine Islands. Each post was garrisoned by at least one company of American infantrymen. The natives around each base were driven from their homes, which were then destroyed. Soldiers herded the displaced natives into reconcentrado camps, where they could be “protected” by the nearby garrisons. Crops, food stores, and houses outside the camps were destroyed to deny them to the guerrillas. Surrounding each camp was a “dead line,” within which anyone appearing would be shot on sight.

Operating from these small garrisons, the Americans pressured the guerrillas, allowing them no rest. Kept off balance, short of supplies, and constantly pursued by the American army, the Filipino guerrillas, suffering from sickness, hunger, and dwindling popular support, began to lose their will to fight. Many insurgent leaders surrendered, signaling that the tide at last had turned in the Americans’ favor.

In March 1901, a group of Macabebe Scouts, commanded by American Colonel Frederick “Fighting Fred” Funston, captured Aguinaldo. Aguinaldo’s subsequent proclamation that he would fight no more, and his pledge of loyalty to the United States, sped the collapse of the insurrection.

As in the past, and as would happen again during the Vietnam conflict of the 1960s and ’70s, American optimism was premature. Although a civilian commission headed by William H. Taft took control of the colonial government from the American army in July 1901, the army faced more bitter fighting in its “pacification” of the islands.
As the war sputtered, the insurgents’ massacre of fifty-nine American soldiers at Balangiga on the island of Samar caused Brigadier General Jacob W. “Hell-Roaring Jake” Smith, veteran of the Wounded Knee massacre of the Sioux in 1890, to order his officers to turn Samar into a “howling wilderness.” His orders to a battalion of three hundred Marines headed for Samar were precise: “I want no prisoners. I wish you to kill and burn, the more you kill and burn the better it will please me. I want all persons killed who are capable of bearing arms against the United States.” Fortunately, the Marines did not take Smith’s orders literally and, later, Smith would be court-martialed.

On July 4, 1902, the Philippine Insurrection officially ended. Although it took the American army another eleven years to crush the fierce Moros of the southern Philippines, the civilian government’s security force (the Philippine Constabulary), aided by the army’s Philippine Scouts, maintained a fitful peace throughout the islands. The army’s campaign to secure the Philippines as an American colony had succeeded.

American commanders would have experienced vastly greater difficulties except for two distinct advantages: 1) the enemy had to operate in a restricted area, in isolated islands, and was prevented by the U.S. Navy from importing weapons and other needed supplies; and 2) though the insurgents attempted to enlist help from Japan, no outside power intervened. These conditions would not prevail in some subsequent guerrilla conflicts in Asia.

In addition to the many tactical lessons the army learned from fighting a guerrilla war in a tropical climate, other problems experienced during this campaign validated the need for several military reforms that were subsequently carried out, including improved logistics, tropical medicine, and communications.

The combination of harsh and unrelenting military force against the guerrillas, complemented by the exercise of fair and equitable civil government and civic action toward those who cooperated, proved to be the Americans’ most effective tactic for dealing with the insurgency. This probably was the most significant lesson to be learned from the Philippine Insurrection.

LESSONS FOR THE FUTURE

Vietnam veterans reading this account might nod in recollection of a personal, perhaps painful experience from their own war.

Many similarities exist between America’s three-year struggle with the Filipino insurrectos and the decade-long campaign against the Communists in Vietnam. Both wars, modestly begun, went far beyond what anyone had foreseen in time, money, equipment, manpower, casualties, and suffering.

Both wars featured small-unit infantry actions. Young infantrymen, if they had any initial enthusiasm, usually lost it once they saw the war’s true nature; they nevertheless learned to endure their allotted time while adopting personal self-survival measures as months “in-country” lengthened and casualty lists grew.

Both wars were harsh, brutal, cruel. Both had their Samar Islands and their My Lais. Human nature being what it is, both conflicts also included acts of great heroism, kindness, compassion, and self-sacrifice.

Both wars saw an increasingly disenchanted American public withdrawing its support (and even disavowing its servicemen) as the campaigns dragged on, casualties mounted, and news accounts vividly described the horror of the battlefields.

Some useful lessons might be gleaned from a comparison of the two conflicts. Human nature really does not change—war will bring out the best and the worst in the tired, wet, hungry, and fearful men who are doing the fighting; Guerrilla campaigns—particularly where local military and civic reforms cannot be effected to separate the guerrilla from his base of popular support—will be long and difficult, and will demand tremendous commitments in resources and national will. Finally, before America commits its armed forces to similar ventures in the future, it would do well to recall the lessons learned from previous campaigns. For, as the Spanish-born American educator, poet, and philosopher George Santayana reminded us, those who do not learn from the past are doomed to repeat it.
QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

1. How and why did the United States initially become involved in the Philippines? What, according to the authors, were the fundamental mistakes committed by the Americans in making that decision?

2. Why did the Americans decide to take over the Philippines? What were the different categories of American public opinion in reaction to this development? How were they different, and what attitudes did they share?

3. What military advantages did the Philippine insurgents have? What were American military tactics and goals, and how did they change in response to the conditions of the Philippine conflict?

4. How does the conflict in the Philippines compare with the Indian wars that preceded it? In particular, how did the American public and American soldiers differ in comparing the Philippine conflict with the Indian wars, and what were the results and significance of this difference?

5. What, according to the authors, are the lessons to be learned from our involvement in the Philippines? Have they been learned?