

Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository

7-26-2021 1:00 PM

Colonial Education as a Mode of Governance in the Philippines Under U.S. Rule, 1900-1916

David C.S. Buglass, *The University of Western Ontario*

Supervisor: Schumacher, Frank, *The University of Western Ontario*

: Sendzikas, Aldona, *The University of Western Ontario*

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in History

© David C.S. Buglass 2021

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Buglass, David C.S., "Colonial Education as a Mode of Governance in the Philippines Under U.S. Rule, 1900-1916" (2021). *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 7966.

<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/7966>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact wlsadmin@uwo.ca.

Abstract

Concentrating on colonial education policy in the Philippines during the period of U.S. rule, this thesis explores the dynamics of knowledge circulation – namely the transfer and continuities of racial preconceptions and administrative techniques – within the American imperial enterprise. Mapping the emergence of the U.S. colonial administration in the islands with the establishment of the Taft Commission in 1900 to the move Filipino self-rule with the passage of the *Philippine Autonomy Act* in 1916, this thesis assesses elite commentaries and discourses concerning the management of non-white subject populations and the contingent manner in which these policies corresponded to or differed in their formulation and execution according to their respective zones of application. Spanning the contours of knowledge transfers in the trans-imperial and intra-imperial arenas, it analyses the interactions and exchanges between congruent and disparate colonial jurisdictions – both within the U.S. empire and among the neighboring possessions of their European peers.

Keywords

U.S. colonial empire, U.S. imperialism, Philippines, colonial education, knowledge exchanges, trans-imperial, inter-imperial, intra-imperial, colonialism, national-exceptionalism, ethnocentrism, race, assimilation, civilizing mission.

Summary for Lay Audience

For my thesis I assume an institutional lens to assess the U.S. education regime in the Philippines. Analyzing elite commentaries and discourses, my research explores the perspectives of critical decision makers and functionaries within the American colonial administration in the Philippines, U.S. government, and private actors in philanthropic-missionary bodies such as the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples. Assessing the circulation of concepts and practices between major centers of power, these accounts serve to highlight the ideological intersections between governmental and non-governmental actors in the U.S. colonial lobby and their codependence in the process of knowledge formulation, particularly in the fluid transition

from settler colonial expansion at the end of the 19th century to the nation's formal embrace of overseas imperialism in the years following the Spanish American War of 1898.

This thesis analyzes the ethnocentric foundations of the ideological precepts that the U.S. sought to impart on its overseas subjects in the Philippines. Drawing upon the precedents of educational models devised for African Americans and Native Americans in the nation's experience of transcontinental expansion, these modes of curriculum were disseminated from the continental sphere and subsequently refashioned to accommodate new environments and subjects overseas. Moving beyond studies that have traditionally emphasized primacy of industrial education within the colonial curriculum and the imperatives of capital and material development, my analysis explores contemporary currents of moral and civics curriculum forged within the ethnocentric bounds of the nation's prevailing Anglo-American, English speaking, Protestant social order and turn of the century Progressivism.

Interlinked with issues of curriculum and ideology, my thesis addresses questions surrounding the circulation, exchange, and expression of knowledge across imperial jurisdictions. Moving away from nationalist-exceptionalist narratives, this thesis evaluates the trans-imperial dimensions of knowledge formation within U.S. colonial education policy. Thus, I consider how American policymakers conceptualized and interpreted the curricular policies of their European counterparts in other colonial possessions, namely the Dutch East Indies. Furthermore, I assess the configurations of knowledge construction within the intra-imperial arena, addressing how curricular formations differed between the Moro peoples in the Southern Philippines and those of the Christian populations in rest of the archipelago.

Acknowledgments

For as long as I can remember, I have always possessed a strong interest in the foreign policy of the United States. Like many born around the millennium, I grew up observing the excesses of America's War on Terror and the nation's interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan. These events shaped my understanding of the U.S. as a global superpower and its proclivity to intercede overseas in order to mold other nations in its image. Observing these misadventures in overseas statecraft over the last twenty years, I have realized that it is incumbent to look back to the past colonial undertakings in Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Philippines and occupations of nations such as Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Haiti in order to understand the proselytizing, zealous character of notions of American exceptionalism and how this shaped their interactions with weaker, peripheral countries.

Over the last two years, I have undertaken an expansive project that I never would have foreseen myself completing. Whether in terms of the depth of research, the scale of writing, or the length of time editing, my thesis project has proven to be a test of my capacities to adapt and overcome even the most stressful of obstacles. In light of the global pandemic, I, along with everyone else, have had to wholly reorient my routine by working from home without immediate access to the resources available on campus. Furthermore, in regard to source base, I have had to rely on digital sources and was unable to travel to the University of Michigan to access the Dean Worcester Philippine History Collection and The Bentley Historical Library. Regardless, I am more than happy with the work I have produced despite external unforeseen circumstances.

Among all others, I wish to extend my sincerest gratitude to Dr. Frank Schumacher for his meticulous feedback and guidance. It was in his graduate course on Colonialism that I discovered the topic of American education policy in the Philippines. Over the course of the last two years, he has provided me with extensive advice and literary recommendations that have enabled me to expand the contours of my research. In addition, he has devoted countless hours to reviewing my drafts, compiling his feedback and meeting with me on a monthly basis to keep each other up to date on my progress. I am forever grateful for the time and energy that he has put forth to assist me in this endeavor.

I would also like to thank Dr. Aldona Sendzikas for her supplemental feedback on my thesis. While Dr. Schumacher's advice lent to the content and context of my work, Dr.

Sendzikas was vital to the presentation and structure of the final paper. This, for which, I am very appreciative.

Beyond my supervisors, I must extend my gratitude to the Department of History more broadly. In particular, Kara Brown has emerged as not only an instrumental figure in helping me to navigate the technical and procedural aspects of the thesis process, but as an advocate and confidant in my personal affairs. Thank you to all the office staff and administrators in particular, Dr. Francine McKenzie, and Dr. Laurel Shire, for all that you do for the department and its students.

Towards the end of my undergraduate studies, I began to consider my options for graduate school. My learning difficulties in public school though high school made me determined to emphasize education and view excelling in academics as a source of achievement and personal growth. To this end, I must thank Dr. Stephanie Bangarth for her emphasis on academic rigor and her vote of confidence as I advanced through my years at King's University College. My thanks are also extended to Dr. Eric Jarvis for innumerable hours of face-to-face interaction in office hours discussing everything from current events to charting my academic future. In addition to King's faculty, on main campus, I would like to thank Dr. Luz Maria Hernandez-Saenz for her approachability and willingness to help me navigate graduate applications while also discussing Latin American politics.

Outside of campus the list of those to thank grows long. Thank you to my friends and family who have stuck by me through the years. In particular, Davis Whittington-Heeney and Allison McDougall have provided me years of intellectual stimulation, support and love. Our debates run long without animus and there is never a shortage of our mutual loves of music and LP records.

From my father, Peter Buglass, I have inherited an intellectual inclination and interest in history and politics. From my mother, Catherine Peacock, her judicious disposition and work ethic. During my formative years their advocacy for academic support gave me the necessary footing to cultivate and hone my capacities, for which I am forever grateful. I thank you and I love you both. I must also extend my thanks to my late grandfather, David Robert Moysey Buglass, with whom I share a passion for history as well as a name. He was a Royal Canadian Air Force veteran who lived through four reigning monarchs. His accumulated wisdom over his 96-year life provided me with not only entertainment, but an appreciation for the value of historical knowledge.

In closing, I wish to extend my utmost gratitude to my partner Ellery Cuculick. Over the last year, she has provided me with indispensable support in completing my thesis. Throughout the course of my writing, she has assisted me in the process of formulating and synthesizing my ideas. In the final stages, she has proved crucial in the general editing of my final product. More personally, Ellery has provided unconditional comfort in my moments of adversity and tribulation, calming me down when I thought that all was lost. As both a companion and colleague, I owe her a great debt in realizing this protracted undertaking.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Summary for Lay Audience.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Images.....	ix
Introduction.....	1
Historical Overview.....	1
Research Questions.....	4
Historiography and Methodology.....	5
Periodization.....	11
Source Materials.....	11
Chapter Overviews.....	12
Chapter 1 : Anglo-American Ethnocentrism and the Ideological Foundations of U.S. Colonial Curriculum in the Philippines.....	16
1 Introduction.....	16
1.1 Refined Prejudices and the Filipino’s Prospects for Development.....	21
1.2 Nondenominational Education and Protestant Reformation.....	31
1.3 Moral Education and Character Building.....	38
1.4 Civic Education.....	41
1.5 The Primacy of English and Cultural Diffusion.....	55
Chapter 2 : U.S. Colonial Education in the Philippines and Trans-imperial Exchanges..	66
2 Introduction.....	66
2.1 Ethnocentric Foundations of Trans-imperial Exchange.....	69
2.2 Trans-imperial Exchanges at the Outset of U.S. Rule in the Philippines.....	76

2.3 Trans-imperial Commentaries on Education in the Age of Wilsonian Internationalism	83
Chapter 3 : The Moro Question: Differentiated Curriculum in the Southern Philippines	90
3 Introduction	90
3.1 Precedents of Continental Empire as the Template of Differentiated Colonial Rule	93
3.2 Curricular Discourses and National Integration of the Moro	101
3.3 Differentiated Curriculums for Christian Filipinos and the Moro	111
Conclusion	121
U.S. Colonial Education, Filipino Elites, and the Disarming of Postcolonial Nationalism	121
Colonial Education in Contemporary, Transnational Contexts	130
Bibliography	132
Curriculum Vitae	143

List of Images

Image 1: Truancy	43
Image 2: Colonial School House	44
Image 3: Grooming and Sartorial Instruction	45
Image 4: Grade Structure of the Philippine Public School System	117

Introduction

Historical Overview

At the turn of the 20th century, the United States was an emergent great power. With its formal ascent into the camp of overseas imperial powers – regarded by many contemporaries as a marker of its sovereign maturity – the nation’s acquisition of overseas territorial holdings came in quick succession in the immediate years after 1898. Following its victory in the Spanish-American War, the U.S. took possession of the Philippines along with Guam and Puerto Rico. Complementing these acquisitions, the nation assumed the annexation of the former Kingdom of Hawaii in 1898, the claiming of Wake Island in 1899, and the acquisition of the eastern portions of the Samoan archipelago following their partition with Germany later in that year. In addition to territorial acquisitions in the Pacific, the U.S. delineated a hemispheric zone of influence in Central America and the Caribbean comprising a protectorate over Cuba from 1898-1902; the leasing of Guantanamo Bay in 1901; and the procurement of the Panama Canal Zone in 1903. As opposed to a watershed moment marking U.S. entry into the camp of Western imperial powers, America’s outward thrust instead constituted a culminative experience, an observable outgrowth of the attitudes and impulses underlying the nation’s period of transcontinental expansion.¹

¹ There are longstanding scholarly debates concerning the supposed uniqueness of the American empire. These debates stem from the questions regarding categorization of the Spanish American War of 1898 and nation’s subsequent territorial acquisitions aftermath as an aberration in the traditions of transcontinental expansion and statecraft. Among the aberrationist school, see Samuel Flagg Bemis, “The Great Aberration,” in *A Diplomatic History of the United States* (Henry Holt and Company, 1936), 463–475 and Richard Hofstadter, “Cuba, the Philippines, and Manifest Destiny,” in *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays* (Vintage Books, 1965), 145–187. The emphasis on the peculiarity of transcontinental expansion is grounded in the frontier thesis postulated by Frederick Jackson Turner. With an eye on the nation-building and diffusion of democratic political culture implied in the process of westward settlement, the frontier thesis has emerged as an important facet of nationalist exceptionalist narratives of the U.S. imperial project. See Frederick Jackson Turner, “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” in *Annual Report of the American Historical Society for the Year 1893*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894). In the decades since their respective postulations, both the aberrationist and frontier theses have been critically reassessed by contemporary scholars from an array of methodological lenses. For a comprehensive review on recent historiography, see Paul A. Kramer, “Power and Connection: Imperial Histories of the United States in the World,” in *Diplomatic History*, 42 no.5 (2018).

The external thrust of the U.S. was forged in the aftermath of the formal closing of the Western frontier in 1890 – a protracted process of territorial expansion that was marked by the mass displacement of Native American peoples and the destruction of indigenous polities – and the reconciliation between North and South in the post-Reconstruction period – a consensus forged at the expense of political agency on the part of African Americans through the enactment of Jim Crow.² In the overseas arena, U.S. policymakers were compelled to adapt and refine preexisting prejudices carried over from the continental domain as the nation encountered foreign racial groups that were alien to their traditional frame of reference. Noting the fluidity of racial categorization, Paul Kramer emphasizes that race constitutes “a dynamic, contextual, contested, and contingent field of power.” On the interactive nature of race formation, he stressed the necessity of “examining metropole and colony as a single, densely interactive field in which colonial dynamics are not strictly derivative of, dependent upon, or respondent to metropolitan forces.”³ Within this framework, there was an observable transition in the adaption of the impulses of settler colonialism at the end the 19th century to the managerial imperatives of overseas imperialism at the onset of the 20th century.

In contrast with other possessions and foreign dependencies within the U.S. overseas empire, the colonial project in the Philippines is distinct regarding its measurable scope and magnitude. This is apparent in efforts at the mass acculturation of the Filipino peoples through universal public education. At the outset of American civil rule in the Philippines in 1901-1902, the colonial administration appointed an excess of

² Greg Grandin, *The End of the Myth: From the Frontier to the Border Wall in the Mind of America* (Metropolitan Books, 2019), 132-147. Grandin notes how the Spanish-American War of 1898 garnered particular enthusiasm from the former states of the Confederacy, which regarded the conflict as a redemptive cause to solidify their reintegration in the Union. Occurring amidst the post-Reconstruction era and the entrenchment of Jim Crow in the 1890s, he emphasizes the racial connotations of the nation’s external conquests, explaining that “The overseas frontier... acted as a prism, refracting the color line abroad back home. In each military occupation and prolonged counterinsurgency they fought, southerners could replay the dissonance of the Confederacy again and again. They could fight in the name of the loftiest ideals - liberty, valor, self-sacrifice, camaraderie - while putting down people of color.”

³ Paul Kramer, *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, and the United States & the Philippines* (University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 2-3.

1,074 teachers from the continental U.S., most famously those who arrived aboard the U.S.S. *Thomas* – referred to as “The Thomasites” - who numbered 523.⁴ This number steadily increased over the next decade. Furthermore, the employment of English-based instruction emerged as a critical pillar of the colonial curriculum in the archipelago. Conversely, in the context of early rule in Puerto Rico, the majority of teachers would be native rather than foreign, owing to low turnover among American instructors and their general lack of fluency in the Spanish language. Despite the initial designs of the U.S. colonial regime, English-based instruction was never fully achieved. Instead, an accommodation was reached balancing the use of English and Spanish, emphasizing the promotion of the former and the conservation of the latter.⁵ In Cuba, during the period of U.S. occupation, efforts to impose English-based instruction and to import American teachers at the expense of local teachers were met with opposition from the Cuban citizenry.⁶

Among the various mechanisms of imperial rule, education may constitute the most invasive tool at the disposal of the colonial state. As an instrument not necessitating the application of direct military force, it offers a protracted means of coercion through which the state can pacify subject populations through assimilation. As an avenue for social engineering, education enables the transmission of metropolitan concepts, principles, and values to the periphery. Concentrated on colonial education policy in Philippines, my thesis explores the dynamics of knowledge circulation - namely the continuity of racial preconceptions and administrative techniques - within the American imperial project. Within this framework, it addresses the transference of previous notions

⁴ Alexander A. Calata, “The Role of American Education in Americanizing Filipinos,” in *Mixed Blessing: The Impact of the American Colonial Experience on Politics and Society in the Philippines*, ed. Hazel M. McFerson (Greenwood Press, 2002) 90-91; Glenn Anthony May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines: The Aims, Execution, and Impact of American Colonial Policy, 1900-1913* (Greenwood Press, 1980), 85.

⁵ Solsiree del Moral, *Negotiating Empire: The Cultural Politics of Schools in Puerto Rico, 1898-1912* (University of Wisconsin Press, 2013), 9-10; 96-97.

⁶ Marial Iglesias Utest, *A Cultural History of Cuba during the U.S. Occupation, 1898-1902*, trans. Russ Davidson (University Press of North Carolina, 2011), 72-75.

of racial difference from the continental U.S. and their refashioning to be applicable in the overseas arena in the post-1898 period. Therefore, the understanding of race is simultaneously reconstituted and remade when encountering previously unfamiliar racial groups. Within the framework of knowledge circulation, it aims to address the exchange and interaction of knowledge between both congruent and disparate colonial jurisdictions – both within the U.S. empire and among the possessions of their European peers - in the management of non-white populations and the varying manner in which these policies corresponded to and differed from their formulation and understanding.

Research Questions

This thesis will contemplate what concepts, ideas, and principles the U.S. sought to impart on its subjects. Within this context, I will consider what expectations the American colonial state envisaged these diverse peoples fulfilling within the colony proper, and within the broader U.S. imperial project following upon assimilation. Considering metropolitan language as a medium of mass acculturation, I will discuss how the use of English-based instruction was instrumentalized within the colonial curriculum. To this extent, I will consider how local Filipino languages were interpreted and reconciled within this assimilationist framework as projected by U.S. colonial elites.

Beyond matters of curriculum and ideology alone, my thesis additionally seeks to address questions surrounding the circulation, exchange, and expression of knowledge within the broader contours of other imperial jurisdictions. Thus, the dimensions of trans-imperial exchanges between the U.S. and their European counterparts in the arena of colonial education must be considered. Within this framework of interaction, I will evaluate how American colonial officials conceptualized and interpreted the actions and policies of their European peers. Moreover, this thesis will assess the configurations of interaction within the intra-imperial realm, specifically among the diverse peoples that comprised the Philippines under U.S. rule. In this regard, I investigate how educational practices differed between Moro Province in the Southern Philippines and the rest of the archipelago. Within this divergent framework, I will consider how the Muslim Moros and other non-Christian groups were differentiated from their Christian counterparts based on

their assigned civilizational capacity and their roles in the nation following the extension of self-rule.

Historiography and Methodology

Among the scholarly literature, Glenn Anthony May's research constitutes the most authoritative and comprehensive assessment of American education policy in the Philippines, discussing at considerable length the educational regime during its formative period in the early years of the colony between 1900-1913.⁷ In more recent studies, the topic is often alluded to in passing in the context of broader discussions of colonial education policy, often in parallel to the experiences of other U.S. possessions such as Hawaii and Puerto Rico.⁸ Within the scope of contemporary scholarship, the topic of U.S. education policy in the Philippines has yet to be the leading subject of any comprehensive study that questions the use of education as a tool in the management of empire.

Notably, Anne Paulet's research explores the broad continuities between education policy as developed for Native Americans in the U.S. that were subsequently exported and replicated overseas in the Philippines.⁹ Her thesis is contingent upon the notion that practices and techniques in the management of subject populations in U.S. domains were unique in the context of American imperialism, drawing upon the assimilationist precedents directed to indigenous peoples from the nation's period of transcontinental expansion. Advancing a nationalist exceptionalist narrative, Paulet

⁷ May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines*.

⁸ Cliff Stratton, *Education for Empire: American Schools, Race, and the Path of Good Citizenship* (University of California Press, 2016).

⁹ Anne Paulet, "To Change the World: The Use of American Indian Education in the Philippines," *History of Education Quarterly* 47 no. 2 (2007), 172-202; Anne Paulet, "The Only Good Indian is a Dead Indian: The Use of United States Indian Policy as a Guide for the Conquest and Occupation of the Philippines, 1898-1905," (PhD. diss., Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 1995).

asserts that these measures were conceived to provide a rationale for the nation's foray into overseas imperialism and to distinguish the U.S. from their European counterparts.¹⁰

However, this line of national particularism is challenged by other scholars. While Margaret D. Jacobs explores the parallels in the practices of child removal policies between the U.S. and other settler colonial societies, Frank Schumacher examines intellectual knowledge transfers in the technical priorities of overseas colonial management between the Americans and their more established European rivals.¹¹ Contrasting Paulet, these scholars assert that the U.S. was not exceptional in their management of overseas empire and, in fact, learned from the examples of their counterparts. Nevertheless, in their scholarship, colonial education emerges as a topic of peripheral consideration as compared to other tools of subjugation. Thus, considering this gap in contemporary literature, I seek to analyze the exchanges and interactions between both congruent and disparate colonial jurisdictions in the management of non-white populations, and the uneven way such policies were executed.

More recent works by scholars such as Elisabeth M. Eittrich and Sarah Steinbock-Pratt have explored the experiences of those charged with the practical execution of colonial education policy.¹² In general, contemporary literature has

¹⁰ Anne Paulet, "To Change the World: The Use of American Indian Education in the Philippines," 173-174. Emphasizing the functionality of Indian education as a measure of rhetorical differentiation of the U.S. from European imperialism, Paulet notes that "The United States' experience with American Indians thus provided both justification for overseas expansion, particularly into the Philippine Islands, and an educational precedent that would enable Americans to claim that their expansion was different from European imperialism based on the American use of education to transform the cultures of their subjects and prepare them for self-government rather than continued colonial control."

¹¹ Margaret D. Jacobs, *White Mother to a Dark Race: Settler Colonialism, Maternalism, and the Removal of Indigenous Children in the American West and Australia, 1880-1940* (University of Nebraska Press, 2009); Christina Firpo and Margaret D. Jacobs, "Taking Children, Ruling Colonies: Child Removal and Colonial Subjugation in Australia, Canada, French Indochina, and the United States, 1870-1950s," *Journal of World History* 29, no. 4 (2018), 529-562; Frank Schumacher, "Embedded Empire: The United States and Colonialism," *Journal of Modern European History/ Zeitschrift für moderne europäische Geschichte/Revue d'histoire européenne contemporaine* 14, no. 2, The Imperial Cloud (2016), 202-224.

¹² Jane A. Margold, "Egalitarian Ideals and Exclusionary Practices: US Pedagogy in the Colonial Philippines," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 8 no. 4 (1995), 375-394; Elisabeth M. Eittrich, *Teaching Empire: Native Americans, Filipinos, and US Education, 1879-1918* (University of Kansas Press, 2019);

considered U.S. education policy in the Philippines from a micro-level perspective. Moving beyond the realm of officialdom and the major centers of power, it is focused on exploring the practical application of education policy on a day-to-day basis. Within this context, this stream is focused on the individual, lived experiences of teachers in their critical role as primary functionaries within the U.S. colonial system. Moreover, such studies consider the fluidity of identity categories such as class, gender, and race and how such questions fostered a varied terrain in the execution of the imperial mission. Noting the intersection of education with the uneven dynamics of colonial governance, Steinbock-Pratt explained that:

The colonial state was constructed through both collaboration and conflict, and the schools were at the heart of this process. The relationships between teachers and students highlight this crucial point colonization intermingled contestation, cooperation, and adaptation together in the same communities, schools, and even sometimes within the same individuals... Empire was not simply a process of power inflicted from above or resisted from below. It was a complex matrix of various actors with different agendas and unequal ability to enact their visions of the colonial relationship, all operating on the same field at once.¹³

In essence, this school of thought is concerned with the diffuse and varied manifestations of colonial governance. Examining the role of pedagogues as critical intermediaries within the colonial system, relations between teacher and student constitute the focal point of interactions between the colonizer and the colonized. In this context, the objectives, preconceived prejudices, and romantic ideals of imperial governance are contested or upended through sustained, tangible encounters with subject populations.

My thesis aims to assess the American curriculum in the Philippines in its conceptual scope. Expanding on contemporary literature using the approach of Stratton, I seek to explore the concepts, principles, and values that the U.S sought to export to its periphery in an effort to forge differentiated categories of citizenship among its non-white, subject populations. In this context, it will assess the continuity and transfer of

Sarah Steinbock-Pratt, *Educating the Empire: American Empire and the Contested Colonization in the Philippines* (Cambridge University Press, 2019).

¹³ Steinbock-Pratt, *Educating the Empire*, 18.

preconceptions and practices by the U.S. colonial state from the continental sphere to its newly conquered overseas territory of the Philippines in the realm of education. Expanding on the contemporary literature employing Schumacher's approach, my narrative aims to identify the dimensions of trans-imperial knowledge circulation between the U.S. and their European counterparts in the arena of colonial education. With an eye to trans-imperial and intra-imperial engagements, I seek to address the exchanges and interactions between both congruent and disparate colonial jurisdictions in the management of non-white populations and the uneven manner in which such policies were executed.

Inspired by earlier approaches in the vein of May and Paulet, I will assume an institutional perspective in order to assess the colonial education regime in the Philippines. Thus, I will be approaching this topic using a top-down approach that considers major centers of power. My narrative will assess the testimonies of critical decision makers and functionaries as agents within the broader colonial education system. In an effort to capture the full breadth of the American imperial enterprise, I will analyze sources from both the public and private domains. This will enable me to explore documentation from relevant bureaucratic bodies such as the Philippine Commission - Department of Public Instruction. Furthermore, my research will be assessing published materials from non-government organizations, namely the proceedings from the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples.

The assessment of such non-governmental forums serves to highlight the ideological intersections between the United States government and private actors in the colonial lobby and American society more broadly. Furthermore, such forums serve to identify the practical crossover and institutional linkages between the continental and overseas empires. Looking beyond colonial governance alone, this approach captures the full scope of the U.S. colonial project by assessing both state and non-state actors. On the role and influence of the Lake Mohonk Conference at the turn of the 20th century, Walter L. Williams notes that "This annual meeting of missionaries, educators, and philanthropists tried to protect Indians from exploitation by whites; but they had no respect for native cultures and believed that Indians should abandon their traditional ways

of life and merge onto the American melting pot. The conference speakers by and large supported imperialism abroad and encouraged similar feelings toward Indians and [overseas subjects].”¹⁴ Incorporating sources from both bureaucratic and philanthropic bodies, this approach will allow me to assess the circulation and transfer of ideas and practices between such major centers of power.

Within the institutional framework, scholarship on colonial education in the Philippines has largely assessed this topic as an extension of broader discussions concerning power projection and military interventionism within the U.S. empire. Rather than assessed as an independent pursuit, education is analyzed as a facet of pacification efforts on part of U.S. occupation forces or the material priorities of pro-imperial interests. Journalist Stanley Karnow presents a broad assessment of the relationship between the United States and the Philippines from the Spanish colonial era to the Reagan administration.¹⁵ While education is mentioned in detail in addition to other features of American colonial governance in the archipelago, Karnow’s scope of analysis is too general to warrant a specialized study. Conversely, A.J. Angulo assesses the educational policies of various U.S. occupation regimes in relation to the nation’s commercial and economic interests abroad.¹⁶ Although education policy is central to his thesis, Angulo predominantly frames these measures within the prevalence of U.S. corporate interests in the Philippines and the material development of the archipelago. Although industrial and vocational education emerged as the dominant stream of the colonial curriculum, material considerations alone are often overstated as compared with the ideological or philosophical underpinnings of such policies. Along with industrial arts and vocational classes, the colonial curriculum additionally sought to indoctrinate

¹⁴ Walter L. Williams, “United States Indian Policy and the Debate Over Philippine Annexation: Implications for the Origins of American Imperialism,” *The Journal of American History* 66 no.4 (1980), 814.

¹⁵ Stanley Karnow, *In Our Image: America’s Empire in the Philippines* (Random House, 1989).

¹⁶ A.J. Angulo, *Empire and Education: A History of Greed and Goodwill from the War of 1898 to the War on Terror* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

Filipino schoolchildren with moral principles of decency and proper self-orientation. Complementing these material considerations, my analysis seeks to address those cultural currents of moral curriculum within the context of the prevailing Anglo-American, English speaking, Protestant social order of the United States.

I acknowledge that in assuming an institutional perspective, my narrative inevitably privileges the accounts and testimonies of elite actors within the imperial state over those of Filipinos or Native Americans who were the chief victims of the imperial state. While the perspectives of these subject populations should neither be obfuscated or omitted, this analysis is primarily concerned with assessing the construction and circulation of the concepts of assimilation among critical actors within the imperial system. Therefore, my research seeks to address the formulation of these ideas rather than their reception. This mode of analysis emanates more out of necessity rather than intentionality. In logistical terms, as my source base stems largely from official bodies and institutions, it is more difficult to gain immediate access to materials taking into account the experience and perspective of those relegated to subordination.

At various points in the course of the narrative, self-authored commentaries and testimonies of Filipino actors emerge within elite forums such as the Lake Mohonk Conference as well as the American Education Association. Nevertheless, rather than authentic expressions of Filipino agency, the predominant narrative of such testimonies reflects the objectives and prejudices of white organizers in their efforts to exalt the tangible achievements of the U.S. among its ‘dependent’ subjects in its overseas possessions.¹⁷ More frequently, dissenting or sympathetic voices from within the colonial lobby – namely Najeeb M. Saleeby – come to the fore, challenging and disrupting mainstream assumptions regarding the civilizational aptitude and educational capacities

¹⁷ Kramer, *The Blood of Government*, 285-286. Explaining the circumscribed nature of the Lake Mohonk Conference for nonwhite participants, Kramer notes that those Filipinos who had the opportunity to speak at the forum “inevitably did so as a ‘representative man’ of the Philippines whose deportment, demeanor, and speech would be carefully scrutinized and made to reflect on Filipinos as a whole. The role of representative was itself embedded in the racist organizational terms of the conference, whose subjects became ‘dependent’ in part through the conference's insistence that their ‘Friends’ had legitimate claims to speak on their behalf.”

of these subject populations. However, despite their comparatively liberal orientation, any lines of divergence in these testimonies must be qualified. To this extent, their statements ultimately reflect the prevailing conceptions and prejudices of Anglo-American, Protestant society and objectives of the U.S. colonial state in the Philippines.

It should be emphasized that these policies and procedures directly affected the Filipino and Native American peoples that were educated under this system. In both cases, the curriculums crafted for the colonial student were such that they would relegate a person to a social station of subordination and menial work, precluding their upward mobility. Within an ethnocentric framework, these policies served to undermine and stunt the cultural development and identity formation of indigenous and nonwhite populations, causing irreparable harm to not only the students, but their future generations. Therefore, throughout the course of my narrative, in no way do I seek to romanticize the trappings of imperialism or minimize the lived experiences of nonwhite, subject peoples.

Periodization

Concerning periodization, my analysis is concentrated in mapping the emergence of the U.S. colonial administration in the Philippines at the outset of civilian rule in 1900 to the early moves toward Filipino self-governance in 1916. My study seeks to explore the development of the colonial education system during its early, formative stage. During this period, a majority of Americans staffed the colonial administration in the Philippines. By the time of the passage of the *Philippine Autonomy Act* of 1916, the U.S. had already taken measures to establish the foundations for eventual Filipino self-governance. To this extent, the Department of Public Instruction - at both an administrative and instructional level - was predominantly staffed by Filipino functionaries, albeit under the oversight of U.S. officials.

Source Materials

Examining the system of instruction in the early years of U.S. rule in its conceptual formation, this study is grounded on a broad set of official materials including: (1) Administrative materials such as correspondence and reports from the

Department of the Army – Bureau of Insular Affairs, the Philippine Commission (Schurman and Taft), the Department of Public Instruction, and other relevant bureaucratic bodies within the colonial administration in the Philippines; (2) published materials from non-government organizations, namely proceedings from the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples; (3) instructional materials such as readers, primers, and other textbooks used for instruction; and (4) accounts and testimonies from critical decision makers and functionaries within the colonial education system, including colonial policymakers and unofficial actors such as academics and missionaries.

Chapter Overviews

Chapter One explores the ideological foundations of the U.S. curricular regime in the Philippines. Drawing upon educational precedents for African Americans and Native Americans, these principles were again projected externally to the overseas arena. The ethnocentric assumptions underlying these models served as a conceptual backdrop to inform U.S. policymakers in their assessment of Filipinos in their capacities for ‘advancement’ and in devising appropriate modes of curriculum that were suited to the conditions on the islands. Broadly, the colonial curriculum in the Philippines was crafted to inculcate Filipino students with principles of prudence, thrift, personal productivity, and self-sufficiency. While conceptualized by some as promoting deference to and veneration of authority, these same principles were at once casted by others as constituting the necessary prerequisites for the exercise of self-rule and the formation of a democratic political culture.

Although romanticized as a commonwealth of interests that was rhetorically grounded in promise of liberty and prosperity to its subjects, the U.S. imperial enterprise nevertheless constituted an ethnocentric political project – reflecting the prevailing Anglo-American, English speaking, Protestant social order. Thus, it sought to forge differentiated categories of citizenship and subjecthood among its non-white populations. Within an emphasis on character building through moral education, the system was aimed at imparting principles of economy and proper self-orientation to the Filipino citizenry. Furthermore, it will consider the question of civics education and how the

American colonial state sought to fashion alternative avenues of patriotic expression for their ‘little brown brothers.’¹⁸ Although not formally extended U.S. citizenship, Filipino nationals were nevertheless envisioned as fraternal subjects in America’s overseas empire.

Chapter Two explores educational knowledge transfers between officials in the Philippine Islands and neighboring European possessions in Southeast Asia. While grounding commentary within the frame of reference of the nation’s transcontinental frontier, U.S. policymakers simultaneously drew upon the experience and knowledge of their European counterparts to contextualize and refine their nation’s exercise in overseas colonial governance. In one regard, commentators framed their assertions upon linkages between Americans and their racial brethren in the broader Northern European, Protestant world, grounding their statements within the parameters text of 19th century Anglo-Saxonist ideology. At the same time, by advancing a narrative of nationalist exceptionalism, other commentaries sought to differentiate the U.S. from their European counterparts with regards to the nature and purpose of their exercise of colonial governance.

Accompanying the establishment of a civilian colonial administration in the Philippines in 1900, U.S. colonial officials looked to their adjacent colonies for administrative and technical models that could be replicated within their jurisdiction. In the framework of inter-imperial knowledge transfers, this chapter explores the accounts of established American colonial officials – namely education superintendent David P. Barrows (1903-1909) and Governor General Francis Burton Harrison (1913-1921) – and their commentaries on the educational reforms within neighboring colonial jurisdictions, in particular the Dutch East Indies. While displaying an apparent awareness of their European counterparts, American policymakers explored these developments from a

¹⁸ Coined and popularized by William Howard Taft, ‘little brown brothers’ was a pejorative term used to refer to Filipinos as students of American governance and statecraft in the context of the U.S.’ self-declared mission of ‘benevolent assimilation’ for the Philippines. See Stuart Creighton Miller, “*Benevolent Assimilation*”: *The American Conquest of the Philippines, 1899-1903* (Yale University Press, 1983), 134.

nationalist-exceptionalist mantle, reflecting U.S. attitudes and principles regarding the treatment of native populations and the caretaker responsibilities entailed in colonial governance.

Chapter Three explores the similarities and divergencies in curricular regimes crafted in the Southern Philippines relative to the rest of the archipelago during the early period of U.S. rule. In general, the regions of Mindanao and Sulu were administered separately from the provinces under the jurisdiction of the Insular Government of the Philippines. Although traditional racial prejudices and prevailing Anglo-American cultural conceptions served as the broad framework governing relations with Filipinos, the precedents of the U.S. transcontinental empire found their most palpable manifestation in the administration of the predominantly Muslim peoples of Moro Province. Within the context of the so-called Moro Rebellion, the governance of the Southern Philippines came to magnify the ethnocentric assumptions and racial pathologies of Anglo-American colonial elites. To this extent, in the eyes of the U.S. colonizers, the purportedly ‘exceptional’ conditions that were ascribed to the non-Christian populations of Moro Province demanded the maintenance of a military government to subdue and consolidate control over the indigenous populations of the province amidst the Moro Wars of 1899-1913.

Among the major administrators in the Philippines during the early period of U.S. rule, Najeeb M. Saleeby is notable in his efforts aimed at developing a local curriculum that sought to integrate Moro language and customs. Serving as Superintendent of Schools for Moro Province from 1903 - 1906, his accounts provide a window into broader policy discussions reflecting questions as to the status of the Moro people and the integration of the Southern province into an emerging Philippine nation in the later period of U.S. rule. Within official discourse, U.S. policymakers were certain to differentiate between Christian Filipinos and their non-Christian counterparts concerning their assumed capacities for advancement and ability to exercise self-rule. In this context, it is necessary to differentiate between the manner in which curricular precedents were applied in different jurisdictions to correspond to the varying conditions and environments among the diverse peoples that made up the Philippines. Thus, adoption of

industrial education as implemented in the Southern Philippines served to magnify the prejudices and rationales underlying the prevailing lines of thought that informed the curriculum in the islands. This mode of curriculum was instrumental in establishing a downward trajectory for the inhabitants of Moro Province relative to their Christian counterparts, the latter of whom were envisioned as constituting the likely leadership of an independent Philippines.

Chapter 1 : Anglo-American Ethnocentrism and the Ideological Foundations of U.S. Colonial Curriculum in the Philippines

1 Introduction

Although 1898 constituted the formal commencement of the nation's entry into the camp of overseas imperialism through the acquisition of territorial holdings, the United States was not wholly absent from or inattentive to the undertakings of their peer competitors among the great powers of Europe over the preceding century. Despite an absence of formal overseas possessions, the U.S. nonetheless affirmed its interests through an intersection of government-led and private-led initiatives that dually served to project the nation's interests in geopolitically sensitive regions. These initiatives ranged from naval detachments, diplomatic postings, scientific expeditions, and commercial ventures.¹⁹ Amongst this multitude of formal and informal avenues, the U.S. extended its influence into the coveted regions of Africa, the Mediterranean, and the Asia-Pacific through means of private ventures conceived at the initiative of American citizens, namely those engaged in commercial and missionary activities.

From the early 19th century onwards, from among these two groups, Protestant missionaries originating from the Northeast U.S. constituted perhaps the most vocal and zealous in disseminating the nation's variety of nationalist exceptionalism abroad. Mapping the ideological contours of their proselytizing activities, George C. Herring explained that "Much of the initiative for the extension of American ideals came from individuals, and the impetus was mainly religious. Inspired by the American Revolution and by a [religious] revival that swept the nation in the 1820s (the Second Great Awakening), troubled by the rampant materialism that accompanied frenzied economic growth, a small group of New England missionaries set out to evangelize the world."

¹⁹ Frank Schumacher, "Reclaiming Territory: The Spatial Contours of Empire in US History," in *Spatial Formats Under the Global Condition - Dialectics of the Global*, ed. Matthias Middell and Steffi Marung (De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2019), 116-118.

Emphasizing the coalescence of commercial and conversionary purposes, Herring explained that by hailing “primarily in the seaport communities and often backed by leading merchants, they saw religion, patriotism, and commerce working hand in hand... In the 1820s, they struck out on their own. They did not seek or expect government support.”²⁰ In the course of their missionary endeavors overseas, private American citizens were active in proselytizing among indigenous populations. Despite the absence of a formal mandate from the U.S. government, Protestant missionaries - driven by evangelizing zeal – constituted the ideological vanguard in the U.S. contribution to the conversionary efforts of the European powers in their penetration of indigenous polities across Africa, Asia, and the Pacific.

Among other realms of interests for Western imperial powers, American missionaries were present in the Kingdom of Hawaii starting in the 1820s through the 1830s. Generally hailing from New England, these proselytizers were instrumental in the establishment of a Westernized system of public instruction on the islands. With an emphasis on basic literacy and mathematics, English-only instruction, and training in manual labor, the curriculum instituted in these schools constituted a model for nonwhite groups that would be replicated and refined in the continental empire over the course of the coming decades.²¹ Among other actors with trans-imperial connections, notable is the upbringings of a young Samuel Chapman Armstrong - founder of the Hampton Agricultural and Industrial School in Hampton, Virginia (Hampton Institute) - whose father as a Presbyterian missionary was assigned to the islands by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

Among the initiatives of manual curriculum forged at the school that was organized by his father, Richard Armstrong “saw the need of steady industrial occupation for the natives, and it was through him that the first sawmills and sugar plantations on the island

²⁰ George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776* (Oxford University Press, 2017), 159.

²¹ Stratton, *Education for Empire*, 88.

of Maui were started.” Furthermore, the senior Armstrong “foresaw the need of diversified crops, and instructed the natives in the first principles of tilling the land.” Characterizing Samuel’s experience in the Kingdom during his formative years and its effect on the development of his racial biases, a contemporary biography by his daughter noted that while as “The young Southerner is reared in close association with the Negro” and the “the plainsman knows the Indian,” the young “Armstrong absorbed from the atmosphere about him an attitude of protection and helpfulness toward the weaker race.” Imbued in a spirit of pity and paternalistic service towards their Hawaiian flocks, this imparted on Chapman the conviction that “though individuals may often have failed in discretion and wisdom, the missionaries as a whole never forgot the thought, the mainspring of their work, that to build up and strengthen a human soul is the most important work that a man can do.”²²

During the period following the American Civil War, the curricular regime contrived in Hawaii - with an emphasis on the industrial arts and individual moral reorientation through Protestant conversion - would later be circulated back to and refined in the continental U.S. in educational institutions dedicated to the social transformation of African Americans and Native Americans. This instance of knowledge circulation is analogous to Alfred W. McCoy’s notion of the “capillaries of empire,” characterizing the overseas colonial arena as a laboratory for the development of managerial knowledge. In like manner, the development of U.S. education policy for non-white populations was in a state of constant circulation, subject to adaption and refinement when applied in new environments and among new subject populations.²³ In

²² Edith Armstrong Talbot, *Samuel Chapman Armstrong: A Biographical Study* (New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1904), 6; 27.

²³ See Alfred W. McCoy, “Capillaries of Empire,” in *Policing America’s Empire: The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance State* (University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 15-56. Explaining the broad contours of this process of continuity and transfer in the context of American intelligence and policing methods, McCoy stated that the “The flow of security personnel and practices coursing through these capillaries of empire was neither unilateral nor confined to a particular period. Once their roots were planted in the first decade of colonial rule, the circulation of ideas would continue unabated for another century, first westward from Manila to Washington, where they shaped U.S. internal security

time after their incubation in the mainland U.S., these principles of curricular formulation and their accompanying notions of colonial subjecthood would again be reexported overseas in the post-1898 period.

The principles underlying this mode of curriculum are explained effectively by Charles Bartlett Dyke – a former official at the Hampton Institute and at the Kamehameha Schools in Hawaii – in an address to the National Education Association in 1909. Speaking to competing schools of thought as to the proper avenue for educating nonwhite populations, namely liberal and industrial streams, while as the former was aimed at the gradual enfranchisement and integration of nonwhites into the prevailing Anglo-American social order, the latter Dyke advocated for a curriculum that “pleads for the development of the best in the Indian, the negro, the Filipino, the Hawaiian, instead of trying to make of him a poor white man.” Eleven years since the nation’s outward thrust in 1898, Dyke explained that “the various new American possessions, benevolently assimilated during the last decade, afford us a laboratory for the study of these vital problems” as to the best course for the education of nonwhite populations within the prevailing Anglo-American social order.²⁴

To flourish in a white-dominated society, Dyke advocated for a four-way curriculum grounded in industrial arts and moral education. This curriculum emphasized “(1) A study of nature in its broadest sense, including self-cultivation; (2) home arts and industries, culminating in a vocational training warranted by industrial capacity and social demand; (3) moral regulation of personal and social life; (4) such aesthetics as make for happiness and self-respect.” Explaining the transference of these principles to a number of notable institutions in the continental U.S. dedicated to the tutoring of nonwhite groups, Dyke noted that such “was the curriculum of the schools for Hawaiians

operations during World War I, and then eastward back across the Pacific, where they strengthened the repressive capacities of the postcolonial Philippine state.”

²⁴ Charles B. Dyke, “Essential Features in the Education of the Child Races,” *National Education Association - The Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Forty-Seventh Annual Meeting* (Winona, Minn.: National Education Association, 1909), 928.

founded by missionaries nearly eighty years ago. And such has been the curriculum of Hampton, Tuskegee, Carlisle, and Kamehameha.”²⁵ As an avenue for social engineering, these schools sought to inculcate their students with principles of prudence and thrift, self-sufficiency and material productivity, and deference and veneration of authority. With the closing of the frontier in 1890 and the nation’s rapid accumulation of overseas territorial holdings in the immediate years following the Spanish American War, these concepts were again circulated externally. In the context of the Philippines, such precedents served as an ideological backdrop to inform U.S. political leaders and colonial policymakers and functioned as a gauge to measure the aptitudes and capacities of their new Filipino subjects.

While rationalized as a commonwealth of interests that was rhetorically grounded in the nominal promise of liberty and prosperity to its colonial populations, the U.S. imperial enterprise nevertheless constituted an ethnocentric political project – reflecting the prevailing Anglo-American, English speaking, Protestant social order – that sought to forge differentiated categories of citizenship and subjecthood among its non-white subjects. This chapter explores how the U.S. colonial state in the Philippines endeavored to imbue their subjects in Anglo-American, Protestant principles. With an emphasis on moral education and character building, the curriculum was oriented to impart principles of personal economy and proper self-orientation to the Filipino populace. In addition, this chapter will consider the question of civics education and how the U.S. colonial state sought to fashion alternative avenues of patriotic expression for their overseas subjects. While conceptualized by some as promoting deference to and veneration of authority, these same principles were at once casted by others as constituting the necessary prerequisites for the exercise of self-rule and the formation of a democratic political culture.

²⁵ Dyke, “Essential Features in the Education of the Child Races,” 930-931.

1.1 Refined Prejudices and the Filipino's Prospects for Development

Within the U.S. colonial administration, opinion differed as to the supposed civilizational capacity of the Filipino people. Speaking to their broad political persuasions, it is crucial to note the archetypally conservative orientation of the U.S. colonial leadership; by extension, these individuals were deeply immersed in the prevailing lines of prejudice in their day. The first Governor General of the Philippines, William Howard Taft, Secretary of Commerce and Police, W. Cameron Forbes, and others in the Philippine Commission typically hailed from a professional background in private enterprise or identified with notions of American exceptionalism. Not dissimilar to many white Americans at the turn of the 20th century, these affluent men “believed in the superiority of Caucasians, especially Anglo-Saxons, over other peoples.”²⁶ This conventional set of perspectives was grounded in the longstanding strains of supremacist sentiments in Western nations during the period.

In this current, one observes the carryover of the traditional strains of prejudices that characterized encounters between Anglo-Americans and non-white populations in the context of continental expansion in the Western frontier, namely indigenous polities and enslaved African populations. Notwithstanding the currents of bigotry that characterized the disposition of U.S. administrators, many were simultaneously vocal advocates of the President McKinley's declared mission of ‘benevolent assimilation’ for the Filipino people, convinced of the capacity of their subjects to embrace and incorporate American values and institutions in their mode of living.²⁷ Noting the

²⁶ May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines*, 6; 11.

²⁷ The term ‘benevolent assimilation’ refers to the broad policy adopted by the McKinley Administration with regards to the indigenous populations of the Philippines. In his proclamation issued in December, 1898, specifying the objectives of U.S. rule over the islands, President McKinley stated that “it should be the earnest wish and paramount aim of the military administration to win the confidence, respect, and affection of the inhabitants of the Philippines by assuring them in every possible way that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples, and by proving to them that the mission of the United States is one of *benevolent assimilation* substituting the mild sway of justice and right for arbitrary rule.” At the same time, the proclamation did not rule out the necessary use of force to affirm American authority, cautioning that “In the fulfillment of this high mission, supporting the temperate

contradictions inherent in this ambivalent posture, Michael Adas states that “the civilizing rhetoric and practice of American policymakers in the Philippines in the early 1900s implicitly problematized, and often explicitly contravened the racist beliefs of the age.”²⁸

Within the context of their nation’s new overseas possessions, U.S. administrators were compelled to adapt and refine preexisting prejudices carried over from the continental domain even as the nation encountered foreign racial groups that were alien to their traditional frames of reference. While evoking these strains of prejudice, under a banner of purported paternalism and declared commitment to eventual self-rule for their new subjects, official commentaries were crafted to reflect this overarching objective of developing the Filipino peoples’ practical capacities. This is apparent in the proceedings for the Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples. Beyond the formal colonial government, the Lake Mohonk Conference captures the full scope of the U.S. colonial project, representing the intersection of both the state and non-state interests. Denoting the scale and scope of personalities participating, Paul Kramer states that “Colonial Officials cycling back to the United States on sabbatical or following retirement, missionaries returning from services in the field, and journalists and travelers eager to convey their impressions converged each year to collectively debate and mold conventional wisdom regarding” America’s new overseas holdings.²⁹ In essence, the Lake Mohonk Conference constituted an avenue for the circulation and exchange of colonial knowledge between major centers of power and the varying contours of the U.S. imperial sphere. The proceedings of this elite, intra-imperial forum

administration of affairs for the greatest good of the governed, there must be sedulously maintained the strong arm of authority, to repress disturbance and to overcome all obstacles to the bestowal of the blessings of good and stable government upon the people of the Philippine Islands under the free flag of the United States.” For an unabridged account of the “Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation,” see James H. Blount, *American Occupation of the Philippines, 1898-1912* (New York; London: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1912), 147-150.

²⁸ Michael Adas, *Dominance by Design: Technological Imperatives and America’s Civilizing Mission* (Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006), 159.

²⁹ Paul Kramer, *The Blood of Government*, 285.

and others serve to highlight the ideological intersections between governmental and private actors in the American colonial lobby and their codependence in the process of knowledge formulation.

From its inception in 1883, the Lake Mohonk Conference was initially concerned with addressing what was referred to as the “Indian problem” at the end of the 19th century, spurred by the cultural and demographic pressures brought to bear on Native American in the aftermath of the nation’s transcontinental expansion. Founded by an association of Protestant missionaries and affluent philanthropists, the organization aimed to achieve the assimilation of Native American peoples into mainstream white society through their immersion into Anglo-American culture, Christianization, and the qualified extension of American citizenship.³⁰ At its annual meeting in 1904, the conference convened its first formal sessions dedicated to the country’s recent overseas acquisitions - namely Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. Characterizing the need for a paternalist strategy of protracted development and deferred enfranchisement of the Filipino people, W. Leon Pepperman - Assistant to the Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs - drew upon the experience of assimilationist efforts directed to Native Americans. Evoking the supposed indefiniteness inherent in the imperatives associated with colonial governance, he explained that:

Your experience with the American Indians has shown you that to enable them to govern themselves, something more than a law proclaiming that they are fit to govern themselves is necessary. A preliminary period of training is required. Such training is being given to the Indians. It has not been considered necessary or advisable to promise them that in ten years, or in two hundred years, they will become American citizens. Nor were the inhabitants of the Indian Territory and the other Indians who are now citizens at any given time, promised that they were to be made citizens at any given time, but undoubtedly when their shoulders have grown strong enough to bear the burden of citizenship, it will be placed upon them.

³⁰ For a brief history of the Lake Mohonk Conference and the social climate that the organization emerged during the late 19th century, see Francis Paul Prucha, “Introduction” in *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the “Friends of the Indians,” 1880-1900*, ed. Francis Paul Prucha (University of Nebraska Press, 1978), 1-10.

Emphasizing the overseas application of this principle, Pepperman observed that “What your body is interested in seeing should be done and well done in the case of the Indians, the Insular Government in the Philippines is interested in seeing should be done and well done among the Filipinos.”³¹ In essence, Pepperman’s remarks constitute a rhetorical effort to bridge the separate lobbies of continental and overseas interests by drawing upon their common objectives. To this extent, he draws upon the precedents of the former as instructive to the interests of the latter lobby in the nation’s present efforts overseas. Instructive to assimilations efforts overseas, he cites the carryover of a principle of incrementalistic development – namely that self-rule was to be deferred in perpetuity as colonial officials determined circumstances and conditions to be appropriate.

Throughout the colonial archive, Filipinos were frequently referred to in an infantilized light, as though they bore the mental facility and temperament of children.³² In contrast to Anglo-Saxons, Filipinos were characterized as occupying a lesser stage of development, a racial group whose capacities had to be progressively cultivated and nurtured. Elaborating on the supposed distinction between Malays and Anglo-Saxons in the realm of learning, E.B. Bryan – former superintendent of education in the Philippines – observed that that “These people excel in certain things; in certain other things they do not equal the Saxon child. Briefly, these people excel in all things that are based upon memory or imitation. They excel in handicraft, in penmanship, in drawing, in the rudiments of music, in the rudiments of art. They excel in gaining a working knowledge of languages.” However, he continued that “In the more abstruse thought-work I think I

³¹ W. Leon Pepperman, “What the Government Has Done in the Philippines,” in *The Report of the Twenty-Second Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by William J. Rose (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1904), 67; also cited in Williams, “United States Indian Policy and the Debate Over Philippine Annexation,” 830.

³² The concept of the colonial archive refers to a “common knowledge on the treatment, exploitation, and extermination of ‘sub-humans’ accumulated by the western powers over the course of colonial history. Once established, the knowledge accumulated in the ‘colonial archive’ could be ‘activated’ in different geographical areas.” Within this framework of knowledge exchange, such channels enabled the circulation and transfer of racial prejudices between the continental and overseas domains of the U.S. empire. See Robert Gerwarth and Stephan Malinowski, “Hannah Arendt’s Ghosts: Reflections on the Disputable Path from Windhoek to Auschwitz,” *Central European History* 42 (2009), 287.

am correct when I say they do not equal the Saxon child.”³³ For their competence in imitation and reproduction, Filipinos were regarded as qualifying in learning the rudiments of political autonomy. However, purportedly lacking in their capacity to comprehend and grasp the nuances entailed in the practical exercise of self-governance, the firm but sympathetic guidance of Anglo-Americans was seen as necessary to shepherd Filipinos in their advancement over the long term.

Critiquing anti-imperialist and liberal voices calling for a hastened pace of political devolution for the Philippines, another superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Fred W. Atkinson, was skeptical of the capacity of the islands’ indigenous populations for self-rule. Speculating on the superficial consequences of U.S. efforts and the perceived limitations ascribed to Filipinos, Atkinson observed that “From a purely scientific point of view, the experiment is interesting as an attempt to do what has never been done before with an Oriental race of Malay origin in the tropics. The Filipinos will become Americanized only in the sense that they will speak English and adopt American innovations as they are introduced.” Belittling any high expectations for advancement, he cautioned that “the character of the people, and their stronger, more individual characteristics will be retained. What is good in Philippine civilization must not be handled roughly; the Filipino himself will always remain such as he was under the Latinizing process of the Spaniards.” Within this framework, U.S. policymakers often characterized Filipinos as appreciating the form rather than the substance of the principles of self-governance. This observation extended also to the realm of education, where Atkinson explained that “in the Philippines the masses have learned little else than the catechism, and the higher classes have acquired hardly more than a veneer, Education is now desired apparently with greatest eagerness, but when the novelty wears off and the

³³ E.B. Bryan, "Education in the Philippines", in *National Education Association - The Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Forty-Third Annual Meeting* (Winona, Minn.: National Education Association, 1904), 103.

hard work is required, the attendance decreases.”³⁴ To this extent, Atkinson dismissed the appeal for education among Filipinos as a merely ornamental, lacking the necessary aptitude and discipline to practically apply themselves.

Underscoring the length and scale of the task at hand in educating the citizenry of the archipelago, Atkinson drew upon parallels between the enfranchisement of Filipinos and plight of African Americans in the post-Reconstruction era. Emphasizing the persistent nature of the question and the factor of duration, Atkinson stated that “Thirty-nine years have now passed since the Civil War, and the Negro problem is still unsolved; at the end of a like period of time we shall be struggling with the Philippine question.”³⁵ With an emphasis on the element of time, Filipinos were viewed as immediately lacking in the necessary cultural and social prerequisites to ensure a functional democratic system. Attesting to the mainstream nature of these attitudes among U.S. political elites, Governor General Taft purportedly stated in an exchange with President McKinley in 1900 that Filipinos would require “‘fifty to one hundred years’ of close supervision to ‘develop anything resembling Anglo-Saxon political principles and skills.’”³⁶ While modestly hopeful of their capacity to study and replicate metropolitan concepts and institutions over the long term, U.S. policymakers of a more conservative disposition regarded Filipinos as supposedly limited in their capacity to speedily overcome their supposed racial deficits. Regardless of whether transcendence of such conditions was possible, the extension of political independence was deferred in perpetuity as American officials could not come to an ideological agreement to determine circumstances to be appropriate for self-governance.

³⁴ Dr. Fred W. Atkinson, “The Philippine Problem,” in *The Report of the Twenty-Second Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and other Dependent Peoples*, (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1904), 62; 63.

³⁵ Atkinson, “The Philippine Problem,” 64.

³⁶ Miller, “*Benevolent Assimilation*”: *The American Conquest of the Philippines, 1899-1903*, 134.

As much as supposedly innate strains of racial inferiority, commentaries from U.S. officials correspondingly attributed these perceived deficits among Filipino to questions of civilizational inheritance. In this respect, American leaders ascribed the plight of the Filipino people as a natural consequence of negligence and misrule on part of the preceding Spanish regime. Along with Guam and the Philippines, Puerto Rico was also formally transferred to the United States in the Treaty of Paris of 1899. As in the Philippines, U.S. administrators faced similar challenges in consolidating their authority over the island, particularly underdevelopment in areas of social infrastructure such as healthcare and education. To this extent, one observes similar lines of prejudice informing the frame of reference for American commentators in both Puerto Rico and the Philippines. Emphasizing the reactionary nature of Spanish rule, Dr. Azal Ames stated that “The people of Porto Rico have been for many centuries under the rule of a very ancient, if effete, civilization, which has been to them, I regret to say, not an ‘uplift,’ but only an oppressor, tax-gatherer, and taskmaster.” Characterizing the plight of the Puerto Rican people relative to that of Native Americans, he continued that “Filth, poverty, disease, and degradation have been the lot of the Indian as a wild nomad; and in a like manner have become the lot of the people of Porto Rico under the unbalanced conditions of a corrupt and degenerate civilization. It has been a class government, like that of [Alexis] De Tocqueville, the education and control of the few, as against the education and the uplifting of the many.”³⁷

According to such contemporary commentaries, the social development of their overseas subjects had been progressively diminished as a consequence of reactionary character of Spanish civilization. As opposed to cultivating and nurturing their capacity for autonomy and self-sufficiency as in the context of an Anglo-Saxon polity, their subjects were purportedly mired in a collective state of destitution and squalor under an autocratic colonial regime that hindered their prospects for self-governance. In the

³⁷ Azal Ames, “Conditions in Puerto Rico,” in *The Report of the Twenty-First Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian*, edited by William J. Rose (Lake Mohonk: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1903), 82.

context of Philippines, U.S. administrators drew similar conclusions about the ‘tyranny’ ascribed to Latin-Hispanic rule and the ineptitudes that it engendered among the Filipino populace. To this extent, they directed their criticism at the pillars of the Spanish colonial state – namely the colonial leadership, the indigenous elites, and the Roman Catholic Church. Describing the prevailing centers of power in the colony, Paul Charlton – then legal counsel for the Bureau of Insular Affairs and later a federal judge in Puerto Rico from 1911-1913 – observed that “Under the Spanish rule, the people were governed by the military, and the local administration of provinces and municipalities was carried on by the priests of the Roman Catholic Church, actually, even if not in all cases nominally.” Characterizing the scope of public education, he continued that that “The children of the *Principales*, and a few bright ones among the lower classes, received fragmentary primary instruction in the parish schools, but the instruction given was mostly religious.” Deprived of Spanish-based instruction, lessons were conducted “always in the dialect of the province, never in Spanish except in the few cities” with “the policy of the Spanish Government being to keep the body of the people more easily in subjection through inability to inform themselves, and of the friars in charge of the schools to maintain their influence by being the sole intermediaries between the people and the Government.”³⁸

In general, Charlton’s remarks emphasized the predominance of the role of the Catholic Church, under whose purview rested the administration of public education during the period of Spanish rule. Furthermore, it alludes to the irregularities in the delivery of instruction within the public education system under Spanish rule. While the broader population was more likely to speak a language or dialect local to their area of origin, fluency in Spanish was narrowly confined to the colony’s indigenous elites, known as the *cacique*, the *principales*, and the *ilustrados*.³⁹ Unlike the broader Filipino

³⁸ Paul Charlton., “The Philippine Assembly,” in *The Report of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian*, edited by Lilian D. Powers (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1907), 77.

³⁹ Karnow, *In Our Image*, 15; 51-52; 60; 151; 175; 176-177; 228. Constituting the indigenous elite of the Philippines, these three groups emerging during the preceding period of Spanish rule and reconstituted their influence under U.S. rule. The *cacique* comprised the conservative class of landowners whose power was concentrated in the rural provinces of the archipelago. Closely aligned with the *cacique*, the *principalía*

citizenry, May notes that “only the [indigenous elites] had the financial resources and, therefore, the opportunity to send their children to secondary schools and to the university,” generally church-run and private institutions.⁴⁰ Through this complex of rule comprising the Spanish colonial state, the indigenous elite, and the Catholic Church, the broad masses were excluded from the general governance of the Philippines. In contrast to Anglo-American norms of republican self-governance and Protestant individualism, the Spanish mode of rule and social organization was characterized in U.S. commentaries as fundamentally authoritarian, semi-feudal, and reactionary in character.

Even as Spain was regarded by contemporaries as a declining and retrograde empire, many U.S. officials nevertheless expressed an indebtedness to Spain for the civilizational influence that it imbued its subjects and institutional groundwork that had it laid over the course of its preceding 300-year rule over the archipelago.⁴¹ Capturing this ambivalent nature of this posture, Jacob Gould Schurman – President of Cornell University and chairman of the First Philippine Commission – explained that “In the time of the Spanish sovereignty the church was part of the state, and the church controlled all education. We do not know statistically the extent or efficiency of their work, but the masses of the Philippine people are certainly uneducated and grossly ignorant, and it seems no exaggeration to say that only a minority of them can read or write.” At the same time, he goes on to say that “in estimating the services of Spain to the Filipinos, we must remember that she lifted them from barbarism to civilization, and from heathenism to

constituted a class of local notables and magistrates tasked with general administration of the *pueblos*. Typically, of a more liberal orientation, the *ilustrado* broadly comprised the intelligentsia, professional classes (lawyers, bankers, physicians, etc.), and sections of the landowning class.

⁴⁰ May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines*, 78.

⁴¹ For further commentary of the U.S. appropriation of the Spanish colonial inheritance, see Gregg M. French, “The Foundations of Empire Building: Spain’s Legacy and the American Imperial Identity, 1776-1921,” PhD diss., (University of Western Ontario, 2017) and Francisco A. Scarano “Censuses in the Transition to Modern Colonialism: Spain and the United States in Puerto Rico,” in *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano, (The University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 210-219.

Christianity.”⁴² To this extent, both Spain and the Catholic Church were regarded as sources of enlightenment, the former responsible for imparting the rudimentary principles of Western civilization to their Filipino subjects and the latter spearheading the conversion of these populations to the basic elements of Christianity.

In the end, U.S. policymakers had inherited a diverse set of conditions on the islands. Evoking the ambivalent sentiment these aroused, Pepperman stated of Filipinos that “some writers credit them with a high degree of civilization, and compare them to our colonial ancestors, while others regard them, even the more civilized people, as little better than barbarians. It is safe to say that the truth is to be found between these two extremes, and among a people of such diverse origin, culture, and faith, it is unsafe to predicate any general statement.”⁴³ Within the context of their new overseas possessions, U.S. administrators were compelled to adapt and refine preexisting prejudices carried over from the continental sphere. The nation’s collective experiences and indigenous polities in the Western territories and formally enslaved African Americans in the Southern U.S. served as precedent as the American officials encountered nonwhite groups that were unfamiliar to their traditional frame of reference. While evoking these strains of prejudice, official commentaries nevertheless reflected the overarching narrative of ‘benevolent assimilation,’ namely the development of the practical capacities of the Filipino people in the exercise of self-rule. Where established frames of racial prejudices informed U.S. policymakers as to their overseas subjects’ innate capacities for political autonomy or the period of time required to foster the conditions conducive to achieve this end, Anglo-American conceptions of civilization informed their approach as to the best structure to marshal the Filipinos’ social and political development.

⁴² Jacob Gould Schurman, “Education in the Philippines,” in *National Education Association - The Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Forty-First Annual Meeting* (Winona, Minn.: National Education Association, 1904), 110-111.

⁴³ Pepperman, “What the Government Has Done in the Philippines,” 67-68.

1.2 Nondenominational Education and Protestant Reformation

At the outset of U.S. military occupation in 1899, the McKinley administration appointed an exploratory commission to investigate conditions on the island and formulate a plan with recommendations for the future status of the territory. The First Philippine Commission (or Schurman Commission) comprised civilians Jacob Gould Schurman, along with Dean Worcester – a zoologist with prior experience in the Philippines – and Charles Denby. Furthermore, it included military liaisons Maj. Gen. Elwell Stephen Otis and Commodore George Dewey who were at the head of the U.S. occupation regime presiding over islands.⁴⁴ Among the Commission's findings detailing the range of social, economic, and political challenges on the islands, those issues confronting the public school system in the Philippines were elaborated at length in Part III of the *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President* issued in January, 1900, with accompanying recommendations for its reorganization.

Throughout this section of the report, featured prominently is the authority of the Catholic Church in the colonial education system. At the outset, the report noted the issue of inadequate staffing of educational personnel relative to the archipelago's population. Although the Spanish colonial regime had mandated that there should be one male and one female teacher for every 5,000 inhabitants, this provision had not been implemented.⁴⁵ Furthermore, the report further noted that this disparity was most acute in terms of the distribution of instructors between rural, outlying regions and the more densely populated urban areas.⁴⁶ Describing the demographic distribution of officials under the Spanish colonial regime, Lanny Thompson states that while “The Spanish administrators and colonists occupied urban enclaves of centralized political control and

⁴⁴ Karnow, In *Our Image*, 150-153.

⁴⁵ Philippine Commission (Schurman), *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President*, Vol. 1., (Washington: Government Printing House, 1900), 17-18.

⁴⁶ *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President*, 18; 31.

commerce” it was “only the Spanish clergy and friars were widely dispersed throughout the provinces.”⁴⁷ With its wide geographic hold, discernable within this distributive discrepancy is the tangible reach of the Catholic Church in the extent to which this institution penetrated the depths of Filipino society in its peripheral, rural regions.

In addition to questions on the distribution of personnel and resources, issues on the influence of the Catholic Church regarding curriculum and instruction were also raised. By and large, the Spanish system was largely steeped in the doctrines and teachings of the Church. Consequently, the Schurman report notes that other topics were regarded in secondary consideration to religious instruction. Not unlike the issue of staffing, this matter came in spite of an official curriculum prescribing topics such as reading, writing, mathematics, geography, and Spanish history in equal weight to that of religious instruction.⁴⁸ While stated policy had formally prescribed Spanish as the official medium of instruction within the colonial classroom, the Schurman report noted that in numerous instances its use was unofficially precluded by individual clergy who discouraged its use among the native Filipinos.⁴⁹

Encountering a populace that was denominationally Roman Catholic and governed within a Latin-Hispanic communal framework, U.S. politicians, colonial officials, and other public notables drew varying conclusions on how to proceed in their efforts in the colony. Rather than merely a secular endeavor to consolidate practical administrative control over the islands, this undertaking was contextualized within a Christian cultural framework that drew upon prevailing Protestant social values within mainstream American society. Explaining his contemplation on the question of annexation of the Philippines to the Methodist *Christian Advocate*, President William

⁴⁷ Lanny Thompson, “Colonial Governmentality in Puerto Rico and the Philippines: Sovereign Force, Governmental Rationality, and Disciplinary Institutions Under US Rule,” *Rethinking the Colonial State (Political Power and Social Theory)* 33 (2017), 26.

⁴⁸ *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President*, 31.

⁴⁹ *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President*, 31-32.

McKinley explained that “I walked the floor of the White House night after night until midnight; and I am not ashamed to tell you, gentlemen, that I went down on my knees and prayed to Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night.” Describing the evangelizing nature of this undertaking, McKinley described further that “there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to *educate* the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them and by God's grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellow men for whom Christ also died.”⁵⁰ Although ignoring the longstanding Catholic orientation of the Philippines, in this statement McKinley framed the U.S. campaign in the islands in language that would resonate with the predominantly white, Protestant public.

Within the emerging U.S. colonial administration in the archipelago, American policymakers charted a more pragmatic course. In early 1900, the McKinley Administration appointed a second commission headed by jurist William Howard Taft with a mandate to oversee the transition from military to civilian authority in the islands. In contrast to the Schurman Commission which functioned as a civil-military exploratory body, the Taft Commission was comprised of an entirely civilian leadership and was extended formal executive and legislative powers.⁵¹ Under their orders from the president, the commission was directed to establish a universal system of public education conducted through English-based instruction.⁵² In January 1901, the Taft Commission moved forward in instituting a comprehensive public-school system in the Philippines, demonstrated in Act No. 74. Under Section 16 of the Act, the statute authorized the creation of nondenominational school system. Banning religious

⁵⁰ General James Rusling, “Interview with President William McKinley,” *The Christian Advocate*, 22 January 1903, 17.

⁵¹ Karnow, In *Our Image*, 168-169.

⁵² William McKinley, *Instructions of the President to the Philippine Commission, April 7, 1900*, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900), 10. Moving to foster a formal framework for public instruction, the directive stated that “It will be the duty of the commission to promote and extend, and, as they find occasion, to improve, the system of education already inaugurated by the military authorities. In doing this they should regard as of first importance the extension of a system of primary education which shall be free to all.”

instruction in the classroom, the provision stated that “no teacher or other person shall teach or criticize the doctrines of any church, religious sect, or denomination, or shall attempt to influence the pupils for or against any church or religious sect in any public school established under this Act.” However, in a caveat, the provision stated that “it shall be lawful for the priest or minister of any church established in the pueblo where a public school is situated, either in person or by a designated teacher of religion, to teach religion for one half an hour three times a week in the school building to those public school pupils whose parents or guardians desire it and express their desire therefor.”⁵³

This exception served as a measure to incentivize Filipino participation in the new school system by ameliorating local anxieties among the largely Catholic populace about the absence of catechistic instruction and the perceived conversionary aims of the U.S. school reforms.⁵⁴

In general, the political objectives of the Taft Commission coalesced with the conversionary aims of Protestant missionaries. Although the education system instituted by the civilian administration was statedly non-denominational under statute, these schools were nonetheless understood by the U.S. missionary community as an avenue for immersion in Anglo-American, Protestant cultural values. Kenton J. Clymer notes that “American Protestants had long viewed the public school in the United States ‘as part of a strategy for a Christian America.’” Denoting the ethnocentric impulses underlying this objective, he continued that these public schools “could help in the same way in the Philippines by helping create a new Philippine society, free from superstition and outmoded styles of life. The Filipino would be democratic in inclination, questioning in

⁵³ Philippine Commission (Taft), *An Act Establishing A Department Of Public Instruction In The Philippine Islands And Appropriating Forty Thousand Dollars For The Organization And Maintenance Of A Normal And A Trade School In Manila, And Fifteen Thousand Dollars For The Organization And Maintenance Of An Agricultural School In The Island Of Negros For The Year Nineteen Hundred And One*. Act No. 74 (1901).

⁵⁴ Karnow, *In Our Image*, 201; May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines*, 82.

mind, strong in body, and in general capable of contributing to the new society.”⁵⁵ Within this framework, the political objective of Filipino self-governance coalesced with Protestant notions of self-sufficiency and personal steadfastness. To this extent, the school system was necessary in overcoming the supposed personal deficiencies among the populace that were engendered under Spanish rule and thus crucial for imparting the principles that were necessary prerequisites in the development of Filipino self-rule. Preceding their overseas efforts in the Philippines, the aims and zeal of the U.S. missionary community emanated from reformist campaigns oriented towards African Americans and Native Americans back home.

Even while the public school was broadly understood as the ideal avenue to advance these objectives, others within the U.S. missionary community harbored doubts about the practical reach of the system. Considering its formally secular orientation, their skepticism as to the capacity of the institutionalized school system to provide necessary instruction in moral and character training in accordance with Protestant principles. Broadly describing the distrust of American missionaries towards public schools for Native Americans, a Quaker teacher Edward H. Magill explained that “The long and patient labor for the elevation of a race, to be effectual, must devolve upon earnest men and women, who gladly devote their lives to it, and whose high qualification for this service depends on no mere government appointment... A merely secular education, a training of the intellect alone, will not accomplish it.” As opposed to a mere utilitarian reliance on the material merits of industrial arts or technical instruction alone, Magill declared that “your attempts will be forever vain, and worse than vain, unless their moral and spiritual natures are trained to keep pace with the intellectual.”⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Kenton J. Clymer, *Protestant Missionaries in the Philippines, 1898-1916: An Inquiry into the American Colonial Mentality*, (University of Illinois Press, 1986), 162.

⁵⁶ Edward H. Magill, “Christian Education,” in *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the “Friends of the Indians,” 1880-1900*, ed. Francis Paul Prucha, (University of Nebraska Press, 1978), 283.

Extending the threshold of cynicism to degenerate urbanites, recently emancipated blacks in Southern United States, and displaced Native populations, Merrill E. Gates – President of Amherst College – similarly evoked the imperatives of evangelization. He stated that “Sodden masses of humanity, whether depraved whites in our great cities or ignorant blacks in the South, or savage red men, isolated upon reservations, cannot be redeemed and lifted up as masses or by wholesale legislation. The life of the soul is awakened and strengthened and saved only by the touch of another life.” Rather than a merely a secular enterprise, U.S. Protestants sought to convert their supposedly benighted subjects into pious and morally upright (though unequal) citizens within the nation’s republican polity. Beyond any concentrated institutional effort directed by state functionaries alone, conversion and uplift of the ‘benighted’ was an imperative to be spearheaded by conscientious individuals of Christian rectitude and virtue. In this vein, he observed that “Only as men and women who are full of the light and education and the life of Christ go in and out among these savage brothers and sisters of ours, only as the living thought and the feeling heart touch their hearts one by one, can Indians be lifted from savagery and made into useful citizens.”⁵⁷

After 1898, these spiritual considerations extended to the nation’s overseas possessions as well. Beyond merely a liberal or industrial curriculum, missionaries were convinced that the best avenue to imbue non-white peoples in proper moral education and character training was through proselytizing efforts rather than through the secular school system alone. Rev. Arthur Judson Brown – Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions – observed that “real problem in the Philippines is not political or educational; it is moral. From Secretary of War Taft down, students of the Filipinos agree that the vital need of these people is character. The defects from which they are suffering are not so much governmental and intellectual as personal.” Holding that “stable government” was contingent upon “the character of its citizens,” Brown was skeptical of

⁵⁷ Merrill E. Gates, “Christianizing the Indians,” in *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the “Friends of the Indians,” 1880-1900*, ed. Francis Paul Prucha, (University of Nebraska Press, 1978), 287-288.

the capacity of the civil government to effectively address these purported “moral” problems affecting their Filipino subjects through institutionally directed measures. Concerning the consequences of secular education, he stated that “[Schools] teach morals as far as they can, but they are forbidden by their very constitution from teaching the basis of morals. They are avowedly purely secular. Knowledge is power, but it depends upon the principle which regulates it whether it is a power for good or a power for evil.”⁵⁸

However, regardless of such esoteric objections based on Protestant doctrines alone, the broad set of moral norms and principles that the U.S. missionary community sought to propagate effectively remained a facet of the colonial curriculum in the Philippines. Despite its formally secular orientation, the curriculum reflected fundamental attitudes of the prevailing Anglo-American, Protestant social order. In what he terms “the Mohonk spirit” or “the Christian spirit,” Rev. John Bancroft Devins observed the common objectives between Protestant missionaries and the U.S. government in their emphasis on the indoctrination of African Americans, Native Americans, and Filipinos alike. With reference to a pledge by noted Presbyterian businessman and philanthropist Horace B. Silliman, Devins stated that “The Hon. Horace B. Silliman of Cohoes, a friend of Hampton, Tuskegee and Northfield, said: ‘I will put a school for boys on that island which will do for the Filipino boys what Hampton is doing for the Negro and the Indian...’ That spirit, of helpfulness, the Mohonk spirit, the Christian spirit, that is what is winning men.” Such commentaries by U.S. missionaries reveal the degree of confidence that was invested in the public school system at large and the efforts of American teachers in particular. Rev. Devins explained further that: “The army of American teachers- an army of invasion more terrible to superstition than an army with guns – entered the Philippines in 1901, and taught the people to think for

⁵⁸ Arthur Judson Brown, “Our Moral Problems in the Philippines, in *The Report of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1907), 88-89.

themselves. They have learned how to think and how to act as well.”⁵⁹ Analogous to the function of Protestant missionaries, U.S. teachers were thus casted as agents of change and as an ideal avenue for Filipino immersion in Anglo-American cultural values.

This process of Protestant acculturation was to be executed within a curricular framework that imparted principles of personal betterment and proper self-orientation to the Catholic Filipino student. Rev. Lyman Abbott observed that “The end of law is not merely to protect property as it already exists, it is not merely to promote the acquisition of property for the future, it is still more to develop human character, and the secret of human character lies in the will and the fundamental quality of child of God, is the power to control himself.” Eschewing any purely material considerations such as the acquisition of property or the imparting of vocational skills, moral education was to complement these aims, serving as an avenue for character building and personal development. Abbott later stated that “the power to develop the motive powers, to put reverence and faith, and hope, and love on top, and appetite and self-indulgence and licentiousness, and avarice and vanity, under foot, the power that does that whether it be Catholic or Protestant or Jewish or Christian or Mohammedan... is a religious power, and wherever that is done, there religion is at work.”⁶⁰ Rather than peculiarly Anglo-American or Protestant, these sources of personal betterment and proper self-orientation were thus ecumenically framed as universal, spiritual prerequisites that were foundational for a self-governing society.

1.3 Moral Education and Character Building

In their drive towards ‘benevolent assimilation’ of the Filipinos, concerns about efficiency and productivity emerged as a major point of reference for U.S. policymakers in the formulation of the colonial curriculum. In America at the turn-of-the-century,

⁵⁹ John Bancroft Devins, “The Philippine Islands,” in *The Report of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1906), 65.

⁶⁰ Lyman Abbott, “Our Duty to the Filipinos,” in *The Report of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers (Lake Mohonk: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1906) 72-73.

considerations about educational structure concerned not only whether “school budgets [were] to be efficient in the allocation of local, state, and in the case of colonial possessions, federal tax dollars... but [also whether] schools were also supposed to generate efficiencies among the children of working-class citizens, immigrants, and colonial subjects.” With regards to curriculum and cultural immersion, public schools were seen to affirm “values of productivity, patriotism, and social order among society’s youngest members and [thus] reciprocally strengthened community, nation, and empire.”⁶¹ In turn, these concepts of efficiency and productivity embodied the core set of principles and values that the U.S. prided itself on and therefore sought to impart amongst its nonwhite students – both at home and overseas. As noted by education superintendent David. P. Barrows, “One of the most necessary qualities to inculcate in the Filipino pupil is the love and habit of self-reliance. The feeling of dependence, the desire for assistance and protection, is inherent in the race. It is a weakness that has been greatly encouraged by paternal government.”⁶² In essence, this curriculum was understood as an avenue for immersion in Anglo-American cultural values. Within this context, the political ideals of the self-governance coalesced with Protestant notions of self-sufficiency and personal steadfastness. With an emphasis on the value of hard work, private property, and frugality, such educational principles additionally served to advance the cultural underpinnings of laissez-faire capitalism.

In the early period of U.S. rule, textbooks, primers, and other essential materials were lacking in the Philippine education system. Wracked by years of conflict between Filipino nationalist revolutionaries and the Spanish and later U.S. forces, ongoing hostilities had caused major disruptions within the various functions of government and society in the Philippines, including public instruction. As the U.S. occupiers moved to restore stability and consolidate their grip over the islands, policymakers sought to bring order and consistency to the colonial education system. During this period, the

⁶¹ Stratton, *Education for Empire*, 185.

⁶² Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of Education. *Eighth Annual Report of the Director of Education – July 1, 1907, TO June 30, 1908*, 2nd ed. (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1909), 36.

occupation regime imported around 120,000 textbooks from the mainland U.S.⁶³ These early materials were ill-suited for their intended users. According to Malini Johar Schueller, these textbooks – intended as they were for an Anglo-American student base – reflected a worldview that would be foreign to a Filipino student. Characterizing the social model depicted, she states that “the ideal American in these textbooks [was] white, Northern European, Protestant, and self-made.”⁶⁴ In essence, the component of moral curriculum in these textbooks functioned to “inculcate values affirmed by the colonizer’s self-representations and to disparage habits and attitudes associated with the ‘tradition’ bound Filipino culture.”⁶⁵ To this end, the education regime sought to impart principles of honesty, accuracy, thrift, cleanliness, and self-control extending to all facets of the colonial subjects’ lives, both public and private. Complementing the industrial arts and vocational classes, the colonial curriculum additionally sought to inculcate Filipino schoolchildren with principles of decency and uprightness.

In the lessons found throughout the course of the *Insular Reader* series, a reader observes the pronounced emphasis on moral education or character training for the given colonial student, replete with accompanying images and dictations. Among the key moral lessons presented in stories throughout the text include issues of truancy, idleness and laziness, as captured in the follies of the fictional Juan in his routine absences from school. One story further emphasizes the wrongs of truancy and touching upon themes of traditional gender roles (Image 1).⁶⁶ Touching upon the ills of poor attendance, the story suggests to the function of the public school in instilling basic skills in reading and writing and the development of one’s productive capacities through the making of jars

⁶³ May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines*, 79.

⁶⁴ Malini Johar Schueller, “Colonial Management, Collaborative Dissent: English Readers in the Philippines and Camilo Osias, 1905-1932,” *Journal of Asian American Studies* 17, no. 2 (2014), 167.

⁶⁵ Adas, *Dominance by Design*, 175.

⁶⁶ David Gibbs, *The Revised Insular First Reader* (New York; Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company, 1914), 26.

and baskets. Beyond the academic realm, the story alludes to the social expectations projected upon male students, emphasizing familial obligation and masculine integrity.

While attempting to accommodate the perceived cultural sensibilities of the Filipino populace through indigenous imageries, these textbooks ultimately emanated from Anglo-American, Protestant modes of self-representation as the new colonizers sought to project their political ideals onto their new subject populations overseas. This is epitomized in an accompanying image of *pueblo* schoolhouse (Image 2). With the U.S. flag foisted above the building, the image alludes to the colonial school as the key conduit for the dissemination of metropolitan knowledge. In his absence from class, the colonial student is thus deprived of the opportunity to access this knowledge.⁶⁷ Similarly, the *Insular Reader* offers guidelines as to one's ideal sartorial choices and the necessity of maintaining an orderly appearance. Within this context, the text presents tracts and imagery stressing the necessity of proper self-regulation and routine (Image 3).⁶⁸ In general, the stories and images presented in these primers emulate the concept of efficiencies, emphasizing proper moral behaviors – qualities that necessarily translate into the principles of good citizenship – and modes of behavior that maximize the productivity of one's daily efforts and therefore contribute to the welfare of society at large.

1.4 Civic Education

In the U.S. at the turn 20th century, public education was broadly instrumentalized as an institutional remedy to the widespread economic and social problems that characterized American society.⁶⁹ In a period marked by the sociopolitical excesses of rapid

⁶⁷ Gibbs, *The Revised Insular First Reader*, 43.

⁶⁸ Gibbs, *The Revised Insular First Reader*, 118.

⁶⁹ Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), viii. Explaining its functionality, the author notes that “progressive education began as part of a vast humanitarian effort to apply the promise of American life the ideal of government by, of, and for the people - to the puzzling new urban-industrial civilization that came into

industrialization, increased urbanization, mass labor strife, and large waves of immigration with diverse populations from Central and Eastern Europe, Progressive reformers advocated for civics instruction to engender norms of patriotic obligation in the political sphere and the broader national community among newly arrived immigrants and other non-white populations. Explaining the conceptual contours in this curricular shift in civic curriculum, Cliff Stratton noted that:

Rather than emphasize a partnership between individuals and the republic through voting, the new civics model stressed membership in a larger community of citizens and workers, citizens and workers... The individual, reified as hard working, loyal, obedient, and unquestionably patriotic, continued to enjoy symbolic meaning within the school curriculum. Rather than eradicate the individual's role in favor of mass loyalty to the state, the individual citizen simply became, in theory and symbol, the most ardent supporter and pillar of the national community of citizens.

Within this conceptual framework, “the community civics model at once opened new spaces to marginalized citizens and reinforced the inequalities of white-only primaries and male suffrage.” As opposed to emphasizing traditional civic activities such as the exercise of franchise or more direct forms of political activism, this curriculum encouraged alternative avenues of participation within the nation’s prevailing civic order through “exposition exhibits, daily pledges of allegiance, patriotic songs and exercises, war commemorations, and active [displays of] support for America's war efforts.”⁷⁰ As opposed to adopting a universalist curriculum prescribed for all children regardless of background or creed, white political leaders and social reformers alike broadly sought to fashion curricular regime for diverse populations of immigrants within the prevailing assumptions of Anglo-American, Protestant society. With varied effects, this ethnocentric framework served the function of fostering cultural homogeneity and national uniformity while precluding the unwanted exercise of independent political agency among non-Anglo citizens.

being during the latter half of the nineteenth century... In effect, progressive education began as Progressivism in education: a many-sided effort to use the schools to improve the lives of individuals.”

⁷⁰ Stratton, *Education for Empire*, 43.



good

bad

This boy did not
go to school.
He went to play
in the water.

He does not want to go to school.
He does not like to read and write.
He does not like his teacher.
He will not make jars and baskets.
He will not get water for his mother.
He will not carry the baskets for her.
He is not a good boy.
He is a bad boy.
He will not be a good man.

My mother likes good boys.

Image 1: Truancy

David Gibbs, *The Revised Insular First Reader* (New York; Cincinnati,
Chicago: American Book Company, 1914), 26.



This is our new schoolhouse.
We are not in our schoolhouse now.
We are going to our homes.
Our teacher gave us some new books.
Did you see us in school this morning?
Juan was not in school with us.
The teacher did not give him a new book.

We have our new books.

Image 2: Colonial School House

David Gibbs, *The Revised Insular First Reader* (New York; Cincinnati,
Chicago: American Book Company, 1914), 43.

118



coat trousers

wear slippers

Girls wear dresses.
Boys wear coats and
trousers.

This boy has on a
coat and trousers.

What is he wearing on his feet?

He is wearing slippers on his feet.

Both girls and boys wear slippers.

Do you wear red or blue slippers?

Are your coat and trousers clean?

Yes, they were washed and ironed yesterday.

Boys wear coats and trousers.

Image 3: Grooming and Sartorial Instruction

David Gibbs, *The Revised Insular First Reader* (New York; Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company, 1914), 118.

Although this curricular model emerged as the Progressive movement's response to the immediate demographic, economic, and social changes affecting the U.S. at the start of 20th century, the general drive to forge differentiated modes of civic participation within the diverse sections of nation's populace reflected an assimilationist ethos that was historically entrenched within mainstream Anglo-American society. This was grounded in the national efforts towards continental expansion and the accompanying dynamic of physical displacement and cultural dislocation of Native American polities that characterized the nation's westward dive throughout the 19th century. In general, the dynamics of westward settlement correspond to Patrick Wolfe's notion of the "logic of elimination."

Initially victims to physical displacement in a protracted process of territorial conquest and white settlement, the vestiges of these Native American polities soon became subjects in a campaign of cultural genocide in efforts by the colonial authorities to make such populations adaptable to and productive within the new settler order.⁷¹ Within the context of these protected, systematic campaigns of mass subjugation, Marilyn Lake notes that "the assimilation and education policies directed at indigenous peoples — especially children, through boarding and mission schools — and the continuing appropriation of indigenous lands, through breaking treaties and breaking up reserves and reservations, were central to, indeed definitive of, the progressive vision of advancement, efficiency, and modernity."⁷² Rather than a departure from the nation's liberal, enterprise-oriented traditions, the reformist motivations of the Progressive

⁷¹ Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 no. 4 (2006), 388. Distinguishing between "negative" (physical) versus "positive" forms of elimination, Wolfe emphasizes that "In its positive aspect, elimination is an organizing principal of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superseded) occurrence. The positive outcomes of the logic of elimination can include officially encouraged miscegenation, the breaking-down of native title into alienable individual freeholds, native citizenship, child abduction, religious conversion, *resocialization in total institutions such as missions or boarding schools*, and a whole range of cognate biocultural assimilations. All these strategies, including frontier homicide, are characteristic of settler colonialism."

⁷² Marilyn Lake, *Progressive New World: How Settler Colonialism and Transpacific Exchange Shaped American Reform* (Harvard University Press, 2019), 15.

movement reflected a continuation of the assimilationist, impulses underlying the nation's settler colonial ethos.

To this extent, the ongoing assimilationist campaigns conducted by the U.S. against indigenous peoples on the continental frontier and overseas after 1898 constituted both an extension of preceding ideological impulses common to the frontier and a concurrent offshoot of contemporary currents of Progressive reformism in the Northeast and elsewhere in the nation.⁷³ Not unlike the experiences of African Americans and other diverse immigrant communities ranging from Asia to Eastern and Southern Europe, the variants of civics education crafted for Native Americans and Filipinos is emulative of the assimilationist objectives inherent in this mode of curriculum. Within the parameters of regulated exercises such as debating societies, class elections, and school newspapers, both Native American and Filipinos could be provided measured immersion in the practices and procedures of democratic governance.

Operating within the confines of a supervised deliberative environment, such conditions enabled the propagation of ideas and knowledge deemed acceptable by white American leaders and policymakers. While rationalized as a commonwealth of interests that promised liberty and prosperity to its subjects, the U.S. imperial enterprise constituted an ethnocentric political project – reflecting the prevailing white, Anglo-American, Protestant social order- that sought to forge differentiated categories of citizenship or subjecthood among its non-white demographics. With the delayed promise of citizenship – as with Native Americans – or deferred extension of self-rule – as with Filipinos – these modes of curriculum offered alternative, uncontroversial avenues of civic participation within the nation's prevailing republican political order.

⁷³ As a broad-based political movement from the end of the 19th century to outset of the First World War, Progressivism comprised both populist-oriented and elite tendencies. Emerging in the 1890s, the populist movement constituted a grassroots campaign comprised largely of agrarian interests concentrated in the Western states. By contrast, the latter, more respectable tendency emerged from among socially minded sections of intellectual and professional circles of the middle classes in the major cities in the Northeast and other metropolitan centers across the country. For commentary of the linkages and divergencies between these two movements, see Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to FDR* (Vintage Books, 1955).

For Native Americans – physically displaced from their traditional environments and culturally removed from their cultural heritage – such persons were envisioned by missionaries, philanthropists, and other social reformers as becoming transformed individuals assimilated into the prevailing white cultural order as citizens in America’s republican polity.⁷⁴ This effort is illustrated mainly in the form of the school’s literary societies at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School.⁷⁵ Although not formally prescribed in the curriculum of the institution, these extracurricular pursuits presented an opportunity to showcase the assimilatory goals of the school. Explaining their recreational value and complementary, applied function that these societies served, the Carlisle’s founder Richard Henry Pratt remarked that: “As the Indian pupils develop mentally, the need for other interests than the regular schoolwork grows. This need is in part supplied by the work of the Literary Societies, of which there are two conducted by the boys, and one by the girls, each having its own ball for meeting, with its proper equipment.” He continued that “These societies supplement admirably the lessons of the School room and lead to a great deal of individual effort and research, as well as friendly rivalry between the societies.”⁷⁶ Despite the prevailing curriculum in industrial instruction that pupils were provided and the subordinate social roles that students would likely fulfill following graduation, this extracurricular pursuit nominally offered an alternative avenue of civic

⁷⁴ While the hallmarks of Anglo-American civilization were a trope frequently invoked within 19th century assimilationist rhetoric among white advocates of Indian education, the tangible extension of citizenship remained deferred. Native Americans were not formally granted U.S. citizenship until the passage of the *Indian Citizenship Act* under President Calvin Coolidge in 1924. For commentary on questions of citizenship and Indian education, see Jon Reyhner and Jeanne Eder, *American Indian Education: A History* (University of Oklahoma Press, 2004), 80; 95.

⁷⁵ Operating from 1879 to 1918, The Carlisle Indian Industrial School was founded by Brig. Gen. Richard Henry Pratt. An off-reserve school, the institution functioned as a model for similar state operated, boarding schools for Native Americans. Physically removed from their families, students were immersed in a curriculum grounded in immersion in Anglo-American, Protestant culture, English-based instruction, and the industrial arts. For commentary on the parallel experiences of teachers at Carlisle and those overseas in the Philippines, see Elisabeth M. Eitrem, *Teaching Empire: Native Americans, Filipinos, and US Education, 1879-1918* (University of Kansas Press, 2019).

⁷⁶ Richard Henry Pratt, *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Indian Industrial School at Carlisle, Penna.* (1897), 18, see *Carlisle Indian School Digital Research Center*, <http://carlisleindian.dickinson.edu/publications/eighteenth-annual-report-indian-industrial-school-carlisle-penna>.

participation within the nation’s prevailing Anglo-American, republican political culture.⁷⁷

The Carlisle School contained four debating societies, each organized by on gender-basis. Three of these societies were designated for boys – the Invincibles, the Mercers, and the Standards – and one for girls – the Susans. Among these four groups, the Standards were the oldest and constituted the standard-bearer that other debating societies were modelled after. Summarizing their origins and purpose, an 1895 promotional pamphlet for the school stated that “The Standards represent the oldest Literary Society of the School and have had under various names twelve years of life. From a very crude beginning, through much coaching and fostering, its members have developed a society of debaters in which live questions of *national and international policy*, as well as *grave ethical questions*, are discussed, much to the benefit of the students and the School [emphasis added].⁷⁸ While physically shielded from the outside world in the confines of their boarding school, the debating societies served to immerse students in contemporary affairs and relevant social issues occupying the attention of the U.S. public at the turn of the century. Coalescing with current events, the explicit reference to discussion of “grave ethical questions” speaks to the fundamental ideological

⁷⁷ Alyssa A. Hunziker, “Playing Indian, Playing Filipino: Native American and Filipino Interactions at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School,” *American Quarterly* 72, no.2 (2020), 434-436. Noting the irony of these debating societies relative to the vocational education that the students of Carlisle received, the author explained that “In their debate subjects, the literary societies seemed to train students to become politicians and policymakers, as these topics follow wider national debate and conversations that were happening in Congress; however, Carlisle’s students were not actually primed for governmental positions, as they rarely graduated, and many were cycled into the school’s famous ‘outing system,’ working as farmhands or domestic laborers for white families throughout the Northeast. While some former students were given administrative or teaching positions at Carlisle, most were trained as low-skill laborers, yet school debates asked them to reflect on larger issues of governmental policy, empowering Native students for roles they were unable to attain”

⁷⁸ *United States Indian Industrial School Carlisle, PA*, (Philadelphia, PA., [publisher not identified] 1895), 55, see *Library of Congress*, <https://catalog.loc.gov/vwebv/search?searchCode=LCCN&searchArg=07030346&searchType=1&permalink=y>.

mission of the school to remold its students in accordance with the predominant knowledge and norms of mainstream Anglo-American, Protestant society.

These debates reflected a broad range of contemporary issues. These varied from mundane questions such as “That the government ought to construct an extensive system of irrigation works in New Mexico, Arizona, Oklahoma, and Indian Territory” to progressive social propositions such as “That all the railroads in the United States should be controlled by the national government.”⁷⁹ While some questions dispassionately pondered current issues of the day, the initial phrasing in many motions reflected ethnocentric attitudes and prevailing policy priorities of the white mainstream. Most notable were those debates in which students considered the plight of other marginalized communities in the United States. These ranged from curricular questions such as “The education of the negro should be industrial rather than liberal” to “That immigrants coming into the United States should be compelled to be and able to read and write English.”⁸⁰ More notable were those debates in which students considered questions about the status of America’s insular territories and overseas interests.⁸¹ These ranged from motions on U.S. interests in Latin America - such as “That Cuba has not shown sufficient ability in self-government to be an independent state” and “That the Panama Canal will be forever a blessing to the United States” – to American possessions in the Pacific – such as “That the United States should permanently retain the Philippine Islands.”⁸²

While the motions as initially proposed may have reflected the prevailing sentiments of Carlisle administrators, the responses among Native American students at times varied. This is observable in motions concerning the status of the Indian reserve

⁷⁹ *The Arrow*, (Carlisle, PA), February 16, 1905, 01 no. 25; November 3, 1905, 02 no. 11.

⁸⁰ *The Arrow*, (Carlisle, PA), February 9, 1905, 01 no. 24; March 2, 1905, 01 no. 27.

⁸¹ *The Arrow*, (Carlisle, PA), December 1, 1905, 02 no. 15; February 16, 1906, 02:25; March 16, 1906, 02 no. 29.

⁸² *The Arrow*, (Carlisle, PA), December 1, 1905, 02 no. 15; March 16, 1906, 02 no. 29.

system. At the turn of the 20th century, there was debate within administrative circles as to the best model for Native American education, principally between on-reserve day and off-reserve boarding schools. Reflecting the broader questions of the civilizational mission, the motions in question read “the Reservation system fails to make useful independent citizens of Indian” and that “the Indian Agency system as carried on since its establishment should be abolished.”⁸³ In the end, both motions were rejected by the Invincibles and the Standards respectively. Despite the parameters imposed through the initial phrasing of the motions, they can nevertheless serve as an discernable gauge to broadly measure sentiment among Carlisle’s students.

An ardent assimilationist, the school’s founder Richard Henry Pratt was a vocal critic of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the reserve system more broadly. Characterizing the vested interests that comprised the ranks of this bureaucracy, Pratt stated “that the government-salaried denizens in the Indian and Ethnological bureaus saw their occupations vanish with every development of the Indian into the ability of citizens.”⁸⁴ To this end, Pratt regarded the use of boarding schools and the dismantling of the reservation system more broadly as the best avenue for ensuring the integration of Native subjects into white society. At the turn of the 20th century, Indian boarding schools and the reserve system were viewed unfavorably by large sections of the U.S. public. While objections to the former emanated from racially conscious sectional interests from the South and West that objected to federal funding for nonwhite groups, protests regarding the latter ranged from business lobbies and settler-agrarian interests.⁸⁵ For Native Americans, the concept of disbandment of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and reserve system invariably threatened to hasten the pace of cultural and political

⁸³ *The Arrow*, (Carlisle, PA), March 2, 1906, 02:27; March 16, 1906, 02:29.

⁸⁴ Richard Henry Pratt, *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904* (University of Oklahoma Press; Illustrated edition, 2004), 283.

⁸⁵ Frederick E. Hoxie, *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920* (University of Nebraska Press; Bison Books edition, 2001), 41-50; 60-62.

assimilation into the U.S. polity, doing away with what little rights to self-rule and territorial holdings that guaranteed within the treaties frameworks.

After 1898, among the populations of the nation's various overseas possessions, Filipinos were envisioned as foreign appendages to America's variant of liberal imperialism. As opposed to the immediate granting of autonomy or independence, the Insular government framed their efforts as a process fostering the preconditions for the eventual exercise of self-rule. In its annual 1914 departmental report, the civic objectives of the Department of Public Instruction are elucidated in relevance to this objective. In a subsection entitled "The Schools as a Civic Factor," the report explained that:

After the fortunes of war had transferred the Philippine Islands from the tutelage of Spain to that of the United States, the latter nation declared as its policy the establishment of a democratic form of government in the Archipelago. To prepare a larger proportion of the Filipino people for participation in such a government was one of the chief purposes of the establishment of the Bureau of Education... The effective carrying out of this policy depended, not so much upon the establishment of a democratic form of government, as upon the development of a truly democratic social organization. Athletics and industrial work have contributed much toward the democratization of the people, and all phases of school activities have worked together to promote the growth of a middle class which, experience has proved, is a requisite for successful popular government.

In the realm of public instruction, this meant the promotion of alternative avenues of participation and patriotic expression within the territory's political order to provide practical immersion in civic activities. For instance, the document noted use of village improvement societies during the primary grades of III and IV. According to the report, their members "receive practice in holding deliberative meetings, and discuss the needs of the municipality with reference to sanitation, roads, public buildings, and government," at times would "organize as municipal councils to consider questions of this sort" and "throughout the year do much to improve streets, plazas, and school and home premises."⁸⁶ In general, the logic of these activities were to cultivate the requisite experience and knowledge in the social arena that would later be transferred in the practical exercise of citizenship and political franchise.

⁸⁶ Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of Education. *Fifteenth Annual Report of the Director of Education – January 1 1914 TO December 31, 1914* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1915), 95; 96.

Throughout the primary, intermediate, and secondary programs, the U.S. colonial curriculum prescribed a minimum degree of instruction in civic lessons, becoming progressively more numerous as students advanced in the system. In the *Filipino Teacher's Manual* (1907), a prospective indigenous instructor was provided with a comprehensive set of guidelines covering school organization, classroom management, and major subjects of curriculum. In Part I, Chapter VIII, entitled "Moral Training in the School," the text sets out to inform Filipino teachers on imparting moral principles on their students. Throughout the course of the chapter, the manual provides a series of moral lessons and maxims, aimed at imparting principles of personal betterment and proper self-orientation to the Filipino student. This scheme emphasized requisite knowledge in the social arena that would later be transferred in the practical exercise of citizenship.

Concurrent with the emphasis on moral curriculum, among these maxims mentioned, the *Manual* emphasized: "the consequences of crime"; "the lesson of self-control" and of "honesty"; "the consequences of a lie" and "fair play"; "duty is the greatest word in any language," and various others.⁸⁷ Consistent with its discussions on topics of morality, the *Teacher's Manual* also extended consideration to questions of citizenship and civic duty. This is explored in Part II, Chapter VII, entitled "Elementary Civics in Primary Schools." Over the course of this chapter, a prospective reader observes the culmination of moral values that the U.S. has endeavored to impart on its overseas subjects. Emphasizing principles of "industry, loyalty, honesty, truthfulness, and humanity," the *Manual* presents these values as a necessary bridge for binding individuals together in the civic arena, forming the foundation for good citizenship.⁸⁸

In section II, the manual suggests that a teacher should organize their classes in an exercise emulating the structure of a municipal government. In this exercise, the teacher

⁸⁷ H.C. Theobald, *The Filipino Teacher's Manual*, (New York; Manila: World Book Company, 1907), 99; 100-101; 101-102; 104.

⁸⁸ Theobald, *The Filipino Teacher's Manual*, 224.

is encouraged to organize classes into units mimicking the politics of local *pueblos*, replete with an elected council – with mandates conferred through regular elections – and body of laws. Stressing the moral imperatives of voting, the manual states that “by voting, the dignity and meaning of citizenship is impressed upon the individual as at no other time.” During this chapter, a prospective reader can observe the culmination of moral values that the U.S. had endeavored to impart on its colonial subjects. Throughout this section, the Manual presents the teacher as the prevailing figure within the civic exercise. While students are tasked with organizing themselves, the teacher serves as the guiding hand, providing their pupils with the necessary counsel and instruction in their mock deliberations. This firm but instructive mode of guidance is displayed on the question of the quality of prospective candidates for the student. The manual stated that “The children will need to be advised by the teacher as to what pupils are in his opinion suitable for the offices, lest the school city get a bad start. The choice of the president or mayor should be made from among the best behaved and most capable older boys.”⁸⁹

In many ways, the relationship between the instructor and student in the civics exercise replicates – in miniature form – the structure of colonial government in the Philippines. Among the earliest reforms initiated under military occupation, the U.S. army erected formal civil institutions through the convening of elections and formation of local governments and under U.S. oversight.⁹⁰ Until the first legislative elections in July of 1907, Filipino participation in the governance of the colony was most observable in the municipal and provincial governments. Like the teacher serving as a referee in the civics exercise on practical citizenship, the Philippine Commission served as a check over the Philippine Assembly and locally assigned American official supervised an indigenously elected municipal councils and provincial governments.

⁸⁹ Theobald, *The Filipino Teacher's Manual*, 224; 229; 230-231.

⁹⁰ Katharine Bjork, *Prairie Imperialists: The Indian Country Origins of American Empire*. (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019), 156-157; Karnow, *In Our Image*, 153-54; 229-230. Among other initiatives of civic engagement, the formation of local governments was contrived by the U.S. military as a measure to win the hearts and minds of the Filipino populace amidst the counterinsurgency campaign against nationalist revolutionaries under the leadership of President Emilio Aguinaldo.

1.5 The Primacy of English and Cultural Diffusion

Under President McKinley's instructions to the Taft Commission, English-based instruction in the Philippine education system was given priority.⁹¹ Under Section 14 of Act No. 74, the commission mandated that "the English language shall, as soon as practicable, be made the basis of all public-school instruction."⁹² At a more practical level, U.S. policy makers were confronted with immense difficulties in the prospective management of the archipelago. Capturing the myriad of logistical issues faced by the colonial government, May states that "U.S. policy-makers could not, realistically have chosen Spanish as the medium of instruction. It made no sense to reject English in favor of a language which only a small percentage of the population understood. What is more, it would have been too costly for the United States to hire enough qualified Spanish-speaking teachers to supervise the instruction."⁹³ With the indigenous populations lacking a binding tongue, the imposition of a common language as a medium of instruction was regarded as a matter of practical necessity for U.S. colonial administrators in order to foster social cohesion and political order for the sake of simplifying administration of the colony.

In an 1887 congressional report, J.D.C. Atkins – Commissioner of Indian Affairs – emphasized the gravity attached to English instruction among non-white peoples. For the immersion of present and future generations of Native Americans into white-dominated society and political culture, he observed of these populations that "The adults are expected to assume the role of citizens and of course the rising generation will be expected and required more nearly to fill the measure of citizenship, and the main

⁹¹ McKinley, *Instructions of the President to the Philippine Commission*, 10. On the supposed necessity of English-based instruction, the President's directive stated that "In view of the great number of languages spoken by the different tribes, it is especially important to the prosperity of the islands that a common medium of communication may be established, and it is obviously desirable that this medium should be the English language. Especial attention should be at once given to affording full opportunity to all the people of the islands to acquire the use of the English language."

⁹² *An Act Establishing A Department Of Public Instruction In The Philippine Islands*.

⁹³ May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines*, 83.

purpose of educating them is to enable them to read, write, and speak the English language and to transact business with English speaking people.” As a tool of colonial governance, English-based instruction was envisioned to foster political cohesion and homogeneity among subject populations, transcending the divisions of local, indigenous languages by means of linguistic absorption into the colonial body politic. Atkins continued that “When they take upon themselves the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship their vernacular will be of no advantage. Only through the medium of the English tongue can they acquire a knowledge of the constitution of the country and their rights and duties thereafter.”⁹⁴ Within this ethnocentric framework, a command of English was envisioned as fostering the practical comprehension of the prerogatives and duties entailed in republican citizenship. In essence, English-based instruction would function as the primary vehicle to facilitate immersion of nonwhite populations into the prevailing Anglo-American, Protestant social order.

In this context, English was envisioned as an ideological vehicle that would enable the Filipino populace to tangibly embrace Anglo-American ideals of republican citizenship and liberty through linguistic immersion.⁹⁵ This course of policy constituted an outward manifestation of an established tool of colonial governance that was deeply embedded in the nation’s continental expansion. As a means of rhetorically differentiating themselves from their predecessors, the U.S. regarded English-based instruction as a fundamentally emancipatory act that served to empower the non-white populations. In a pamphlet issued for the Philippine Exposition in the 1904 World’s Fair in St. Louis, an excerpt characterizes divergence in teaching methods between the Spain and the U.S. with regards to linguistic instruction in the six years of American rule: “The result of the work of the American educators is summed up in the statement that more English is spoken today in the islands than was Spanish after the 400 years of regime of

⁹⁴ J.D.C. Atkins, “The English Language in the Indian Schools,” in *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the “Friends of the Indians,” 1880-1900*, ed. Francis Paul Prucha, (University of Nebraska Press, 1978), 200; also cited in Anne Paulet, “The Use of United States Indian Policy as a Guide for the Conquest and Occupation of the Philippines,” 201-202.

⁹⁵ Paulet, “The Use of American Indian Education in the Philippines,” 199-200.

Spain. The Spanish encouraged a Babel of dialects. They believed that a common language would make the natives too dangerous.”⁹⁶ According to this pamphlet, under Spanish rule the Filipino people were mired in a tangled web of languages. The broad masses were thus consigned to a state of ignorance and constrained agency, with knowledge of Spanish language confined to the indigenous elite. As noted by Jürgen Osterhammel, among established European powers, traditional concerns dictated that extending access to metropolitan languages would grant subject populations access to emancipatory concepts and ideas that could serve to disrupt colonial rule. To preclude this possibility, instruction in local language was emphasized over that of the dominant, metropolitan language.⁹⁷

In essence, the new language rules were framed as a tool to advance Anglo-American principles and values in preparing the Philippines for self-governance. English was to function as a vehicle for cultural immersion by enabling access the fruits of higher civilization. In a 1904 address to the National Education Association, a Filipino teacher, Maria Del Pilar Zamora, spoke to the functionality that English served in the islands. Emphasizing the purported ‘necessity’ of English as a common language for the archipelago, she stated that:

If a Tagalog writes to an Ilocano, the Ilocano will not be able to read such a letter. This is because the Tagalog and the Ilocano are different tribes and the language or dialect of one is quite different from that of the other. There are a very large number of these dialects spoken in the islands, and most Filipinos understand but one of these.

With the indigenous populations supposedly lacking a binding, common tongue, the institution of a common language was regarded as a practical imperative in order to foster cohesion and order among the archipelago’s citizenry. In the colonialist language of the period, Zamora explained further that the other reason for teaching English was that there was supposedly “no literature in the dialects of the Philippines, even the Tagalog

⁹⁶ *Philippine Exposition: World's Fair, St. Louis, 1904*, edited and compiled by Alfred C. Newell (St. Louis: s.n., 1904), 4.

⁹⁷ Jürgen Osterhammel, *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (Markus Wiener Publishers, 2009), 101.

language having no literature. Without a literature we should be unable to enlarge the knowledge of this people.”⁹⁸ As a marker of civility, the diffusion of English was envisioned to serve as a unilateral avenue to enable literary production and foster knowledge intercourse among the archipelago’s populace. Although an indigenous actor, Zamora’s remarks must be qualified. Far from an authentic indigenous voice, her remarks serve embellish the progress of U.S. initiatives in the Philippines and extend an altruistic veneer to the appeal of these measures among the Filipino populace. Conveyed within the parameters of an elite forum as the National Education Association, such an idealized account - that of local populations receptive to the offerings of their new overseas masters - served to reinforce contrived narratives of enlightened governance in the Philippine Islands on part of U.S policymakers.

Among notable American officials, David P. Barrows emerged as a vocal proponent of educational initiatives of the U.S. colonial administration. During his tenure as director of public instruction from 1903 to 1909, there was greater stress on liberal curriculum, emphasizing more academic subjects such as reading and writing, arithmetic, history and other topics that extended beyond industrial or vocational education.⁹⁹ Within this context, English instruction emerged as a critical facet of the colonial curriculum. Over the course of his directorship, Barrows’ zeal was apparent in his active immersion in the formulation of the colonial curriculum, displayed in his personal authorship or oversight of the annual reports issued by the education department.

In a 1906 report, Barrows sought to counter criticism on part of indigenous elites concerning the cultural consequences of English-based instruction among Filipino students. He stated that such nationalist criticism emanated from concern that English constituted “a menace to the ‘Filipino soul,’ and argue that knowledge of English will

⁹⁸ Maria Del Pilar Zamora, “A Filipino’s View of Education in the Philippines,” in *National Education Association - The Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Forty-Third Annual Meeting* (Winona, Minn.: National Education Association, 1904), 470-471.

⁹⁹ May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines*, 99-104.

‘Saxonize’ the Filipino people.” Comparable to the rhetorical efforts on part of Protestant missionaries that sought to dispel apprehension of their proselytizing aims among the largely Catholic populace, Barrows similarly sought to contextualize the emphasis on English instruction within a universalist framework. Countering this criticism, Barrows drew parallels to the long-term predominance of the Spanish language among the Indian populations of Latin America. On the purportedly natural gravitation to metropolitan languages among subject populations, the director observed that

The history of other peoples... does not justify the belief that the adoption of English speech will result in making over the race to conform to artificial standards. Mexico might be mentioned as a country where Spanish speech has spread among the Indian population without destroying the best native elements of its character. I suppose no one would argue that Mexico would be better off today if Spanish were not the universal medium of communication and the native Indian languages had continued to be the only idioms spoken by the great mass of the population. It is however, the choice of the Filipino people which must eventually decide this matter, and this is at present overwhelmingly in favor of English instruction.¹⁰⁰

Rather than a purely assimilationist measure emanating from Anglo-American ethnocentrism, Barrows attempted to frame the adoption of English as a purportedly ‘natural’ measure of gravitation on part of the broad Filipino masses. Not unlike other contemporaries, Barrows made frequent reference to increasing demand for English instruction among local populations, both adults and children alike. A comparatively liberal assertion, such claims served to reinforce Anglo-American self-representation as the U.S. colonizers sought to project their ideals onto their new subject populations and differentiate themselves from their European counterparts.

Addressing the long-term prospects for the continuance of Spanish language, Barrows stated that in a 1908 report “English is the common language of every port from Japan to Australia and Suez. The chance to make Spanish the language of the Islands existed half a century ago but it is gone today.” To this end, the adoption of English was thus framed as a matter of enlightened self-interest for an aspiring modern nation in light

¹⁰⁰ David P. Barrows, *Sixth Annual Report of the Director of Education – Fiscal Year 1906* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1906), 17.

of its functionality as the primary external medium of communication in the diplomatic and commercial arenas. Furthermore, Barrows also drew parallels to the projected decline of indigenous languages in other European overseas possessions, stating that:

If we may judge by what is taking place in all parts of the globe, the Philippine languages will disappear from use. There are scores of languages throughout both Americas which today are known only by name. Even in Africa... no native languages will persist except Swahili (itself part Arabic) and Hausa; elsewhere the languages of Africa will be English, Arabic, French, Portuguese, and Italian. The multitudinous dialects of the Philippines will likewise disappear. They will leave with us an enormous number of place names, many of which are older than the languages at present spoken in the locality of these names, names of trees and plants, and a considerable additional vocabulary descriptive of objects native to Malaysia. These will all become a part of the English language spoken throughout the Archipelago.¹⁰¹

Like the peoples, the native languages of these possessions would ultimately be assimilated. In his statement, Barrows makes reference to the scholarly observations of William John McGee and Sir Harry Johnston, both of whom were contemporary researchers in the expanding field of anthropology. During the age of high imperialism, such academic specialties were critical in the formation of the science of difference and the development of ethnocentric conceptions of colonial cultures and bodies. An anthropologist by profession, Barrows had prior experience interacting with and managing non-white populations in his research of Native American tribes in California and Colorado and in his tenure as the Chief of the Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes in the Philippines.¹⁰²

From an academic perspective, the long-term fate of Filipino dialects was thus framed within the context of a purportedly natural cycle of progressive linguistic development in the growth of advanced languages. In this process, the plurality of local vernaculars would subsequently adapt and blend with the ascent of English and other metropolitan languages. In general, Barrows' universalist prescriptions served to obfuscate the deliberate political aims of U.S. language policy in the Philippines.

¹⁰¹ David P. Barrows, *Eighth Annual Report of the Director of Education*, 30-31; 33-34

¹⁰² May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines*, 97.

Whether framed as a measure of voluntary choice on part of the Filipino populace or a matter of imposition, his statement serves to obscure the particularistic nature of these measures as emanating from a conviction of Anglo-American supremacism. Whether contextualized as a practical tool of communication in general intercourse in the international sphere or emanating from an organic cycle of linguistic development, Barrows' statements fail to acknowledge the dimension of coercion entailed in these processes.

In a 1902 address to the U.S. Senate Committee on the Philippines, Barrows discussed the general conditions on the islands and spoke to the utility of the English language in the execution of U.S. aims.¹⁰³ Emphasizing the functionality of the language in ensuring both national and international intercourse for the broad masses, he stated that “if the Filipino is to be enlightened at all, he has to have some medium of exchange from tribe to tribe and from himself with the white race, and it is an exceedingly fortunate thing I think that his ambition at the present time is to acquire English, and that he never acquired any deep attachment to the Spanish language.”¹⁰⁴ Barrows regarded it as impractical to adopt a local Filipino language, based on the supposedly limited likelihood that such vernaculars could immediately amalgamate or blend. Due to the purportedly undeveloped character of local languages and the narrow use of Spanish to the indigenous elite, the adoption of English was regarded as optimal to foster national cohesion and international exchange.

As to the capacity to integrate foreign terminology, he observed that “I do not think it would be feasible, and it would be almost impossible, I think, because the

¹⁰³ Chaired Henry Cabot Lodge, the 1902 U.S. Senate Committee on the Philippine Islands was convened in response to domestic concerns about the counterinsurgency tactics and allegations of prisoner abuse at the hands of U.S. forces in their efforts against Filipino nationalist forces. Along with David P. Barrows, other prominent persons to testify at the hearings included William Howard Taft, Maj. Gen. Elwell Stephen Otis, and Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur Jr. See Karnow, *In Our Image*, 192.

¹⁰⁴ United States Congress, Senate, Committee on the Philippines Islands of the United States, *Annual Affairs in the Philippines: Hearings before the Committee on the Philippines Islands of the United States Senate*, 57th Cong., 1st sess., doc. No. 331, pt. 1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902): 695.

educated Filipino is not developing his own dialect. The tendency has been for him, under Spanish education, to lose knowledge of his native dialect as he became educated in Spanish.”¹⁰⁵ In an effort to forge a Western-style national community, Barrows thought it impractical to adopt Filipino language due to their alleged lack of historical development in integrating foreign expressions and words. In essence, such terms constituted a key to the sophisticated knowledge of a higher civilization. Because of a lack of requisite terminology, local languages were regarded as impractical as a common medium of communication for commercial affairs or literary pursuits.

In the realm of national culture, Barrows hoped that the use of English would serve as a bridge to foster bi-national intercourse between Americans and Filipinos. In his questioning by Senator Joseph L. Rawlins of Utah, Barrows stated that “We hope that it will have a beneficial political effect: that is, the more they know of America and Americans and American institutions the more satisfied they will be under American rule.” To this end, the institution of English was regarded as an ideological tool to facilitate the diffusion of Anglo-American political principles. Towards the latter part of his exchange with the presiding legislators, Barrows’ remarks revealed the gap that existed in the practical priorities of the colonial state versus the liberal rhetoric often employed. This is apparent in his questioning by Senator Edward W. Carmack of Tennessee:

Mr. Barrows: I should say that for them to be in love with American institutions or to acquire confidence in American institutions, they would have to be guaranteed the ordinary civil rights of an American citizen.

Senator Carmack. What about the political rights?

Mr. Barrows. I understand there are no political rights guaranteed to an inhabitant of a Territory, and yet he enjoys certain political rights. I think the Filipino would pass under the same organization and be satisfied.

Senator Carmack. An inhabitant of a Territory is a citizen of the United States.

¹⁰⁵ *Annual Affairs in the Philippines*, 698.

Mr. Barrows. I mean he has no political rights guaranteed by the Constitution, as distinguished from civil rights.¹⁰⁶

This exchange with Senator Carmack occurred amidst debates over questions of the legal status of the newly acquired overseas possessions such as Puerto Rico and the Philippines. Under Section 4 of the *Philippine Organic Act* of 1902, the indigenous inhabitants of the islands were classified as citizens of the islands and “as such entitled to the Protection of the United States.”¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, questions remained over the extension of the U.S. Constitution to the inhabitants of these territories. This concerned whether such persons were guaranteed citizenship with the civil rights and protections entailed.¹⁰⁸

In a series of landmark rulings in 1901 that came to be referred to as the Insular Cases, the Supreme Court designated a legal distinction between *incorporated* and *unincorporated* territories, the former designated as on the path to statehood while the latter were relegated to the status of foreign appendages to the United States. In essence, the Insular Cases constructed an amendable, elastic relationship between the U.S. metropole and their unincorporated, overseas territories. While at once asserting ultimate sovereignty over these possessions and their inadmissibility into the American union, these rulings simultaneously afforded the U.S. the authority to unilaterally relinquish sovereignty over these unincorporated territories.¹⁰⁹ This convoluted legal formula

¹⁰⁶ *Annual Affairs in the Philippines*, 701-702.

¹⁰⁷ United States Congress, *An Act Temporarily To Provide For The Administration of the Affairs of Civil Government in the Philippine Islands, And Other Purposes*, 57th Congress, 1st sess. (1902).

¹⁰⁸ For commentary of the extension of the U.S. constitution to the nation’s insular territories in the, See also Bartholomew Sparrow, *The Insular Cases and the Emergence of American Empire* (2006).

¹⁰⁹ Christina Duffy Barnett, “United States: American Expansion and Territorial Deannexation,” *The University of Chicago Law Review* 72 no. 3 (2005), 797-879. Explaining this unorthodox constitutional relationship between metropole and periphery, the Barnett that “While is true that the Insular Cases rejected the assumption that all U.S. territories were on their way to statehood, the unprecedented implication of this reasoning was not that Congress could withhold statehood indefinitely from an unincorporated territory - after all, Congress could withhold statehood indefinitely from an incorporated territory, too - but rather that the United States could relinquish sovereignty over an unincorporated territory altogether. The Insular Cases established that such territories could be separated from the United States, or what I call here

functioned to placate anti-imperialist sentiment in the metropolitan political arena in opposition to annexation while affirming ultimate sovereignty over their peripheral dependencies. Advancing an inherent separateness in spatial and temporal parameters, this constitutional framework served to obfuscate the constitutional relationship between the continental U.S. and their overseas territories such as the Philippines.¹¹⁰

In general, these judgements issued reflected prevailing ethnocentric notions of Anglo-Saxon supremacism¹¹¹ Within this frame of cultural reference, the extension of citizenship was contingent upon the civilizational aptitude of those foreign populations inhabiting those possessions. Writing in the plurality opinion in *Downes v. Bidwell* (1901), Justice Henry B. Brown declared that:

If those possessions are inhabited by alien races, differing from us in religion, customs, laws, methods of taxation, and modes of thought, the administration of government and justice according to Anglo-Saxon principles may for a time be impossible, and the question at once arises whether large concessions ought not to be made for a time, that ultimately our own theories may be carried out and the blessings of a free government under the Constitution extended to them.¹¹²

Within this ethnocentric framework, the rights and privileges guaranteed in U.S. citizenship constituted a preserve that was particular to the culture of the Anglo-Saxon peoples. In this context, Barrows' remarks are prescient as they speak to the divergent priorities of the U.S. colonial state. Although it promised the fruits of higher civilization through immersion in universal principles of self-governance, this engagement between the U.S. metropole and the overseas periphery was to be achieved through American projection rather than bilateral cultural exchange. In this context, English was conceived as a unilateral medium to facilitate the dissemination of Anglo-American cultural

'deannexed,' as long as they remained unincorporated. Preserving the option of deannexation was precisely the reason not to incorporate a territory in the first place."

¹¹⁰ Schumacher, "Reclaiming Territory," 127-130.

¹¹¹ Mark S. Weiner, "Teutonic Constitutionalism: The Role of Ethno-Judicial Discourse in the Spanish American War," in *Foreign in a Domestic Sense*, ed. Christina Duffy Burnett and Burke Marshall (Duke University Press 2001), 65.

¹¹² *Downes v. Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 244 (1901).

knowledge. From an ethnocentric point of view, as a consequence of the allegedly underdeveloped character of local languages such as Tagalog, English was regarded as the only viable channel to achieve this diffusion. However, although English was a medium to comprehend American culture and political institutions, an understanding of the language did not necessarily constitute a pathway to U.S. citizenship or effective enfranchisement. To this end, the preeminence of English – with the rhetorical trappings as opposed to the substance of self-governance – served as a tool to forge a mode of differentiated homogeneity between white citizens in the continent and Filipino subjects overseas.

Chapter 2 : U.S. Colonial Education in the Philippines and Trans-imperial Exchanges

2 Introduction

On October 23, 1912, Dr. Elmer Ellsworth Brown presented the opening address to the thirtieth annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples. Setting out the broad objectives of the Conference, Brown spoke to the transnational dimensions associated with the assimilationist efforts against colonized peoples by metropolitan nations. Rather than a purely national pursuit on part of individual states, the ‘civilizing mission’ instead constituted a universalist undertaking. Denoting the international proportions of this mission, he observed in the colonialist language of the time that:

The white man's burden is the burden of saving the more retarded peoples from the death and destruction that come with civilization, by giving them more and better civilization. Beyond question, this is a world-problem; and much of the best work of the world, for generations to come, must go to its solution. It is England's problem, in India and Egypt and South Africa; it is Germany's colonial problem; it is the Dutch in their East Indian possessions; it is Japan in Korea and Formosa, and it is all of us and all civilized peoples, in our relations with peoples not so far advanced in civilization.

Denoting the perceived deficiencies ascribed to their dependent populations, Brown linked the historical experience of the United States with that of their European counterparts, stating that “our problems concerning the Indian, the Filipino, and other retarded peoples is a part of the general problem of the modern world.”¹¹³ Although a recent newcomer to the camp of overseas imperial powers, the ongoing experience of the U.S. in its encounters with nonwhite, colonized peoples - whether in the context of the nation’s continental empire or its new overseas possessions - was often understood by white society as part of a broader process of ‘progressive’ development in the march of modern ‘civilization.’

¹¹³ Elmer Ellsworth Brown, “Opening Address of Dr. Elmer Ellsworth Brown,” in *The Report of the Thirtieth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Henry S. Haskins (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1912), 18-19.

Even as the imperatives of this undertaking were broadly contextualized within global dimensions, colonialism was nonetheless framed within particularistic parameters contrived relative to the conditions of each metropolitan nation. For instance, Tsarist Russia also framed their expansionist designs across Eurasia within Pan-Slavic or Slavophile ideology, emphasizing the unity and cultural peculiarity of Slavic peoples, not unlike the British Empire in its advance of Anglo-Saxonist civilization. Within similar parameters, metropolitan states framed their imperial ambitions within a mission of national providence, grounded in values and principles unique to their national character.¹¹⁴ To this extent, commentaries of Anglo-American elites framed the American imperial project within the parameters of Anglo-Saxonist ideology, emphasizing linkages between Americans and their racial brethren in the broader English-speaking world.

This chapter explores the trans-imperial dimensions of U.S. colonial education in the Philippines.¹¹⁵ In general, the U.S. colonial mission in the Philippines was contextualized in a dualistic manner. In one regard, commentators grounded their assertions upon linkages between Americans and their racial brethren in the broader Northern European, Protestant world, framing their statements within the parameters text of 19th century Anglo-Saxonist ideology. At the same time, by advancing a narrative of nationalist exceptionalism, other commentaries sought to differentiate the U.S. from their European counterparts with regards to the nature and purpose of their overseas colonial mission. In essence, while grounding commentary within the frame of reference of the

¹¹⁴ For comparative analysis of the British Empire and the Russian Empire in their ideological orientations, see also Dominic Lieven, *Empire: Russia and Its Rivals* (Yale University Press, 2000) and *Towards the Flame: Empire, War and the End of Tsarist Russia* (Allen Lane, 2015). Similarly, for compassion between the United States and Russia, see Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires across Continents: The United States and Russia*, in *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton University Press, 2010), 251-286. Finally, for analysis on the U.S. experience of settler colonialism within a comparative framework, see Michael Adas, "From Settler Colony to Global Hegemon: Integrating the Exceptionalist Narrative of the American Experience into World History," *American Historical Review* 106 no. 5 (2001), 1692-1720.

¹¹⁵ The terms trans-imperial and inter-imperial are used interchangeably throughout the course this chapter to denote intercourse between imperial powers and jurisdictions.

nation's domestic colonial frontier, elites drew upon the experience and knowledge of their European counterparts to contextualize and refine the nation's exercise in overseas colonial administration. Asserting the non-exceptionality of the U.S. as to their techniques of management in overseas empire, Frank Schumacher observes the hybrid character of intellectual transfers in knowledge of colonial management between the Americans and their more established European predecessors in the former's selective appropriation of foreign knowledge.¹¹⁶ While predominantly grounding their commentary in the framework of transcontinental, settler expansion in the North American frontier, U.S. policymakers correspondingly drew upon the experience and knowledge of their European counterparts to refine and enhance their nation's exercise in overseas imperial governance.

With the establishment of a civilian colonial administration in the Philippines in 1901, U.S. colonial officials journeyed to neighboring colonies to investigate administrative and technical models that could be replicated in the archipelago. Within the framework of inter-imperial knowledge transfers, this chapter explores the accounts of prominent American colonial officials – namely education superintendent David P. Barrows (1903-1909) and Governor General Francis Burton Harrison (1913-1921) – and their commentaries on the educational reforms within neighboring colonial jurisdictions, in particular the Netherlands East Indies. While displaying an apparent awareness of their European counterparts, U.S. policymakers observed these developments from a nationalist-exceptionalist perspective, reflecting American attitudes and principles regarding the treatment of indigenous populations and the purported caretaker responsibilities entailed in colonial governance.

¹¹⁶ Frank Schumacher, "The American Way of Empire: National Tradition and Transatlantic Adaptation in America's Search for Imperial Identity, 1898-1910," in *German Historical Institute Bulletin* no. 31 (2002), 36. Explaining this process of knowledge transmission, Schumacher observes that "As with all forms of cultural and ideational transfers, the process of mining the nation's past for precedents and adapting transnational concepts was carried out in a highly selective manner. Some arguments and ideas were appropriated, while others were rejected. Americans borrowed from both the national and international contexts, reconfigured the information and adapted the findings to a new context. The result was neither a carbon copy of the original nor old wine in new bottles, but an amalgam, a hybrid of national tradition and transatlantic adaptation that shaped the American way of empire."

2.1 Ethnocentric Foundations of Trans-imperial Exchange

Long before 1898, the seeds of Anglo-Saxonist ideology were well established within the Anglo-American political discourse. Even at the outset of the American Revolution, intellectual and political leaders in the North American colonies made reference to the political inheritance endowed to their fellow colonists as members of the English-speaking peoples. In the 1774 petition entitled *A Summary View of the Rights of British America*, Thomas Jefferson drew parallels between the processes of Anglo-Saxon settlement of Britain and the English settlement of North America. Drawing on the common imperatives of settlement and the political legacies of these peoples, Jefferson elucidated that “Our ancestors, before their emigration to America, were the free inhabitants of the British dominions in Europe, and possessed a right which nature has given to all men, of departing from the country in which chance, not choice, has placed them, of going in quest of new habitations, and of their establishing new societies, under such laws and regulations as to them shall seem most likely to promote public happiness.” Emphasizing the developmental imperatives and system of laws conferred by their racial forebearers, the future author of the Declaration of Independence continued that “That their Saxon ancestors had under this universal law, in like manner left their native wilds and woods in the north of Europe, had possessed themselves of the island of Britain... and had established there that system of laws which has of long been the glory and protection of that country.”¹¹⁷ While initially forged through the independent efforts of English settlers, the development of the American colonies was inherently understood within the template of Anglo-Saxon settlement across the British Isles.

In the decades following the American Revolution, this strand of Anglo-Saxonism gradually advanced within mainstream national discourse as an ideological framework to rationalize the nation’s transcontinental expansion. During the mid-19th century, U.S.

¹¹⁷ Thomas Jefferson, *A Summary View of the Rights of British America: Set Forth in Some Resolutions Intended for the Inspection of the Present Delegates of the People of Virginia, Now in Convention* (Williamsburg: Clementina Rind, 1774), 6.

political elites and the public at large were “inspired [by] a belief that the American Anglo-Saxons were destined to dominate or penetrate the American continents and large areas of the world. Americans had faith that they would increase in such numbers that they would personally shape the destiny of other areas.” Crucially, Anglo-Saxonist ideology was progressively reinforced through increased contact with non-white groups, namely black slaves in the plantation economy of the Southern United States; Native Americans in the Western frontier; and with Mexican populations through the annexation of Texas in 1845 and the acquisition of California and the Southwest territories in the Mexican-American War in 1848.¹¹⁸

As the nation moved towards overseas imperialism in the late 19th century, political leaders Theodore Roosevelt, Albert J. Beveridge, Henry Cabot Lodge, John Hay and intellectuals such as military strategist Alfred Thayer Mahan came to identify transatlantic linkages between Great Britain and the U.S. to explain their nation’s global rise.¹¹⁹ On the basis of ethnocentric connections manifested in common values and institutions whether presented as members of the Anglo-Saxon or English-speaking peoples, such commentaries conveyed the imperatives associated with the newfound standing of the U.S. among the league of Western imperial powers. Similar to Jefferson, this emphasis on continuity and permanence in the nation’s expansionist impulse is also reflected in the writings of Theodore Roosevelt, particularly his landmark 1889 piece *The Winning of the West*.

In his first chapter, “Spread of the English-Speaking Peoples,” Roosevelt stated that “During the past three centuries the spread of the English-speaking peoples over the world’s wastespaces has been not only the most striking feature in the world’s history, but

¹¹⁸ Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Harvard University Press, 1981), 208; 298-303.

¹¹⁹ Stuart Anderson, *Race and Rapprochement: Anglo-Saxonism and Anglo-American Relations, 1895-1904* (Farleigh Dickenson University; Associated University Presses, 1981), 73; 128.; Frank Schumacher, “Lessons of Empire: The United States, the Quest for Colonial Expertise and the British Example, 1898-1917,” in *From Enmity to Friendship: Anglo-American Relations in the 19th and 20th Century*, ed. Ursula Lehmkuhl and Gustav Schmidt (Wissner-Verlang, 2005), 76.

also the event of all others most far-reaching in its effects and its importance.” Noting the progressive nature of this expansionist dynamic in the context of the U.S. , he continued that “The vast movement by which this continent was conquered and peopled cannot be rightly understood if considered solely by itself. It was the crowning and greatest achievement of a series of mighty movements, and it must be taken in connection with them.” Even as he emphasized the nation’s inheritance, the future President’s narrative nevertheless sought to demarcate the distinctive racial composition of the U.S. He stated that “It is well always to remember that at the day when we began our career as a nation we already differed from our kinsmen of Britain in blood as well as in name; the word American already had more than a merely geographical signification. Americans belong to the English race only in the sense in which Englishmen belong to the German.” To this extent, Roosevelt emphasized the contributions of other Northern European and Protestant peoples to America’s racial makeup, mentioning the presence of Dutch, German, and Scandinavian peoples and of French Huguenots. He concluded therefore that “Thus it appears that no new element of importance has been added to the blood. Additions have been made to the elemental race-strains in much the same proportion as these were originally combined.”¹²⁰

In essence, Roosevelt’s observations speak to the ambiguity of ethnocentric ideologies within the demographic context of the U.S. Imprecise in its cultural-historical and scientific groundings, American Anglo-Saxonism was both fluid and pliable as a mode of nationalism. A coalescence of nationalist currents and pseudo-scientific thought, these porous parameters facilitated a flexible evocation of the concept in elite commentaries, contingent upon present circumstances and prevailing political interests.¹²¹ While acknowledging the primacy of the cultural and political inheritance

¹²⁰ Theodore Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, vol. 1 *The Spread of the English-Speaking Peoples* (New York and London, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1900), 17; 24; 38; 39.

¹²¹ Anderson, *Race and Rapprochement*, 18-19. Addressing the fluidity of Anglo-Saxonist ideology, Anderson explained that “By tying racism to national aspirations, late nineteenth-century society accorded it eminence and importance. However, the purveyors of racist notions in the late nineteenth century, like racists at most times in human history, eschewed precision of thought. Asked to define exactly what was

endowed by Great Britain, Roosevelt noted that comparable traits could also be attributed to racial other groupings, particularly to the contributions of Northern European and Protestant peoples. Assuming a nationalist exceptionalist mantle, such rhetorical characterizations served to differentiate the U.S. from their European counterparts and temporally elevate their stature in the span of civilization to not only rival but supersede Great Britain. After victory in the Spanish American War, this dualistic discursive dynamic became more pronounced as U.S. political leaders, commentators, and colonial administrators looked to the precedents of their established European counterparts in colonial governance. Within the arena of mainstream political discourse in the mainland U.S., pro-imperial elements contrived to communicate the projected advantages and benefits of the nation's thrust into overseas imperialism.

Constructing links of historical precedent, political leaders, public commentators, and other civic notables sought to draw parallels between the pace of territorial expansion of the U.S. and the experiences of their European counterparts. Within the context of Anglo-Saxonist ideology, commentators would frame their assertions upon linkages between Anglo-Americans and their racial brethren within the broader English-speaking world. Summarizing the host of imperatives associated with the nation's newfound standing among the league of Western imperial powers, a contemporary anti-imperial pamphlet effectively framed the narratives advanced by the pro-imperial lobby. Evoking common rhetorical tropes of the period exalting the nation's liberal political orientation, the pamphlet explained "We are solicited to extend our proprietorship and rule in order to disseminate our free institutions over the earth. Wherever our liberal institutions go they are presumed to convey enlightenment and elevation." Explaining the relative decline of Great Britain, the pamphlet observed that "We are told that it is a critical moment for mankind, that England has for some generations been bucking against the entire world alone, that her strength is failing, and that destiny calls us to the rescue." Noting the common obligations observed by Great Britain and the U.S., the piece continued that

meant by the expression 'Anglo-Saxon' race, few persons in Britain or the United States could have given a definite answer."

“Anglo-Saxonism is set forth to be a higher form of civilization than any other race can bring to the conquered continents, and it is plaintively alleged that England's struggle is ours and that the spread of Anglo-Saxonism, its lofty realities and loftier ideals, is the sacred affair of every English speaking man.”¹²² As members of the English-speaking peoples, Americans were presented as heirs to the liberal democratic institutions of their former colonial masters across the Atlantic. Assuming the mantle of their racial forebears in shouldering the purported burdens of imperialism, the U.S. was tasked with advancing the frontiers of ‘civilization’ and liberty to ‘benighted,’ subject populations over whom they exercised dominion.

If not framed as mere successors to the legacy of their predecessors, other Anglo-American commentaries would frame Great Britain and the United States as partners in a joint enterprise in a liberal variant of imperialism. On the basis of common values and institutions as members of the English-speaking peoples, both nations were regarded as bearing a shared responsibility in expanding the frontiers of civilization and spreading liberal principles to the benighted populations of the Far East. In an address to the twenty-sixth annual Lake Mohonk Conference in 1908, Mason S. Stone – former Superintendent of Schools in Manila between 1901 and 1905 – evoked the mutual civilizational imperatives that both countries shared in the Asia-Pacific region as English-speaking nations. He observed that “Now the Union Jack, which represents the Eastern wing of our Anglo-Saxon race, floats over Tasmania, Australia, Borneo, Fiji and Hong Kong; while the Stars-and-Stripes, which represent the Western wing of the Anglo-Saxon race, floats over Hawaii, Guam, Samoa and in the Philippines.” With their respective footholds in the Asia Pacific, he asserted that “these two great wings of the Anglo-Saxon race must be brought into harmonious action and convey to the far-off peoples of the Orient the elements of a righteous government, the principles of a higher estate and the

¹²² Morrison I. Swift, *Expansion for the Sake of God, Love and Civilization* (Los Angeles: The Ronbroke Press, 1900), 9.

alchemy of a better life.”¹²³ Within this context of such commentaries, the Anglo-American relationship was contextualized in an air of friendship and fraternal cooperation. By extension of this rhetorical framework, the U.S. could be casted as coequal to Great Britain in stature in the international arena.

Whether regarded as energetic successors or coequal partners in the overseas imperial arena, both commentaries emphasized the common cultural legacy of the Anglo-American relationship. These purportedly organic linkages between Americans and their brethren in the English-speaking world serve as an ethnocentric reserve of knowledge that U.S. policymakers could draw upon to inform their intellectual sources for the exercise of colonial rule. In addition to Great Britain, pro-imperial commentaries would also draw upon the precedents of other Northern European peoples in their experiences in overseas colonialism. Within the broader imperial discourse, the experiences of Great Britain and the Netherlands – with their common cultural inheritance and racial connections – dually functioned as ethnocentrically conducive, synonymous points of reference for U.S. commentators and policymakers at the outset of the nation’s external thrust.

In a 1900 pro-imperial article, judge Norton P. Chipman cited the experiences of the Netherlands in its possessions in the East Indies. After alluding to the recent efforts on the part of Great Britain to effectively settle their tropical possessions in the Pacific and Africa, he observed that “Nor is England alone, among the peoples of the north of Europe, engaged in civilizing and controlling tropical countries. Holland of late years has been rapidly increasing her settlements in Sumatra, until that island now contains a white population of not less than fifty thousand.” While not strictly Anglo-Saxon in origin, the Dutch nonetheless were regarded as an analogous racial grouping in light of their Protestant, Northern European stock. In this vein, Chipman stated that “for this north of Europe Dutchman it has never been claimed that he is the equal of the Anglo-Saxon as a

¹²³ Mason S. Stone, “The Philippines – An Opportunity,” in *The Report of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1908), 87.

colonizer, and still he has proven a permanent and successful settler in the tropics, the colony to which he belongs being rated as the wealthiest. per capita, of any colony in any zone of the world.”¹²⁴

In an address to the twenty-fifth annual Lake Mohonk Conference in 1907, Mrs. Samuel McCune Lindsay - the spouse of a former Commissioner for Education of Puerto Rico - spoke to the development of educational models for subject populations in tropical colonial possessions. Within the context of Puerto Rico, she posed the question as to what constituted the best framework to “educate a tropical race to bring out all the fine and noble qualities that are inherent in tropical nations, and at the same time carry on the culture of Greece and Rome, and the proud ideals of Anglo-Saxon liberty and justice?” To this conjecture, McCune Lindsay responded that the United States should look to tangible precedents among their racial kin. She stated that:

All we can do in our lifetime is to put the utmost study and research on this subject, and to compare our system of education with the temperamental traits of different races, and then see in what way racial education can best be applied... We have the influence and example of England in her governmental schools of India, and her other colonies and dependencies; we also have the influence of the Dutch system of education in her colonies, which in many ways are very finely handled; and we also have the great network of missionary schools, whose history covers more than one hundred years.¹²⁵

In one regard, the experiences of both countries in tropical regions served as a measure to gauge the potential of the United States for success in their capacity to adapt in similar conditions. Furthermore, their experiences provided precedents for the management of non-white subject populations in tropical regions. With their networks of formal territorial holdings in the Caribbean and the Asia-Pacific, Great Britain and the Netherlands respectively possessed decades of experience in the management of tropical subjects going back to the late 16th century. By comparison, the U.S. was limited to

¹²⁴ Norton P. Chipman, “Territorial Expansion: The Philippines – The Oriental Problem,” *Overland Monthly* (1900) 18-19.

¹²⁵ Samuel McCune Lindsay, “New Aspects of the Problem in Porto Rico,” in *The Report of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1907), 165.

informal efforts at the initiative Protestant missionary in their establishment of schools among indigenous societies in tropical zones through the early 19th century onwards. Among both avenues of reference, the British and Dutch provided institutional precedents that could be reasonably assessed within an ethnocentrically conducive frame. Whether strictly Anglo-Saxon, English-speaking, or Northern European, the convergence of white, Protestant, liberal values between Great Britain, the Netherlands, and the U.S. provided an identifiable frame of cultural reference that Anglo-Americans leaders could cite when exploring viable avenues of study among their European counterparts.

2.2 Trans-imperial Exchanges at the Outset of U.S. Rule in the Philippines

After assuming authority over the Philippines, the McKinley administration moved to hasten the transition from a regime of military occupation to civil government, culminating in the passage of the *Philippine Organic Act* in 1902. With the establishment of a formal colonial administration, U.S. policymakers looked to their neighboring colonies for managerial models that could be replicated within their jurisdiction. In a process of “[inter-imperial] knowledge transfers,” there is the transmission and continuity of concepts, principles, and techniques across numerous colonial jurisdictions. Within this process of intercourse, trans-imperial travel constituted a major avenue for knowledge circulation between realms, enabling colonial administrators to conduct fact-finding missions in neighboring jurisdictions. For U.S. policymakers, the process of travel “constituted an important form of knowledge gathering and comparative observation. Travelers encompassed tourists, missionaries, businessmen, scholars and *colonial officials*, utilizing their encounter with the world to compare and contrast their own nation with others and to locate America on the map of global civilization [emphasis added].”¹²⁶

¹²⁶ Schumacher, “Embedded Empire,” 207-211. The author notes the activities of various American colonial officials – such as engineering specialist George S. Stroebe in his travels to Dutch Indonesia in June 1916 or military surgeon Lieutenant-Colonel Robert Maitland O’Reilly in Jamaica in December 1898 – who traveled to other colonial jurisdictions to investigate established methods of management and organization. Similar exchanges are also noted in Frank Schumacher, “Lessons of Empire,” 71-98.

As the U.S. solidified its formal authority over the Philippines during the early 1900s, American officials continued to actively observe the activities of their European counterparts in administrative developments within their respective territorial holdings in the Asia-Pacific region. In the context of such exchanges, the reference to Anglo-Saxon ideology by U.S. policymakers that had served to rationalize and legitimate their nation's venture overseas imperialism emerged as contingent and non-fixed. With the maturation of the U.S. colonial government in the years after 1902 through to the 1910s, such allusions to Anglo-Saxonism became less frequent with the emergence of a professional colonial administration. Comprised of an experienced cadre of U.S. experts and technicians, this group distinguished itself from their British counterparts through independent achievements and feats in colonial governance, ranging from infrastructure projects to anthropological classification of the archipelago's inhabitants.¹²⁷

However, even as the U.S. emerged self-assured in its capacity for the exercise of overseas colonialism, American officials still maintained procedural communication and practical exchanges with their European counterparts.¹²⁸ Rather than look to the tropical

¹²⁷ Paul A. Kramer, "Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule between British and United States Empires, 1880-1910," in *The Journal of American History* 88 no.4 (2002), 1349-1351. Explaining this process of administrative maturation and declining reference to Anglo-Saxonism, Kramer noted that "Americans tended to respond against the British Empire, rather than through it. The most significant factor in undermining imperial racial exceptionalism was the consolidation of an American colonial state. American colonialists had invoked the British Empire between 1898 and 1902 in part because they had no colonial state of their own to point to... But after the war, the promotional and informational machinery of the American colonial state made possible arguments based, not on Anglo-Saxon empire in the abstract, but on actually existing American colonialism. American civil engineers were busy deepening Manila's harbor; botanists and mineralogists were classifying the islands' exploitable resources; anthropologists were studying the islands' peoples; constabulary patrols were eyeing their neighborhoods. Colonial departments and bureaus advertised their success and rights to expanded appropriations in the annual report of the Philippine Commission, published and distributed annually by the Bureau of Insular Affairs. A new class of American colonial experts stepped forward to engage the press and public." Within this context, U.S. policymakers adopted nationalist-exceptionalist platitudes to illustrate their 'distinctive' mode of governance over the Philippines.

¹²⁸ Kramer, "Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons," 1349-1352. Noting the continuity of such inter-imperial exchanges, Kramer explained further that "National-exceptionalist depictions of American colonialism did not... prevent Americans from scouring the European colonies of Southeast Asia in search of practical models of colonial state building... Soon Enough, American colonial officials took their place in a network of imperial policy tours and exchanges with colonial officials from the American Philippines, Dutch Java and the East Indies, and the British Straits Settlements and Federated Malay States. On such

possessions of other European powers such as France or Germany, American administrators looked predominantly to the British and Dutch possessions for technical precedents to investigate and analyze. Typically, of an applied or technical nature, these inter-imperial exchanges were most prominent on matters pertaining to agriculture, public health, infrastructure, and colonial administrative organization¹²⁹ Among the various sectors of the U.S. regime in the Philippines, colonial educational officials also contributed to this process of knowledge circulation across neighboring colonial jurisdictions. Most notably, David P. Barrows conducted an exploratory trip to the Dutch East Indies in the course of his tenure as education superintendent in the school term of 1908-1909.

During his career as an official in the Philippines in the early 1900s, Barrows unfavorably observed policy developments in neighboring European possessions in Southeast Asia, taking a critical stance as to their applicability in the Philippine Islands. This stemmed from the concern that such models were geared more towards the commercial exploitation of the colony rather than the civilized advancement or political ‘enlightenment’ of their subjects. In an address to the U.S. Senate Committee on the Philippines in 1902, Barrows discussed the desirability of adopting a liberal policy towards the Philippines. This was conceptualized with the objective of Filipino self-rule and the prospects for establishing amiable relations between the U.S. and their Filipino subjects. In an exchange with Senator Edward W. Carmack of Tennessee, Barrows drew a comparison between the successes in both British Malaya and Dutch Indonesia in forging harmonious or “sympathetic” relations with their subjects, establishing “secure

tours, officials discussed regime organization, schooling, public health, plantation agriculture, opium and vice control, among other immediate problems.”

¹²⁹ This assertion should be qualified depending on the policy questions under investigation. This is apparent on the matter of regulating the sale and distribution of opium in the Philippines, wherein U.S. officials looked to neighboring colonial jurisdictions in for models to emulate. In addition to exploratory missions to British, Dutch, and French dependencies, U.S. policymakers were particularly influenced by the regulatory model practiced in Japanese possession of Formosa. See Anne L. Foster, “Models for Governing: Opium and Colonial Policies in Southeast Asia, 1898-1910.” in *The American Colonial State in the Philippines: Global Perspectives*, ed. Julian Go and Anne. L. Foster (Durham and London, 2003), 92-117.

government,” and general prosperity in their respective jurisdictions. In his responses to the senator, Barrows assumed a critical tone as to the nature of these success and the prospect of the replication of such systems in the context of the Philippines:

Senator CARMACK. You do not imagine, however, that any such system of government could be conducted by the United States as the government of the Dutch in Java?

Mr. BARROWS. No, sir; I do not. I do not think we can imitate them all.

Senator CARMACK. The success there is purely a commercial success for Holland. It has not been a government which has developed the people, has it?

Mr. BARROWS. I think not, from the standpoint of *enlightenment* [emphasis added].¹³⁰

Within this context, Barrows regarded the colonial regime in the East Indies as being useful to the material interests of the Netherlands, as opposed to a model for the imparting of liberal principles upon indigenous populations. Rather than a regime to emulate, the director considered it inimical to the objectives of the U.S. in the Philippines in the goal of exporting Anglo-American political principles.

The official account of Barrows' trip was detailed in a departmental report entitled "Memorandum on Public Instruction in Netherlands-India." During the course of his visit, the director met with incumbent Governor General J.B. van Heutz and visited educational facilities on the main island of Java. Throughout the Memorandum, Barrows reflects upon recent reforms by the Dutch colonial administration concerning indigenous education. In the Netherlands at the turn of the 20th century, domestic pressures brought by the electoral ascendance of a broad assemblage of Christian democratic and socialist parties stimulated the adoption of an 'enlightened' course of colonial governance of the Dutch East Indies. This reorientation of overseas policy constituted a rebuke of decades of material exploitation in the agricultural sector of the East Indies. This mismanagement had been encouraged under the laissez-faire policies of the preceding Liberal Party, which had correspondingly precipitated an economic depression in the Dutch

¹³⁰ *Annual Affairs in the Philippines*, 691-692.

metropole.¹³¹ In 1901 Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands – at the advice of the newly elected Christian democratic Anti-Revolutionary Party – proclaimed the “Ethical Policy” for the East Indies, under which the Dutch government committed to the advancement and uplift of their Indonesian subjects. Among the various facets of this policy including health, irrigation, and migration schemes, education reform emerged as a major pillar. Around 1907, in an effort to broaden enrolment, the colonial government initiated a campaign to expand access to primary schools within village communities.¹³² Similar to the U.S. policy of ‘benevolent assimilation’ of the Filipino people, under the banner of “Benevolent Policy” the Dutch too were engaged in a liberalizing campaign purportedly aimed at improving the subject populations within their major Southeast Asian possession.

Over the course of his memorandum, Barrows assessed these developments from a nationalist-exceptionalist perspective, reflecting Anglo-American attitudes and principles regarding the obligations and responsibilities entailed in colonial governance and the treatment of subject peoples. Characterizing the watershed nature of the Dutch efforts, he stated that “What was originally a selfish régime, devoted to the exploitation of the natives, is being transformed into one of the most *just, prudent, and liberal* of colonial governments [emphasis added].” In contrast to other nations within the imperialist camp, Barrows commended the Dutch as adopting a more ‘enlightened’ educational regime aimed at empowering the indigenous populations. In a tone of chauvinism, the director’s statements casted the expectations for measuring the success of Dutch reformism within a nationalist-exceptionalist framework reflecting U.S. political principles. In comparative tone, he stated further that “the educational aims of the Dutch in Netherlands-India are hardly to be distinguished from our own here in the Philippines, except perhaps for the more careful and deliberate manner in which their work

¹³¹ Adrian Vickers, *A History of Modern Indonesia* (Cambridge University Press, 2013), 16-17.

¹³² Ewout Frankema and Frans Buelens, *Colonial Exploitation and Economic Development: The Belgian Congo and the Netherlands Indies Compared* (Routledge, 2013), 158.

proceeds.”¹³³ To this extent, the director contrasted the reformist efforts of the Dutch with those of the United States in the Philippines, noting in some cases where the former was seen as surpassing the latter in judicious execution.

Among the reforms discussed, the Barrows’ report put particular emphasis on the question of linguistic instruction. The director noted the introduction of the Dutch language within native schools and emphasized the ‘beneficial’ nature of this policy for the indigenous populations by offering a key to advancement and modernization. Contrasting the purported utility of indigenous versus metropolitan languages, Barrows observed that “experience has shown that the native languages do not offer the necessary basis for higher training, especially in administrative, technical, and professional lines. The possession of a modern language is recognized as an essential for the development of the native.” Similar to the U.S. experience in the Philippines with the introduction of English versus the preponderance of Tagalog and other local languages, the introduction of Dutch was envisioned as encountering the diverse set of native languages in the islands of the East Indies. Casting the linguistic pluralism of the islands in a pejorative vein, Barrows observed of that:

Netherlands-India presents the same multiplicity of languages with which we are familiar in the Philippines. On the Island of Java, the population is divided into three native peoples, each speaking a distinct native language, Sundanese, Javanese, and Madurese. On most of Sumatra, Malay is the language of the people. Elsewhere, the Lesser Sundas, the Moluccas, and Amboina have their special languages, while Celebes has numerous languages. Through all of this territory, as well as in Borneo and the Sulu Archipelago, Malay, though not of the literary type, furnishes a lingua franca. But even this useful and widely spread language does not offer a satisfactory linguistic bond for the development of the peoples of the Indies.¹³⁴

Within this understanding, Barrows emphasized the important effect of the Dutch language as a medium for cultural immersion, enabling the native population to access the purported fruits of a ‘higher civilization.’ Comparable to the introduction of English

¹³³ David P. Barrows, “Memorandum on Public Instruction in Netherlands India,” in *Ninth Annual Report of the Director of Education – July 1, 1909 TO June 30, 1909* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1909), 51.

¹³⁴ Barrows, “Memorandum on Public Instruction in Netherlands India,” 58-59.

in the Philippines, the Dutch language was envisioned as serving the practical function of a common tongue, fostering unity within the colonial realm and enabling the indigenous populations' access to the wider world. In general, Barrows' observations on indigenous languages served to obscure his own the nationalist-exceptionalist rhetoric by evoking the universal challenges faced by fellow white powers in overseas colonial governance.

Although predominantly drawing upon the continental precedent in devising models for indigenous education in the Philippines, U.S. colonial officials such as David Barrows were not unaware of policy developments within neighboring colonial jurisdictions. Nevertheless, an awareness of external affairs did not necessarily constitute a desire or willingness to receive and assimilate foreign knowledge. The director concluded by commending the Dutch in adopting a more benign attitude toward its subjects. He stated that: "I believe that Dutch statesmen have come to the deliberate conclusion that the diffusion of the Dutch language among the peoples of their great empire may be a political force of the highest value." In a tone of praise, Barrows further stated that "Holland has deliberately forsaken its previous policy of discouraging the native education in Dutch and upon this important matter of native education and the dissemination of its own language must now be associated with the U.S. in the Philippines and France in Indo-China."¹³⁵

As demonstrated in the observations articulated in Barrow's memorandum, U.S. officials assessed the activities of their European counterparts from a nationalist-exceptionalist point of view reflecting prevailing American political principles. Within this framework, American officials sought to assess the policies of their European counterparts from a measure of 'progressive' governance. In this worldview, the imperial metropole was tasked with exercising a benevolent policy of purported stewardship over their subject populations in the periphery, engaging in a campaign of guided emancipation to prepare local populations for eventual self-rule, if not national independence. Imagining the U.S. regime in the Philippines as a model for other great

¹³⁵ Barrows, "Memorandum on Public Instruction in Netherlands India," 59.

powers to emulate, such was in contrast to other states in the imperial camp such as Great Britain where norms of material exploitation and self-interest prevailed. Within this chauvinistic framework reflecting prevailing national-exceptionalist discourses emphasizing the ‘distinctiveness’ of the U.S. colonial project in the Philippines, the Dutch were measured as pursuing a comparatively enlightened educational regime aimed at empowering the indigenous populations.

2.3 Trans-imperial Commentaries on Education in the Age of Wilsonian Internationalism

In later years as the U.S. colonial administration in the Philippines matured, this nationalist-exceptionalist narrative of stewardly governance carried on within official commentaries and discourses. This line of continuity is evident in the memoirs of Francis Burton Harrison – Governor General of the Philippines from 1913 to 1921. Harrison’s tenure as chief executive was concurrent to a series of changes, both internally in the administration of the Philippines as an overseas possession and externally through broader transformations occurring within the international arena. With regards to the former, the U.S. had already taken measures to establish the foundations for eventual Filipino self-rule through a formal process of administrative and political devolution with the passage of the *Philippine Autonomy Act* in 1916. Within the wave of reorganization that followed, the Philippine Department of Public Instruction – at both an administrative and instructional level – was predominantly staffed by Filipinos, albeit under American oversight.

With the conclusion of the First World War, the U.S. forged ahead in the inauguration of the liberal international order through the postwar settlement and the founding of the League of Nations around 1918-1920. In this context, the status of U.S. colonial possessions acquired after the Spanish American War were inexorably linked with the foreign policy priorities of President Woodrow Wilson in his commitment to advancing the cause of liberal internationalism and the principle of self-determination for colonized peoples. With the entry of the U.S. into the war in Europe looming, President Wilson observed in his 1915 congressional address that “There is another matter which seems to me to be very intimately associated with the question of national safety and

preparation for defense.” With regards to Philippines and Puerto Rico, he stated that “Our treatment of them and their attitude towards us are manifestly of the first consequence in the development of our duties in the world and in getting a free hand to perform those duties.” Drawing linkages between the imperatives of America’s colonial governance and the nation’s wartime interests, Wilson asserted that “We must be free from every unnecessary burden or embarrassment; and there is no better way to be clear of embarrassment than to fulfil our promises and promote the interests of those dependent on us to the utmost.”¹³⁶ In both the exercise of overseas colonial administration and the arena of international governance, the U.S. viewed itself on the ascendance as its model of liberal governance was projected abroad in the tumultuous climate of the First World War. With precedent of their campaigns of ‘benevolent assimilation’ in the Philippines, U.S. political leaders and colonial officials could trumpet the virtues of an alternative model of development that offered the prospect of political emancipation to subject peoples.

While expounding their international posture as an effort to uplift and to expand the frontiers of democracy, this campaign invariably conformed to U.S. conceptions of liberal governance and logically inferred the export of domestic institutional models. In essence, Wilsonian internationalism fundamentally constituted an assimilationist posture. Explaining the concept of self-determination in principle, William Appleman Williams noted that “a commitment to the principle of self-determination means a policy of standing aside for peoples to make their own choices, economic as well as political and cultural. It is based on a willingness to live and let live - a broad tolerance for other peoples’ preferences and a willingness, if the opportunity is offered, to help them achieve their own goals in their own fashion.” Emphasizing the fundamentally zealous nature of Wilsonian Liberalism, Williams stated that “Though it avowed this principle, the actions of America in the realm of foreign affairs [and overseas colonialism] did not follow this pattern.” Emphasizing the nationalist-exceptionalist groundings of this posture, Williams

¹³⁶ Woodrow Wilson, “Third Annual Message” (December 07, 1915), see *The American Presidency Project*, <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/third-annual-message-19>.

elaborated that the “program amounted to a direct and almost literal application of the principles of America’s domestic liberalism to the world at large.”¹³⁷ Superseding indigenous modes of governance and social organization, the brand of internationalism espoused by Woodrow Wilson and others fundamentally constituted an assimilationist program necessitating the adoption of a liberal mode of self-governance and a market-based economic system.

Under the Mandates system extended under Article 22 of the *Covenant of the League of Nations*, this worldview was fundamentally circumscribed in ethnocentric racial parameters. Notwithstanding the triumph of liberal internationalist discourses and its appeal among colonized and subjugated peoples in the aftermath of the First World War, the extension of self-determination was itself limited to those national groupings regarded as suitable in possessing the requisite cultural capacities for the exercise of self-governance.¹³⁸ The immediate applicability of this concept was generally confined to those newly independent states in Central and Eastern Europe such as the Czech Republic and Poland. For those non-white populations of the European dependencies in Africa and Asia, the extension of self-determination was to be deferred in perpetuity as the Mandatory powers determined conditions to be appropriate over the territories of which they administered.

¹³⁷ William Appleman Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (W.W. Norton and Company, 1959), 167-168.

¹³⁸ Erez Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism* (Oxford University Press, 2007), 24-25. Elaborating on its ambiguity concerning the extension of self-determination among non-white national groupings, the author explained further that “Though there is little evidence that Wilson considered the impact that his rhetoric on self-determination would have on colonial peoples or expected the peace conference to deal with colonial questions beyond those arising directly from the war, he also did not exclude non-European peoples from the right to self-determination as a matter of principle. Rather, he envisioned them achieving it through an evolutionary process under the benevolent tutelage of a ‘civilized’ power that would prepare them for self-government... non-European populations would eventually practice self-determination, but they would get there through gradual reforms and international institutional and legal processes, not violent revolutions. This was the logic behind Wilson’s struggle in Paris to establish League of Nations ‘mandates’ over colonial territories, in which ‘advanced’ powers, supervised by the League, would serve as ‘trustees’ of populations deemed not yet ready to govern themselves.”

Written in the aftermath of the postwar settlement of 1919, Harrison considered the broad influence of U.S. policy in the Philippines upon their European counterparts in bordering jurisdictions. Composed more than a decade after David P. Barrows' tenure as education superintendent, Harrison's memoir provided an updated commentary on the state of affairs in the major British, Dutch, and French colonies neighboring the Philippines. Assuming a nationalist-exceptionalist mantle, Harrison emphasized the broad impact that the Philippine model has had on the broader region. Rhetorically distinguishing the U.S. from the practices of their European counterparts, Harrison stated that "The results of our heresy have been far-reaching, and have shaken seriously the colonial offices of Great Britain, of France, and of Holland; they have also brought hope and inspiration to millions of patient brown and yellow men who find in the new ideas of America a promise for the future."¹³⁹ Furthermore, Harrison noted the impact of U.S. participation in the First World War and reverberations of the postwar settlement among their non-white subject populations in their embrace of liberal democratic ideals in the pursuit of national self-determination.

Emphasizing the influence of the Philippine model among colonized or subjugated peoples and the ideological burden that was brought to bear among European powers in the immediate post-war period, Harrison observed that "in that mysterious way in which news travels in the East, word went out to the farthest confines of the Orient of what America was doing in the Philippines. In the bazaars of India, along the harbors of Malaysia, and even in the far-away mountain passes of Armenia, the word was whispered about."¹⁴⁰ In this statement, Harrison drew no distinction between the sentiments of peoples in the former continental European empires – notably Armenia – and the plight of the subject populations in the Asian possessions of the Western Europe. With no explicit distinction, such remarks drew an ethical equivalency between the Triple

¹³⁹ Francis Burton Harrison, *The Cornerstone of Philippine Independence: A Narrative of Seven Years* (New York: The Century Company, 1922), 325.

¹⁴⁰ Harrison, *The Cornerstone of Philippine Independence*, 326.

Alliance – Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Ottoman Empire – and the Entente states of Britain and France.

Underscoring the power of Wilsonian ideals among the colonized peoples of the East, Harrison continued that “The pressure of native opinion in Java, in Ceylon, and in Indo-China, which has led within the past five years to the beginnings in those colonies of native participation in the government, sprang in large part from the same source. The conclusion to be drawn is evident: ideas are still more powerful in the regulation of human conduct than mere force.”¹⁴¹ In contrast to their European allies who indulged in the material exploitation of their overseas possessions and engaged in the application of direct coercive force to compel the submission of their native subjects, the U.S. was imagined as possessing a captivating command of the non-white peoples of the colonial world from of a universalist political ideal. According to Harrison’s commentary, the U.S. claimed to present these subject peoples with an avenue to achieve the prospect of national self-determination. To realize such ends, it offered to these populations the impartation of practical knowledge in the exercise of liberal self-governance as derived from a tangible precedent from their experience in the U.S. administration of the Philippines.

While peripheral to his thesis throughout the chapter, public education arises as a critical feature in Harrison’s narrative. In this regard, the extension and provision of education served as a measure to gauge of the purported altruism of the European powers and their willingness to elevate their non-white subjects intellectually and politically by extending to them the universal bounties of European culture. In contrast to the U.S., Harrison noted the common practice of European colonial powers to govern within the parameters of established indigenous power structures, rather than to wholly overturn such systems and institute a more formal colonial authority. He stated that “the White Man’s Burden in Asia up to within twenty years has conveyed to the peoples of Asia little share in the benefits of European civilization. The cardinal principle has been, with the

¹⁴¹ Harrison, *The Cornerstone of Philippine Independence*, 326.

British, Dutch, and French, not to interfere in the customs and beliefs of the native populations.” Inhibiting their intellectual and political development, Harrison observed crucially that “General public education was never attempted until very recently, sanitation among the common people was neglected, and the inhabitants were left to sink into sloth and ignorance.” Emphasizing the purported pervasiveness of “ignorance and vice” among native communities, Harrison observed that “Deprived of whatever inspiration might come from self-government and the development of their own system of culture, the people sink into apathy and decay under a rule which offers them no social hope.”¹⁴² In the failure of the colonial powers to extend the fruits of higher civilization, their subject populations were presented as languishing in a state of degeneration and indolence, impaired from achieving the development of their capacities for the exercise of political agency.

While particularly critical of the actions of Britain and France in their respective possession, Harrison devoted a moderate measure of praise to the Netherlands East Indies. Assuming a chauvinistic tone, the former governor general observed that “following the example of the Americans in the islands to the north, [the Dutch] have now taken the first steps toward granting self-government to their fifty million Malay subjects.” Not unlike Barrows, Harrison continued to frame these reforms as emanating from the influence of the precedent of the U.S. in the Philippines. Of particular note, the former governor general’s memoir serves to provide an updated account on recent educational reforms in the Dutch East Indies, noting the advances in educational outcomes over the preceding decade. Similarly, Harrison also continued to contrast the success of Dutch language policies with those of the U.S. in the Philippines, emphasizing how the former surpassed the latter in effectiveness and quality. He explained that “About fifteen years ago [the Dutch] started a system of universal education, and, as a Javanese said at the time, education is the beginning of independence. At first only two per cent. of their budget was devoted to the public schools, but the school system is

¹⁴² Harrison, *The Cornerstone of Philippine Independence*, 332-333.

growing rapidly, and is worked out with that thoroughness and scientific accuracy for which the Dutch are famous.”¹⁴³

As demonstrated in the various observations articulated in Barrow’s memorandum and Harrison’s memoir, U.S. officials assessed the activities of their European counterparts from a nationalist-exceptionalist point of view reflecting prevailing American political principles. Within this framework, U.S. commentators sought to assess the policies of their European counterparts from a scale of enlightened, progressive governance. Imagining the U.S. colonial regime in the Philippines as a model for other great powers to emulate, such contrasted with other states in the imperial camp such as Great Britain where norms of material exploitation and self-interest prevailed. Within this chauvinistic framework reflecting prevailing national-exceptionalist discourses, the Dutch were measured as pursuing a comparatively enlightened educational regime aimed at empowering the indigenous populations. Rather than observe activities in bordering jurisdictions in the spirit of impartially or inquisitiveness, their accounts reflected chauvinistic attitudes regarding the treatment of local populations and the supposed caretaker responsibilities associated with colonial governance.

¹⁴³ Harrison, *The Cornerstone of Philippine Independence*, 337-338.

Chapter 3 : The Moro Question: Differentiated Curriculum in the Southern Philippines

3 Introduction

In his address to the twenty second annual Lake Mohonk Conference in October 1904, E.B. Bryan – superintendent of education in the Philippines – expounded upon the educational component of the American colonial mission in the Philippines. At the outset of remarks, he sought to differentiate between the Roman Catholic majority and the non-Christian peoples of the archipelago – namely the Igorots, the Moros of Mindanao and Sulu, and the Negritos. Demarcating the former as the primary beneficiaries of U.S. colonial education, he remarked that the Christian Filipino majority “are as different from these wild [and uncivilized] tribes as are members of this Conference different from the wild people that were found here hundreds of years ago, and in whom this Conference is so greatly and so wisely concerned.” Bryan went on to observe of the islands’ Christian populations that they “are an appreciative people, they are an alert people, they are a bright people, they are a polite people.”¹⁴⁴ For their respectful and deferential disposition, Christian Filipinos were characterized as deserving of American guidance in the practical exercise of self-governance.

In an earlier address to the National Education Association in July of that same year, Bryan was even more blatant in delineating his distinction between Christian Filipinos and their non-Christian counterparts. Categorically, he stated that “The [Igorots] are not Filipinos, [although] they live in the Philippine Islands; the Moros a not Filipinos, [although] they live in the southern portion of the Philippine Archipelago; the Negritoes are not Filipinos, as the term ‘Filipino’ is understood and should be understood.” In spite of their physical presence in the peripheral regions of the archipelago, these tribes were categorized as foreign elements as a consequence of a lack of assigned anthropological,

¹⁴⁴ E.B. Bryan, “Education in the Philippines,” in *The Report of the Twenty-Second Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by William J. Rose (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1904), 43-44.

ethnological, or historical linkages with their Christian counterparts.¹⁴⁵ In both addresses, Bryan was adamant to demarcate the participatory parameters of the U.S. colonial project in the Philippines – namely those demographic groupings in the islands that were considered worthy of American tutelage in their prospect for cultural assimilation.

This chapter explores the similarities and divergencies in curricular regimes crafted in the Southern Philippines relative to the rest of the Philippine Islands during the early period of U.S. rule.¹⁴⁶ In general, the regions of Mindanao and Sulu were administered separately from the provinces under the jurisdiction of the Insular Government of the Philippines.¹⁴⁷ Although traditional racial prejudices and prevailing Anglo-American cultural conceptions served as the broad framework governing relations with Filipinos, the precedents of the U.S. continental empire found their most palpable manifestation in the administration of the non-Christian populations of Moro Province. Within the context of the so-called Moro Rebellion, the governance of the Southern Philippines came to magnify the ethnocentric assumptions and racial pathologies of Anglo-American colonial elites. To this extent, in the eyes of the U.S. colonizers, the purportedly ‘exceptional’ conditions that were ascribed to the non-Christian populations of Moro Province demanded the maintenance of a military government to subdue and consolidate control over the indigenous populations of the province amidst the Moro Wars of 1899-1913.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁵ Bryan, “Education in the Philippines” (National Education Association), 100.

¹⁴⁶ Among notable works addressing the history of Mindanao and Sulu and its differentiated mode of governance relative to the rest of the Philippines, see Peter G. Gowing, *Mandate in Moroland: The American Government of Muslim Filipinos, 1899-1920* (Philippine Center for Advanced Studies, 1977); Michael C. Hawkins, *Making Moros: Imperial Historicism and American Military Rule in the Philippines’ Muslim South* (Northern Illinois University Press, 2012); and Oliver Charbonneau, *Civilizational Imperatives: Americans, Moros, and the Colonial World* (Cornell University Press, 2020).

¹⁴⁷ The use of the term “insular” refers to the Philippines falling within the broad jurisdiction of the Bureau of Insular Affairs. Mandated with overseeing the civil administration of various of the nation’s overseas territories and foreign dependencies including the Philippines along with Cuba and Puerto Rico, the Bureau constituted a subbranch of the United States Department of War.

¹⁴⁸ For works detailing the history of U.S. counterinsurgency efforts in the Southern Philippines, see James R. Arnold, *The Moro War: How American Battled a Muslim Insurgency in the Philippine Jungle, 1902-*

Within a formal scheme of civil-military administration from 1903 to 1914, Moro Province was governed under an effective military occupation with senior officers of the U.S. Army at the helm of major cabinet portfolios. To this end, the educational regime that emerged in Moro Province operated independently of the central government. Serving as Superintendent of Schools for Moro Province from 1903 to 1906, Najeeb Mitry Saleeby constituted as an exceptional figure within this civil-military regime. Hailing from Ottoman Lebanon, in light of his Middle Eastern lineage and indigenous fluency in Arabic, Saleeby emerged as the foremost expert on Moro language and culture. A civilian official, the superintendent was adamant in developing a curricular regime that sought to integrate Moro languages and customs. While openly professing assimilationist sentiments that conformed to the objectives of the American elites, the superintendent constituted a figure of dissension within the U.S. colonial state, inadvertently challenging the objectives and prevailing prejudices of the Anglo-American elites. Presiding during the early period of U.S. rule over the islands, Saleeby's statements provided a window into broader policy discussions reflecting questions as to the status of the Moro people and the integration of the Mindanao and Sulu into an emerging Philippine nation.

In the realm of colonial curriculum, some scholars have noted the carryover of precedent of the U.S. transcontinental empire and prior models of domination over non-white, subject peoples such as African Americans and Native Americans. Within official commentaries and discourses, U.S. policymakers were certain to differentiate between Christian Filipinos and their non-Christian counterparts with regards to their respective capacities for advancement. To this extent, it is necessary to differentiate between the manner in which these precedents were applied in different jurisdictions in the Philippines. In line with curricular precedents established at Samuel Chapman Armstrong's Hampton Institute in Virginia and Booker T. Washington's Tuskegee Institute in Alabama – whose student bodies were drawn from Native American and

1913, (Bloomsbury Press, 2011) and Ronald K. Edgerton, *American Datu: John J. Pershing and Counterinsurgency Warfare in the Muslim Philippines, 1899-1913* (University Press of Kentucky, 2020).

African American communities respectively – the industrial and vocational arts were regarded as the course of study best suited for non-white populations. Exported overseas, these modes of curriculum were subsequently replicated and refined in the colonial curriculum in the Philippines. In the context of the Southern Philippines, the adoption of industrial education as implemented in Moro Province served to magnify the prejudices and rationales underlying the prevailing lines of thought that informed the curricular regimes instituted in the archipelago.

3.1 Precedents of Continental Empire as the Template of Differentiated Colonial Rule

Walter L. Williams was the first scholar to systematically point towards the transference between the precedents in the administration of ‘Indian Country’ in the Western territories of North America and their application overseas possessions of the United States after 1898.¹⁴⁹ In particular, Williams identifies how the precedents of tribal sovereignty and territorial incorporation served as a template for colonial governance in the Philippines.¹⁵⁰ Nevertheless, his analysis presents little mention of how these precedents were differentially applied among the Muslim Moro and the ‘pagan’ tribes of the Philippines. Although this dynamic is observable in the ethnocentric policies of the Insular government over the whole of the archipelago, the continuities and transfers between the continental and overseas empires manifested most explicitly in the administration of Moro peoples in the southern regions of Mindanao and Sulu.

¹⁴⁹ Denoting the convoluted institutionalization of this term in governing interactions between indigenous polities, the U.S. government, and American society at large, Imre Sutton explains that “Indian Country denotes a policy of legal and geographical separatism in the evolution of Indian/white relations in the United States. Since the earliest establishment of lines separating the tribes from the settlers, Indian nations from colonies, territories, and states, Indian Country has also connoted the limited sovereignty that tribes hold over members and lands. In time, as policies changed – e.g., treaty negotiations ended, tribal property was individualized (allotted), reservations were opened up and thus diminished—the distinctive nature of separatism became blurred, and lines of demarcation yielded to continuous intrusion in fact and in law.” See also Imre Sutton, “The Political Geography of Indian Country: An Introduction,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 15 no. 02 (1991), 1-2.

¹⁵⁰ Walter L. Williams, “United States Indian Policy and the Debate Over Philippine Annexation,” 830-831.

With the inception of divergent frameworks of administration between the jurisdiction of the Insular government and the predominantly non-Christian regions, U.S. colonial officials forged what Paul Kramer termed a “bifurcated racial state.” While Christian Filipinos would receive instruction in the fundamentals of political autonomy and gradually be extended the promise of qualified self-rule through integration into the emerging colonial-national state that U.S. policymakers contrived to forge, the non-Christian jurisdictions of Moro Province in the South and Mountain Province in Northern Luzon remained outside of the mainstream framework of civil administration in the rest of the archipelago.¹⁵¹ With the waning of hostilities with the revolutionary nationalist forces of Emilio Aguinaldo in 1901-1902, the U.S. authorities shifted their focus to the regions of Mindanao and Sulu.

At the outset, U.S. military authorities drew upon the precedent of the department-division administrative structure employed in the Western territories of the U.S during the period of transcontinental expansion.¹⁵² From 1899-1903, the region was

¹⁵¹ Paul Kramer, *The Blood of Government*, 208. Explaining this process of identity construction for the Filipino subjects of the United States, Kramer observes that “This bifurcated state was built upon an imperial indigenism, one of whose fundamental features was a racialized construction of religion, specifically an account of the radical, typological difference between Hispanicized Catholics and what were called non-Christians. Where Americans' imperial indigenism recognized Filipino elites in lowland areas, it recognized them as Catholics, partly civilized by centuries of Spanish influence. The bifurcated racial state involved an internalization of wartime discourses of savagery: the recognition of Catholic Filipinos was predicated on the displacement of the characteristics that had been attributed to the warring Filipino population as a whole—especially savagery and tribalism—onto non-Christian peoples. This bifurcated racial formation confirmed the relative civilization of Filipino Catholics, who would contribute to official knowledge of non-Christians and, especially, their distinction from Christians.” In a process of dual administration, Kramer observed that “The Philippine colonial state would undertake what anthropologists Felix and Marie Keesing would later call a ‘dual task,’ with Hispanicized Filipinos governed within one set of political institutions, evolving toward self-government, and non-Christians governed by U.S. politico-military commanders. The territorialization of race and racialization of territory would come together in the formation two special provinces, the Moro Province founded in Mindanao and Sulu in 1903 and the Mountain Province in Northern Luzon, established in 1908.”

¹⁵² Katharine Bjork, *Prairie Imperialists*, 150. Delineating this mode of administration, Bjork explains that “The army’s department-division administrative structure, which had evolved as a means for pacifying and integrating western territories into the national polity, was extended to the Philippines with the creation of the Military Division of the Philippines in March 1900. As they had in the West, each department constituted a semiautonomous zone of command. The division was further divided into departments - as the Division of the Missouri or the Department of the Pacific had been during the Indian Wars. In the

organized as the Department of Mindanao-Jolo. Administered by the U.S. Army, it constituted the southernmost military district in the archipelago. Nevertheless, the Insular government declared its formal authority over the predominantly Muslim South with the establishment of Moro Province in June of 1903 and the abrogation of the Kiram-Bates Treaty in March 1904.¹⁵³ Within this tumultuous context, the governance of Moro Province came to magnify the ethnocentric assumptions and racial pathologies of Anglo-American colonial leaders. Unlike with Christian Filipinos, to achieve their eventual integration with the Filipino nation, the Moro were regarded as necessitating education in the foundational, rudimentary aspects of ‘modern civilization,’ rather than mere instruction in the fundamentals of liberal self-governance. Although traditional racial prejudices and prevailing Anglo-American cultural conceptions served as the broad framework governing relations with Filipinos, the precedents of the U.S. continental empire found their most palpable manifestation in the administration of the Muslim Moro of Mindanao and Sulu.

In his orders to the Taft Commission in early 1900 delineating the establishment of civil government over the archipelago, President William McKinley set divergent expectations as to the assumed capacity and status envisioned for their new subjects. For

Philippines, these were the Departments of Northern Luzon, Southern Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao-Joló, each further divided into districts and subdistricts.”

¹⁵³ Katharine Bjork, *Prairie Imperialists*, 173-174. The Kiram-Bates Treaty was a diplomatic agreement promulgated in August 1899. Signed by Sultan Jamalul Kiram II and Brig. Gen. John Bates, the Treaty extended nominal U.S. sovereignty over the Southern regions. In exchange, the U.S. recognized the internal autonomy of the Sultanate of Sulu and stipulated the issuance of an annual stipend by the American administration. In light of ongoing hostilities with republican-nationalist forces in the Northern regions of the Philippines, the Treaty ensured the neutrality of the Sultanate. Regarded as an arrangement of expediency, these terms precluded the diversion of U.S. forces to Mindanao and Sulu. Noting the downgraded status of this agreement in the leadup to its abrogation in 1904, Katherine Bjork explains that “In defending payments made to ‘the Sulu tribe or nation’ to Congress, President McKinley stated that they were made ‘in conformity with the practice of this Government from the earliest times in its agreements with the various Indian nations occupying and governing portions of territory subject to the sovereignty of the United States.’ This was the situation the United States inherited from Spain. Put another way, the Muslim south was Indian Country, a territory far from imperial centers of power where terms laid out in international compacts between colonial powers were contested on the ground by headmen with regional influence who had not been party to their creation.”

the broad indigenous masses, the U.S. set out to establish a regime of purported stewardship that would impart civilizational principles to coach the Filipino masses in the exercise of self-governance. In terms of their capacity for advancement, Christian Filipinos were regarded as qualified to learn the rudiments of political autonomy. Within this framework, the orders specified that the Commission “should regard as of first importance the extension of a system of primary education which shall... tend to fit the people for the duties of citizenship and for the ordinary avocations of a civilized community.”¹⁵⁴

Conversely, McKinley’s orders established separate parameters in the management of the non-Christian peoples of the islands. His instructions specified that “In dealing with the uncivilized tribes of the islands the commission should adopt the same course followed by Congress in permitting the tribes of our North American Indians to maintain their tribal organization and government, and under which many of those tribes are now living in peace and contentment, surrounded by a civilization to which they are unable or unwilling to conform.” Evoking the precedents of the continental frontier, U.S. administrators would for the immediate future permit the continuity of indigenous social structures among the non-Christian communities. Even so, this broad regime of non-interference was qualified, with the order stipulating that “Such tribal governments should, however, be subjected to wise and firm regulation; and, without undue or petty interference, constant and active effort should be exercised to prevent barbarous practices and introduce civilized customs.”¹⁵⁵

Mirroring the military administrations that operated in the Western territories of the U.S. throughout the period of transcontinental expansion in the 19th century, a regime of military occupation would emerge as the prevailing mode of administration in the context of the predominantly Muslim south. In a 1902 report, Secretary of War Elihu Root observed that “The establishment of civil government in the Philippines still left

¹⁵⁴ McKinley, *Instructions of the President to the Philippine Commission*, 10

¹⁵⁵ McKinley, *Instructions of the President to the Philippine Commission*, 11.

function for the Army to perform in the control of the Moros in the Sulu Archipelago, Southern Mindanao, and the southern part of Palawan very similar to that which it has long performed in relation to the Indian tribes in the Western part of the United States.” Citing the landmark 1831 case *The Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia* which declared Native American polities entities as “domestic dependent nations,” Root referenced the designation of nonwhite, indigenous peoples as “wards” of the state and its application to the Moro.¹⁵⁶ Peter C. Gowing observes that the principle of wardship as applied to the Southern Philippines “was to subject the Moros [peoples] to certain legal constraints not applicable to Filipinos elsewhere. It meant, as well, that while the [U.S government] acknowledged the possessory rights of the ‘tribes’ of the geographic area they occupied, it nevertheless exercised trusteeship over their territories and regulated ‘right of alienation’ requiring government approval.”¹⁵⁷ Regarded as lacking the necessary civilizational prerequisites to exercise self-rule, the Moro were to be governed within a special framework permitting the continuity of indigenous customs and social structures while circumscribing their practical autonomy within the long-term goal of integration.

Later in his report, Secretary Root alluded to the apparent ambiguities that arose in the divergent modes of administration in the Southern Philippines as compared with that in the North of the archipelago. Drawing an analogy between the nation’s Western territories and its Insular possessions, the secretary observed that “The questions to be worked out in that process are altogether apart from the general questions of government

¹⁵⁶ United States Department of War, *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1902 – Volume I. Report of the Secretary of War and Reports of Bureau Chiefs* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1903), 16-17; also cited in Peter G. Gowing, “Moros and Indians: Commonalities of Purpose, Policy and Practice in American Government of Two Hostile Subject Peoples,” *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society*, 8 no. 2/3 (1980), 136-137. Noting the provisional nature of this policy and its functionality in furtherance of the goal of political integration of Moro Province, Gowing further explains that “While American Government policy made provision for Moros to exist as wards protected in their traditional territories, this was not in fact what the Government had in mind as its final goal for the Moros. That goal was integration, understood really as assimilation. Indeed, it was envisaged in the design of the Moro Province’s ‘tribal wards’ that as their inhabitants developed ‘civilized’ ways, eventually the ward structure would evolve into municipal districts, and someday perhaps into full-fledged municipalities.”

¹⁵⁷ Gowing, “Moros and Indians,” 136.

in the Philippines, and such measures of force as are necessary to control the various Moro tribes have no more relation to the recent Philippine insurrection than our troubles with the Sioux or the Apaches had to do with the suppression of the Southern rebellion.”¹⁵⁸ Conjuring recent memory of the Civil War and the Indian Wars, Root drew a distinction between the nature of hostilities with the Moro communities in Mindanao and Sulu and conflict with nationalist revolutionaries in the North. While as the former were likened to unruly tribal elements that were to be neutralized or pacified as with Native Americans in the Western territories, the latter were equated with the Southern Confederacy in their pursuit of independence amidst the movement for secession in the Civil War between 1861-1865. Although both constituted tangible obstacles to effective rule over the archipelago, the political aspirations of Filipino nationalists could be conceived as legitimate designs that could be co-opted within the assimilationist framework of the U.S. colonial state. Not unlike Native Americans in the Western frontier, the peoples of the Muslim South were considered as incapable of adapting and conforming to Anglo-American political principles.

In the course of ongoing, sporadic hostilities with Moro insurgents between 1899-1913, the province would be administered separately from the Insular government until its reorganization as the Department of Mindanao and Sulu in 1914. Within this scheme of civil-military administration, Moro Province operated under military oversight with senior officers at the helm assuming administrative posts. Describing the exceptional character and broad powers assigned to the provincial government in the South, W. Leon Pepperman explained that:

The legislative council has been granted a very large measure of discretion in dealing with the Moros and in preserving, as far as possible, consistent with the act creating the Moro Province, the customs of the Moros, the authority of the *Datos*, and a system of justice in which the Moro should take part. The first governor of the Moro Province is an officer of the army, detailed for that purpose, and the remaining offices mentioned are filled both by civilians and by detailed officers.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁸ *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1902*, 17-18.

¹⁵⁹ Pepperman, “What the Government Has Done in the Philippines,” 71.

Among those senior U.S. Army officers that served as the early governors of Moro Province – namely Leonard Wood (1903-1906) and John J. Pershing (1909-1913) – and district governors – specifically Hugh Lennox Scott in Sulu district (1903-1906) – respectively had experience in the various campaigns of the Indian Wars of the American West prior to their deployments overseas during the Spanish American War.¹⁶⁰ The transferability of these experiences in the Western territories forged a distinct frame of reference that informed the perspectives of these officers in their governance and general interactions with the Moro communities.¹⁶¹ Capturing this mentality of necessity, Maj. George H. Shelton observed in 1908 that “Even today in the Moro Province where the problem of controlling a savage people is closely allied to our own Indian question in the past, there is civil government under the central government of the Philippines, yet in a large measure distinct, with a military officer at its head and with military methods of necessity still largely in control.”¹⁶² Not unlike Indian Country in the century past, the exceptional conditions that were ascribed to the populations of Moro Province were

¹⁶⁰Bjork, *Prairie Imperialists*, 175-176. Explaining this carryover of practices, the author notes that “The institutions and federal powers built up in the process of western expansion in turn provided a model as well as a set of cultural attitudes and practices that shaped the next stage of American expansion overseas and which left their mark on American efforts at colonial state-building in the new insular territories abroad. As their life and administrative experience mirrored the transition from the domestic to the overseas realm, communications with the War Department between western men like Pershing... offer examples of the transposition of frontier categories of perception and value onto the newly incorporated colonial sphere. The repertoire of colonial actions in the insular territories drew upon techniques for extending control over and extracting value from land that had developed in the context of westward expansion.”

¹⁶¹ Katharine Bjork, “Prairie Imperialists: The Bureau of Insular Affairs and Continuities in Colonial Expansion from Nebraska to Cuba and the Philippines,” *Nebraska History* 95 no. 4 (2014), 219. In another piece, Bjork notes that for these senior officers “the work of governing the Muslims of the southern Philippines drew significantly on their experience with Indians at home. As commanders of outposts on the frontiers of the U.S. occupation of the Philippines and as district governors charged with pacifying Moros, [these] men deployed similar techniques for asserting U.S. authority in the new Indian Country. Their assumptions about what techniques would be effective were informed by an axiomatic equivalence between Moros and Indians, which was an article of faith for many in the army... Such comparisons were commonplace as the army cast around for models for pressing its claims of control over people who rejected them.”

¹⁶² George H. Shelton, “Should the Functions of the Bureau of Insular Affairs be Transferred to Some Other Department Than the Department of War? A Negative View,” in *Report of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1908), 111.

envisioned as necessitating the maintenance of a military government in order to subdue and exercise control over the indigenous populations of the province.

Even as the governance of Moro Province was declared a predominantly martial undertaking, this did not preclude contrived sentiments of benevolence or sympathy on part of military officers in Mindanao and Sulu. In his memoir *Some Memoirs of a Soldier*, Maj. Gen. Hugh L. Scott ambivalently lamented of the contradictions entailed in frontier governance. Prior to serving as the governor of Sulu district, Scott had previously served on the Western frontier in campaigns against the tribes of the Cheyenne, Sioux, and Nez Perce. Drawing upon his experience during the Indian Wars, Scott romantically compared the plight of the Moro with that of Native Americans. He explained that:

To me the Moros were the most promising element, under proper guidance, to be found in the entire Philippine Islands, and I so much wanted to live myself for so many reasons, that I had a vast respect for a race so bold, tenacious, and fearless of death. Moreover it was most important to preserve the pride of the Moros and safeguard it from attack from any quarter. One of the greatest mistakes made by our missionaries in our Indian country is their opposition to everything native - the notion that everything peculiar to the Indian must be broken down and destroyed, and their pride in the achievements of their ancestors must be preached against, derided, and wiped out.

The district governor went on to say that:

It is not possible to raise up any people who are destitute of pride; and pride once lost is one of the things most difficult to restore; it lies at the root of all formation of character; its possession is a priceless gift; and no effort should be spared to save it. Nor should any attack be permitted on the religion Or customs of races *except where those factors bring them in conflict with the law, as did the murder, slavery, and theft which were daily events in the Sulu of that time* [emphasis added].¹⁶³

In one regard, Scott expressed reservations at blanket policies aimed at eliminating indigenous cultures and ways of life. While expressing sympathy with the predicament of the Moro and the preservation of the local cultures and their Islamic faith, Scott was still adamant about the supposed necessity for firm ‘stewardship’ over the Moros of the Southern Philippines in much the same way as with Native Americans. In accordance

¹⁶³ Hugh Lennox Scott, *Some Memoirs of a Soldier* (New York: The Century Company, 1928), 313; also cited in Joseph P. McCallus, *Forgotten Under the Sun: War Stories by American Veterans in the Philippines, 1898-1903* (The Kent State University Press, 2017), 168-170.

with the assimilationist tendencies of U.S. colonial administrators, this was to quash elements of disorder, doing away with ‘barbaric’ cultural practices such as slavery, and forge conditions that were conducive to the incremental transformation of the Moro peoples into compliant subjects.

3.2 Curricular Discourses and National Integration of the Moro

Within this bifurcated colonial state, the educational regime that emerged in Moro Province operated semi-independently of the central government of the Philippine Commission. Within these administrative parameters, the superintendent of schools deferred to the provincial governor as opposed to the general superintendent of the Philippine Department of Public Instruction. This scheme of organization fostered administrative conditions conducive to the creation of a comprehensive system of public instruction in the Southern Philippines.¹⁶⁴ From 1903 to 1906, Dr. Najeeb Mitry Saleeby served as the first Superintendent of Schools in Moro Province.

Born in Ottoman Lebanon in 1870, Saleeby was an Arab Christian of the Protestant persuasion. A physician by profession, Saleeby enlisted as a field surgeon in the U.S. Army during the Spanish American War, serving in Cuba from 1899-1900 and then was transferred to the Philippines in 1901. Following his discharge in 1903, Saleeby was appointed by the Insular government to the Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes, tasked with Moro affairs and was later elevated to the post of education superintendent of Moro Province in August of that same year. Despite his prior military service, Saleeby was unique among his military colleagues as he constituted a lone civilian official within a provincial cabinet largely comprised of commissioned officers.¹⁶⁵ As compared with his military counterparts who would just as easily project their traditional prejudices of non-white groups such as African Americans and Native Americans towards the tribal

¹⁶⁴ Charbonneau, *Civilizational Imperatives*, 74.

¹⁶⁵ Charbonneau, *Civilizational Imperatives*, 33.

populations of Mindanao and Sulu, Saleeby's frame of reference was one of broad cultural tolerance towards the Muslim peoples of the Southern Philippines.

Despite his non-European background, Saleeby was imbued with notions of American exceptionalism and the promise of tutelage that the U.S. policymakers extended to the diverse peoples of the Philippines. Touching upon how his elevated class standing and cosmopolitan cultural orientation served to inform his early worldview in this colonial setting, Timothy Marr notes that "Saleeby's advanced education, professional status, and Protestant faith converted him to the paternalist elitism of American noblesse oblige. He became entangled in the paradoxical duty of offering his intellectual talents to prove his fitness as an emergent citizen of the United States while preparing the people of the Philippines for their own democratic self-government." At the same time, in light of his Arab cultural background and indigenous fluency in Arabic, Saleeby emerged as the foremost expert on Moro language and culture within the provincial government. During his tenure as education superintendent, he emerged as the leading intellectual authority on Moro language and culture. Alluding to the dual character of Saleeby's research of the Moro, Marr explains further that:

Although Saleeby confessed that 'I am not a missionary, nor do I intend to be the missionary,' his 'natural preparedness' and incomparable influence with the Moros inspired in him a 'sense of duty' to take part in the 'great undertaking' of introducing them to modern Western ways. He worked with educated Moros to develop his own capacity to converse in Tausug and Magindanoan and to read and write their scripts. Setting aside his pursuit of further medical expertise, Saleeby committed himself to documenting Moro history, religion, government, and folklore as a means of assisting American officials to understand how to approach the unconquered Muslims they had annexed as their wards.¹⁶⁶

In his efforts to learn local languages and to record the intricate facets of Moro culture and society, the superintendent fulfilled his duties as functionary of the U.S. colonial state. Within this context, such efforts at knowledge accumulation and recording were in

¹⁶⁶ Timothy Marr, "Diasporic Intelligences in the American Philippin Empire: Transnational Career of Dr Najeeb Mitry Saleeby," *Mashriq & Mahjar* 2, no. 1 (2014), 79; 82.

accordance with the objectives and operations of the colonial rule.¹⁶⁷ Nonetheless, while openly professing assimilationist sentiments that conformed to the prevailing prejudices of Anglo-American policymakers, Saleeby constituted a colonial actor of broad tolerance in his efforts to learn and record local customs and knowledge. More generally, Saleeby's research activities illustrate broader policy discussions surrounding questions of the status of the Moro relative to their Christian counterparts and the prospects of integrating the Southern provinces into an emerging Philippine nation.

By means of his fluency in Arabic script and understanding of local languages, Saleeby spearheaded efforts to formulate translational primers for Moro students. This resulted in the publications of the *Sulu Reader* and the *Magindanaw Reader* in 1905. In the forward to the *Magindanaw Reader*, Saleeby alluded to a predicament that was initially faced by educational officials. He explained that:

The Moros have no readers for instruction in their own dialects, and their education is limited to the study of the Koran, and & few other books on law and religion. The Moro students begin with the study of the Arabic alphabet and as soon as they are able to pronounce its characters, they take up the Koran and proceed to read it without however, understanding a single word. Such a course of instruction is obviously unsatisfactory and objectionable, and the need of suitable Moro readers for the public schools of this province was recognized at an early period.¹⁶⁸

In these remarks, Saleeby recognized a practical necessity in adopting standardized primers in the languages of the indigenous populations of Moro Province. Additionally, the superintendent's observations suggested a disconnect between the knowledge of and application of the script, implying a drawback of Quranic instruction in imparting a well-rounded education and tangible skills to the pupils. However, while attributing weaknesses to these indigenous modes of pedagogy, Saleeby was adamant in developing

¹⁶⁷ Jeffrey Ayala Milligan, *Islamic Identity, Postcoloniality, and Education Policy: Schooling and Ethno-Religious Conflict in the Southern Philippines* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 47-48. Addressing the efforts of Najeeb M. Saleeby and his successor Charles R. Cameron to accommodate Moro culture and the Islamic religion into the curriculum of Moro Province, Milligan notes that this liberal approach ultimately served as a measure of expediency. This attitude was grounded in "recognition that any perceived threat to Islam would [likely] generate more opposition to colonial policy than it was worth."

¹⁶⁸ *Magindanaw Reader for the Public Schools of the Moro Province* (Zamboanga, P.I.: Mindanao Herald Press, 1905), i.

a curricular regime that would integrate local language and customs. In addition to the primary readers, Saleeby also advocated the provisional use of traditional *pandita* schools among Moro communities until such time as a formal curriculum could be developed by the provincial government.¹⁶⁹

Building upon his expertise of the indigenous populations of the Southern Philippines, Saleeby later emerged as an advocate for the rights and interests of Moro people. This line of sentiment was captured in a 1913 lecture delivered to the Philippine Academy in Manila on the question of the integration of the Moro with the broader Philippine Islands. While assuming a comparatively critical posture, Saleeby nonetheless remained convinced of the ‘enlightened’ precepts of the U.S. colonial mission in Philippines. Trumpeting the cause of ‘benevolent assimilation’ as it extended to non-Christian peoples, Saleeby stated that “We have not gone to Moroland to exploit the resources of the country nor to rule it for our benefit. Its government is a sacred trust and the principle of ‘the Philippines for the Filipinos’ was meant to apply to Mindanao and Sulu in the same sense as that in which it was applied to the Bisayas and Luzon.” Still, the former superintendent diverged from the colonial regime in their management of Moro Province and their efforts to the non-Christian populations of the region into the broader colony over the long term. To this point, Saleeby states that “Moroland is destined to ultimately form one or more provinces which will be integral parts of the general provincial organization of the Philippine Islands, and it is the duty of its present government to so develop its citizens and institutions as to bring about such a

¹⁶⁹ Marr, “Diasporic Intelligences in the American Philippine Empire,” 85; Milligan, *Islamic Identity, Postcoloniality, and Education Policy*, 33-34. The *pandita* school was an institution of local learning situated in Moro communities. These schools were centered around the authority of the *pandita*. This title “was a name given to individuals who, regardless of social standing, had distinguished themselves by acquiring a superior knowledge of Islam. But, in a cultural context in which Islam was believed to govern all aspects of social and individual life, the *pandita*’s knowledge was extensive. In addition to serving as religious functionaries, they served as courtiers of the sultan, judges, scribes, and medical experts... [In this context,] the *pandita* was a figure of considerable importance in Muslim Filipino society.” These schools functioned as an outlet of traditional knowledge transmission and religious instruction in Moro society.

transformation and incorporation in due time.”¹⁷⁰ Recognizing the objective of eventual incorporation, the former superintendent wanted to ensure the equitable integration of the Moro people into a future Philippine state.

Saleeby was aware of the immense divisions that existed between Christian Filipino and Moro societies. He stated that “A wide and deep chasm separates the Moros from their Christian neighbors. Marked inequality in culture and radical differences of civilization make it impossible to govern them alike. Two forms of government are at present necessary, one for the Moro and one for the Christian.” To rectify this dichotomy between the two societies, it was necessary for the Moro “to develop, reform, and rise to the level of the Christian before the two governments can be united or incorporated.” Noting that “The basic unit of the Philippines governmental organization is a republican municipality” while “The basic unit of the Moro political organization is a feudal *datanship*,” Saleeby was skeptical of the ability of the U.S. colonial government reconcile these disparate systems within a Philippine state.¹⁷¹ For local self-government, Saleeby regarded the model of municipal governance of the former as the ideal system of organization to emulate in the context of the Southern Philippines. In order to achieve these ends, it was necessary for the Moro to advance to a comparable level of advancement relative to their Christian counterparts and to progressively transform their *datuships* into modern municipalities.¹⁷² In his recommendation for Western modes of political organization and his calls for gradual political absorption of Moro localities, Saleeby thus openly professed assimilationist sentiments that conformed to the objectives of the U.S. colonial state.

¹⁷⁰ Najeeb Saleeby, *The Moro Problem: An Academic Discussion of the History and Solution of the Problem of the Government of the Moros of the Philippine Islands* (Manila: Press of E. C. McCullough & co., 1913), 16.

¹⁷¹ Saleeby, *The Moro Problem*, 16-17.

¹⁷² Milligan, *Islamic Identity, Postcoloniality, and Education Policy*, 63. Within the context of indigenous power structures, the *datu* functioned as figure of local authority in Moro communities. In the context of these localities, “land was traditionally owned in common by interconnected networks of extended families. The *datu*, the traditional leader of this network, exercised authority over the right to use the land.”

Even as he admonished their traditional modes of government and social organization in a supposedly primitive or reactionary light, Saleeby expressed hopeful attitudes concerning the capacities of the Moro in their ‘civilizational’ aptitude and capacity for ‘advancement.’ In the latter half of the lecture, he discussed the contemporary social and political barriers that constrained the political integration of the Moro community. Ascribing a broad condition of “ignorance and illiteracy” to the Moro people, Saleeby ambivalently lamented that:

The Moros were richer, better organized, and more civilized sixty years ago than now. The results of the Spanish wars with Sulu and Mindanao reduced their strength very considerably and wrought havoc with their institutions. Disorganized and demoralized as they are now, they still retain signs of former progress and better days. We find a considerable number among them who can read and write and have a distinct desire to learn and improve. Thousands can read and write in Arabic characters and stand ready to convey knowledge and learning to the masses.

He goes on to observe the advances the Moro had made despite the adverse conditions of colonial rule:

They have books, courts, judges, and a governmental system and, with adequate effort, well developed and civilized communities can at once be organized among them, if properly qualified American officers are available for such work. Strictly speaking, the masses are ignorant and illiterate, but there is sufficient intelligence among the members of the better classes to enable the government to make a beginning at least, and the future is no doubt promising.

Despite the despondency and discord that wrought the Moro people after decades of conflict with external forces (notably described as the consequence of Spanish actions rather than recent U.S. encroachments), he emphasized the cultural and literary capacities amongst the upper sections of the community. Not unlike the *ilustrados* in the Christian North, it was among this indigenous elite that Saleeby cast his hopes to cultivating an inner core that could serve in positions of civil leadership and disseminate knowledge to the ‘benighted’ masses. On the state of mass education for the Moro, Saleeby observed that:

Schools have been established among the Moros with undoubted success. Moro students are fairly apt and capable of development and their education can follow the same general lines as those adopted for the education of the Christian tribes further north. However, having no means of communicating with the Moros except through their own dialects, the

knowledge of the Arabic system of writing and of the local dialects become necessary as qualifications for office and as part of the curriculum of the primary schools.¹⁷³

In general, Saleeby's lecture evoked a tone of optimism about the Moro peoples' general capacity for advancement. In light of their aptitude, the former superintendent advocated for the adoption of a mainstream curriculum similar to that used in the rest of the Philippines. In theory, such would impart the necessary knowledge and skills to mentor the Moros in the exercise of self-government in a manner same as their Christian Filipino counterparts.

Despite his earlier calls for the gradual political incorporation of Moro communities into a future Philippine state within a secular-republican model, Saleeby did not extend this assimilationist logic to the realm of language. Rather than calling for the adoption of English or another Filipino language to bind the non-Christian regions into the national framework, Saleeby instead proposed the continued use of Arabic script and of regional languages as the prevailing civic language in the affairs in Moro Province. The former superintendent would further elaborate on this theme of linguistic incorporation in a 1924 piece *The Language of Education of the Philippine Islands*, extending his commentary to the broader Philippines. Long after his tenure as education superintendent of Moro Province, Saleeby admonished U.S. policymakers for their efforts to impose European languages as the primary medium of instruction in public schools. Whether in the context of Spanish or U.S. rule, both failed to extend use of their languages to the indigenous populations of the colony. Beyond their practice by indigenous elites, local languages continued to prevail in the archipelago among the various indigenous groups. As opposed to being unilaterally imposed, Saleeby argued instead that the general language of instruction should derive from the consent and will of the local populace. He stated that:

Teaching English broadcast and enforcing its official use is one thing, and its adoption as the basis of education and as the sole medium of public instruction is a completely different matter. This point cannot be fully grasped or comprehended without special attention and experience in colonial education and administration. Such policy is exalted and ambitious to an extreme degree. It aims at something unknown before in human affairs. It is

¹⁷³ Saleeby, *The Moro Problem*, 24.

attempting to do what ancient Persia, Rome, Alexander the Great and Napoleon failed to accomplish.

Continuing, he emphasized of this Anglo-American language policy that “It aims at nothing less than the obliteration of the tribal differences of the Filipinos, the substitution of English for the vernacular dialects as a home tongue, and making English the national, common language of the Archipelago.”¹⁷⁴ In essence, the use in English in public schools served as a tool of cultural transformation and social engineering. Derived from his experience as an administrator on the internal periphery of the Insular government, Saleeby was intimately aware of the diversity that characterized the peoples of the Archipelago, particularly the Moro and non-Christian tribes of Mindanao and Sulu. For U.S. officials, in overcoming the diversity of dialects that differentiated the regions of the archipelago, English served the function of a common language with the intention of fostering homogeneity and uniformity among their diverse subjects.

In the course of his term as superintendent, Saleeby’s accommodative methods were met with skepticism from his military counterparts in the provincial government.¹⁷⁵ While as Saleeby aimed to accommodate indigenous populations by incorporating local customs and languages, U.S. military administrators sought to forge an educational regime that would serve to alter the cultural character of their jurisdiction’s inhabitants and thereby promote order and efficiency in governance of the Southern Philippines. These conflicting curricular priorities were apparent in the early annual reports of the provincial administration. In the 1904 report for the first academic year the province, the military government explicitly specified the objective of imposing English as the primary medium of instruction. Dismissing the functional value of the multiplicity of languages that abounded in the region, the report stated that:

¹⁷⁴ Najeeb Saleeby, *The Language of Education of the Philippine Islands* (Manila, [publisher not identified] 1924), quoted in Renato Constantino, “The Miseducation of the Filipino,” in *Vestiges of War: the Philippine American War and the Afterman of an Imperial Dream, 1899-1999*, ed. Angel Velasco Shaw and Luis H. Francia (New York University Press, 2002), 188-189.

¹⁷⁵ Charbonneau, *Civilizational Imperatives*, 78.

There is no object whatever in attempting to preserve the native dialects, as they are crude, devoid of literature, and limited in range. The Moro dialects have been used as a medium for translating the Koran and the recording of such rudimentary laws and regulations as remain from the old Mohammedan teaching and laws. There is little or nothing of a historical character which has been made of record, and absolutely nothing in the way of literature. The language is limited and crude and is not believed to present any features of value or interest other than as a type of savage tongue.¹⁷⁶

While as Saleeby's earlier efforts at translation reflected a genuine intellectual interest in codification and preservation, this report reflected the prevailing prejudices of provincial administrators during his tenure. Regarded as lacking any apparent legal or literary value in transcribed form, the Moro languages were characterized by U.S. policymakers as purportedly primitive and unsophisticated. In essence, the absence of such markers was regarded as evidence of a people of lower order lacking civilization.

Counter to these assumptions, Saleeby's interactions with the Moro peoples through his travels into the interior of the Southern province and meticulous research resulted in a successful effort to formally record and document Moro civilization, culminating in the publication of *Studies in Moro History, Law, and Religion* (1905) and the *History of Sulu* (1908).¹⁷⁷ Still, despite Saleeby's personal activities, the civil-military government was adamant about the necessity of instituting English-based instruction. Reflecting the urgency of this priority, the 1904 report recommended that "The teaching of English... should be pushed forward as rapidly as possible. We [cannot] expect to continue the many different dialects of the island, and any attempt to do so would be unwise, but we can hope with a reasonable degree of assurance to make English the main language and the medium of transacting all official and most business affairs in the comparatively near future."¹⁷⁸ To this extent, the multiplicity of local dialects that flourished in the region were regarded as a hinderance to the effective administration of the province. To overcome this practical obstacle, colonial officials sought to institute a

¹⁷⁶ Bureau of Insular Affairs, War Department. *Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province – September 1, 1903, to August 31, 1904* (Washington: Government Printing House, 1904), 13.

¹⁷⁷ Charbonneau, *Civilizational Imperatives*, 33-34.

¹⁷⁸ *Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province* (1904), 13.

uniform language in order to foster efficiency in the formal governance over the populations of the province and expedite their integration into a future Philippine nation.

In the 1905 provincial report, the document took a more dispassionate, procedural tone, reflecting on the major events and noting the expenses for the second academic year in Moro Province. The report merely stated the “the publication by the province of two Moro readers prepared by Dr. Saleeby, one in Sulu and one in Maguindanao, has been of much interest.”¹⁷⁹ The passive mention of this development is likely indicative of the discord between the incumbent superintendent and the civil-military government, particularly with regard to his experimental curricular methods for the Moro peoples. In June 1906, Saleeby formally resigned from the provincial administration and was succeeded by Charles R. Cameron as Superintendent of Schools. His departure resulted in a shift in the priorities for the provincial administration.¹⁸⁰

As suggested in the administrative 1906 report, the government sought to reorient the curriculum in line with a more applied course of instruction that would address the material needs of the province as prescribed by U.S. colonial officials. According to the report, “Now that we have reached the time... when general disorder has ceased, the question of the kind of education that will prove both of immediate and lasting benefit to the people, *useful in developing an agricultural and industrial community*, and in cementing a friendly feeling towards the government which gives them that education, has become of supreme importance [emphasis added].”¹⁸¹ In light of the supposedly ‘primitive’ character of the province’s inhabitants, it was regarded as imperative to lay

¹⁷⁹ Geo T. Langhorne, *Second Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1905* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1905), 22.

¹⁸⁰ *Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province – Major General Leonard Wood, U.S.A. July 1, 1905 TO April 16, 1906 – Brigadier General Tasker H. Bliss, U.S.A. April 16 1906, TO August 27, 1906* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1906), 77; 103.

¹⁸¹ *Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province – Major General Leonard Wood, U.S.A. July 1, 1905 TO April 16, 1906*, 79-80.

the practical foundations for the region's transition to a 'modern' mode of economic organization through agricultural and industrial initiatives.

The report stated that it was crucial to develop a curriculum that "must not have a tendency there to bring back the condition of disorder and armed resistance from which we are emerging." To preclude this, the report professed that the situation required the military government "to cut away from traditional systems and to create a new one so elastic that it can adapt itself to all the varying conditions between the extremes of civilization and barbarism."¹⁸² Within this declared cessation of hostilities with Moro insurgents, the provincial administrators emphasized the imperative of implementing a curriculum that would foster peace and order in Moro Province.¹⁸³ Such a practical course would provide the civil-military regime with the adaptive capacity to administer and regulate the social transformation of Mindanao and Sulu and to lay the material groundwork for the region's long term integration with the rest of the Philippines.

3.3 Differentiated Curriculums for Christian Filipinos and the Moro

Scholars such Glenn Anthony May and Anne Paulet have discussed at length the predominance of industrial education in the Philippines. In this context, they each have noted the carryover of this curricular preference was in conformity with precedent in the context of the U.S. continental empire and prior models of domination over non-white, subject peoples.¹⁸⁴ During the early period of development within the Philippine education system between 1900-1913, the Department of Public Instruction and the Philippine Commission oscillated between competing tendencies as to the best

¹⁸² *Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province – Major General Leonard Wood, U.S.A. July 1, 1905 TO April 16, 1906*, 80.

¹⁸³ Despite the assertion in this report, localized, on-and off skirmishes between Moro rebels and U.S. forces remained a frequent occurrence long after the establishment of civil government in the Southern Philippines.

¹⁸⁴ Anne Paulet, "To Change the World," 185-186; 189; Glenn Anthony May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines*, 91-92.

curriculum to educate the ingenious populations of the archipelago. The first Director of Public Instruction, Fred Atkinson, drew initial inspiration from the model of industrial education as practiced by African American notable Booker T. Washington at the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama and Samuel Chapman Armstrong's Hampton Institute in Virginia, whose student bodies respectively were drawn from black and indigenous communities. By contrast, Atkinson's successor, David Barrows, drew inspiration from the liberal arts curriculum that was applied in on-reservations schools. Among these contending schools of thought, the former eventually prevailed as the dominant stream within the colonial curriculum on the islands.¹⁸⁵

By limiting students to a curriculum grounded in the industrial arts and manual labor, this stream served to circumscribe their opportunities in the job market and thus "left ordinary Filipinos with few options other than subordinate positions as skilled laborer's serving the [American] colonizers and the indigenous elite."¹⁸⁶ Nevertheless, while these base assertion remains uncontested when analyzing the Philippines more broadly, it is necessary to differentiate between the manner in which these ideas were applied in separate jurisdictions in the islands. In this context, the adoption of industrial education as implemented in the Southern Philippines served to magnify the prejudices and rationales underlying this curricular model.

Within official commentaries, U.S. colonial officials were certain to distinguish between Christian Filipinos and their non-Christian counterparts with regards to their purported capacities for civilizational advancement. These distinctions were formulated within prevailing academic concepts on social evolution and racial science. Among these, the broad influence of contemporary scientific race theories such as Lewis Henry Morgan's notions of civilizational development is evident throughout documents issued by the provincial administration. Delineated in *Ancient Society* (1877), Morgan conceived of social evolution within a progressive scale of social development: savagery, barbarism,

¹⁸⁵ May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines*, 113; 116-117; 125.

¹⁸⁶ Adas, *Dominance by Design*, 176.

and civilization. A linear track, Morgan represented “each race (common-descent group) as a distinct evolutionary link advancing in a progressive race (running) toward attaining and perfecting civilization.”¹⁸⁷ In the context of the Philippines, the indigenous populations were viewed by U.S. policymakers as falling between the categories of savagery and barbarism. While Christian Filipinos were seen as falling within the intermediary camp of barbarism, the Moro and other non-Christian populations were regarded as falling within the premature stage of savagery.

Within the long-term priorities of the U.S. colonial leadership, it was assumed Christian Filipinos – after the necessary period of American guidance and education in the exercise in self-government – would eventually assume the mantle of leadership in the internal governance of the colony, albeit under the oversight of U.S. official. In light of their Christian orientation and their prior encounters with European civilization under Spanish rule, Northern Filipinos were regarded as possessing some rudimentary civilizational prerequisites as compared to their non-Christian counterparts. Extending such considerations to the context of Moro Province, the 1906 provincial report observed that “The Christian Filipino in Mindanao is pretty much the same as his brother in the Visayas” and other Northern regions. Emphasizing ongoing hostilities with Muslim insurgents in the South, the report further noted that:

Hitherto the Moro has had to receive the first and bitter lesson which, in all history, has been the savage's preliminary instruction in the ways of civilization; he has had to be taught that civilization is physically stronger than barbarism. While he was learning this lesson he unable to learn the next one, nor was he in a frame of mind to benefit by it. Therefore, hitherto it has been impossible to carry any extended scheme of school instruction among the Moros. A development of this instruction on any scale has been possible only among the Filipinos; and there most of our schools now are.

In essence, the report stated that violence served as a necessary means to subdue and degrade a noncompliant element within the colony. To this extent, it was thought necessary to force the submission of the Moro and guide their populations in a scheme of

¹⁸⁷ Yael Ben-swi, “Where Did Red Go?: Lewis Henry Morgan’s Evolutionary Inheritance and U.S. Racial Imagination,” *CR: The New Continental Review* 7 no. 2 (2007), 204-205.

gradual development. In the allocation of educational resources for Filipino versus Moro populations in the Southern Philippines, the report recommended “that the former should, for the present, receive less attention than the latter; because the Filipino already has the highest form of religion, already has considerable culture and is friendly to the government.”¹⁸⁸ As a consequence of their ongoing resistance to U.S. encroachment, the Moro were hence deprived of comprehensive educational opportunities in contrast to the Christians Filipinos among whom the new colonizers were willing to devote resources in light of their modicum of civilization and perceived amenability to American rule.

Explaining the political functionality of the colonial curriculum as constituting an avenue to prepare Mindanao and Sulu for its integration with the Philippines, Jeffery Milligan observed that “American educational policy for Muslim Filipinos was aimed at moving them along the evolutionary channels of civilization’ toward the attainable ideal epitomized by Christian Filipinos and integrating them into a unified Philippines as a subordinated class of workers and farmers. Within this bifurcated framework, “Muslim Filipinos were not being educated for self-government; they were being educated for government by Christian Filipinos.” From this mantle, there emerged marked disparities in the formal curriculum provided to the Christian Filipinos as compared with their Moro counterparts. While the former was afforded a more comprehensive program comprising of literary and vocational subjects from primary through secondary grades, that of the latter constituted a rudimentary curriculum emphasizing basic instruction in the industrial and domestic arts.¹⁸⁹

In general, the differentiated curriculum for Christian Filipinos and Moros was linked with their assumed capacities for development. Furthermore, their respective curriculums were framed in the context of the social roles that U.S. policymakers envisioned each group fulfilling in the period following the granting of self-rule. For the

¹⁸⁸ *Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province – Major General Leonard Wood, U.S.A. July 1, 1905 TO April 16, 1906*, 81.

¹⁸⁹ Milligan, *Islamic Identity, Postcoloniality, and Education Policy*, 60-61

majority of Hispanicized-Catholic Filipinos, this curriculum was understood as an avenue for immersion in Anglo-American, Protestant cultural values. Alluding to the yeomen ideal professed by Thomas Jefferson in the founding of the American republic, David P. Barrows noted that “The hope of the common people lies either in possessing small farms or engaging successfully in lines of trade which will contribute generally to the commercial development of the Islands.” He continued that “These small farmers and these traders, both of them with enough education to keep their own accounts and manage their own affairs... are two classes which we hope to produce in great numbers through the work of the primary schools.” Oriented toward laying the prerequisites of political autonomy, this curriculum was aimed to inculcate students with the principles of self-sufficiency and material productivity. Imbued in such principles, U.S. policymakers envisioned Christian Filipinos as constituting the core of a democratic political culture with each citizen possessing a tangible stake in the civic affairs of the nation.¹⁹⁰

In a pamphlet for the 1915 Panama-Pacific International Exposition (Image 4), a flow chart laid out the various courses that a Filipino student would have access to in the course of their time in the Philippine public school system. From the primary grades through to secondary school, the general curriculum placed great emphasis on vocational skills and professional training. In this context, the occupations that were most emphasized were teaching, skilled trades, and agriculture. As students progressed through the various tiers of the colonial education system, courses in a given vocational stream would become more advanced and specialized. As noted in the pamphlet, “Upon the hypothesis that economic independence is the basis of citizenship, every pupil in the elementary grades is required to take up industrial training.”¹⁹¹ To this extent, the Insular curriculum theoretically offered Christian Filipinos a more comprehensive and well-

¹⁹⁰ Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of Education. *Eighth Annual Report of the Director of Education - July 1, 1907 TO June 30, 1908* (Manila: Bureau of Printing), 9.

¹⁹¹ “Philippine Public School System,” in *The Philippine Public Schools at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition* (San Francisco: Marnell and Company, 1915), 33.

rounded education that would provide any prospective pupil with a material stake to achieve advancement in Philippine society.¹⁹²

So as to catch up with the rest of the colony, U.S. officials saw it as necessary for the Moro people to advance to a level of development comparable to their Christian counterparts. To effectively integrate the Muslim South into the political mainstream of the Philippines, Charles R. Cameron – assistant superintendent of education in Moro Province – explained that “certain progress in civilization must be made before the schools, as ordinarily understood, can begin effective work... Then and only then can the schools begin their task of individual and social development.” To counteract the communal and migratory customs associated with the indigenous populations of the province, it was regarded as imperative to promote fixed settlements and sedentary modes of living among the Moro and other non-Christian peoples. Through the promotion of agriculture, commerce, and manufacturing, the 1907 provincial report observed that the “development of these branches of industry will induce community life and the accumulation of property - conditions themselves highly civilizing as well as essential to the establishment of schools.”¹⁹³ Due to their supposedly ‘primitive’ state of development, the non-Christian populations of Moro Province were deemed as necessitating introduction to the most basic aspects of ‘modern’ economic and social organization.

¹⁹² In examining the full scope of the colonial curriculum, its extent must be qualified with consideration to factors of general accessibility among the Filipino populace and provision of resources. In this context, most streams of vocational training remained limited to male students, while female students were relegated to the domestic arts and teaching. Furthermore, as students progressed into the intermediate and secondary school tiers and entered more advanced courses, the number of specialized facilities in operation and quantity of pupils in attendance became narrower. This is largely due to the trends of inadequate funding and streamlined allocation of resources on part of the U.S. colonial administration for the public school system. For commentary of the structural defenses of colonial education system in the Philippines under U.S. rule and its tangible outcomes, see Glenn Antony May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines* (1980), Part III, “Schooling” and Glenn Anthony May, “The Business of Education in the Colonial Philippines: 1909-1930,” in *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano (The University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 151-162.

¹⁹³ Tasker H. Bliss, *The Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province – For Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1907* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1907), 17.

Digitized by
INTERNET ARCHIVE

33

Original from
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

PHILIPPINE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

PRIMARY <small>FOUR YEARS</small> GENERAL <small>43209 PUPILS</small>	INTERMEDIATE <small>THREE YEARS</small> VOCATIONAL <small>30726 PUPILS</small>	SECONDARY <small>FOUR YEARS</small> MINOR PROFESSIONAL <small>5801 STUDENTS</small>	UNIVERSITY <small>TWO TO SEVEN YEARS</small> PROFESSIONAL AND CULTURAL <small>1415 STUDENTS</small>
GRADES I-II-III-IV	GRADES V-VI-VII	FIRST-SECOND-THIRD-FOURTH YEARS	FROM TWO* TO SEVEN COLLEGE YEARS
CURRICULUM GENERAL LANGUAGE-READING NUMBERS-ARITHMETIC HYGIENE-CIVICS-GEOGRAPHY MUSIC AND DRAWING GOOD MANNERS AND RIGHT CONDUCT PLAYS AND GAMES PLAIN SEWING-COOKING-LACE EMBROIDERY-HATS-MATS BASKETRY-WOODWORKING-GARDENING BAMBOO AND RATTAN FURNITURE	COURSES GENERAL <small>224 SCHOOLS 18869 PUPILS</small> TEACHING <small>36 SCHOOLS 4204 PUPILS</small> HOUSEKEEPING AND HOUSEHOLD ARTS <small>72 SCHOOLS 3234 PUPILS</small> TRADES AND <small>40 SCHOOLS 3052 PUPILS</small> FARMING <small>14 SCHOOLS 1367 PUPILS</small>	COURSES GENERAL <small>37 SCHOOLS 4112 STUDENTS</small> NORMAL <small>1 SCHOOL 672 STUDENTS</small> NURSING <small>1 SCHOOL 186 STUDENTS</small> TRADES <small>3 SCHOOLS 248 STUDENTS</small> AGRICULTURAL <small>2 SCHOOLS 226 STUDENTS</small> COMMERCIAL <small>1 SCHOOL 293 STUDENTS</small> SURVEYING <small>1 SCHOOL 39 STUDENTS</small> NAUTICAL <small>1 SCHOOL 25 STUDENTS</small>	COLLEGES LIBERAL ARTS JUNIOR COLLEGE <small>2 YEARS A B 265 STUDENTS</small> SENIOR COLLEGE <small>5 YEARS M.S.M.A. 95 STUDENTS</small> LAW <small>3 YEARS LL.B. 143 STUDENTS</small> MEDICINE AND SURGERY <small>5 YEARS M.D. 94 STUDENTS</small> TROPICAL MEDICINE AND PUBLIC HEALTH <small>7 YEARS D.T.M.O.P.H. 10 STUDENTS</small> PHARMACY <small>3 YEARS PHAR.G. 43 STUDENTS</small> VETERINARY SCIENCE <small>5 YEARS D.V.M. 31 STUDENTS</small> AGRICULTURE <small>2-4 YEARS B.AGR. B.S.AGR. 53 STUDENTS</small> FORESTRY <small>2 YEARS B.S.F. 55 STUDENTS</small> ENGINEERING <small>4 YEARS B.S.C.E. 12 STUDENTS</small> FINE ARTS <small>5 YEARS CERTIFICATE 700 STUDENTS</small>

Image 4: Grade Structure of the Philippine Public School System

“Philippine Public School System,” in *The Philippine Public Schools at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition* (San Francisco/ Marnell and Company, 1915), 33.

In order to lay the groundwork for the industrial development of the Southern Philippines, it was regarded as essential to tap into the comprising regions' abundance of natural resources for commercial development. Foundational to the "industrial evolution" of Mindanao and Sulu, Major John P. Finlay explained that "Moro Province offers great agricultural possibilities for the social uplifting of the Moros and Pagans and their energies must be directed along commercial and agricultural lines." He asserted further that "The land, the sea and the forests teem with the fullness of natural riches that are well within the capacity of the natives to gather for their sustenance, and to place the surplus in the markets of the world."¹⁹⁴ Within this context, there emerged among U.S. policymakers a preference for a mode of curriculum that would permit the foundational, rudimentary development of the agricultural and resources sectors of the southern province. Rather than embracing a curriculum that would imbue students in the industrial arts and skilled trades, non-Christian pupils in Moro Province would instead receive basic instruction in the elementary aspects of economic life. Emphasizing the limited horizons assigned to non-Christian students, the 1908 provincial report explained that:

By a thorough knowledge of wood and iron working is not meant training in the use of costly and complicated machinery, which must be driven by steam power, and skill in the use of which would secure employment only in a very few manufactories in these islands. A far more practical and equally educative purpose is served by giving training in the use of those small tools which are not beyond the reach of the humblest worker.¹⁹⁵

To this extent, Moro students were taught the most basic skills and proficiencies that would enable any given subject to enter the workforce of the colonial economy. While satisfying the rudimentary material demands of the U.S. colonial state, the industrial curriculum further precluded the prospect of social and economic mobility for non-Christian populations within the emerging Filipino state. Regarded as lacking the

¹⁹⁴ John P. Finlay, "The Non-Christians of the Southern Islands of the Philippines – Their Self-Government and Industrial Development," *The Report of the Thirtieth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Henry S. Haskins (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1912), 128.

¹⁹⁵ Tasker H. Bliss, *Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1908* (Zamboanga: The Mindanao Herald Publishing Company, 1908), 14.

requisite cultural knowledge that was seen as essential in the functioning of a modern economy, non-Christian pupils were relegated to a subordinate standing relative to their Christian counterparts.

Explaining the disparities and variances in vocational instruction prescribed to non-Christian Filipinos as compared with their Christian counterparts, a 1915 report of the Insular education bureau noted that “The industrial work prescribed for the pagan and Mohammedan schools has been of a very practical nature and has been limited almost entirely to agriculture for boys and plain sewing for girls. The minor industries have not been introduced in these schools with the exception of brass work at Tugaya in Lanao and at Kudarangan in Cotabato.” In contrast, among Christian Filipino schools “the minor lines of industrial work have been followed with marked success, especially lace making, embroidery, basketry, and abaca work.”¹⁹⁶ Corresponding to concerns of efficiency and material productivity, both lines of curriculum were generally oriented to ensure that students among either group would graduate with marketable skills that would enable them to become productive members of the workforce in the colonial economy. Even so, the expectations of the U.S. colonial state as to the capacity of their subjects was neither consistent nor uniform. While the education of the Moro and other non-Christian populations was envisioned as promoting the embrace of rudimentary facets of modern economic and social organization, their Christian counterparts were regarded as qualified to learn more advanced industrial pursuits. In general, Christian Filipinos – the population envisioned as the core of an autonomous government in the islands - were seen as embodying the basic civilizational standards toward which the Moro peoples needed to advance.

During the early period of U.S. rule in Mindanao and Sulu, the region witnessed a migratory influx of Christian Filipino settlers from the island of Luzon prompted by a regional homesteading policy commencing in 1913. During this period, the non-Muslim

¹⁹⁶ Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of Education, *Fifteenth Annual Report of the Director of Education – January 1914 TO December 30, 1914*, 61.

populations in the Southern Philippines rose dramatically.¹⁹⁷ This scheme of intra-colonial resettlement was rationalized nurture social cohesion between the Moro and their Filipino counterparts within an emerging colonial-national state and encourage sedentary agriculture and private property ownership among the native populations of the Southern Philippines. Nevertheless, Christopher John Chanco notes that these processes of “the resettlement programs and land registration policies resulted in a starkly uneven form of development that limited property ownership to those who not only had privileged access to the resources of a nascent government bureaucracy but could also read and write, excluding most ordinary Moros and Lumad by default.”¹⁹⁸ Persisting into the post-colonial period following U.S. disengagement from the islands in 1946, these demographic engineering and land allotment policies engendered long term dynamic of uneven material development of Southern Philippines as compared with the rest of the archipelago and laid the foundations for the subordination of the Moro relative to their Christian counterparts. Within this context, the differentiated modes of curriculum proffered for the non-Christian peoples of Mindanao and Sulu constituted an extension of broader efforts of the Insular Government to radically transform the region to promote the material development and thereby hasten its integration into the emerging colonial-national state in the Philippines.

¹⁹⁷ Thomas J. O’Shaughnessy, “How Many Muslims Has the Philippines?,” *Philippine Studies* 23 no.3 (1975), 377. This trend is evident in demographic data of the Southern Philippines compiled between in census between 1918-1948. The total numbers differed depending on province. In Cotabato in 1918 there were 61,052 non-Muslims as compared with 110,926 Muslims, while in 1948 there 284,507 versus 115,162; in Lanao in 1918 there were 8,140 non-Muslims as compared with 83,319 Muslims, while in 1948 there 106,703 versus 237,215; and in Sulu in 1918 there were 4,147 non-Muslims as compared with 168,629 Muslims, while as in 1948 there were 13,934 versus 226,883. These sample Southern provinces make up some of the areas of Mindanao and Sulu that were redivided multiple times throughout the period of direct U.S. rule in the Philippines through the Commonwealth era after 1935 and up to formal decolonization in 1946.

¹⁹⁸ Christopher John Chanco, “Frontier Politics and Imaginaries: The Reproduction of Settler Colonial Space in the Southern Philippines,” *Settler Colonial Studies* 7 no. 1 (2017), 117-119.

Conclusion

U.S. Colonial Education, Filipino Elites, and the Disarming of Postcolonial Nationalism

During the first decade of U.S. rule in the Philippines, metropolitan leaders were decidedly opposed to the immediate granting of self-rule to the islands. Through their bases of support among capital elites in the Northeast and agrarian interests in the Midwest, over the course of three successive Republican presidencies – William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and William Howard Taft – the U.S. remained committed to the principle of ‘benevolent assimilation’ in the Philippines during this period. To the extent that local self-governance was a priority, its extension was to be indefinitely deferred until conditions in the colony were deemed allowable by U.S. policymakers. Grayson L. Kirk explained that “Absorbed as it was in this task the [McKinley] administration took the point of view that a reasonable amount of autonomy should be granted as soon as it proved to be practicable to do so, but that no definite commitment to any policy of ultimate retention or freedom should be prematurely made.”¹⁹⁹

Speaking to the broad appeal of pro-retentionist sentiment had among major media outlets, Manuel L. Quezon similarly observed that “The three former [Republican] Presidents...had created the belief that the Filipino would not be ready for a long time to be entrusted with the government of their own country, and with the exception of some of the newspapers in the southern states, the immense majority of publications here, whether dailies or magazines, ridiculed the idea of allowing the Filipinos to govern themselves.”²⁰⁰ Nevertheless, by the late 1900s and through the 1910s, appeals for expanded autonomy and political devolution for the Philippines gradually gained traction within domestic discourse in the United States.

¹⁹⁹ Grayson L. Kirk, *Philippine Independence: Motives, Problems, and Prospects* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1936), 36.

²⁰⁰ Manuel L. Quezon, *The Good Fight*, (New York, London: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1946), 124.

These calls for the extension of autonomy for the archipelago originated from elite actors in both the U.S. metropole and the overseas periphery. With regards to the former, these efforts emanated from the legislative initiatives of the Democratic Party, gaining traction with the election of Woodrow Wilson in 1912. Under the platform for the presidential election of 1912, the Democrats committed to the principle of political self-determination for the Islands. Evoking liberal anti-imperialist platitudes harkening back to longstanding narratives of nationalist exceptionalism, the platform condemned imperialism and provisionally stipulated that “We favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other Powers.”²⁰¹ Following his election, President Wilson clarified his personal position with regard to the future status of the Philippines, pledging in 1913 that “the Philippines are at present our frontier but I hope we presently are to deprive ourselves of that frontier.”²⁰² Until the passage of the *Philippine Autonomy Act* in 1916, the long term status of America’s insular possessions – in particular the Philippines and Puerto Rico – remained a frequent feature of Wilson’s annual State of the Union Address.²⁰³

While the Democratic Party apparatus established the broad tone for public debate on Philippine self-governance, practical efforts in furtherance of this objective were most pronounced in the legislative arena of the U.S. Congress. These congressional efforts were spearheaded by Rep. William Atkinson Jones of Virginia in his capacity as chairman of the House Committee on Insular Affairs from 1911 until his death in

²⁰¹ “Democratic Party Platform of 1912” (June 25, 1912), see *The American Presidency Project*, <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/1912-democratic-party-platform>.

²⁰² “Wilson Renews Independence Pledge during Staunton Visit,” *Filipino People* 1, no. 5 (Jan. 1913), 4; quoted in Kirk, *Philippine Independence*, 44.

²⁰³ In his major congressional addresses from 1913 through 1915, Wilson briefly alluded to the status of America’s overseas territorial possessions. In his addresses from 1916 onwards, as the conflict in Europe intensified and as U.S. entry into the First World War loomed, there was limited mention of matters relating to the Philippines and other insular dependencies.

1918.²⁰⁴ Speaking to the question of Filipino capacity for self-rule in a 1912 committee report, Jones highlighted that “The unparalleled and phenomenal spread of education throughout the archipelago in recent years... and the valuable experience gained through actual practice in a popular legislative assembly have not only contributed immensely toward preparing the Filipinos for the exercise of self-government, but have at the same time quickened and intensified their desire to become a free and independent people.”²⁰⁵ Nevertheless, while acknowledging their capacities for self-rule, support for Filipino self-determination among white Americans was often conditional and emerged out of political expediency. Rather than a sincere expression of solidarity with the Filipino national aspirations, these efforts emanated more from practical concerns about the strategic implications for the retention of the islands or the expenditures entailed in the governance of the colony.²⁰⁶

²⁰⁴ During his tenure as committee chairman, Jones was instrumental in passage of the Philippine Autonomy Act of 1916 (the Jones Law) and the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act of 1917 (the Jones-Shafroth Act), the former granting conditional independence to the Philippine Islands and the latter extending U.S. citizenship to the Hispanic nationals of Puerto Rico. Both statutes were crucial in altering relations between the U.S. and their overseas possessions acquired in the Spanish American War.

²⁰⁵ William A. Jones, *Independent Government for the Philippines*, 62nd Congress, House of Representatives, Report No. 606 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1912), 3.

²⁰⁶ Paul Kramer, *The Blood of Government*, 355-356. Kramer emphasizes concerns about the geopolitical costs entailed given the proximity of the Philippines to Japan. In a 1913 congressional address, Rep. Jones critiqued the mismanagement and misappropriation of funds on part of the U.S. colonial administration in the Philippines. Noting the unequal relations between the elected Philippine Assembly and the Philippine Commission in the authorization of funds, Jones stated that of the former that “A people whose self-restraint is equal to orderly and peaceful submission to nets of tyranny and oppression such as these are surely capable of governing themselves.” Taking aim at what he characterized as a cadre of opportunists and special interests embedded among the civilian and military officials that made up the colonial government, Jones stated that “If the American public are too seriously heed testimony derived from sources such as these, we may as well abandon now and forever all hope that the Filipinos are ever to be given their independence, and that the American people are ever to be relieved of the enormous financial burdens which their retention yearly entails.” Although nominally acknowledging the plight of Filipino nationalist leaders and their unequal power relations between indigenous elites and the colonial state, Rep. Jones’ argument nonetheless circled back to questions of American national interests in the annual costs entailed in overseas rule. See William A. Jones, *Misgovernment in the Philippines and Cost to the United States Occupation* (January 28, 1913), House of Representatives (Washington: Government Printing House, 1913), 8; 23.

Filipino leaders too were instrumental in the push for increased autonomy for the Philippines. Following the establishment of civil government in 1902, Governor William Howard Taft and the Philippines Commission moved to establish amiable relations with indigenous elites of the islands as a means to quell ongoing hostilities with nationalist revolutionaries. Appealing to the traditional classes of the *caciques*, *principalía*, and the emergent *ilustrado*, such groups were progressively integrated into the corridors of power with their incorporation into the emergent U.S. colonial administration. However, rather than a mere cooption of indigenous elites through their absorption into the prevailing power structures, this process is better understood as a collaborative imperial project.²⁰⁷

Within this context, competing elements among the Filipino national elites wedded themselves to developing institutions of the colony. At the expense of the *caciques* and *principales* and the *Partido Federalista*, the *ilustrado* and the *Partido Nacionalista* eventually emerged as the dominant actors within the politics of the nascent colony. Speaking to the informal parameters of indigenous agency in the Philippines, A.G. Hopkins explained that “in a grand bargain of collaboration that lasted throughout the colonial era, Governor Taft and his successors endowed the *ilustrados* with a degree of political authority and hence legitimacy that they had not enjoyed under Spanish rule. The accord, moreover, was negotiated rather than imposed: the United States was ruler of its subjects but a prisoner of its colony.”²⁰⁸ Within this arrangement, the Filipino elites and middle classes flourished in a period marked by their dominance of the *Partido Nacionalista* in local, provincial, and national elections and reward by patronage in the colonial administration.

²⁰⁷ Michael Cullinane, “Bringing in the Brigands: The Politics of Pacification in the Colonial Philippines, 1902-1907,” *Philippine Studies* 57 no. 2 (2009), 46-79. Explaining this multifaceted process, the Cullinane notes that “indigenous elite alliances with, rather than struggles against, the representatives of the colonial regime had a greater impact on the nature of Filipino politics than did the legacy of nationalism that emerged from these same years. Between 1902 and 1907, to the dismay of both committed Filipino nationalists and entrenched American imperialists, a Filipino-American collaborative empire was launched.”

²⁰⁸ A.G. Hopkins, *American Empire: A Global History* (Princeton University Press, 2018), 612.

Within this state of collaborative relations, education and employment within the colonial civil service emerged as an avenue for social advancement for aspiring Filipinos. Explaining the peculiar conditions that arose at institutions of higher learning in the Philippines relative to neighboring colonial possessions, Vince Boudreau explains that:

While young Indonesians, Vietnamese, and Burmese could acquire a passable administrative education in their own countries, those who aspired to advanced university education typically traveled to Europe. In the Philippines, several old Spanish colleges already existed to provide such education, and the Americans soon built others, such as the University of the Philippines (1908) on American University models -that is, not as mere training academies for administrators but as vehicles for providing higher, professional education. Some students still traveled abroad to study, but from the early 1900s, it became possible for local people to obtain advanced, professional degrees in the archipelago. Hence unlike their counterparts across Southeast Asia, many of the Philippines' twentieth-century leaders had not studied abroad for any length of time. Rather, they rose within domestic networks that continued to connect them to campus life even as they moved into government.²⁰⁹

Predominantly attending academic institutions situated in the Philippines itself, rather in the U.S. metropole or elsewhere abroad, Filipino leaders were relegated to a nationally oriented education. Within these peculiar institutional conditions, future Filipino leaders were imbued in the prevailing ideological paradigm of Anglo-American leaders and the messianic objectives of the U.S. colonial state in the Philippines. Within this context, the horizons of Filipino nationalism were ideologically circumscribed, limited to the cultural concepts and modes of expression deemed legitimate by the American colonial lobby. Consequently, although framed as a collaborative imperial project, the prospects of Filipino self-determination were functionally bounded to the whims of the U.S.

In his seminal work published in 1952, *Black Skin, White Masks*, postcolonial theorist Frantz Fanon spoke to the functionality of metropolitan languages for colonized peoples. He observed that “To speak means to be in a position to use a certain syntax and possessing the morphology of such and such a language, but it means above all too assuming a culture and bearing the weight of a civilization.” Fanon continued that “All

²⁰⁹ Vince Boudreau, “Methods of Domination and Modes of Resistance: The U.S. Colonial State in the Philippines and Philippine Mobilization in Comparative Perspective,” in *The American Colonial State in the Philippines: Global Perspectives* ed. Julian Go and Anne. L. Foster (Durham and London, 2003), 266.

colonized people – in other words, people in whose soul an inferiority complex has taken root, whose local cultural originality has been committed to the grave – position themselves in relation to the civilizing language: i.e., the metropolitan culture.”²¹⁰ Within this relationship of stratified power relations, the metropolitan language constitutes a marker of a nonwhite person’s civilizational aptitude. In the broader course of subjugation, it emerges as an instrument to display a colonized person’s capacity to culturally integrate and mentally ascend to the expectations of their metropolitan overseers. This same dynamic is observable in discursive interactions between Americans and Filipinos during the course of contemporary debates over the future status of the Philippines in the early 1910s. While at once assuming an antagonistic posture as a means to assert their aspirations for national self-determination, Filipino leaders simultaneously assumed a deferential tone in praise of the efforts of American leaders and the principles that they professed through the medium of the English language.

In an address to the thirtieth annual Lake Mohonk Conference in October 1912, Maximo M. Kalaw struck a similar though more strident tone. Born in 1891, Kalaw came of age during the early period of U.S. colonial rule in the Philippines. Nineteen at the time of his address to the conference, Kalaw was a law student at Georgetown University and served as private secretary to Resident Commissioner Manuel L. Quezon. Crucially, Kalaw’s address was concurrent with Congressional debates over the future status of the Philippine Islands spearheaded by Quezon during his term from 1909 to 1916.²¹¹ Entitled “The Filipino Youth and the Independence of the Philippines,” the young Kalaw drew upon the reach of the colonial education system and the embrace of American culture as markers for Filipino capacities in their struggle for independence. He observed that

²¹⁰ Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Richard Philcox (Grove Press, 1952), 1-2; 2-3.

²¹¹ Paul Kramer, *The Blood of Government*, 285-286; 352-357; 369-370. Under the provisions of the *Philippine Organic Act* of 1902, the statute provided for the election of two resident commissioners to represent the Philippines in the U.S. Congress. While afforded the qualified opportunity of participating in the formal affairs and deliberations of Congress, such territorial delegates were limited in exercising practical agency in the interests of their constituents as non-voting members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

“Every student of the Philippine problem, every American official who has visited the Islands, has a word of praise for the rising generation of Filipinos those young men and women who speak and write English, who have been taught by American teachers, who play baseball and tennis, and who are, in short, to use a misleading term-being ‘Americanized.’” A representative of this “rising generation,” who having received “all my education in English, after going through the graded and high school courses and then attending the government university,” Kalaw spoke with authority on contemporary nationalist currents within the Philippines. Although delivered within the context of an elite forum, Kalaw’s address constitutes a forceful, vocal display of indigenous agency.

Capturing the dynamics of cultural diffusion in the intimate confines of the colonial classroom in the Philippines, Kalaw stated that “Speaking your own language and reading the books written by your own people, the young Filipinos can appreciate better your national characteristics and your political institutions.” Characterizing the English language an avenue for immersion into Anglo-Saxonist political culture, Kalaw observed that “could they teach us a more forceful language for the expression of free thoughts and free actions than the language of the Britons? What other tongue possesses more masterly pleas for freedom than that in which Jefferson wrote his immortal Declaration, Burke his famous orations, Byron his poems on liberty, and Emmet his Speech on Vindication?”²¹² Even while stressing the Filipino agency, Kalaw’s remarks ultimately paid deference to the preponderant culture and language of the power. A product of the American system, Kalaw’s statements reveal the inherent contradictions of colonial education system, namely its capacity to serve both as an instrument of oppression and a potential tool of emancipation for indigenous peoples. By extension, these structural contradictions show the ideological tensions between ethnocentric conceptions of Anglo-American elites and the universalist proclamations of the U.S. imperial project in the Philippines.

²¹² Maximo M. Kalaw, “The Filipino Youth and the Independence of the Philippines,” *The Report of the Thirtieth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Henry S. Haskins (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1912), 158; 161.

Within this context, the young Kalaw challenged the assertions of other speakers at the conference such as S. B. Rossiter who – expressing reservations concerning contemporary debates about the extension of self-rule to the islands – charged that Filipinos were purportedly debilitated by a “lack of initiative” which was characterized as “constitutional with the Filipino” and “with the whole Malay race.” Citing the social reforms instituted under U.S. occupation including “education, schools, universities, the ballot, republican government,” Rossiter contended that “that these great works of reform and of sanitation require a tremendous impulse to keep them going, and that impulse rests on that initiative back in the breast and brain and the blood of the American.”²¹³ With the indigenous populations supposedly lacking the requisite qualities of good temperament and judiciousness, the speaker contended that a premature extension of self-rule risked jeopardizing the gains of the U.S. efforts in the Philippines.

Emphasizing the purportedly collaborative nature of the imperial project in the Philippines, Kalaw emphasized that “it should also be noted that whatever progress the Philippine administration has achieved has been achieved through the cooperation of the Filipino people.” Among other government campaigns, Kalaw cited the role of Filipinos in the organization and construction of local schools, despite the meagre provision of funds and resources by the Insular government. To this, he stated that “If that is not ‘initiative,’ I should like to know what it is!”²¹⁴ In one regard, Kalaw sought to rhetorically accentuate indigenous agency in the project of ‘benevolent assimilation,’ emphasizing the element of active Filipino participation in the functions of the Insular government. Nevertheless, even while stressing the Filipino agency within the parameters of prevailing power structures, Kalaw’s remarks ultimately paid deference to the preponderant culture and language of the U.S. and Western Civilization more broadly.

²¹³ S. B. Rossiter, “Remarks of Dr. S. B. Rossiter,” *The Report of the Thirtieth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Henry S. Haskins (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1912), 187-188.

²¹⁴ Maximo M. Kalaw, “Remarks of Maximo M. Kalaw,” *The Report of the Thirtieth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Henry S. Haskins (Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1912), 190.

In contrast to other European possessions Southeast Asia such as French Indochina or Dutch Indonesia where political independence was forged through armed struggle and other modes mass popular resistance, the political fate of the Philippines was determined in a comparatively peaceable manner through a process of concession and negotiation between U.S. authorities and Filipino elites in the imperial metropole. Building on the limited political leverage garnered through the Jones Law, Philippine self-determination was realized with the passage of the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934. Upgraded to commonwealth status, the archipelago was provisionally guaranteed independence following a ten-year transitional period concluding in 1946. Noting the reactionary character of the postcolonial leadership, Renato Constantino cynically observed of this era that “when a Filipino took over under the Commonwealth [of the Philippines in 1935], a new generation of ‘Filipino-American’ had already been produced. There was no longer any need for American overseers in this field because a captive generation had already come of age, thinking and acting like little Americans.”²¹⁵

Whereas nationalist opposition movements in other colonies emerged independently of the imperial state, self-determination in the Philippines was forged through the efforts of an indigenous elite whose political aspirations were largely aligned and wedded to the institutions and priorities of the U.S. colonial state. While at once assuming an antagonistic posture so as to assert their aspirations for national self-determination, Filipino leaders at the same time assumed a deferential tone in praise of the efforts of American leaders and the principles that they professed through the medium of the English language. Explaining this peculiar condition of Filipino nationalism, journalist Stanley Karnow observed that:

Despite their own vague past, the Filipinos might have forged their national personality had they been compelled to fight for freedom - as they were indeed doing in their conflict against Spain. By acceding to their aspirations for sovereignty so soon after conquest, the United States spared them the long struggle for independence. But, in a sense, their hopes

²¹⁵ Renato Constantino, “The Miseducation of the Filipino,” 180.

were fulfilled too early. America's acquiescence to their ambitions deflated the élan, leaving them confused and ambivalent.²¹⁶

Although casted as an expression of indigenous agency and self-assertion, this cultural and linguistic identification is instead emblematic of a broader disarming and cooption of Filipino nationalism by the U.S. colonial state.

Colonial Education in Contemporary, Transnational Contexts

Over the course of 2020-2021, English-speaking societies such as Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and the United States have observed an upsurge in debates concerning the commemoration and memorialization of various prominent persons involved in the oppression of historically colonized peoples and other marginalized groups. Within this tumultuous context, the legacy of U.S. colonial rule in the Philippines was not left untouched. In November 2020, the University of California at Berkeley chose to rename a hall originally named after David P. Barrows.²¹⁷ Following his tenure as superintendent of schools in the Philippines from 1903-1909, Barrows returned to postsecondary lecturing and served as President of the University of California from 1919-1923. Similarly, on June 6, 2020, a statue of education reformer Egerton Ryerson at Ryerson University in Toronto was toppled by a group of protestors. Criticized for his role in the formulation of Canada's native residential school, there remain ongoing, indeterminate discussions over the possible renaming of the university.²¹⁸ In general, the cases of both Barrows and Ryerson display an ongoing, transnational dimensions in the oppressive systems of colonial education and broader efforts at the assimilation of indigenous peoples. These patterns are manifested across colonial spaces, encompassing direct, indirect, or settler-colonialist variants.

²¹⁶ Karnow, *In Our Image*, 16.

²¹⁷ Gretchen Kell, "UC Berkeley's Le Conte and Barrows Halls Lose Their Names," in *Berkeley News*, November 20, 2020, <https://news.berkeley.edu/2020/11/18/uc-berkeleys-leconte-and-barrows-halls-lose-their-names/>.

²¹⁸ Shawn Jeffords, "School Task Force on Egerton Ryerson Legacy Won't Speed Up Report Despite Protests," in *Toronto Star*, June 7, 2021, <https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2021/06/07/beheaded-statue-of-egerton-ryerson-toppled-sunday-in-toronto-wont-be-replaced.html>.

Whether manifested in the form of statue removal or the renaming of public sites, such actions often constitute an expression of political fervor frequently enacted in the heat of the moment. Even so, such measures fail to ameliorate the longstanding, tangible scars inflicted through both historical and enduring forms of oppression against non-white peoples. While maintaining awareness of the lived consequences of these policies, it is necessary for society to engage in ongoing, substantial discussions about the legacies of colonial violence. To this extent, it is essential to reckon with the racist modes of thought essential to these actions and policies, so as to consider why colonial actors thought the way they did and the pathologies underlying their actions. Working within this contemporary environment, my thesis has attempted to address the ethnocentric impulses of U.S. colonial administrators in the Philippines. Noting the legacies of settler colonialism as an ideological and administrative reserve of knowledge for colonial rule, it has explained transference of previous notions of racial difference from the mainland U.S. and their refashioning to be applicable in the overseas context following the nation's outward thrust in the post-1898 period. Within this dynamic framework, prevailing understandings of race are simultaneously reconstituted and reshaped when encountering previously unfamiliar racial groups in new colonial arenas.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

- Abbott, Lyman. "Our Duty to the Filipinos." In *The Report of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers, 68-74. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1906.
- Ames, Azal. "Conditions in Puerto Rico." In *The Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian*, edited by William J. Rose, 81-86. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1903.
- Atkinson, Fred W. "The Philippine Problem." In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by William J. Rose, 58-66. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1904.
- Atkins, J.D.C. "The English Language in the Indian Schools." In *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indians" 1880-1900*, edited by Francis Paul Prucha, 197-206. University of Nebraska Press, 1978.
- Brown, Arthur Judson. "Our Moral Problems in the Philippines." In *The Report of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers, 84-91. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1907.
- Brown, Elmer Ellsworth. "Opening Address of Dr. Elmer Ellsworth Brown." In *Report of the Thirtieth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Henry S. Haskins, 18-22. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1912.
- Bryan, E.B. "Education in the Philippines." In *National Education Association - The Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Forty-Third Annual Meeting*, 100-104. Winona, Minn.: National Education Association, 1904.
- "Education in the Philippines." In *The Report of the Twenty-Second Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by William J. Rose, 43-47. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1904.
- Charlton, Paul. "The Philippine Assembly." In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers, 77-84. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1907.
- Chipman, Norton P. "Territorial Expansion: The Philippines – The Oriental Problem." In *Overland Monthly* (December 1900).
- "Democratic Party Platform of 1912" (June 25, 1912). See *The American Presidency Project*, <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/1912-democratic-party-platform>.

- Devins, John Bancroft. "The Philippine Islands," in *The Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers, 63-68. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1906.
- Dyke, Charles B. "Essential Features in the Education of the Child Races." In *National Education Association - The Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Forty-Seventh Annual Meeting*, 928-932. Winona, Minn.: National Education Association, 1909.
- Finley, John P. "The Non-Christians of the Southern Islands of the Philippines – Their Self-Government and Industrial Development." In *Report of the Thirtieth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Henry S. Haskins, 105-131. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1912.
- Gates, Merrill E. "Christianizing the Indians." In *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indians," 1880-1900*, edited by Francis Paul Prucha, 287-288. University of Nebraska Press, 1978.
- Gibbs, David. *The Revised Insular First Reader*. New York; Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company, 1914.
- Harrison, Francis Burton. *The Cornerstone of Philippine Independence: A Narrative of Seven Years*. New York: The Century Company, 1922.
- Jefferson, Thomas. *A Summary View of the Rights of British America: Set Forth in Some Resolutions Intended for the Inspection of the Present Delegates of the People of Virginia, Now in Convention*. Williamsburg: Clementina Rind, 1774.
- Kalaw, Maximo M. "The Filipino Youth and the Independence of the Philippines." In *Report of the Thirtieth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Henry S. Haskins, 158-162. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1912.
- "Remarks of Maximo M. Kalaw." In *Report of the Thirtieth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Henry S. Haskins, 189-191. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1912.
- Kirk, Grayson L. *Philippine Independence: Motives, Problems, and Prospects*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1936.
- Magill, Edward H. "Christian Education." In *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indians," 1880-1900*, edited by Francis Paul Prucha, 281-286. University of Nebraska Press, 1978.
- Magindanaw Reader for the Public Schools of the Moro Province*. Zamboanga, P.I.: Mindanao Herald Press, 1905.
- McCune Lindsay, Mrs. Samuel. "New Aspects of the Problem in Porto Rico." In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers, 164-167. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1907.

- McKinley, William. "The Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation." Quoted in James H. Blount. *American Occupation of the Philippines, 1898-1912*, 147-150. New York; London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.
- Pepperman, W. Leon. "What the Government Has Done in the Philippines." In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by William J. Rose, 66-77. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1904.
- Philippine Exposition: World's Fair, St. Louis, 1904*. Edited and compiled by Alfred C. Newell. St. Louis: s.n., 1904.
- Pilar Zamora, Maria Del. "A Filipino's View of Education in the Philippines." In *National Education Association - The Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Forty-Third Annual Meeting*, 468-471. Winona, Minn.: National Education Association, 1904.
- Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. University of Oklahoma Press, 2004.
- Rossiter, S. B. "Remarks of Dr. S. B. Rossiter." In *Report of the Thirtieth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Henry S. Haskins, 186-189. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1912.
- Schurman, Jacob Gould. "Education in the Philippines." In *National Education Association - The Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Forty-First Annual Meeting*, 110-118. Winona, Minn.: National Education Association, 1902.
- Shelton, George H. "Should the Functions of the Bureau of Insular Affairs be Transferred to Some Other Department Than The Department of War? A Negative View." In *Report of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers, 102-112. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1908.
- Stone, Mason S. "The Philippines – An Opportunity." In *Report of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples*, edited by Lilian D. Powers, 84-88. Lake Mohonk, NY: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1908.
- The Arrow*, Carlisle, Pennsylvania. See *Carlisle Indian School Digital Research Center*.
- February 9, 1905. Vol. 01: 24.
 - February 16, 1905. Vol. 01: 25.
 - March 2, 1905. Vol. 01: 27.
 - November 3, 1905. Vol. 02: 11.
 - December 1, 1905. Vol. 02: 15.
 - February 16, 1906. Vol. 02: 25.
 - March 2, 1906. Vol. 02: 27.

--- March 16, 1906. Vol. 02: 29.

--- December 1, 1905. Vol. 02: 15.

United States Indian Industrial School Carlisle, PA. Philadelphia, PA, [publisher not identified] 1895), 55. See *Library of Congress*.
<https://catalog.loc.gov/vwebv/search?searchCode=LCCN&searchArg=07030346&searchType=1&permalink=y>.

Quezon, Manuel L. *The Good Fight*. New York; London: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1946.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *Winning of the West*. Vol.1., *The Spread of the English-Speaking Peoples*. New York; London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1900.

Rusling, James. "Interview with President William McKinley." *The Christian Advocate* 22 (January 1903), 17.

Saleeby, Najeeb Mitry. *The Language of Education of the Philippine Islands*. Manila, [publisher not identified] 1924.

--- *The Moro Problem: An Academic Discussion of the History and Solution of the Problem of the Government of the Moros of the Philippine Islands*. Manila: Press of E. C. McCullough & co., 1913.

Scott, Hugh Lennox. *Some Memoirs of a Soldier*. New York: The Century Company, 1928.

Swift, Morrison I. *Expansion for the Sake of God, Love and Civilization*. Los Angeles: The Ronbroke Press, 1900.

Talbot, Edith Armstrong *Samuel Chapman Armstrong: A Biographical Study*. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1904.

Theobald, H.C. *The Filipino Teacher's Manual*. New York; Manila: World Book Company, 1907.

The Philippine Public Schools at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. San Francisco: Marnell and Company, 1915.

"Wilson Renews Independence Pledge during Staunton Visit." *Filipino People* 1, no. 5 (Jan. 1913), 4. Quoted in Kirk, *Philippine Independence*, 44.

United States Government Documents:

Downes v. Bidwell. 182 U.S. 244 (1901).

Jones, William A. *Independent Government for the Philippines*. 62nd Congress, House of Representatives, Report No. 606. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1912.

--- *Misgovernment in the Philippines and Cost to the United States Occupation* (January 28, 1913). House of Representatives. Washington: Government Printing House, 1913.

McKinley, William. *Instructions of the President to the Philippine Commission, April 7, 1900*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900.

Philippine Commission (Schurman). *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President*. Vol. 1. Washington: Government Printing House, 1900.

Philippine Commission (Taft). *An Act Establishing A Department Of Public Instruction In The Philippine Islands And Appropriating Forty Thousand Dollars For The Organization And Maintenance Of A Normal And A Trade School In Manila, And Fifteen Thousand Dollars For The Organization And Maintenance Of An Agricultural School In The Island Of Negros For The Year Nineteen Hundred And One*. Act No. 74 (1901).

Pratt, Richard Henry. *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Indian Industrial School at Carlisle, Penna.* (1897). See *Carlisle Indian School Digital Research Center*. <http://carlisleindian.dickinson.edu/publications/eighteenth-annual-report-indian-industrial-school-carlisle-penna>.

United States Congress, Senate. Committee on the Philippines Islands of the United States. *Annual Affairs in the Philippines: Hearings before the Committee on the Philippines Islands of the United States Senate*. 57th Cong., 1st session, doc. No. 331, pt. 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902.

United States Congress, *An Act Temporarily To Provide For The Administration of the Affairs of Civil Government in the Philippine Islands, And Other Purposes*, 57th Congress, 1st session. (1902).

United States, Department of War. *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1902 – Volume I. Report of the Secretary of War and Reports of Bureau Chiefs*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1903.

Wilson, Woodrow. “Third Annual Message” (December 07, 1915). See *The American Presidency Project*, <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/third-annual-message-19>.

The Government of the Philippine Islands, Department of Public Instruction:

Barrows, David P. *Sixth Annual Report of the Director of Education – Fiscal Year 1906*. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1906.

Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of Education. *Eighth Annual Report of the Director of Education – July 1, 1907, TO June 30, 1908*, 2nd ed. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1909.

Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of Education. *Ninth Annual Report of the Director of Education – July 1, 1908 TO June 30, 1909*. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1909.

Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of Education. *Fifteenth Annual Report of the Director of Education – January 1, 1914 TO December 31, 1914*. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1915.

Moro Province:

Bureau of Insular Affairs, War Department. *Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province – September 1, 1903, to August 31, 1904*. Washington: Government Printing House, 1904.

Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province – Major General Leonard Wood, U.S.A. July 1, 1905 TO April 16, 1906 – Brigadier General Tasker H. Bliss, U.S.A. April 16 1906, TO August 27, 1906. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1906.

Bliss, Tasker H. *The Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province – For Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1907.* Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1907.

--- *Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1908.* Zamboanga: The Mindanao Herald Publishing Company, 1908.

Langhorne, Geo T. *Second Annual Report of the Governor of Moro Province for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1905.* Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1905.

Secondary Sources:

Adas, Michael. *Dominance by Design: Technological Imperatives and America's Civilizing Mission.* Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006.

--- "From Settler Colony to Global Hegemon: Integrating the Exceptionalist Narrative of the American Experience into World History." *American Historical Review* 106 no. 5 (2001): 1692-1720.

Anderson, Stuart. *Race and Rapprochement: Anglo-Saxonism and Anglo-American Relations, 1895-1904.* Farleigh Dickenson University; Associated University Presses, 1981.

Angulo, A.J. *Empire and Education: A History of Greed and Goodwill from the War of 1898 to the War on Terror.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Arnold, James R. *The Moro War: How American Battled a Muslim Insurgency in the Philippine Jungle, 1902-1913.* Bloomsbury Press, 2011.

Barnett, Christina Duffy. "United States: American Expansion and Territorial Deannexation." *The University of Chicago Law Review* 72 no. 3 (2005): 797-879.

Ben-zwi, Yael. "Where Did Red Go?: Lewis Henry Morgan's Evolutionary Inheritance and U.S. Racial Imagination," *CR: The New Continental Review* 7 no. 2 (2007): 201-229.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg. "The Great Aberration." In *A Diplomatic History of the United States*, 463–475. Henry Holt and Company, 1936.

Bjork, Katharine. "Prairie Imperialists: The Bureau of Insular Affairs and Continuities in Colonial Expansion from Nebraska to Cuba and the Philippines." *Nebraska History* 95 no. 4 (2014): 216-229.

--- *Prairie Imperialists: The Indian Country Origins of American Empire.* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019).

Boudreau, Vince. "Methods of Domination and Modes of Resistance: The U.S. Colonial State in the Philippines and Philippine Mobilization in Comparative Perspective."

- In *The American Colonial State in the Philippines: Global Perspectives*, edited by Julian Go and Anne L. Foster, 256-290. Durham and London, 2003.
- Burbank, Jane and Frederick Cooper. *Empires Across Continents: The United States and Russia, in Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Calata, Alexander A. "The Role of American Education in Americanizing Filipinos." In *Mixed Blessing: The Impact of the American Colonial Experience on Politics and Society in the Philippines*, edited by Hazel M. McFerson, 89-97. Greenwood Press, 2002.
- Chanco, Christopher John. "Frontier Politics and Imaginaries: The Reproduction of Settler Colonial Space in the Southern Philippines." *Settler Colonial Studies* 7 no. 1 (2017): 111-113.
- Charbonneau, Oliver. *Civilizational Imperatives: Americans, Moros, and the Colonial World*. Cornell University Press, 2020.
- Clymer, Kenton J. *Protestant Missionaries in the Philippines, 1898-1916: An Inquiry into the American Colonial Mentality*. University of Illinois Press, 1986.
- Constantino, Renato. "The Miseducation of the Filipino." In *Vestiges of War: The Philippine American War and the Aftermath of an Imperial Dream, 1899-1999*, edited by Angel Velasco Shaw and Luis H. Francia, 177-192. New York University Press, 2002.
- Cremin, Lawrence A. *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
- Cullinane, Michael. "Bringing in the Brigands: The Politics of Pacification in the Colonial Philippines, 1902-1907." *Philippine Studies* 57 no. 2 (2009): 46-79.
- Edgerton, Ronald K. *American Datu: John J. Pershing and Counterinsurgency Warfare in the Muslim Philippines, 1899-1913*. University Press of Kentucky, 2020.
- Eittem, Elisabeth M. *Teaching Empire: Native Americans, Filipinos, and US Education, 1879-1918*. University of Kansas Press, 2019.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Richard Philcox. Grove Press, 1952.
- Firpo, Christina and Margaret Jacobs. "Taking Children, Ruling Colonies: Child Removal and Colonial Subjugation in Australia, Canada, French Indochina, and the United States, 1870-1950s." *Journal of World History* 29, no. 4 (2018): 529-562.
- Foster, Anne L. "Models for Governing: Opium and Colonial Policies in Southeast Asia, 1898-1910." In *The American Colonial State in the Philippines: Global Perspectives*, edited by Julian Go and Anne L. Foster, 92-117. Durham and London, 2003.
- Frankema, Ewout and Frans Buelens. *Colonial Exploitation and Economic Development: The Belgian Congo and the Netherlands Indies Compared*. Routledge, 2013.

- French, Gregg M. "The Foundations of Empire Building: Spain's Legacy and the American Imperial Identity, 1776-1921." PhD diss. University of Western Ontario, 2017.
- Foster, Anne L. "Models for Governing: Opium and Colonial Policies in Southeast Asia, 1898-1910." In *The American Colonial State in the Philippines: Global Perspectives*, edited by Julian Go and Anne L. Foster, 92-117. Durham and London, 2003.
- Gerwarth, Robert and Stephan Malinowski. "Hannah Arendt's Ghosts: Reflections on the Disputable Path from Windhoek to Auschwitz." *Central European History* 42 (2009): 279-300.
- Gowing, Peter G. "Moros and Indians: Commonalities of Purpose, Policy and Practice in American Government of Two Hostile Subject Peoples." *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society*, 8 no. 2/3 (1980): 125-149.
- *Mandate in Moroland: The American Government of Muslim Filipinos, 1899-1920*. Philippine Center for Advanced Studies, 1977.
- Grandin, Greg. *The End of the Myth: From the Frontier to the Border Wall in the Mind of America*. Metropolitan Books, 2019.
- Hawkins, Michael C. *Making Moros: Imperial Historicism and American Military Rule in the Philippines' Muslim South*. Northern Illinois University Press, 2012.
- Herring, George C. *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776*. Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Hofstadter, Richard. "Cuba, the Philippines, and Manifest Destiny." In *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays*, 145-187. Vintage Books, 1965.
- *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to FDR*. Vintage Books, 1955.
- Hopkins, A.G. *American Empire: A Global History*. Princeton University Press, 2018.
- Horsman, Reginald. *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Hoxie, Frederick E. *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920*. University of Nebraska Press; Bison Books edition, 2001.
- Hunziker, Alyssa A. "Playing Indian, Playing Filipino: Native American and Filipino Interactions at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School." *American Quarterly* 72, no.2 (2020): 423-448.
- Jeffords, Shawn. "School Task Force on Egerton Ryerson Legacy Won't Speed Up Report Despite Protests." In *Toronto Star*. June 7, 2021.
<https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2021/06/07/beheaded-statue-of-egerton-ryerson-toppled-sunday-in-toronto-wont-be-replaced.html>.
- Karnow, Stanley. *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines*. Random House, 1989.

- Kell, Gretchen. "UC Berkeley's Le Conte and Barrows Halls Lose Their Names." In *Berkeley News*. November 20, 2020. <https://news.berkeley.edu/2020/11/18/uc-berkeleys-leconte-and-barrows-halls-lose-their-names/>
- Kramer, Paul. "Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule between British and United States Empires, 1880-1910." *The Journal of American History* 88 no.4 (2002): 1315-1353.
- "Power and Connection: Imperial Histories of the United States in the World." *Diplomatic History* 42 no.5 (2018): 911-931.
- *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, and the United States & the Philippines*. The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Lake, Marilyn. *Progressive New World: How Settler Colonialism and Transpacific Exchange Shaped American Reform*. Harvard University Press, 2019.
- Lieven, Dominic. *Empire: Russia and Its Rivals*. Yale University Press, 2000.
- *Towards the Flame: Empire, War and the End of Tsarist Russia*. Allen Lane, 2015.
- Manela, Erez. *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism*. Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Margold, Jane. A. "Egalitarian Ideals and Exclusionary Practices: US Pedagogy in the Colonial Philippines" *Journal of Historical Sociology* 8 no. 4 (1995): 375-394.
- Marr, Timothy. "Diasporic Intelligences in the American Philippin Empire: Transnational Career of Dr Najeeb Mitry Saleeby." *Mashriq & Mahjar* 2, no. 1 (2014): 78-106.
- May, Glenn Anthony. *Social Engineering in the Philippines: The Aims, Execution, and Impact of American Colonial Policy, 1900-1913*. Greenwood Press, 1980.
- "The Business of Education in the Colonial Philippines: 1909-1930." In *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, edited by Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano, 151-162. The University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.
- McCallus, Joseph P. *Forgotten Under the Sun: War Stories by American Veterans in the Philippines, 1898-1903*. The Kent State University Press, 2017.
- McCoy, Alfred W. "Capillaries of Empire." In *Policing America's Empire: The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance State*, 15-56. University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.
- Miller, Stuart Creighton. "*Benevolent Assimilation*": *The American Conquest of the Philippines, 1899-1903*. Yale University Press, 1983.
- Milligan, Jeffrey Ayala. *Islamic Identity, Postcoloniality, and Education Policy: Schooling and Ethno-Religious Conflict in the Southern Philippines*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Moral, Solsiree del. *Negotiating Empire: The Cultural Politics of Schools in Puerto Rico, 1898-1912*. University of Wisconsin Press, 2013.

- O'Shaugnessy, Thomas J. "How Many Muslims Has the Philippines?" *Philippine Studies* 23 no.3 (1975): 375-382.
- Osterhammel, Jürgen. *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. Markus Wiener Publishers, 2009.
- Paulet, Anne. "The Only Good Indian is a Dead Indian: The Use of United States Indian Policy as a Guide for the Conquest and Occupation of the Philippines, 1898-1905." PhD. diss. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 1995.
- "To Change the World: The Use of American Indian Education in the Philippines." *History of Education Quarterly* 47 no. 2 (2007): 172-202.
- Reyhner, Jon and Jeanne Eder. *American Indian Education: A History*. University of Oklahoma Press, 2004.
- Scarano, Francisco A. "Censuses in the Transition to Modern Colonialism: Spain and the United States in Puerto Rico," in *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, edited by Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano, 210-219. The University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.
- Schueller, Malini Johar. "Colonial Management, Collaborative Dissent: English Readers in the Philippines and Camilo Osias, 1905-1932." *Journal of Asian American Studies* 17, no. 2 (2014): 161-198.
- Schumacher, Frank. "Embedded Empire: The United States and Colonialism." *Journal of Modern European History/ Zeitschrift für moderne europäische Geschichte/Revue d'histoire européenne contemporaine* 14, no. 2, *The Imperial Cloud* (2016): 202-224.
- "Lessons of Empire: The United States, the Quest for Colonial Expertise and the British Example, 1898-1917," in *From Enmity to Friendship: Anglo-American Relations in the 19th and 20th Century*, edited by Ursula Lehmkuhl and Gustav Schmidt, 71-98. Wissner-Verlang, 2005.
- "Reclaiming Territory: The Spatial Contours of Empire in US History," in *Spatial Formats Under the Global Condition - Dialectics of the Global*, edited by Matthias Middell and Steffi Marung, 106-148. De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2019.
- "The American Way of Empire: National Tradition and Transatlantic Adaptation in America's Search for Imperial Identity, 1898-1910." *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* no. 31 (2002): 35-50.
- Sparrow, Bartholomew. *The Insular Cases and the Emergence of American Empire*. University Press of Kansas, 2006.
- Steinbock-Pratt, Sarah. *Educating the Empire: American Teachers and Contested Colonization in the Philippines*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Stratton, Cliff. *Education for Empire: American Schools, Race, and the Path of Good Citizenship*. University of California Press, 2016.
- Sutton, Imre. "The Political Geography of Indian Country: An Introduction." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 15 no. 02 (1991): 1-2

- Thompson, Lanny. "Colonial Governmentality in Puerto Rico and the Philippines: Sovereign Force, Governmental Rationality, and Disciplinary Institutions Under US Rule." *Rethinking the Colonial State (Political Power and Social Theory)* 33 (2017): 21-46.
- Weiner, Mark S. "Teutonic Constitutionalism: The Role of Ethno-Judicial Discourse in the Spanish American War." In *Foreign in a Domestic Sense*, edited by Christina Duffy Burnett and Burke Marshall, 48-81. Duke University Press, 2001.
- Utest, Marial Iglesias. *A Cultural History of Cuba during the U.S. Occupation, 1898-1902*. Translated by Russ Davidson. University Press of North Carolina, 2011.
- Vickers, Adrian. *A History of Modern Indonesia*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Williams, Walter L. "United States Indian Policy and the Debate Over Philippine Annexation: Implications for the Origins of American Imperialism." *The Journal of American History* 66 no.4 (1980): 810-831.
- Williams, William Appleman. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. W.W. Norton and Company, 1959.
- Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 no. 4 (2006): 387-409.

Curriculum Vitae

Name: David Campbell Stanley Buglass

Post-secondary Education and Degrees: University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada
2019-2021 MA

King's University College at The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada
2015-2019 BAH

Trent University
Peterborough, Ontario, Canada
2014-2015

Honors and Awards: Graduate Research Awards Fund (GRAF)
2020

Western Graduate Research Scholarship (WGRS)
2019 - 2021

Related Work Experience Teaching Assistant
The University of Western Ontario
2019-2021
Courses:
HIST 2601: Modern China
HIST 2192: The History of Beer
HIST 2188: Pirates and Piracy