

EMPIRE AND EDUCATION:  
FILIPINO SCHOOLING UNDER UNITED STATES RULE, 1900-1910

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the  
Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Roland Sintos Coloma, M.A.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Ohio State University  
2004

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Patricia A. Lather, co-adviser

Professor Antoinette Errante, co-adviser

Professor Cynthia B. Dillard

Professor Judy Tzu-Chun Wu

Approved by

---

Patricia A. Lather, co-adviser  
Educational Policy and Leadership

---

Antoinette Errante, co-adviser  
Educational Policy and Leadership

Copyright by  
Roland Sintos Coloma  
2004

## ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a history of United States imperialism and Filipino education in the early twentieth century. It is bounded by a time period beginning in 1900 with the establishment of public education in the Philippines, a territory that the U.S. acquired along with Cuba and Puerto Rico at the end of the Spanish-American War. It culminates with the return to the islands in 1910 of Camilo Osias (1889-1976), an American-trained Filipino educator who helped transform his country's school and political systems.

Grounded in postcolonial and ethnic studies, a combined framework that examines the transnational oppression and resistance of colonized peoples of color, this study analyzes the themes of interconnection, identity and agency. Methodologically, data was collected through archival research in universities, government agencies, and public and private libraries in the United States and the Philippines. Michel Foucault's analytical method of archaeology facilitated the close reading of primary sources, such as government reports, educational materials, newspapers, and the personal papers of American and Filipino teachers. Based on the data, research findings also shed light on the discourses of gender, race, and nationalism as well as the educational aspects of policy, teacher training, and pedagogy.

The study offers three central claims: (a) the United States marshaled education as a tool to civilize, modernize and pacify Filipinos; (b) American imperialism was

shaped by the transnational elaboration of gendered and racialized orders in which male educators dominated the colonial structure while African American schooling served as the template to instruct subjugated people; and (c) Filipinos enacted a hybrid form of nationalism which brought together western and native influences to subversively employ colonial education and fight for national liberation.

The implications of the dissertation are: (a) this research challenges the pervasive American view of the United States as benign and altruistic as well as the disavowal of U.S. imperialist violence and complicity; (b) it disrupts the separate narrations of American and Philippine histories and foregrounds issues of gender, race and nationalism in studies of globalization; and lastly, (c) it points out the contradictions in education as a mechanism for subordination and empowerment.

Dedicated to Aida and Jesus,  
and to Helena and Aidan,  
the generations who came before and after me

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I have tremendously benefited from the mentoring of exemplary scholar-teachers who have become the fire, wind, earth and water that nurture my intellectual and political development. I especially thank my co-advisers, Patti Lather and Antoinette Errante, for sparking my interests and allowing my thinking to fly. I also thank Cynthia Dillard and Judy Wu for foregrounding issues of difference and intersections and facilitating my transnational forays.

At The Ohio State University, I am fortunate to have studied with Kenneth Goings, Leila Rupp, Valerie Lee, Laura Chrisman, Luz Calvo, and Thomas Piontek. I appreciate Nina Ha, Mollie Blackburn, Mel Adelman, and Heather Davis for their guidance and encouragement. At the University of California at Riverside, I am grateful to Rod Ogawa, Flora Ortiz, Grace Yoo, Joe Virata, and the late Steffi San Buenaventura who first planted the seed in me that research and teaching could grow to become tools for advocacy.

Friends are a vital source of mental and emotional nourishment. To Oona Besman, Stephanie Lynn Daza, Awad Ibrahim, Anne Pfohl, Jeong-eun Rhee, John Streamas, Binaya Subedi, Sharon Subreenduth, and others in postcolonial, queer, and Asian American reading groups, I appreciate your critical insights and warm camaraderie. To the Asian Pacific American Caucus, especially co-founders Natacha Foo Kune, Amy

Horan, Elena Kim, Szu-Hui Lee, and Nancy Yan, I admire your vision and commitment. I thank Brett Beemyn, Julie Clemens, Kay Fukuda, Delia Gamble, Sirin Holst, Alan Ratliff, Tamara Welch, and the Ed P&L staff for looking out for me.

Even though I have lived in the Midwest for the past four years, friends from both coasts like Carmen Abeyta, Richel Aguirre, Joseph Carmona, Robert Diaz, Michael Giang, Brenda Y. Goei, Nicholas Hua, Luisa Huang, Nancy I. Kim, Michael Lucke, John Medina, Eric Nguyen, Prim Kanchanastit, Edwin Ramoran, Koji Uesugi, David Wang, Cynthia Wilson, Fern Yee, and Analee Zelaya, keep me connected. To Shannon Michael McGee, thank you for your commitment to my personal and professional growth.

My research was supported by the AERA/Spencer Pre-Dissertation Fellowship, the Elsie J. Alberty Dissertation Fellowship, the Washington State University Summer Doctoral Fellowship, the Mershon Research Abroad Grant, and the Wilde-Stein Scholarship. I am grateful to Melinda Mangin, Laura Muñoz, Victoria Pettis, Sandra T. Martell, and Troy Richardson for being wonderful colleagues and to Michael Hayes and Thomas Popkewitz for being my fellowship mentors. Special thanks to Michael Berglund, Michael Chen, Joe Lott, Doug Sutton, and Dwayne Wright for making our Pacific Northwest summer memorable. My trip to the Philippines was a much-needed reunion with the Sintos and Coloma families. I also made new friends there, such as Walter Ang, Edward Cruz, Bong Lozano, and Bong Yap, who helped me balance work and fun. I wish to thank, in particular, Rebecca Osias for sharing her knowledge and collections, Reynaldo Imperial for making academic and political connections, and Israel Martinez for accompanying me in various trips.

I could not have completed my research without the help of archivists and librarians. I thank the staff at the Library of Congress, the Teachers College at Columbia University, the University of Michigan, and the University of California at Berkeley. I also appreciate the assistance at the National Library and Archives, the University of the Philippines, the Ateneo de Manila University, the Philippine Normal University, the Lopez Museum, and the Department of Education, Culture and Sports. I am much indebted to Marla Vizdal of Western Illinois University and to Fred and Dorothy Cordova of the National Pinoy Archives in Seattle, WA.

To the late Edward W. Said and Gloria E. Anzaldúa, your intellectual and political projects serve as foundation and inspiration for scholar-activists like me.

Lastly, to James C. Eslinger, I am glad that you have come into my life and our journey has begun together. I also thank my older siblings and in-laws, Mary Bernadette, Edward and Katherine, Desiree and Joe, for believing in me. I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Aida and Jesus, and to my niece Helena and nephew Aidan, whose love, prayers and hugs keep me going.



## VITA

November 19, 1972 ..... Born - Quezon City, Philippines

### Education

1995 ..... B.A. in Liberal Studies  
University of California at Riverside

1998 ..... M.A. in Educational Administration  
University of California at Riverside

1999 ..... Teaching Credential in English  
California State Polytechnic University at Pomona

2002 ..... M.A. in Cultural Studies in Education  
The Ohio State University

### Employment

1993-96 ..... Coordinator, Asian Pacific Student Programs  
University of California at Riverside

1997 ..... English Teacher, Ramona High School  
Riverside Unified School District, California

1997-99 ..... English Teacher, Baldwin Park High School  
Baldwin Park Unified School District, California

1999-2000 ..... English Teacher, Los Angeles High School  
Los Angeles Unified School District, California

2001-02 ..... Graduate Research Associate  
The Ohio State University

Spring 2003, Spring 2004 ..... Graduate Teaching Associate  
The Ohio State University

## PUBLICATIONS

Coloma, Roland Sintos. 2003. "Que(e)r(y)ing Nationalism: History, Nation, and Imperialism." *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 19 (3): 51-70.

Coloma, Roland Sintos. 2003. "Fragmented Entries, Multiple Selves: In Search of a Place to Call Home." In *Restoried Selves: Autobiographies of Queer Asian / Pacific American Activists*, edited by Kevin K. Kumashiro, 19-28. Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press.

Coloma, Roland Sintos. 2002. "Can I Speak and Do You Hear Me?: Quest(ion)s for R/Evolution." *International Journal of Sexuality and Gender Studies* 7 (1): 61-68.

## FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Education  
Cultural Studies - History, Policy, and Curriculum

Minor Field: Postcolonial and Ethnic Studies  
Ph.D. Minor - African American and African Studies

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract .....	iii
Dedication .....	v
Acknowledgments .....	vi
Vita .....	ix
List of Tables .....	xiii

### Chapters

1	Disorienting History: Envisioning through the Lens of Postcolonial and Ethnic Studies .....	1
	Political and Academic Significance .....	4
	Theoretical and Literature Review .....	9
	Archives and Data Collection .....	17
	Analysis and Chapter Overviews .....	20
2	“not by force but by persuasion”: Educational Policies and the Establishment of a Colonial System .....	24
	American Imperial Mission .....	26
	Administration and Finance .....	31
	Supervision and Teaching as Gendered Practices .....	37
	Student Achievement and Community Response .....	42
	Queering Imperial Encounters .....	47
3	Domesticating the Empire: The “White Man’s Burden” and the Colors of Teacher Training .....	54
	Race and Empire in “Progressive” Education .....	57
	Black and Brown Linkages .....	61
	Colonial Training at Home and Abroad .....	68
	Contesting Curriculum .....	78

4	Disidentifying Nationalism: Revolution, Pedagogy, and Agency .....	85
	History and Nationalism .....	88
	Revolution as Pedagogy .....	91
	Schooling the Colonized .....	94
	From Potentiality to Actuality .....	102
	Lessons from a Filipino Nationalist .....	107
5	Research, Subjectivity, and Desire .....	113
	Summary and Implications .....	115
	Continuations .....	118
	Insider and Outsider Subjectivities .....	122
	Desire in Research .....	132
Appendices		
A	Statistics for the Philippine School System, 1902-1910 .....	138
B	“The White Man’s Burden” by Rudyard Kipling (1899) .....	139
C	“The Aspiration of the Filipinos” by Camilo Osias (1908) .....	140
	Bibliography .....	147

## LIST OF TABLES

### Table

A.1	Total Population, School Population, and School Attendance (1909) .....	138
A.2	Students, Schools, and Teachers (1902-10) .....	138
A.3	Education Staff by Race and Gender (1910) .....	138
A.4	Student Enrollment by Course and Gender (1910) .....	138

## CHAPTER 1:

### DISORIENTING HISTORY: ENVISIONING THROUGH THE LENS OF POSTCOLONIAL AND ETHNIC STUDIES

The trouble is that once you see it, you can't unsee it. And once you've seen it, keeping quiet, saying nothing, becomes as political an act as speaking out. There's no innocence. Either way, you're accountable.  
- Arundathi Roy (2001, 7)

As a mechanism to mobilize the past in order to make sense of the present and imagine directions for the future, history is a powerful invention. To assert that it is an invention by no means indicates that the people, events and institutions in the past were not real or were figments of imagination. It highlights, instead, the constructed condition of history within particular intellectual traditions, narrative styles, and political purposes. Such an understanding troubles the conventional notion of history as a neutral and transparent reflection of lives and phenomena that corresponds to an actual past reality (Appleby, Hunt and Jacob 1994; Jenkins 1997). Scholars demonstrate the ways in which history is invented or constructed by foregrounding the stories of marginalized individuals and groups that contest dominant narratives, by contextualizing lived experiences and historical accounts within specific discourses and literary structures, and by emphasizing the power relations embedded within projects of representation (Okihiro 1994; Scott 1988; White 1973; Foucault 1980; Spivak 1987). History as a representation

of the past has a specific content, form and function which involves “ontological and epistemic choices with distinct ideological and even specifically political implications” (White 1987, ix). From this perspective, history operates not as a mere account of peoples, events, causes and effects, but as an analytical optic that gazes into what history *is* and what it *does* (Duara 1995; Guha 1997). It constitutes and regulates subjectivities, memories, psyches, bodies, and performances (Foucault 1977; Butler 1989). The effects of history on education also influence how those of us in the present perceive the various engagements which take place in schools and beyond (Cremin 1961; Tyack 1974; Cuban 1984; San Miguel 1987; Anderson 1988; Kliebard 1992; Tamura 1994; Adams 1995; Siddle Walker 1996; Donato 1997).

The central research problems of my dissertation ask: How were Filipinos inscribed by, and how did they navigate within and against, the discourses of American colonial schooling in the Philippines and the United States? Under what conditions did the inscription and maneuvering of Filipinos as subjects of colonial discourse take place? As a history of empire<sup>1</sup> and education, my study focuses on the colonial discourses of gender, race, and nationalism, and the educational aspects of policy, teacher training, and pedagogy. Its narration begins with the instructions given by U.S. President William McKinley in 1900 to establish public education in the Philippines, a territory that the United States acquired along with Cuba and Puerto Rico at the end of the Spanish-American War. It ends with the return to the archipelago in 1910 of a Filipino product of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Imperialism* is a process of domination and control emanating from the metropolis for ideological and financial reasons that generates practices of colonialism and neocolonialism. Whereas *colonialism* is the conquest and direct control of other people’s land and resources, *neocolonialism* is the continuation of the metropolis’ economic and socio-cultural domination after the colony has gained nominal political independence.

American education who played a substantial role in transforming his country's school system. My research has three central claims: (a) education was employed in the United States' imperialist mission to civilize, modernize, and pacify Filipinos; (b) America's school system in the Philippines was shaped by gendered and racialized orders which elaborated on the dominance of men in education and on the template of African American schooling; and (c) Filipinos enacted a hybrid nationalism which incorporated western and local influences to subversively marshal colonial education for individual and national advancement.

My critical engagements with current political and academic discussions are at the core of the study's importance and innovations. Its importance cannot be discounted, especially in light of the 9/11 incidents and aftermath in the United States and abroad. My research aims to disorient or challenge the common understanding in the United States that there is no such thing as an American empire and that this country's international involvements are devoid of political and economic agendas. It contributes to the exploration of

the multiple histories of continental and overseas expansion, conquest, conflict, and resistance which have shaped the cultures of the United States and the cultures of those it has dominated within and beyond its geopolitical boundaries. (Kaplan 1993, 4)

As attested by the forums in *Radical History Review* (1993), *Journal of American Ethnic History* (1999), and *Journal of American History* (2001), historians are engaging in discussions to rethink United States imperialism, immigration, and comparative histories. The innovations of my project derive from mobilizing the insights of postcolonial and ethnic studies, two interdisciplinary fields which draw from anti-racist, feminist, marxist,



psychoanalytic, and poststructuralist theories. The combined framework of postcolonial and ethnic studies offers analytical and methodological tools to investigate the transnational oppression and resistance of colonized peoples of color. Although there is a growing number of theoretical and empirical studies on the U.S. empire (Kaplan and Pease 1993; Singh and Schmidt 2000; Jacobson 2000), examinations of education as an American colonial apparatus are seriously lacking and needed. With a few exceptions (May 1980; Viswanathan 1989; McCarthy 1998; Willinksy 1998; Beverly 1999), there is also a poverty of scholarship on imperialism in the area of education. My dissertation aims to address both voids by bringing into focus the linkages of empire and education.

Within the current political and academic discussions of empire and education, the use of certain narratives and justifications reveals history's dual function of recognition and renunciation. In other words, history facilitates the symbiotic, selective and contradictory process of remembering and forgetting. Since any representation of the past has been and will continuously be disputed by various interlocutors and constituents, I contend that history is never ideologically neutral and is a site of productive contestation. As a dynamic arena, history works not toward consensus, but toward the refinement of debates and the proliferation of interpretations. Rather than a single hegemonic storyline, the multiplicity of parallel, converging and/or conflicting narratives enables a more fruitful stretch that broadens and deepens understanding.

### **Political and Academic Significance**

My dissertation is significant for three reasons: (a) it provides a historical vantage point for the political and academic discussions regarding the role of the United States in

global affairs; (b) it reveals the invisible history and legacy of the United States empire by foregrounding its colonial operations in the early twentieth century; and (c) it focuses on Filipinos as an ethno-national group that has navigated through imperial encounters in the Philippines and the United States. In his address to the U.S. Congress after the September 11th “Attack on America,” President George W. Bush posed a question which resonated with what many in this country wondered: “Why do they hate us?” (Ford 2001; Black 2001). It is a query that points to a dangerous yet ambiguous “they” who exist outside of the American national body, and that betrays a selective historicism which has short-circuited historical memory and popular representation from the violence inflicted by the U.S. government within and beyond America’s geopolitical boundaries. It reveals an uncritical consideration of, or perhaps a limited exposure to, U.S. domestic and international policies, especially in relation to peoples of color and the “Third World.” It also highlights the ubiquitous American view of the United States as benign and altruistic and the unequivocal disavowal of its imperial violence and complicity. As a result, any work that disrupts the dominant regimes of truth, or the narrations which have been normalized as ontologically accurate and which support current discourses and institutions, is perceived by some as an assault to the national and global order of things.

The increasing critical projects on the U.S. empire and the associated regulations which discipline or manage the work of scholars and researchers demonstrate the intertwined relationship of knowledge and power. Research certainly has relevance beyond the university, and my work engages with and is situated within the present political and academic conditions. In spite of the supposed academic freedom to utilize cutting-edge theories and undertake groundbreaking research, studies that reveal and

challenge the operations of American imperialism and globalization are not always welcomed. For example, the 108th session of the U.S. House of Representatives discussed a resolution (H.R. 3077) in 2003 to create a board that would provide recommendations to the Congress about the allocation and distribution of federal funds to foreign language and area studies centers in American universities. Concerned about recent allegations that these centers harbor faculty members with “anti-American” ideologies and no longer support the government’s priorities on diplomacy, security, and trade, the legislators aimed to control academic activities and establish an oversight mechanism by including representatives from the Homeland Security, the Department of Defense, and the National Security Agency in the board.

The regulation of history and other knowledge production also shapes the construction and proliferation of normative understanding. Although politicians and academics do recognize American involvement abroad, the responses to questions about the motivations and types of involvement are highly disputed. A number of politicians and academics have displayed a strong interest to recuperate and bolster the American image of a benevolent savior. For instance, in his speech to the Philippine National Congress on October 18, 2003, Bush stated that “our soldiers liberated the Philippines from colonial rule” (Pinkerton 2003). Expressing a similar sentiment of imperial goodwill at an academic forum on immigration and ethnic history, Rudolph Vecoli cited a transnational study on Filipina nurses who, he claimed, “surely enjoyed improved life opportunities because of the colonial history of the Philippines” (Vecoli 1999, 120). Both men marshaled dominant narrations of American foreign policies in the archipelago. Whereas Bush aggrandized the role played by the American military and disregarded the

struggles of Filipinos to overthrow their Spanish colonizers, Vecoli redeemed American imperialism by emphasizing the positive contributions of the United States in the islands and discounting the violence inflicted in the name of “improved life opportunities.” Consequently, the disciplining of academic and popular knowledge and the hegemony of certain narrations omit the imperial relationship between the United States and the Philippines, and make the position of Filipinos in American history ambiguous, if not altogether unintelligible (San Juan 2000; Campomanes 1995).

Like history, the term “Filipino” is a potent invention. Its invented character is not due to the absence of Filipinos in the Philippines, the United States, and in the diaspora. It is attributed to the operations of interpellation and identification (Althusser 1971; Fuss 1993) which bring together into a single ethno-national entity the diversity of close to 80 million people (in the Philippines alone) with 87 different languages in an archipelago of over 7,100 islands. The term is something that is both imposed upon and claimed by a group of people. It is an interpellation that, at first, originated from Spanish colonialism when the archipelago was conquered under the auspices of King Philip in 1521 and, subsequently, was elaborated by the United States when it gained possession of the islands in 1898 after the Spanish-American War (Stanley 1974; Miller 1982; Karnow 1989; Scott 1992). As subjects of the U.S. empire, Filipinos were considered *colonials* during the first half of the twentieth century. They were also American *nationals* (but not citizens) who came to the United States due to various push-and-pull factors as laborers, students, and military personnel, until the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934 imposed severe immigration restrictions. They acquired the status of *racial minority* through the census and other tools of government surveillance which manage the American population by

race and ethnicity. Although the Philippines gained independence in 1946, the legacy of American imperialism thrives through political, economic and cultural control (Cordova 1983; Salman 2001; Winant and Omi 1994; Shaw and Francia 2002). The use and meanings of “Filipino” thus have a particular history, one that weaves through the United States’ tense negotiations with issues of imperialism and immigration, race and culture, gender and sexuality, economy and labor (Takaki 1989; Chan 1991; Okihiro 2001).

Conversely, the label “Filipino” is an identification that individuals and groups have self-ascribed for empowerment and solidarity. It was mobilized in liberation struggles in the Philippines against Spanish (1521-1898), American (1898-1941), and Japanese (1941-1945) regimes, encompassing a history of colonialism and resistance that spanned over four hundred years. It was utilized in campaigns against the U.S.-backed Marcos dictatorship in the 1970s and for the removal of American military bases in the early 1990s (Agoncillo 1990; Iletto 1979; Schirmer and Shalom 1987; de la Cruz 1998a; 1998b). In the United States, it has been galvanized to establish organizations and communities, obtain public and educational resources, build coalitions with other Asian Americans and peoples of color, and raise awareness on various issues. More recently, Filipino activists and their allies have supported the plight of Filipino World War II veterans, and protested against distorted depictions of Asians in the media and popular culture, like in the Broadway show *Miss Saigon* (Bulosan 1946; Scharlin and Villanueva 1992; Aguilar-San Juan 1994). Both in the Philippines and the United States, the term “Filipino” also signifies a heritage of challenging imperialism and white supremacy.

Within the U.S. racial matrix, Filipinos are subsumed under the umbrella term “Asian American,” a categorization that is concurrently useful and problematic. It is

useful since “Asian American” can function as a pan-ethnic identity for cultural and political collectivity (Espiritu 1992; Wei 1993). Yet it is problematic since it minimizes the cultural variations, inter-ethnic conflicts, and colonial trajectories within and between the various groups (de la Cruz 1998a; 1998b; Fujikane and Okamura 2000). For instance, in spite of their differences, Asian Americans confront a persisting stereotype in U.S. educational settings - that of the model minority (Lee 1996; Osajima 2000). It is a depiction that lumps Asian Americans together, and shapes the policies, teacher training, and curricula for and about Asian Americans (Takagi 1992; Nakanishi and Nishida 1995; Hirabayashi 1998). What is often not mentioned, however, is that Filipinos are the only Asian Americans who were beneficiaries of affirmative action since its inception, a historical evidence that counters the model minority stereotype that Asians do not need assistance and are successfully navigating through the American system. In many ways, Filipinos are a part of yet apart from the entity that coheres under the Asian American appellation. Within the political and academic discussions that grapple with the workings of history, American empire, and the Filipino “problem,” my dissertation maintains that insights from postcolonial and ethnic studies can offer astute perspectives.

### **Theoretical and Literature Review**

Instead of rehearsing the debates *within* postcolonial and ethnic studies around theory and experience, language and structure, representation and materiality (Appiah 1992; McClintock 1995; Loomba 1998; Omi and Takagi 1995), my dissertation focuses on the convergence of the two fields and the axiomatic themes that trouble normative histories. Although tensions persist *between* these fields over intellectual jargon,

academic authority, scholarly prestige, and community relevance (duCille 1996; Dirlik 1997; San Juan 1998), my study nonetheless marshals their collective perspectives in order to produce a different understanding of history between Filipinos and the United States. As critical projects, both postcolonial and ethnic studies are rooted in dismantling mainstream narratives and emphasizing the experiences of the marginalized. Although postcolonial studies has primarily addressed British and French colonialisms and their impacts on the Middle East, South Asia, and Africa, increasing attention is being paid to the United States as an imperial power within and beyond its geopolitical national boundaries, a shift that is influenced by ethnic studies scholarship (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 1989; Lowe 1991; Kaplan and Pease 1993; Williams and Chrisman 1994; Cooper and Stoler 1997; Young 2001; Chrisman 2003). Conversely, Asian American studies has focused its energy on the conditions and representations of Asian and Pacific Islanders in the United States in order to dispel the stereotype of being always-foreign and to assert their presence and contributions to American culture and development. However, the initial foundations of Asian American studies were already grounded in postcolonial and global frameworks. While scholars and activists have waged critiques of and mobilized against the U.S. military, economic and political involvement in Asia, the continuous interest in transnationalism and diaspora serves as a bridge between Asian and Asian American studies (Omatsu 1994; Mazumdar 1991; Wong 1995). As a meta-analysis of the complex moves generated by postcolonial and ethnic studies, this review of the scholarly literature highlights the three themes of interconnection, identity, and agency as points of historical disorientation for my research project.

Widely credited for inaugurating postcolonial studies, Edward W. Said, in his magisterial work *Orientalism* (Said 1978), foregrounds two interconnections which have become key elements in inquiries on power and transnationalism: the intertwined relationship between the west and the rest of the world as well as the efficacy of a combined discursive and material analysis. Said argues that if the Orient has been imagined and constructed by the west as its Other, then the west relies on the Other for its “planetary consciousness” (Pratt 1992) to develop its civilization and culture. He disrupts the general understanding of the west as homogeneous, pure, and immune to outside influences by positing that the metropolitan worldview and culture depend on imperialism and the peripheral colonies. Postcolonial studies, like ethnic studies, recovers the history of the marginalized within and outside of the metropolitan center, and traces how the Other is integral to and constitutive of the center (Bernal 1987; Gilroy 1993). Such a move works against conventional historiographies that have distinctly separated the histories of the metropole and the colony and that have rendered the effects of imperialism as solely unidirectional toward the colony. Said also contends that western control over the rest of the world is not mere symbolic or ideational. Juxtaposing Gramsci’s neo-marxist notion of hegemony and Foucault’s poststructuralist concept of discourse, he scrutinizes the interplay of domination in ideologies, structures and representations (Gramsci 1971; Foucault 1973). As opposed to the usual economic and material interrogation of western power, a poststructuralist analysis contends that “discourse produces realities - regulating, ordering, and conditioning the possibilities of practical existence” (Wolfe 1997, 409).



Employing and extending Said's insights, Asian American studies aims to reconfigure the relationship between Asia and the United States. For example, David Palumbo-Liu (1999) inserts a solidus ( / ) in Asian/American in order to signify the constructed and porous boundaries between the cultural and national categories of "Asian" and "American" and to blur the demarcations among the intellectual and political fields of Asian, American, and Asian American studies. John Tchen (1999) also demonstrates the cross-Pacific ties by illustrating the ways in which the founding of the U.S. nation was intricately connected to the use of Asian and Asian American materials, peoples and symbols. In her study of Filipina nurses, Catherine Choy (2003) links the history of colonial education in the Philippines with the production of an English-proficient and professionally-trained labor force in order to highlight how the United States has benefited from earlier colonial rule and current neo-colonial control. The theme of interconnection in postcolonial and ethnic studies therefore provides a transnational perspective by juxtaposing the histories and cultures of the west and Asia, and supplies an encompassing form of analytics that deliberately and ingeniously straddles various intellectual frameworks.

Another common theme of the two fields is the focus on identity, especially the differences within an identity category. Sharing the social historian mission to write "history from below," postcolonial and ethnic studies scholars demonstrate how imperialism and white supremacy have exerted power over colonial and racialized communities and how the colonized and peoples of color have responded, adapted and resisted. For instance, the Subaltern Studies group based in India challenges the widely-circulated metropolitan and local histories by retrieving and centering the voices and

experiences of the non-elites (Guha 1982). In her immanent critique of the Subaltern Studies project, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak asserts that the group's retrieval of the subaltern consciousness is "a *strategic* use of positivist essentialism in a scrupulously visible political interest" (Spivak 1987, 205). By deploying strategic essentialism and the necessary error of identity, Spivak focuses not on the essence, the immutable biological and/or cultural traits, of an identity. She insists that identity is mobilized, not to cling to marginality, but to highlight the ways in which essentialism operates: "So long as the critique of essentialism is understood not as an exposure of error, our own or others', but as an acknowledgment of the dangerousness of something one cannot not use" (Spivak 1993, 5). Identity is thus construed as something that is not innate, fixed or neutral; it is inherently constructed yet politically useful.

Moreover, there is a growing interest to demonstrate what Lisa Lowe refers to as the "heterogeneity, hybridity, [and] multiplicity" of identity (Lowe 1996). Asian and Asian American feminists, such as Trinh T. Minh-ha (1989), Delia Aguilar (1998), Shirley Hune and Gail Nomura (2003), attend to the racialized and gendered aspects of difference, and emphasize the lives of third world women and women of color in order to complicate western and ethnic histories. Along with other feminists of color, they dispute the accepted denotations of the categorical terms "colonized," "oppressed," "race," and even "woman" (Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981; Hull, Scott and Smith 1982; Anzaldúa 1990; Shah 1997). Although Spivak (1988) argues that identity and voice are always mediated by and must be contextualized within hegemonic systems of representation in order to be visible and heard, scholarship in Philippine and Filipino American studies works to complicate mainstream narrations which focus on white, male,

elite, and heterosexual experiences. Scholars highlight the use of Native American images and the presence of African Americans in the occupied Philippines, the role of white and Filipina women in colonial and transnational labor, and the global movements of Filipino workers and gay men (San Buenaventura 1998; Rafael 2000; Parreñas 2001; Fujita-Rony 2003; Manalansan 2003). The theme of identity in postcolonial and ethnic studies thereby offers a dynamic and situated approach that takes into account the intersections of social markers, such as race, gender, class and sexuality as well as the prevailing discourses which regulate what is intelligible in people's imaginations and understanding.

The third common theme is the fields' engagement with the notion of agency, or the ability to exert power and make changes. Although imperialism and white supremacy are influential discourses and mechanisms, postcolonial and ethnic studies demonstrates that "no system of coercion or hegemony is ever able wholly to determine the range of subject positions" which the colonized and racialized individuals/communities can take (Parry 1994, 173). Within a framework that views the history and identity of the west and the rest of the world as interconnected, power is not perceived as exclusively domineering, unidirectional and negative; instead, it is seen as positive in terms of generating resistance and transformations (Foucault 1978). Scholars map the ways in which the colonized and peoples of color confront dominant systems through political and armed struggles, social and cultural contestations, and subaltern strategies of resistance (Fanon 1963; Said 1993; McClintock 1995; Scott 1985). Research in Asian American studies, for example about Hawai'ian sovereignty, Japanese American acculturation, Filipino enclaves, Punjabi-Mexican intermarriages, and Black-Asian

linkages, shows how Asian and Pacific Islanders cultivate their culture, establish ethnic communities, and forge multi-racial alliances in order to adapt and survive, to create alternative and empowering spaces, and to dispute the effects of colonialism and white supremacy (Trask 1993; Pak 2002; Bonus 2000; Espiritu 2003; Leonard 1992; Prashad 2001).

Although the construction of alternative identities and spaces that, explicitly or implicitly, counter the mainstream ones is by and large viewed as radical and oppositional, what has become contentious in political and academic circles is the practice of utilizing the discourses and techniques of the dominant against itself. Concerns are especially raised about the effectiveness of what Audre Lorde (1984) calls using the master's tools to dismantle the master's house. On the other hand, theorizing about in-between positions, Homi Bhabha suggests that the colonized and peoples of color perform mimicry as a strategy of "difference that is almost the same, but not quite" in order to unsettle governing representations and structures (Bhabha 1994, 86). Mimicry emerges from a sense of ambivalence between the two renditions of agency in imperial and ethnic histories - the authority of metropolitan and native elites from the top down and the resistance of the colonized and non-elites from the bottom up. Since culture and power are neither complete nor totalizing, mimicry as agency is hybrid, drawing its energy from multiple sources and wielding them tactically. As homologous tools of appropriating the mainstream and challenging with the marginalized, it functions as an inappropriate repetition that intensifies hegemonic regulation as it threatens the authority of normalized knowledge and power. In short, dominant power is fortified as it is simultaneously disrupted. To what degree the disruption is successful is needless to say

unpredictable, a condition which incites hope and concern from those interested in transformation and anti-oppression. The theme of agency in postcolonial and ethnic studies thereby illustrates the multiple and complex strategies that the colonized and peoples of color utilize to deal with the imperial and white supremacist control over their lives and communities. Their responses have ranged from conservative accommodations and radical separations to building alliances and working within the mainstream to challenge it on its own terms.

The combined insights from postcolonial and ethnic studies offer a powerful lens to envision history differently and envision a different history. This review of the fields' scholarly literature suggests that the three themes of interconnection, identity and agency are axiomatic in various theoretical and empirical projects. Interconnection encourages a description and examination of the reciprocal flows of peoples, cultures and materials across the Pacific, albeit such flows may not be equivalent in magnitude and influence. For my research, it emphasizes how the United States impacted the Philippines, especially through the public educational system, and how the Filipinos impacted Americans in the colony and the metropole. Since identity emphasizes the socio-cultural markers embedded within discourses and people, the gendered and racialized underpinnings of educational policies, teacher training, and pedagogy need to be specified. My work probes into the operations of patriarchy and white supremacy in imperialism by interrogating the male-bias in colonial administration and by linking the histories of African Americans and Filipinos. Lastly, agency focuses on the ways in which people exert their power and make changes. My study reveals the dilemmas of living in the midst of revolutionary movements and the colonial transitions between

Spanish and American regimes. Filipinos had to navigate between their ardent aspirations for liberation and the continuing influence of imperialism. In a study about American colonialism and Filipino education, the themes of interconnection, identity and agency provide an especially productive framework for data collection and analysis.

### **Archives and Data Collection**

The successful undertaking of a dissertation which scrutinizes the relationship between the United States and the Philippines necessitated data collection in both countries. Preliminary research began on summer 2002 when I examined archival documents in the libraries of the University of Michigan and the University of California at Berkeley. These two institutions carry extensive materials on the Philippines and the personal papers of American colonial officials who were also faculty members at Michigan and Berkeley. I also obtained materials from Western Illinois University where Filipino government-sponsored students matriculated in the early 1900s. From August 2002 until March 2003, I conducted research in the Philippines and focused on three sites, all located in the Metro Manila capital - the National Library and Archives, the University of the Philippines with its impressive Filipiniana collection, and the Ateneo de Manila University which houses the nation's largest American historical collection. I also examined the archives of the Philippine Normal University, the government Department of Education, Culture and Sports, and the privately-owned Lopez Museum. During the summer of 2003, I traveled to both American coasts to continue my research. In Seattle, Washington, I visited the National Pinoy Archives which contains an assortment of oral history interviews, personal records, pictures, and newspapers,

chronicling the lives of Filipinos in the United States. My trip to New York was particularly disappointing since the Special Collections in Teachers College was closed for library renovations. Documents from Teachers College could have provided additional perspectives in the connections I am making between U.S. imperialism and progressive education. The accessible documents that were relevant to my study were located in the general archives of Columbia University. As my final destination, the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., holds government records which supplemented my findings in the Philippines as well as the papers of several military and education officials.

From my research in the United States and the Philippines, I acquired a substantial amount of archival notes and materials. I obtained the first twenty-five annual reports of the Bureau of Education and the first ten annual reports of the American-led Philippine Commission, the governing body in the occupied archipelago. I also made copies of an American survey which assessed the first twenty-five years of the Philippine educational system and the written response of Filipino legislators. I took notes on the unpublished papers of American administrators and Filipino teachers as well as from newspapers, such as the *Manila Times*, the *New York Times*, and the *Washington Post*. My interest in education also led me to course catalogs, school transcripts, administrative correspondence, and curricular materials, such as the *Filipino Teacher's Manual* and the *Philippine Readers* which were the first Filipino-authored basal textbooks for grades one to seven. The validity for my study can be ascertained in four ways: (a) the detailed documentation of primary sources throughout the chapters and in the list of references at the end of the dissertation; (b) the triangulation of data derived from government and

university collections, from public and private sources, and from primary and secondary materials; (c) the use of other empirical studies to locate my study and corroborate my assertions; and (d) the efficacy of my arguments and evidence in my discussions on history and education (Burstyn 1987; Kaestle 1992).

During my data collection and analysis, I went through four unanticipated yet insightful moments which shaped the outcome of my dissertation. First, my initial proposal was to write a biographical study of Camilo Osias (1889-1976), an American-trained Filipino educator. In the Philippines, I came across two treasures of information: I found out that the National Library houses the Camilo Osias Collection which contains most of his published and unpublished manuscripts, and I was able to locate Osias' only surviving child, Rebecca, who provided a more personal viewpoint of her father. Second, although I had originally wanted to conduct oral history interviews, the snowball technique that I used did not produce adequate results. Although Osias led a long and fruitful life, close to thirty years have gone by since his death, and almost all of his contemporaries are no longer alive. Those who remembered him brought up his political career, an aspect that is beyond the focus of my study. Third, I discovered that Osias had a published memoir and a biography (Osias 1971; Bananal 1974). Although I could have uncovered other facets of his life, I was not interested in rehashing what has already been explored. However, I still wanted to write about Osias, given the amount of materials that I had accumulated. I was uncertain of what a case study on Osias would illuminate until I shifted my emphasis to investigate the broader contexts of American imperialism and Filipino education. The last moment took place when I was reading through and beginning to code my materials. I underwent and came to appreciate the fruitful interplay



between theory and data. Although I was invested in particular theoretical frameworks which address the linkages of empire, race, gender, and sexuality, and wanted to engage with certain academic debates within postcolonial, ethnic and historical studies about the concepts of subject and agency as well as the usefulness of “post” perspectives in research methodology, other themes also emerged from my data which complicated and eventually enriched my earlier desires and formulations. Wrestling with theory and data became a source of predicaments and breakthroughs which elicited simultaneous anxiety and pleasure during my research process. With these four moments, I came to understand that, regardless of how detailed my initial proposal and plans of action were, I also had to be open to learn and enjoy the lessons from the unexpected.

### **Analysis and Chapter Overviews**

The insights from postcolonial and ethnic studies helped me transform my dissertation from a biographical project on Camilo Osias to a relatively larger history of American imperialism and Filipino education. The shift from a micro to a macro perspective does not imply the irrelevance of biographical research; in fact, one of the chapters centers on Osias in order to shed light on the broader topic of nationalism. During my analysis and writing, it became apparent that I needed to locate Osias within the panorama of imperialism and education in order to frame his positions in the Philippine school system. Moreover, the shift to discourse analysis posed additional dilemmas regarding which areas to focus on and which materials to utilize. At the risk of falling into the trap of what historians call the “tyranny of the archives,” or the dominance and privileging of documents from the elites, I decided to focus on the Bureau

of Education reports for the following reasons: (a) my review of earlier studies suggests that no one has performed a close textual analysis on them; (b) the reports present an opportunity to investigate the recorded thoughts and behaviors of colonial officials and educators, thereby enabling me to “research up;” and finally, (c) by reading against the grain, I can dissect the discourses embedded within the documents as well as unmask the rhetoric of U.S. global benevolence and the strategies of Filipino colonial acculturation.

With these insights and choices in mind, analyzing and writing my dissertation proved to be a difficult yet rewarding series of making decisions and setting boundaries. Given that my research question revolved around power and knowledge, I was interested in utilizing the interpretive themes of interconnection, identity and agency from postcolonial and ethnic studies. At the same time, other themes materialized during my analysis of archival materials. Under the category of education, the themes of policy, teacher training, and pedagogy emerged. Under the category of culture, the themes of gender, race and nationalism surfaced. In order to adequately incorporate and address these multiple themes, I settled on the first ten years of Filipino education under United States rule as the scope for my study. The boundaries of the research are marked by the Philippine educational mandate of U.S. President McKinley in 1900 and the return of Camilo Osias to the Philippines in 1910 after studying in America. Although the dissertation is primarily limited to 1900 to 1910, some of the historical sources address what took place prior and after this time period. This has informed me that, no matter how I limit my study, data and analysis always exceed the boundaries that I place.

As an overview of the dissertation, the next chapters are written as three “data” chapters and a final “methodology” chapter on research reflexivity. Chapters two, three

and four address the educational areas of policy, teacher training, and pedagogy with a focus, respectively, on the discourses of gender, race and nationalism. Chapter two is about the establishment of the Philippine public school system, and delineates three areas - administration and finance, supervision and teaching, and student achievement and community response. A crucial finding in probing into the structures, key players, and results of developing the Philippine schools is the colonial elaboration of patriarchy and male dynamics. Chapter three directs attention to the absence of both race and empire in the historical treatments of American education, particularly during the progressive era. By juxtaposing the racial discourses and the curricular contest between academic and industrial training for teachers of color in the United States and abroad, it links the histories of African Americans and Filipinos. Chapter four focuses on Camilo Osias - his childhood during the revolutionary period, his American schooling in the islands and the metropole, and his contributions to Philippine education. As a case study on the construction and performance of a hybrid form of nationalism, it narrates the experiences of a Filipino educator who drew from western and native influences as a strategy to navigate within imperial encounters and advocate for marginalized politics. The last chapter is a personal reflection which brings together the themes of interconnection, identity and agency in my journey as a researcher who was born in the Philippines, grew up in the United States, and visited the archipelago for the first time in seventeen years in order to conduct this research study. Complicating and extending the discussions about the insider/outsider status of qualitative researchers, it argues for a more positioned and constitutive understanding of subjectivities.

In summary, my dissertation elaborates on the three axiomatic themes in postcolonial and ethnic studies. It narrates the interconnected histories of the United States and the Philippines, the underpinnings of gender and race in discourses and identities, and the agency of Filipinos to push for individual and national self-determination. The implications of my study in relation to contemporary discussions on politics, history and education are three-fold. It disorients the normative view that America's involvement abroad was/is innocent and benevolent by paying attention to the history and legacy of the United States as an imperial power. It envisions a different perspective of the past by linking American and Philippine histories and by emphasizing the issues of gender, race and nationalism in imperialism. And lastly, it points to education as a contradictory colonial apparatus for assistance, oppression, control, and empowerment.

## CHAPTER 2:

### “NOT BY FORCE BUT BY PERSUASION”: EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COLONIAL SYSTEM

On April 7, 1900, the President of the United States William McKinley directed the Secretary of War Elihu Root to relay specific guidelines to the second Philippine Commission, the American governing body in the archipelago. While the purpose of the first Commission that was sent to the Philippines the previous year was to survey America's sole colony in Asia and provide recommendations on colonial management, the second Commission was to inaugurate the transfer from military to civil control and to develop colonial bureaucratic structures.<sup>2</sup> Its legislative powers oversaw the “making of rules and orders” in the establishment of school, judicial, taxation and civil service systems. McKinley (1900) instructed the Commission to “regard as of first importance the extension of a system of primary education which shall be free to all, and which shall tend to fit the people for the duties of citizenship and for the ordinary avocations of a civilized community.” As a result, the Commission passed Act No. 74 on January 21, 1901 to create the Bureau of Education which played a key role in the American imperialist mission to civilize, modernize, and pacify Filipinos.

---

<sup>2</sup> Appointed on January 1899, the first U.S. Philippine Commission was composed of Cornell University president Jacob Gould Schurman (chair), former Minister to China Charles Denby, Admiral George Dewey, General Elwell Stephen Otis, and University of Michigan professor Dean C. Worcester. The second commission, appointed on March 1900, included Judge William H. Taft (chair), Professor Bernard Moses, Henry C. Ide, Worcester, and Luke I. Wright (Miller 1982).

This chapter examines the American educational policies in the Philippines by investigating into three aspects of colonial schooling: (a) administration and finance; (b) supervision and teaching; and (c) student achievement and community response. These three aspects are particularly salient to analyze since they provide insights into policy formulation, implementation, and reaction. Analytically, the chapter utilizes the theme of interconnection by demonstrating the ways in which American educators shaped and benefited from Filipino schooling. It focuses on the first ten annual reports of the Bureau of Education, archived materials which document this government agency's activities from 1900 to 1910. It utilizes an archaeological interpretive method to uncover the performance enacted by the text or, in other words, what these reports reveal about United States imperialism and the discourses that it drew from and mobilized. According to historian-philosopher Michel Foucault, archaeology as an analytical tool includes "the description of discursive formations, the analysis of positivities, [and] the mapping of the enunciative field." It "designates the general theme of a description that questions the already-said at the level of its existence," and "describes discourses as practices specified in the element of the archive" (Foucault 1972, 131). An archaeological reading of the Bureau's annual reports suggests that the United States mobilized education as a benign way to persuade Filipinos to acquiesce into its imperialist agenda. While the main focus is to describe how Americans constructed and gained from the colonial educational system, the chapter also explores the theme of identity by revealing the ways in which the discourse of gender animated the enunciative field of U.S. imperialism.

## American Imperial Mission

In its acquisition of the Philippines, the United States declared that it aimed for the “enlightenment and uplifting of a downtrodden people” in order to set them on the “highways of progress” which would allow them to occupy “a plane of equality with the other peoples of the earth” (Bureau of Education<sup>3</sup> 1903, 563). Such a vision not only indicates America’s perception of Filipinos as primitive and backward, unequal to the rest of the world, but also vindicates its mission to conquer the archipelago. The Second Assistant Chief of the Constabulary W. C. Taylor affirmed this mindset: “America took these islands with the avowed intention of lifting them up out of ... savagery” (BE 1902, 162). To modernize and civilize the “savages,” American education became the main ameliorating apparatus. The U.S. government relied on public schools due to the “supreme confidence” placed by Americans in “a democratic, secular, and free-school system, supported and directed by the State,” a system which would help lay the foundation of an “American civilization” in the Pacific. In comparison to other colonial entities, like the municipal agencies, the courts, and other government branches, the school system became “the most typically American institution” in the islands (BE 1903, 259-260). The United States intended to demonstrate that it had the welfare of Filipinos as its highest priority in order to show its harmless intentions.

The U.S. educational policies in the Philippines constructed an image of Americans as benevolent missionaries who came to save Filipinos from atavistic primitivism and Spanish theocracy and to offer modernity and civilization through education. American officials believed that the “great work of civilization is to be

---

<sup>3</sup> “Bureau of Education” will be marked as “BE” in subsequent citations.

accomplished not by force but by persuasion” (BE 1908, 101). The work of uplifting an inferior and backward race would be best accomplished by the persuasive power of education as opposed to the force of Spanish religious or American military might. Although U.S. soldiers began and presided over the first American classes in the Philippines with the expression “Educate ‘em with a Krag” (the standard army rifle of that day), by 1901 the jurisdiction over the public school system shifted from the military to the civilian Philippine Commission and then to the Philippine legislature, a move signifying the nominal separation of education and military (Racelis and Ick 2001, 24; Gates 1973; BE 1908, 146). Even though educators distanced themselves from the armed occupation of the islands, they nonetheless relied on the military. U.S. military transports and troops delivered the teaching personnel and supplies to various, often remote, parts of the archipelago. In return, by ingratiating themselves with the local officials, parents and children, American teachers served to help pacify the stirrings in many communities that felt betrayed by the United States’ duplicity in taking over the country. The teachers “operated as a restraining influence” so that Filipinos who sympathized with the anti-colonial revolutionaries would “soberly inquire of themselves whether, after all, the United States might not have the welfare and well-being of the Filipino people very much at heart” (BE 1903, 232). The connection between education and military was not lost to W. W. Rodwell, the superintendent of Cagayan and Isabela provinces, when he claimed that the introduction of the educational system in the islands was “one of the greatest movements in the history of the world. The aid of the military and civil officials has been of great benefit. The military people say that the schools are the only thing that is doing any good” (BE 1903, 546). While it is unclear from Rodwell’s statement for whom the



schools were “doing any good,” what is evident is the role that education played in United States imperialism.

To discuss the state of education in the Philippines, thirty-one American division superintendents gathered in the country’s capital of Manila in late March 1903. The significance of the occasion marked not only the first convention of colonial school officials, but also the articulation and elaboration of America’s imperialist mission. The U.S. Governor-General remarked that “the benevolent intention of the government is most clearly expressed” in education where it plays the role of “simply a giver, a donor, an almoner” (BE 1903, 565). Cognizant of the violence and damage brought by the U.S. military upon Filipinos during the Philippine-American War which occurred from 1899 to 1903, the Secretary of Public Instruction, General James F. Smith, pointed to educators as the bearers of American benevolence:

Our armies may have conquered in the field, our soldiers may have put aside the sword and set themselves to restore that which they destroyed, our government officials actuated by the purest of motives may adopt the wisest of laws, and all their work in the development of these people, all their labor to make them worthy to stand with the other peoples of the world will pass for naught, nay will be worse than uselessly expended, without the aid of that humble and yet might individual – the teacher.  
(BE 1903, 563)

On the shoulders of American teachers rested the responsibility of formulating and implementing what the colonial government aimed to bestow upon the Filipinos. In spite, or perhaps because, of the daunting task of establishing a national educational system, the convention participants expressed commitment to the American project in the archipelago. Superintendent H. H. Buck captured this zeal when he noted that “[t]here is a certain imperialistic spirit that seizes upon the best of us, and makes us desire to bring about, by

forceful measures, what will, in the natural course of events, require years to accomplish.” To bring about change in the islands, he urged his colleagues, “to sacrifice, in a measure, the present for the sake of the future” (BE 1903, 527, 529).

Central to the American mission in the Philippines was the establishment of a public school system. In order to accomplish this goal, American officials had to confront the challenges posed by the country’s “racial” and linguistic diversity. Dr. Fred W. Atkinson, the first General Superintendent of Public Instruction, estimated that the Philippines was composed of “three distinct races – the Negrito, with 21 tribes; the Indonesian, with 16 tribes, and the Malayan, with 47 tribes, making a total of 84 different tribes” (BE 1902, 87). The superintendent of Camarines also noted that people in his region spoke a “great number of local dialects” and even those living a few miles away possessed “widely divergent peculiarities of speech” (BE 1905, 823). “The Christian peoples inhabiting these provinces,” according to another administrator, “belong to different linguistic stock[s] – Bisayan, Bikol, Tagalog, Pampanga, Sambal, Pangasinan, Ilokano, Ibanag, and others” (BE 1908, 67). An archipelago with over 7,100 islands and a primarily agricultural base, the country further posed geographic and demographic difficulties. Between the most northern school, located on the Batan Island, and the most southern school, located on Siasi, Sulu, was over 1,000 miles (BE 1908, 67). Out of the approximately seven million Christians<sup>4</sup> in the archipelago, 82% lived in small *barrios* or villages scattered across many provinces and the rest inhabited *pueblos* or town centers

---

<sup>4</sup> The early American census of the Philippines had more accurate figures for the “Christian population” that lived in *pueblos* and accessible *barrios*. The indigenous “pagans” and Muslims were counted separately and received a different form of education that is beyond the scope of this chapter. According to a “rough count” in 1903, the total population in the Philippines was 7,572,199 (6,967,011 “Christians” and 605,188 “Non-Christians”) (BE 1903, 256-257).

(BE 1905, 744). Under these conditions, Americans had to design an educational system that simultaneously addressed the country's particularities and served to unify the people.

In designing the system, Americans ensured that their schools were different from the ones under the Spaniards, the colonial rulers that they replaced. Atkinson's successor, David Barrows recognized that the "first real beginning of education" in the islands took place under the tutelage of Spanish priests (BE 1903, 227). Higher education flourished in Manila, the country's capital, with the Colleges of San Ignacio (founded in 1585), San Jose (1610) and Santo Tomas (1611) for men, and the Colleges of Santa Isabela (1632), Santa Catalina (1696), and Beaterio de San Ignacio (1699) for women. In 1863, three hundred years after the Spanish conquest, a royal decree established the first system of primary instruction in the Philippines. By 1886, there were 2,143 schools for boys and girls with a total enrollment of about 200,000. The curriculum consisted of catechism, reading and writing Spanish, arithmetic, and geography (BE 1903, 227-231). While Barrows credited the Spaniards for initiating the school system in the islands, he downplayed Filipinos' persistent demands for political and educational reforms. He also pointed to Spanish friars as barriers to the evolution of Filipinos. He depicted them as "excessively hostile toward the enlightenment of the Filipino" who "actively sought to debar the Filipino from any sort of modern knowledge, from gaining a position of independence and respect, and from entrance into any kind of leadership of his own race" (BE 1903, 263). Although the religious orders developed several institutions of education, Barrows deemed them as archaic and as impediments in light of the contemporary movements of scientific rationality and politico-economic liberalism in the United States and Western Europe at the turn of the twentieth century.

Americans disavowed the vestiges of the Spanish “policy of enforced unenlightenment” (Lardizabal 1991, 35), by studying its weaknesses and failures. In their assessment, the Spanish system did not succeed in educating Filipinos for four reasons: strong religious induction and no academic emphasis; inefficient administration; small salaries for teachers; and inaccessibility of schools that were located in town centers. These four conditions resulted in non-secular and irrelevant education, inconsistent policies and programs, high turn-over rates of teachers, and reinforcement of social class hierarchy (BE 1903, 231). In order to buttress the image of the United States as benevolent saviors, the new national school system had to be secular to counter the tyranny of Spanish theocrats, had to be public and democratically available to all children to displace the stronghold of *caciques* or ruling families, and had to be geographically and occupationally appropriate to ensure skills training and economic sustenance. Consequently the task of establishing colonial schooling was placed on the Bureau of Education that was charged to be “at all times in accordance with the aims of the American administration” (BE 1905, 742).

### **Administration and Finance**

The educational structure was constructed in a hierarchical format which facilitated American administrative control and tokenized Filipino participation. Although the Secretary of Public Instruction as a member of the Philippine Commission oversaw the colonial government’s educational branch, the Director supervised the

overall administrative operations of the Bureau of Education.<sup>5</sup> The national office included a director, two assistant directors, and 34 clerks who handled the departments of property, accounting, records, and statistics (BE 1908, 135; BE 1910, 270). Assisting the Bureau of Education were Filipinos, almost all men from elite families, who served on the national Superior Advisory Board<sup>6</sup> and local school boards. Beyond their role as conveyors of native knowledge and sympathy, these Filipino boards provided “little real benefit to us or to the schools,” remarked an American division superintendent, since their powers were “merely recommendatory” and “on paper” (BE 1902, 184; BE 1905, 830). Colonial officials built a top-down organization that enabled U.S. leadership and domination of Filipino education, a situation that lasted for at least thirty years.<sup>7</sup>

Crucial to the operation of the top-down structure was the technique of increasing administrative scope and centralizing power. The Bureau of Education initially divided the country into 17 school divisions and, by 1910, increased this number to 38 in order to accommodate more territories under the Bureau’s purview (BE 1901, 49; BE 1908, 68). To reach its supervisory and teaching force, the Bureau communicated through reports,

---

<sup>5</sup> Between 1900 and 1910, there were four Secretaries of Public Instruction: Bernard Moses (appointed on March 1900); General James F. Smith (January 1, 1903); W. Morgan Shuster (September 28, 1906); and Newton W. Gilbert (March 1, 1909). During the same time period, there were four Directors of the Bureau of Education (initially called Superintendent of Public Instruction): Fred W. Atkinson (appointed on May 5, 1900); Elmer B. Bryan (January 1, 1903); David P. Barrows (August 14, 1903); and Frank R. White (November 28, 1909) (Department of Education and Culture 1976, 98-101). Passed on October 26, 1905, Act No. 1407 changed the title of the chief executive from “General Superintendent” to “Director of Education” and added two Assistant Directors (BE 1906, 2).

<sup>6</sup> The first Supervisory Advisory Board members of the Bureau of Education were Tomas G. del Rosario, Pedro Serrano Laktaw, Demetrio Larena, and Mena Crisologo y Pecson (BE 1902, 192).

<sup>7</sup> The first Filipino Secretary of Education as a member of the Cabinet was Sergio Osmeña who was appointed on November 15, 1935. The first Filipino to join the directorate of the Bureau of Education was Camilo Osias when he became an Assistant Director in 1917. Celedonio Salvador became the first Filipino director of the Bureau in 1938 (Department of Education and Culture 1976, 98-102).

bulletins and journals. The Bureau required its staff to file monthly and annual reports that attended to both school and community affairs. Using standardized forms, its reporting system provided a

full and accurate record of enrollment and attendance in the schools, individual service of each superintendent, supervisor, American and Filipino teacher, distribution and use of school supplies, collection and disbursement of school funds, construction and repair of school buildings, and construction of school furniture. (BE 1905, 803)

In addition, the Bureau also distributed bulletins that addressed a myriad of topics on national schools, supplementary texts and instruction, and Philippine life and culture (BE 1905, 805-807). It also began publishing a monthly illustrated journal called *Philippine Teacher* on December 1904 which gained such a wide readership that it became an independent magazine several months after its inception (BE 1905, 807-809). With an American audience in mind, the Bureau employed the three mechanisms of reports, bulletins and journals to describe colonial experiences and prescribe U.S. rule in the islands. Subsequently by increasing its power of administration through extensive contacts and knowledge of its staff and local communities, the Bureau expanded its scope beyond the conventional parameters of education, such as topography and public health, and became an important technique of colonial surveillance (BE 1905, 1022-1026).

Financing the construction of schools and, more generally, a national educational system was not an easy task. Since the colonial administration committed to not charge tuition fees, school funds derived from national, provincial, and municipal government appropriations. National funds paid for the Bureau's major expenses, such as salaries of American and Filipino national teachers, textbooks, equipments, tools and machinery as well as the education of non-Christian peoples in the Philippines and of the government-

sponsored scholars in the United States. Provincial funds took care of the construction, rental and maintenance of provincial buildings for secondary and intermediate schools, salaries of provincial staff, and furniture and equipment. Municipal funds disbursed for the salaries of Filipino teachers, school furniture, and the construction, rental and repair of primary schools. The total expenditures for education in 1910 was P6,476,326.81, 62.7% of which was national, 4.4% provincial, and 32.9% municipal (BE 1910, 351-358). A close examination of the national and municipal budgets reveals the ways in which Americans became the main beneficiaries, both financially and administratively, of colonial education in the Philippines.

The national government financed the structure of the school system. The category of salaries and wages for American educators made up at least two-thirds of the expenditures for the years 1902-1910 (BE 1902, 180; BE 1906, 5-6; BE 1910, 298-299, 349-354). The annual salaries of American educators in the Philippines ranged from P1,800 to P4,000 with an average of P2,308.52<sup>8</sup> (BE 1905, 697-698). On the other hand, Filipino national teachers whose salary derived from the national funds were paid P570.34 annually, and municipal teachers whose compensation came from municipal funds received P240 annually or P20 per month, an amount comparable to the rates of unskilled laborers (BE 1905, 698, 785). The Bureau justified the higher salary of Americans by stressing their status as “imported labor, serving under conditions that are temporary, and unwilling to serve except for a considerably higher salary than he would accept for equal service in the United States.” Although several Filipinos had been

---

<sup>8</sup> The currency conversion rate during this period was one United States dollar (\$) equaled two Philippine peso (P) (BE 1901, 53).

appointed to positions formerly held by Americans, they still did not receive Americans' "abnormal compensation." Eschewing any philosophy and practice of meritocracy, the colonial government made it clear that "the proper compensation for a Filipino in the Philippine Islands should at least be not higher than that paid to an American for the same class of service in the United States" (BE 1908, 139). As a result, many Filipino supervisors, clerks and teachers, with meager salaries but with sufficient proficiency in English and administrative knowledge, left the Bureau of Education to seek more gainful opportunities in private or other government sectors. In actuality, the real recipients of colonial funds and the ones who needed to be persuaded with financial incentives to come to the archipelago were the American educators who received the largest amount of national appropriations.

While national appropriations supported the structure of the national system, the municipal appropriations provided the substance, particularly by financing the salaries of Filipino teachers and the establishment of primary schools. The salaries of Filipino teachers made up approximately half of the municipal expenditures; the other half was allocated for school buildings, furniture, transportation, miscellaneous expenses, and reserves. To cover these expenditures, the appropriations derived from the municipal government, land tax, internal revenue, and donations. Based on the 1905 municipal education budget of P1,797,547.67, the appropriations of P960,269.65 (53.4%) came from land tax, P114,193.23 (6.4%) from internal revenue, P232,988.33 (13%) from donations of money, land, material and labor, and the rest (27.2%) from the municipal government (BE 1905, 704-708, 758-761). Since the salary of Filipino primary teachers was drawn entirely from municipal sources, which mostly derived from Filipino taxes



and donations, the educational system in actuality relied on Filipino labor, money and donations. An American division superintendent recognized the sacrifices made by Filipinos when he related that

Nearly all of this contribution has either been made by poor people of the barrios for the erection of barrio schools and has taken the form of gifts of land, materials, labor, and small sums of money, or has been given in the form of gifts for provincial school construction. (BE 1905, 738)

However, due to allegations of impropriety on the collection of land tax, the Philippine Commission passed Act No. 1455 in 1906 which suspended the land tax and Act No. 1579 in 1907 which reimbursed only half of what the municipalities lost from the annual land tax revenues (BE 1906, 4; BE 1907, 42). As a consequence of removing the land tax revenue, the colonial administration weakened the financial base of the primary schools where an overwhelmingly large number of Filipino students attended as well as the ability of Filipinos to shape and contribute to their children's education.

The United States' top-down approach to colonial rule ensured that Americans controlled the Philippine school system. In such a configuration, Filipinos occupied the position of being used and subjugated. Depicted in the Bureau of Education's annual reports as the beneficiaries of America's benevolent mission, Filipinos were persuaded to participate through advisory and school boards as well as through taxes and donations. However, their participation was limited due to the boards' negligible power and the tax suspensions. In reality, Americans retained complete command administratively and, financially, they collected the most amount of money. The power of persuasion ensured that the United States represented itself as different from Spain, the former imperialist ruler, and gave the illusion that Filipinos played a role in shaping the formulation and

development of the educational system. The next section shows how American educators, particularly male superintendents and teachers, orchestrated the persuasive techniques of colonial educational policies.

### **Supervision and Teaching as Gendered Practices**

Establishing the national system of public schools, Act No. 74 mandated a provision for the appointment of 1,000 American educators (see Appendix A for actual figures). Although several enlisted men served as teachers during and after the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars, the majority of the American staff in the archipelago were civilians who applied or were recruited from the United States. Military ships such as *Lawton*, *Sheridan* and *McClellan* brought 143 civilian educators in 1901 and 1902, and the transport *Thomas* brought the largest number of teachers (509) on August 21, 1901 (BE 1901, 3; BE 1902, 144; Racelis and Ick 2001, 4; U.S. Embassy 2001).<sup>9</sup> To be qualified to teach in the islands, potential applicants had to fulfill at least three requirements: (a) they must be either normal or college graduates with at least two years of school work and teaching; (b) they must turn in a photograph, two reference letters that attested to their “moral character and personal habits,” and a physician’s certification of their good health; and (c) they must pass a written examination (BE 1901, 57-59). In the exam, they needed to demonstrate competency in the following areas: American and general history; civil government; political and physical geography; current topics; arithmetic and algebra; school methods; grammar and composition; dictation; and physiology and hygiene (BE 1901, 59-65). According to a study of former

---

<sup>9</sup> Consequently “Thomasites” became the general moniker given to American educators in the islands.

American colonial educators, their reasons for going to the Philippines varied. Although most expressed concern about the education of Filipinos, other factors included the desire for travel and adventure as well as the need for a job or career (Lardizabal 1991, 15).

While the Bureau directors led the fight for modernity, civilization and pacification as the main architects of the colonial education system (Watkins 2001), the supervisors and teachers were the builders of the structure. Aside from the national office staff and the teachers who were employed in Manila, the rest of the U.S. education personnel lived, worked and traveled in various parts of the country. In their respective territories, they were in charge of selecting sites, building schools, hiring and training Filipino teachers, approving and distributing curricular materials, and collaborating with local officials. They played multiple roles that were similar to the ones of “a successful supervising principal” in the United States. In one administrator’s perspective,

He must be the diplomat who could win the interest and cooperation of municipal officials and residents of his town. He must be the statesman with plans and ideas that he would have adopted when the town had been won. He must be an organizer capable of managing and directing his force of five, ten, or more native teachers. He must be superintendent of construction when schoolhouses were to be built, and police commissioner of the town in order that the moral suasion of that force might be used in discouraging truancy. (BE 1903, 531)

Distributed throughout archipelago, hundreds of Americans supervised rural districts and/or taught in provincial or technical schools. Often their work was done in isolation and under dangerous conditions. Bureau director David Barrows described in detail a “typical” routine for American teachers in the islands:

The greater part of his time is spent in school visitations, sometimes on foot, sometimes by horse or vehicle, and frequently by banca or canoe on streams and esteros that connect the different hamlets of the municipality. This work, which must be followed throughout the stormy season, is

frequently onerous and perilous, and can usually be successfully discharged only by men of strong constitution and more than usual courage and resolution.... By reason of their profession, however, teachers are enabled to visit regularly remote hamlets of their districts even in provinces still disturbed by bandits or “ladrones.” (BE 1904, 608-609)

Expected to become geographic and cultural experts of the community, these teachers “must know each hamlet and road, and they must thoroughly understand the social composition of the community where they were working.” Barrows emphasized that “[t]his is the work which can obviously only be performed by a man, and for this reason the great majority of the teaching force is and must continue to be men” (BE 1904, 609).

Between 1900 and 1910, the national educational structure was predominantly male. In the national office, all the directors and clerks were men; all the superintendents and deputy superintendents in charge of the school divisions were men; and at least two-thirds of the teaching staff were men (BE 1906, 11; BE 1907, 37; BE 1909, 230; BE 1910, 320-321). Ideally for the Bureau, the American educator was a “young man – one who has youth, physical strength, endurance, courage, kindness of heart, and willingness to give freely of his time and strength” (BE 1905, 751). Reflecting the patriarchal prejudice of the times, an administrator suggested that, “from a point of view of economy, it would be well to encourage more women to seek these places, as they will work for less. That is, other things being equal, a larger number of competent women can be obtained for the same wages than men” (BE 1903, 511). However, division superintendent B. G. Bleasdale noticed a correlation between the gender of American teachers and the attendance of Filipino students. Various towns in Rizal saw a dramatic increase of enrolled students in the classes of American male teachers. “If the male teacher is changed for a female teacher, the attendance barely holds it own or begins to drop off.”

Bleasdale stressed that, “There are no cases of success in this division where the attendance has been worked through the efforts and ability of a resident female English teacher” (BE 1903, 415). As a result, by 1910, out of 732 American educators, 493 or 67.3% were men, and nearly all of the American appointments on that year were single men (BE 1910, 267, 320-321). The socio-geographic challenges of working in unfamiliar terrains as well as the alleged enrollment success generated by male teachers served to reinforce and excuse the patriarchal attitudes of the (all-male) American administrators towards the gendered abilities of men and women.

The Bureau’s practice of hiring mostly male employees extended to the appointment of Filipino instructors. Hiring more Filipinos to take on primary instruction relieved Americans of teaching and allowed them to focus on supervising. At least two-thirds of the students in Manila’s Philippine Normal School and of those attending normal institutes during the summers and holidays were young men.<sup>10</sup> Similarly, the Filipino teaching staff in provincial and village schools was overwhelmingly male. For instance, in a 1905 report for thirty provinces, there were 4,036 Filipino teachers, 2,820 or 69.9% of whom were men (BE 1905, 753). In 1910, there were 8,275 Filipino employees in the Bureau: 1,010 or 12.2% as national teachers; 7,120 or 86% as municipal teachers; and 145 or 1.8% were *aspirantes* or apprentice teachers. Male teachers consisted of 81.5% of the national, 68.9% of the municipal, and 70.3% of the apprentice staff (BE 1910, 320-321).

---

<sup>10</sup> Established in 1901, the Philippine Normal School had 357 students (245 male and 112 female) by the end of the 1906 academic year. The other national schools had all-male student bodies. The Philippine School of Arts and Trades which also began in 1901 had 237 students. The Philippine Nautical School which was originally organized in 1839 but re-opened in 1902 had 21 students (BE 1906, 10). As an example of the gender breakdown in a normal vacation institute, the Vigan session in 1903 drew 280 male teachers and 127 female teachers (BE 1903, 354).

In the establishment of the public educational system in the Philippines, the main architects and builders as well as the targets and products of the United States colonial policies were predominantly men (Appendix A). Besides the priests who still had strong spiritual and political influence over various communities, the Bureau of Education realized that its success relied “in a marked degree upon the attitude of the public and especially the official class” (BE 1908, 71). This class was composed of local officials and propertied families, from which came many of the Filipino teachers who were hired to provide the country’s primary instruction. William A. Preuitt, the division superintendent of Pampanga and Bataan, observed that “[t]he native teacher is a representative of the best class in the province, and in my opinion can be developed into a faithful and efficient ally of the present system of civil government” (BE 1903, 406). The number of Filipino teachers rose from about 3,000 in 1902 to 8,275 in 1910, an increase of over 275% within the first decade of U.S. rule in the islands (BE 1910, 320-321). Within 1906 and 1910, the percentage of male teachers ranged from 68.6% to 70.9% of the entire Filipino educational staff (BE 1906, 12; BE 1907, 37; BE 1909, 231; BE 1910; 320-321). Following the demographic patterns of American and Filipino educators, the students were also predominantly male with schools having a boy to girl ratio of three to two. For instance, in 1906 out of a total of 374,761 students, 227,747 or 60.8% were boys. The primary grades had 60% boys; the intermediate had 77%; and the secondary had 80%. In 1910, male students made up 61.4% of the total student body. The primary, intermediate and secondary levels had 61%, 78% and 83% boys respectively (BE 1906, 9-10; BE 1910, 310). Within the U.S. colonial school system in the Philippines, the interactions for the most part were between and among men.

It is critical to highlight the gendered discourses and subjects of Filipino-American imperial encounters for, at least, three reasons. First, such an interpretive move stresses that the categorical terms of colonizer and colonized, administrator and teacher, instructor and student, are not neutral. Second, since these categories are not impartial, they are marked by socio-cultural signifiers within the particular socio-historical moments. Lastly, to situate the imperial encounters within the U.S.-controlled school system in the Philippines as predominantly between and among men is a theoretical, political and empirical effort, not to marginalize the role and contributions of women, but to underscore the techniques of patriarchal masculinity that privileged men and perpetuated their power.

### **Student Achievement and Community Response**

The first ten years (1900-1910) of U.S. educational policies in the Philippines constructed a system that consisted of a centralized administrative and financial structure as well as an organized supervisory and teaching personnel. The educational system developed four levels of instruction (primary, intermediate, secondary, and higher education), and prescribed curricula that attempted to balance the academic and vocational needs of the Filipino people (BE 1904, 613-629). What, then, were the results of, and the reactions to, the colonial educational system established by the United States in the Philippines?

By comparing student enrollment and promotion, the overall result pointed to the marginalization and filtering of Filipinos in the educational system. Enrollment figures indicated that there was a 300% increase in the number of students matriculating in the

public schools, from about 150,000 in 1902-03 to 451,938 in 1909-1910 (Appendix A). In 1910, there were 432,585 primary students (grades one to four), 16,888 intermediate students (grades five to seven), and 2,486 secondary students (first to fourth years of high school). The first two grades, consisting of 275,108 in the first grade and 95,177 in the second grade, made up 60.9% and 21.1% respectively of the entire student population. Such numbers indicate that, regardless of the full spectrum of educational offerings, the system's main administrative, economic and pedagogical thrust should be focused on the primary schools, particularly on the first two grades. However, this was not the case. The high enrollment statistics needed to be understood in relation to the staggeringly low percentages of students being promoted to the next grade levels. Although the overall promotion rate for all grade levels rose from 40% to 54% between 1907 and 1910, the promotion rate for first graders was lower; it moved only from 38% to 42% within the same time period (BE 1910, 311-314). To put it differently, 58% of the first graders did not pass and were not promoted to the second grade. These students had two options: to repeat the first grade or, in most cases, to leave school altogether. The colonial system therefore began with the filtering of students immediately at the first grade level.

The lack of student success, as defined by low promotion rates in schools, produced various explanations. To American officials, the failure of Filipino students was due to their irregular attendance and not remaining in school for more than one or two years (BE 1907, 40; BE 1909, 195; BE 1910, 264). They pointed to geography, teacher preparation, and racialized traits, while dismissing curricular relevance and family livelihood in order to rationalize the dismal performance of Filipino students and



perhaps move the attention away from the broken promise of American colonial education:

[A] large majority of these pupils are in attendance in barrio schools under poorly prepared teachers, sometimes not supplied with suitable books and not having the benefit of regular and frequent inspection by supervising teachers and superintendents.... [Their infrequent attendance] is not due to an absence of real interest or confidence in the schools on the part of the people, nor does it have an economic basis though it is frequently stated that pupils are needed for work at home during certain seasons. The difficulty really lies in the lack of appreciation on the part of parents and children of the necessity for punctuality and regularity. (BE 1910, 263-264)

American colonial officials asserted that the colonial system in general and American educators in particular were not to blame for Filipino students' inability to pass grade-based examinations and be promoted to the following level. The problem, in their viewpoint, rested on Filipinos' "lack of appreciation" of American supervision and curriculum, practice of individual hard work and sacrifices, and customs of punctuality and regularity.

A diverging explanation of the students' low performance attributed a large part of the problem to the distribution of school funding.<sup>11</sup> The annual cost per pupil in primary schools was P9.37; in intermediate schools, it was P72.64; and it dramatically increased to P276.22 in secondary schools (BE 1907, 33-35). The three categories of funding in calculating "cost per pupil" were instruction, texts and supplies, and

---

<sup>11</sup> Another scholar provides a different compelling explanation. In response to the American rationale that the irregular school attendance of Filipinos significantly contributed to their low performance, Lardizabal argues that the students' irregular attendance was "not always caused by habit or a lackadaisical attitude. Some children lived far from school and had to walk long distances. Some children of the poorer classes lived seventy to a hundred miles from the nearest school and, in order to get an education, had to live with relatives. In exchange for board and lodging they had to help with the household chores, and this sometimes interfered with schoolwork. These children often did not get a chance to visit their homes during the entire school year. The children of the poorer classes did not have sufficient clothing and, during the planting season and the harvest season, parents needed their children's help" (Lardizabal 1991, 75).

administration. While the category of administration was steady at P1 for all three levels of education, the category of texts and supplies saw a slight increase from P1.17 in primary, to P2.28 in intermediate, and P3.39 in secondary. The enormous disparity in funding, however, was far more evident in the instructional category where the cost per pupil in primary schools was P7.20, compared to P69.26 in intermediate and P271.83 in secondary. American administrators offered two explanations to justify the large differences in funding: (a) the number of students enrolled from primary to intermediate, and from intermediate to secondary, decreased; and (b) the percentages of American and Filipino teachers at each level varied. Such rationalization glossed over who did and did not benefit from colonial education. The so-called decrease in average monthly enrollment must be contextualized as mostly due to the low rates of promotion of Filipino students. Since primary schools had 95.7% of the total student population, the intermediate and secondary levels only dealt with 3.7% and 0.6% respectively of the student body. The cost per pupil figures showed that more money was spent on a considerably smaller and more select group of students (BE 1910, 311-312). Moreover, although the Bureau provided information on the percentages of American and Filipino teachers,<sup>12</sup> it offered no explicit commentary on the correlation between the large percentages of American teachers at secondary and intermediate levels and their much higher salaries that were coded under the category of instruction. It also did not link how low funding for primary schools might be connected to the low performance of primary

---

<sup>12</sup> In 1907, the primary school teaching staff consisted of 6% Americans, 4% Filipino national, and 90% Filipino municipal. The intermediate grades had 78% Americans, 17% Filipino national, and 5% Filipino municipal. At the secondary level, 68% of the teachers were Americans and the rest were Filipino national (BE 1907, 33).

students. Therefore, while Americans acquired financial rewards within the structure that they created, Filipinos suffered from the system that was supposed to educate and uplift them.

In spite of the low promotion rates and funding disparity, many Filipinos participated and supported the schools as attested by the growing number of students who enrolled and attended. Rural parents and children saw education as a way for them to improve their socio-economic lot, and their elite counterparts viewed it as key to retaining their property and financial control and accessing political power through colonial schooling and bureaucracy. The development of the public educational system in the Philippines, however, was not wholeheartedly embraced. Various sectors pressed issues related to religion and tradition to language, culture and labor that were critical of and resistant to the Americanized system. Priests viewed the U.S. educators as threats to their ingrained national and local powers. Displaced as the ultimate purveyors of knowledge and morality, they used the fear of damnation to dissuade Filipinos from participating in the American-controlled secular schools. A division superintendent related how a friar told his parishioners that “they can not expect salvation either for themselves or for their children if the latter go to the public schools” since they were “schools of the ‘demonio’” or devil (BE 1901, 18). Several teachers, particularly the older ones from the Spanish period, felt resentful of the English-based system that rendered them useless and disposable. Many parents thought that their children’s education seemed “disappointingly slow” since primary school lasted four years (BE 1908, 72). Under the Spanish rote memory method of instruction which presided over many generations, students learned the catechism, alphabet, and rudimentary reading

within a period of one or two years, and were then available to help the family at home or in the farm. In addition, while some elite families objected that Spanish was no longer taught since it retained its prominence as the language of the courts, legislature, and business, others raised the need for instruction in native languages, particularly in Tagalog, the dominant local dialect in the capital and central-southern Luzon. Cultural nationalists also articulated their concerns about the further corruption of the “Filipino soul” which had been bombarded by foreign languages and cultures (BE 1908, 100). After over 300 years of Spanish domination, they highlighted the neo-colonial imposition of the United States in the islands. Lastly, there were Americans, particularly from the trade and vocational fields, who advocated for “the practical training for life or industrial efficiency” and opposed the more academic orientation of some of the Bureau’s administrators and teachers. They believed that “public schools interfere with the availability of labor, train boys from the fields, and expend large sums of money which would better be devoted to industrial and commercial development” (BE 1908, 73). The support of and resistance to the colonial system were not clearly demarcated along the lines of Americans and Filipinos respectively. Some people simultaneously participated in and were critical of it. Constituency groups raised demands and objections that American colonial officials had to contend with.

### **Queering Imperial Encounters**

This chapter examined the establishment of the educational system in the Philippines by looking into three aspects: administration and finance; supervision and teaching; and student achievement and community response. As a result, it analyzed

colonial policies in terms of their formulation, implementation, and reaction. It also focused on the benevolent technique of education in order to demonstrate the ways in which United States imperialism distanced itself from the forcefulness of Spanish religious and American military might. Gender, in particular, played a significant role in colonial benevolence. It was a discourse that U.S. officials mobilized in order to counterbalance the two phases of American imperialism. Whereas the initial armed occupation of the archipelago performed the more aggressive and physical domination, the educational structure and content subsequently enacted the gentler and more mental control of the colonized. In both situations, men were in charge and wielded, both directly and implicitly, patriarchal biases in their selection of American and Filipino educators and even in the filtering of Filipino students.

It is critical to highlight the gender and other subject positions of the actors within imperial encounters for, at least, three reasons. First, such an interpretive move stresses that the categorical terms of colonizer/colonized and educator/student are not neutral. Second, since these categories are partial, they are marked by gender and racial discourses of particular socio-historical moments. Lastly, to situate Filipino-American imperial encounters as predominantly between and among men is a theoretical, political and empirical effort, not to marginalize the role and contributions of women, but to underscore the techniques of patriarchal masculinity which privileges men and perpetuates their power.

Scholars of postcolonial and ethnic studies have primarily framed their analysis of the encounters between the colonizer and the colonized within the contexts of gender, race, and class (Fanon 1963; Said 1978; Pratt 1992; Kaplan and Pease 1993; Bhabha

1994; Cooper and Stoler 1997; Spivak 1999; Hardt and Negri 2000; Rafael 2000; Choy 2003; Fujita-Rony 2003). However, within the past two decades, sexuality as an analytical framework has emerged as an important intervention to interrogate the dynamics of imperial encounters (Anzaldúa 1987; McClintock 1995; Alexander and Mohanty 1997; Shah 2001; Stoler 2002; Manalansan 2003). Highlighting the “regime of power-knowledge-pleasure,” Michel Foucault asks,

Why has sexuality been so widely discussed, and what has been said about it? What were the effects of power generated by what was said? What are the links between these discourses, these effects of power, and the pleasures that were invested by them? What knowledge was formed as a result of this linkage? (Foucault 1978, 11)

Foucault’s questions and those of other scholars of sexuality have helped to generate new fields of research on the experiences of lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, and transgenders (lgbt’s) as well as the operations of heteronormativity. That sexuality as an analytical perspective has appeared in the intellectual and political terrain to augment, complement and complicate other perspectives should be of no surprise. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick notes that the “homo/heterosexual definition has been a presiding master term of the past century” which has gained “primary importance” comparable to “the more traditionally visible cruxes of gender, class, and race” (Sedgwick 1990, 11). The innovative projects of Foucault, Sedgwick, and other pioneers have also inaugurated queer studies, another interdisciplinary project which has drawn strategically from poststructuralist, feminist, psychoanalytic, race-conscious, and marxist frameworks (Jagose 1996). As a preliminary attempt to extend my analysis of male dynamics in imperial encounters, the last section of this chapter asks: What possibilities open up when queer studies is mobilized in conjunction with postcolonial and ethnic studies?

To answer this question, I employ a “perverse” use of Foucault’s method of archaeology in order to disrupt the un(re)marked heteronormativity in postcolonial and ethnic studies. Perverse archaeology unpacks not only what is “already-said” in discourses but also what is “un-said” in order to uncover hidden assumptions and produce different conceptualizations. Along with the practices of “deviant historiography” and “policy archaeology” (Terry 1991; Scheurich 1994), this “insurrection of subjugated knowledge” is an in-between reading of the fissures, discontinuities, and contradictions in order to understand and analyze the absent-present in historical analysis and educational policies (Foucault 1978). For this section, perverse archaeology puts pressure on the trope of rape which has served as the dominant symbolic and literal representation of imperial encounters. The trope of rape depicts the dynamics between the colonizer and the colonized as the penetration of the white phallus into the dark other. Fortifying this trope is the “un-said” heterosexuality of a male-female interaction (Coloma 2003).

So, what’s queer theory got to do with imperialism? How is it useful, especially when the subjects or objects of study are not lgbt peoples? How does it help productively rethink the trope of rape? How does the concept of “imperialism as rape” change if the analytic lens shifts from a heterosexual matrix to a same-sex one? And if the focus changes to male-to-male dynamics, what happens to the figure of woman? Queer theory serves as an anchor on discussions regarding same-sex dynamics, allows perverse and enabling interpretations of discourses, policies and representations, and directs attention to patriarchal heteronormativity that legitimates and normalizes certain practices (Butler 1993; Coloma 2003; Lather 2004). The deployment of queer theory is a strategic move neither for celebratory or tokenistic inclusion nor for a dilution of supposedly more

pressing or germane issues such as race, class or gender. The intervention of queer theory underscores that the “contests for discursive power can be specified as competitions for the material or rhetorical leverage required to set the terms of, and to profit in some way from” hegemonic categories and normative understandings (Sedgwick 1990, 11). As a transgressive, political, and pedagogical practice (Britzman 1998), queer theory has a stake in how educational policies are interpreted and how histories are narrated, contested, and utilized.

Queer theory enables a perverse archaeological reading of American policies in the Philippines as a technique of persuasion that was mainly performed by men toward other men. Within the colonial system were the discourses of white supremacy and native primitivism as well as masculine assertiveness and feminized docility. The aims of the American-led Bureau of Education to modernize, civilize, and pacify Filipinos operated to ensure that American male educators retained control over and gained the benefits from school administration, finance, supervision, and teaching. By depicting themselves as missionaries of United States benevolence, American educators used their power of persuasion to entice Filipino involvement in advisory boards, taxes, and donations as well as in teaching classes and attending schools. Cognizant that the Americans in the archipelago were relatively few in numbers and needed local emissaries, they recruited and trained mostly male Filipino teachers to carry on the task of instructing the overwhelming majority in the primary schools. Facilitated by an imperialistic and patriarchal system, the same-sex dynamics between the American male teachers and the Filipino male trainees condoned the belief and practice that the work of governing and teaching must be performed by men. Although there has been no evidence uncovered



regarding same-sex sexual/romantic relations between Americans and Filipinos in the early twentieth century, Eve Sedgwick's notion of triangulated desire (Sedgwick 1992) which posits male homosocial desire as circuiting through the figure of a woman provides an interpretive key to unlock the (im)possibilities of a queer interpretation of same-sex dynamics in colonial schooling. Utilizing Sedgwick's concept of triangulated desire, a queer approach to understanding Filipino-American imperial encounters contextualizes male-to-male engagements as events not in the absence of women but within educational and local spaces inhabited by female teachers and students as well as within the context of a feminized colony.

A queer interpretation of imperialism complements the feminist assertion that the trope of rape undergirds the dynamics between the colonizer and the colonized. Rape, in its literal and figurative sense, signifies the non-consensual use of force and control with one party taking the dominating position and the other being subjugated. While most studies situate such confrontation between a man and woman, they leave unproblematized the male-female heteronormative orientation of their analyses. Although imperial encounters between and among women occur, a study which merits a separate and thorough exploration in and of itself, this section demonstrates that the dominant dynamics in Philippine colonial schooling was between and among men. Bringing a queer lens to study male-to-male interactions may cause some to react that such a focus re-centers men as the main actors of history, others to argue that such interactions were not sexual or erotic, and most to say that sexuality or homosociality is diverting or complicating "the issue" and is forcing itself into something that it has nothing to do with. I contend that, on the contrary, a queer perspective entices the

proliferation of other questions over the subject matter. For instance, within the same-sex dynamics of imperial encounters, does the Filipino become feminized or emasculated since he occupies the subjugated position? Does the one positioned at the bottom only take the dominated or subjugated role, without any acquiescence or opposition? What are the ways in which the colonized can assert his resistance and agency to work within and against the structures and discourses of imperialism and colonial education? What are the limits and dangers of understanding imperial encounters within a dominant/subjugated framework of sexuality, either through an opposite-sex or same-sex lens?

As an enticement for subsequent research, this chapter invites the further utilization of queer theory to help understand same-sex dynamics within the intertwined operations of imperialism, patriarchy, and homosociality in order to dissect and eventually dismantle the privileges and accumulation of male power. While this chapter highlights the discourse of gender in the operations of the United States empire and Filipino education, the next chapter foregrounds the discourse of race and, more specifically, the intertwined histories of Filipinos and African Americans.

## CHAPTER 3:

### DOMESTICATING THE EMPIRE: THE “WHITE MAN’S BURDEN” AND THE COLORS OF TEACHER TRAINING

In response to the end of the Spanish-American War that resulted in the United States gaining possession of the Philippines, the poet Rudyard Kipling celebrated the noble enterprise of imperialism. In a poem published in a popular magazine in 1899, he called for the responsibility of the west to colonized peoples of color around the world.

He specifically urged Americans to:

Take up the White Man’s burden –  
Send forth the best ye breed –  
Go bind your sons to exile  
To serve your captives’ need;  
To wait in heavy harness  
On fluttered folks and wild –  
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,  
Half devil and half child.<sup>13</sup>

Kipling’s verses depicted the seemingly benevolent white man and his best sons as enlightened saviors who caught and then supervised the advancement of the “half devil and half child.” The figure of a devil-child, as represented in photographs from the Philippines and as human displays in World’s Fairs in the United States, conjured images of the colonized as morally, culturally, mentally, psychologically, and physically underdeveloped (de la Cruz and Baluyut 1998; Rydell 1984). The devil-child provided

---

<sup>13</sup> See Appendix B for the full text of the poem.

the paternalistic rationale for military and educational operations as respectively aggressive and benign mechanisms to resolve the “white man’s burden.”

This chapter continues the examination of the themes of interconnection and identity from the previous chapter by exploring the educational aspect of teacher training. Whereas the last chapter highlights how American educators dominated and benefited from the colonial system and how patriarchy mobilized the discourse of gender to privilege men, this chapter interconnects the histories of Filipinos and African Americans and foregrounds the trans/national discourse of race. This chapter contends that the United States domesticated its empire by drawing lessons not only from European models of colonialism but also from its own colonized minorities, particularly African Americans. The technique of “domesticating the empire” signifies the dual and symbiotic process marshaled by those in power in the metropolis and the territories to control and tame as well as to familiarize and naturalize subjugated people. Although these two definitions for the verb “to domesticate,” according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, are related to (controlling) animals and (familiarizing oneself to) places, they capture the colonizers’ pervasive attitude toward and the treatment of peoples of color since the colonized were often perceived as non-human objects in the United States and abroad. Thus, in order to manage the colonized and obtain their acquiescence, those in governing power need to discover and know the cultural patterns, belief systems, and physio-behavioral traits of the colonized. Conversely, knowing about the colonized enables those in power to further extend their surveillance and exert their control. This chapter demonstrates that the intertwined relationship of knowledge and power in early twentieth century Filipino-

American imperial encounters manifested in the trans-Pacific discourses of race and in the development of teacher education.

This research utilizes an analytical framework in which race, comparative and trans/national studies take on a new color, both literally and figuratively. Gaining critical momentum within the past decade, more projects are no longer exclusively limited to single-race inquiries or comparative studies that contrast racialized minority groups with “standard” whites. Neither are they constrained to pursue research within the U.S. geopolitical boundaries. The field of history has seen an increasing number of theoretical and empirical studies that focus on a particular racial/ethnic group, yet make evident linkages with other communities of color (i.e. Okihiro 1994, 2001; Foley 1997; Prashad 2000, 2001). Other scholars of United States history have traced the international flows of race and their attendant intersections with material culture, gender, sexuality, and labor (Tchen 1999; Jacobson 2000; Shah 2000; Choy 2003; Fujita-Rony 2003). The sub-field of educational history is also beginning to respond to this paradigm shift. An assessment made by historians of education laments that there is

almost no synthesis or intersection across the communities; much of the history has been written in isolation – with Blacks, Latinos, Asians, Native Americans and others writing from or about only their particular communities. (Donato and Lazerson 2000, 8)

The prevailing historiographies on the education of peoples of color confirm the single-race focus in many studies (Butchart 1988; San Miguel 1986; Tamura 2001). The “attention to international trends or context” is an additional absence in U.S. educational history (Mahoney 2000, 18). As a result, scholars of history and, in particular, history of education have called for multicultural and global studies which offer intersectional

experiences and multiple perspectives. Such a framework can provide “healthy, viable, and exciting ways to enrich the field” and can tap into “the potential to improve research and teaching” (Donato and Lazerson 2000, 8). Part of this chapter’s aim is to provide a new understanding of how race and empire are intimately intertwined in the history of education during the progressive era.

### **Race and Empire in “Progressive” Education**

Generating a single authoritative definition of progressivism is an elusive quest (Rodgers 1982). Even Lawrence Cremin, the author of the canonical text on “the educational phase of American Progressivism writ large,” maintains that progressivism had a “pluralistic, frequently contradictory character” (Cremin 1964, viii-x). In *The Transformation of the School*, Cremin offers three major themes that encompass the progressive education movement which began following the Civil War and ended after the Second World War. During this time period, schools broadened their functions to address health, vocational and community concerns; scientific research guided educational management and operations; and students’ interests and backgrounds informed teaching and evaluation. The triumvirate of school, science and student emerged to organize and bring meaning to educational policies, administrative structures, curricular materials, pedagogical techniques, student assessment, and teacher training. In the midst of uncertainties and changes brought about by wars, industrialization, migration, urbanization, and shifting demographics, Americans placed their hope and confidence in education to provide answers to their problems and made social amelioration the schools’ primary function.

By the turn of the twentieth century, the “problem” of racialized difference within and outside America’s national borders became a dominant feature in United States politics and culture. America’s encounters with “foreign peoples at home and abroad” directed a wide range of policies about education, public facilities, marriage, labor, immigration, and foreign relations (Jacobson 2000). Within an Anglo-Saxon construction of the U.S. nation, the problem included not only eastern and southern Europeans, but also indigenous peoples, Blacks, Mexicans, Chinese, Hawaiians, and the latest acquisitions from the Spanish-American War – Filipinos, Cubans and Puerto Ricans. Schooling was deemed as the solution to America’s race problem, a condition supported by a white supremacist discourse of the Other as primitive, backward yet corrigible. During the progressive era, the contours of education, particularly for peoples of color, were shaped by United States’ race relations and imperialist motivations. America’s racialized dilemma and its resolution through education were perceived as domestic and global matters. Especially helpful to contextualize this situation is a comparative and trans/national framework of race in education.

Unfortunately many scholars of progressive education have not adequately addressed issues of race and imperialism, and have contributed indirectly to the Eurocentric understanding of progressive education. For example, although Cremin’s “intimate history of progressive thinking about education” was a “sharp break” from earlier studies and “opened new vistas of interpretation,” its “very little discussion” of African American education and manual-industrial instruction was, according to one reviewer, “a major shortcoming” (Rury 1991, 68-72). Other major texts of educational history also do not provide significant attention to the experiences of peoples of color in

schools (Butts and Cremin 1953; Butts 1955; Tyack 1974; Cuban 1993; Ravitch 2000).

The empirical studies on Black education in the South, Black female teachers, and religious and corporate philanthropy during this era remain notable exceptions (Woodson 1933/2000; Goodenow 1981; Anderson 1988; Sadovnik and Semel 2002; Watkins 2001; Anderson and Moss 1999). Consequently, the dominant scholarship presents progressive innovations and transformations affecting predominantly white students in northern, economically privileged schools.

Moreover, progressive education continues to be centered in the West. It has been noted that “[t]he influences of Progressive Education on the general educational system are more directly tangible in those areas where this reform movement originated (Europe and the United States) than in Africa or Asia” (Röhrs 1995, 14). This might be due to the “reformatory tradition of educational science” from which progressive education derived, a tradition which

had its origin in the individualistic spirit of the Reformation and, having come into its own under the impact of late-nineteenth-century urbanization and the expansion of state school systems, countered the organizational order of these systems in the name of the child and young individual. (Herbst 1997, 53)

In this revised periodization, the progressive era is construed to have genealogical linkages with the Reformation and to have ushered in “educational modernity” by the late 1800s (Herbst 1997, 54). However, how do we explain the lack of influence of progressive education in the non-Western world? Is progressive education not as applicable or discernible in Africa and Asia because their traditions offer different conceptualizations and disrupt Western notions of the individual, structure, and reform? Is it also because African and Asian countries have not attained the type of socio-cultural



systems as defined by so-called standards of civilization and modernity? Or, is it because the establishment of school systems in many non-Western nation-states is tied to European and United States colonialism? This line of inquiry points to the need to historicize progressive education within the discourses of racialized difference and the operations of imperialism. More importantly, linking race, empire and education troubles the established hagiographic narration and redemptive legacy of progressivism. This “darker” side of the progressive education story is one that, perhaps, some scholars are uncomfortable with and prefer not to tell.

Progressive education at the turn of the twentieth century coincided with two important moments in United States history, the Reconstruction of the South and the emergence of America as a world imperial power. Progressive educators could not possibly escape the problem of race and the education of peoples of color, especially of Blacks and Filipinos. The education of African Americans served as an archetype for the schooling of other racialized communities in the U.S. and abroad. The pioneering institutions of Hampton and Tuskegee matriculated American Indian students, and Jim Crow school policies impacted Latina/os in similar and different ways (Washington 1901; Adams 1995; San Miguel 1987, 2001; Donato 1997). Black education was also suggested as a standard for other colonized groups. According to a study on Asian Indians, using Black education as a model to instruct and uplift them was relevant due to the following similarities: whites provided the assistance to groups of people of color that exhibited similar stages of racial development; the communities were mainly agricultural, and manual labor was perceived as degrading; the colonized groups had to overcome indolence, helplessness and traditions in order to become self-sufficient; the

standard of living needed to be raised by rectifying dietary, health and sanitary conditions; and lastly, the amount of school time spent by the majority of children was too short (Woods 1928). Even Nazi Germany investigated the applicability of Black schooling in its colonial projects (Rust 1971).<sup>14</sup> It is thereby not surprising that the United States utilized its educational program for African Americans as the domestic racial model to address the foreign colonial problem in the Philippines.

### **Black and Brown Linkages**

The discourse of race was intricately intertwined with the trans/national order of United States imperialism and connected the histories of African Americans and Filipinos.<sup>15</sup> Both groups shared the stereotype of primitive savages and the vestiges of

---

<sup>14</sup> I appreciate Antoinette Errante for sharing this article with me.

<sup>15</sup> I recognize that the education and experiences of Native Americans also shaped the racial discourses in American imperialism within and outside of its national borders. Consider the following advice from an American superintendent that linked industrial education, race, and development.

In all your labors ever keeping mind that you cannot transform your Indian by the wave of the hand into something other than an Indian.... Begin your carpentry with the tepee or medicine lodge if necessary, your domestic art with the Navajo blanket, your cooking lessons with the salted pork... This is what we mean by beginning with the child in his environment. It means searching for all that is fundamental in his life, selecting all that is hopeful and vital in his environment, making that the starting point, giving it a new direction, finally a new setting, leading to a newer and larger environment. (quoted in Woods 1923, 64)

In addition, the content of American textbooks provided Filipinos with an understanding of the ways in which the development of the United States were predicated on the colonization of Native American land, resources and bodies. For instance, the mainstream curriculum's narration of the relationship between the Native Americans and the first Virginia settlers was disrupted by a Filipino student who drew a parallel between Filipino and Native American experiences.

“If the Indians disliked them so and wished them away, why did they give them the means to stay?” he asked.

“Probably, the English bought and paid for it,” the teacher said, but the boy persisted; “We learned yesterday that the Indians had no money and no use for it, and that they did not care for the gold or how much of it the English took with them, if they would only go away.”

slavery (Salman 2001). The “Negro problem” structured the situation of Filipinos in the American mindset, and the “colors of manifest destiny” linked black and brown together (Kramer 1997; San Buenaventura 1998). One of the earliest encounters between African Americans and Filipinos in the Philippines took place during the Spanish-American War when Black soldiers were deployed to the archipelago (Lanning 1997). However, in comparison to their white counterparts, African Americans perceived U.S. imperialism differently. According to historian William Gatewood, they reacted to overseas expansion in ambiguous and contradictory ways and drew upon their experiences as “a colored minority in a white-dominated society” (Gatewood 1975, 320). Initially, they held “an affinity of complexion with the Filipinos” (323) and saw the “similarity between the predicament of the black man in the United States and the brown man in the Philippines: both were subjects of oppression” (284). Subsequently based on America’s history of conflicting policies and the continuously unmitigated atrocities in their own land, African Americans realized that their issues and interests in the U.S. needed to take precedence. With slavery and Reconstruction still fresh in their memories, they knew that they had to take care of their own business first.

---

“Well, I don’t know how they obtained the seed,” the teacher replied. “I only know what the books says, that they got it.”

“I myself do not know,” the boy said, most politely, “But I saw a picture in which Captain Smith held an Indian by the throat, with a pistol at his head, saying, ‘Your money or your life!’ I myself do not know that it was true. I was only thinking – of the Philippines.” (quoted in Racelis and Ick 2001, 230)

Such an incident signaled a fissure in the imperialist discourse which was then utilized by the colonized to trouble the seemingly innocent process of discovering and settling in a “new” land. Mainstream curriculum unintentionally offered the colonized with an opportunity to challenge the colonial condition not only in the Philippines but also in the United States. Another insightful example of comparative analysis is Gowing’s study of Filipino Muslims and American Indians (Gowing 1977). However, in order to have more fruitful descriptions and explorations of the historical connections between Native Americans and Filipinos, additional archival research needs to be undertaken.

African Americans perceived the entrance of the United States into global imperialism within the spectrum of pro-expansion on one end and anti-expansion on the other. As articles in the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* attest, each side was not homogeneous in purpose and motivation. Many Blacks shared white Americans' concern of the Philippines being "quarreled over by the powers of Europe," and several volunteered to serve in the armed forces in order to protect the archipelago and, more importantly, to display their patriotism. A comment was made that "there are no better soldiers in the world tha[n] those whose dark skins are covered with the blue uniform of Uncle Sam." Some also aspired for homes and careers that were unavailable in America. They imagined those opportunities turning into realities due to their perception of racial affinity between "the negroes of the Philippines and their kindred from the United States." A prominent Black newspaper editor T. Thomas Fortune was sent by the U.S. President "to investigate labor and agricultural conditions in Hawaii and the Philippines, with a view to their adaptability to the colored farm hand of the Southern States." Upon his return, he convened a gathering of the "best colored men in the country" where he astutely described the shared conditions of Blacks and Filipinos. According to Fortune, Filipinos posed "another problem of race" for most Americans.

And in this aspect of it, at least, we are companions of theirs, for it is construed that we stand largely where they stand - outside of the American Constitution, but under the American flag. The hazards of war make strange bedfellows, but none stranger than this of the Afro-American and Filipino peoples.

African Americans supported the acquisition of territories abroad not only out of concern of European intervention but also out of divergent interests to demonstrate their U.S.

citizenship by serving in the military and, simultaneously, to disavow the U.S. nation-state by seeking opportunities elsewhere.<sup>16</sup>

Conversely sentiments against imperialism were imbued with moral, racial and economic implications. Anti-imperialists depicted America's international actions as a "criminal aggression against a people struggling for liberty." Aggravating matters for African Americans who wanted to display their patriotism were racial segregation and subjugation, which continued to be the norm in the islands. Cognizant of the white supremacist treatment of both Blacks and Filipinos, a "negro deserter" named David Fagin joined and led Filipino revolutionary forces against American occupation. A newspaper editorial even commented on the violence faced by peoples of color in the United States and wondered about the future in store for those living in the colonies. It stated that

"The best Indian," an army officer has been quoted as saying, "is a dead Indian," and the best negro or Chinaman apparently is one who has been strung up at a lamp-post or grilled alive on a village bonfire. And this is the Nation, with such a record to demonstrate its capacity to deal with subject races, which is to give a new and more benign civilization to the Spanish West Indies and the Philippine Islands!

Others paid more attention to the cheap labor competition that, in part, fueled anti-immigrant attitudes towards Asians within and outside the United States. Democrat Senator McLaurin provided a very telling Southern perspective:

Of one thing I am sure – the American people will never consent for these inferior races to flood our land and add another complication to the labor problem. To permit cheap Asiatic labor to come into competition with our intelligent, well-paid labor will be to degrade and lower our civilization.

---

<sup>16</sup> Citations for *New York Times* and *Washington Post* will be *NYT* and *WP* respectively. *NYT*, August 21, 1898; *WP*, June 16, 1899; *WP*, April 26, 1899; *WP*, April 12, 1903; *WP*, June 27, 1903

Many Blacks would also agree that Republicans, the party of Lincoln that emancipated them, “should settle the race question of the South before it attempted to solve the Philippine problem.” Thus, like the pro-expansion position, the anti-expansion side consisted of multiple and conflicting perspectives, and placed African Americans in a difficult position in relation to Filipinos and to United States imperialism.<sup>17</sup>

As America entered the global colonial arena, a major factor in determining how Filipinos were treated was color or, in the words of Booker T. Washington, “how he shall be classed, whether as a white man or as a black man.” As reported in *New York Times*, Washington shed light on the relevance of phenotypical characteristics as a basis for racialized evaluation and classification:

If the Filipino produces hair long enough and feet small enough, he may be classed as a white man; otherwise he will be assigned to my race. What seems to me to be a far more important thing than the question whether he is white or black, is that he shall not have to go about classed and branded as a problem and not as a man.

The comparisons between African Americans and Filipinos widely circulated in newspapers and everyday conversations. A *Washington Post* article described Filipinos as “little, savage negritos, living away up in the mountain forests. They have black skins and their hair is kinky as that of an African.” They were also referred to as “little brown brothers,” “little brownies,” and “pickaninnies” by white officials and teachers.<sup>18</sup> A Black soldier in the Philippines observed that “if a man was nonwhite, we include him in

---

<sup>17</sup> *NYT*, November 3, 1900; *NYT*, November 4, 1898; *WP*, September 12, 1902; *NYT*, December 9, 1901; *NYT*, January 14, 1899; *WP*, November 13, 1898

<sup>18</sup> *NYT*, February 23, 1903; *NYT*, March 29, 1903; *WP*, November 30, 1902; William Howard Taft, quoted in Lardizabal 1991, 101; BE 1903, 525; French, quoted in Racelis and Ick 2001, 94; Anna N. Benjamin, quoted in Lardizabal 1991, 42

a general class called ‘nigger,’ ... so far as our white soldier is concerned, all Filipinos belonged” to that class (quoted in Gatewood 1975, 281). The course of Filipino and Black lives were thus entwined, and the “experience of the South for the past thirty years with the negro race,” as a result, was culled for “lessons of wisdom for our guidance in the Philippines.”<sup>19</sup>

The treatment and conditions of African Americans became a complicated template for the United States rule in the Philippines, and informed the discussions regarding citizenship, suffrage, sovereignty, and assistance. A newspaper article stated that “the exclusion of the Filipino and the inclusion of the Southern negro in the national electorate are perfectly consistent.” In an attempt to eclipse the histories of slavery and colonialism and, instead, highlight the privilege of U.S. citizenship, it contended that “[t]he Republican party did not give the suffrage to, nor does it demand it for, the Southern negro because he was black ... [but] because he was and is a native American of from one to three centuries’ indigenous ancestry.” The brown Filipinos with their ambiguous status as nationals, on the other hand, received neither U.S. citizenship nor electoral participation in metropolitan affairs. They remained, instead, at the mercy of American imperial management. In addition, Filipino self-determination was connected to the plight of African Americans. An editorial reminded its readers that

Our Washington statesmen who propose to set up the illiterate Filipinos in the business of self-government, and establish native rule which will rest upon the consent of the governed, will not have to rack their memories much to remember what happened when a similar experiment was tried among the freed men of the South. The result of unbridled negro rule was bad government, public neglect, millions and billions of dollars of debt, and finally repudiation after it became necessary to overturn the govern-

---

<sup>19</sup> *NYT*, January 14, 1899

ments by shotgun power.

In order to prevent another supposedly failed Reconstruction and “unbridled negro rule,” many white Americans put their trust in the promise of education. For instance, a North Carolina man believed that “so far as the negro is concerned, nearly all of our broad-minded and intelligent leaders of the South are in favor of educating the race.” He added that what impeded the resolution of the interconnected “race problem and educational problem” were Northern philanthropists who should just “turn their attention to the Indians, Chinese, and Filipinos,” instead of “rant[ing] about how the Southern people should treat the negro.”<sup>20</sup>

In order to appease this pervasive and hostile white Southern attitude, Northern philanthropic and educational leaders placed more emphasis on the economic and instructional conditions of the South (Anderson 1988; Anderson and Moss 1999; Watkins 2001). On January 9, 1903, the president of the General Education Board, William H. Baldwin, announced a fundraising campaign for Southern education to supplement a one-million dollar gift from John D. Rockefeller. Attended by university presidents and representatives of the Armstrong Association and the Southern Education Board, this gathering drew a response from Dr. Dabney of the University of Tennessee who underscored their concerns over national matters. Dabney rhetorically asked, “Have we not missionary work enough to do here at our own doors, without going to Cuba, Porto Rico [sic], or the Philippines?” A year later, Harvard University president Charles W. Eliot spoke at a meeting with white philanthropists such as Andrew Carnegie, Robert

---

<sup>20</sup> *WP*, August 23, 1901; *WP*, January 22, 1899; *WP*, March 31, 1902



Ogden, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and John S. Kennedy as well as Black leaders such as Booker T. Washington and T. Thomas Fortune. Eliot relayed that Northerners

would like to see the Southern universities enabled to maintain separate professional schools for colored men, and they would like to see a way found for the National Government to spend as much money on solving the Southern negro problem as it has been spending for six years past on the Philippine problem.

Political, philanthropic and pedagogical leaders therefore shaped not only the destiny of Blacks in the South but also, explicitly and indirectly, that of Filipinos abroad. In the project of domesticating the empire, the United States ultimately employed its knowledge of African Americans to configure Filipino education in the colony and the metropolis.<sup>21</sup>

### **Colonial Training at Home and Abroad**

The operations of education and empire continued to converge when the establishment of the Philippine public schools mandated administrative consultations with America's top educators. On March 1, 1900, the United States President William Howard Taft asked Eliot, Harvard's president, to recommend a man who could develop and oversee the new school system in the archipelago. Eliot suggested Fred W. Atkinson, a Harvard alumnus and a Massachusetts high school principal, who was interviewed by Taft and was then appointed as the General Superintendent of Public Instruction. Before his departure from the United States, Atkinson wrote to Booker T. Washington for advice and, on May 1900, visited Tuskegee and Hampton, the two most prominent institutions for Black industrial and normal training (May 1980, 80-81, 91-92). Cognizant of the dominant patterns of training peoples of color, Atkinson understood that

---

<sup>21</sup> *NYT*, January 10, 1903; *NYT*, February 13, 1904

In this system, we must beware [of] the possibility of overdoing the matter of higher education and unfitting the Filipino for practical work. We should heed the lesson taught us in our reconstruction period when we started to educate the negro. The education of the masses here must be an agricultural and industrial one, after the pattern of our Tuskegee Institute at home. (quoted in May 1980, 93)

Such sentiments were echoed a couple of years later by Maine representative Charles E. Littlefield who not only referred to the Philippines as an “international vermiform appendix,” but also considered the “practical education of the negro as the only possible solution” to America’s problems with “inferior races.”<sup>22</sup>

The Bureau of Education in the Philippines played a ubiquitous role in formulating and implementing the intellectual, moral, physical and vocational imperatives of colonial training. Along with “bookish learning,” American educators

embrace[d] the wide general purpose of broadening the mental life of the race, raising its moral standards, increasing its self-control, bettering its physique and training it in a variety of useful arts and professions which will raise alike the social plane and economic efficiency of the nation. (BE 1905, 790)

Under the Spanish regime, the three-year course for teaching included religion and ethics, Castilian reading and writing, arithmetic and geometry, geography and history of Spain and the Philippines, physical and natural sciences, agriculture, and music. Female teachers also received instruction in hygiene, domestic economy, and needlework (Alzona 1932; Rutland 1955). From the American perspective, having a highly academic curriculum was inadequate to produce Filipino teachers who could carry out the United States objectives in the islands. American colonial officials had to devise ingenious and pragmatic strategies to increase the number of local educators and impact the curriculum.

---

<sup>22</sup> WP, March 25, 1902

The Bureau of Education developed four main strategies to train Filipino teachers: the after-school sessions; the vacation institutes; the normal and secondary schools; and the government scholarships to American colleges and universities. An example of a training text used by the Bureau was H. C. Theobald's *The Filipino Teacher's Manual* (1907). The most common mechanisms, especially during the Bureau's nascent years, were the daily one-hour classes and the four- to five-week vacation institutes which were both conducted by American supervising teachers (BE 1903, 787). Filipino teachers learned the fundamentals of the English language, arithmetic, Philippine and American geography and history, and often "taught during the week what they themselves had learned during the week previous" (Rutland 1955, 34). Some of the *aspirantes* or apprentice teachers even taught for free in order to attend the courses and receive books and instructional aids (Rutland 1955). These teacher training sessions drew widespread support from practicing and apprentice teachers. The vacation institutes held in thirty-five provinces in 1907 were attended by a total of 6,671 practicing and apprentice teachers (BE 1908, 127). In order to attend the vacation institutes, the participants were required to be between the ages of 16 and 35 years old, to have had previous instruction in English, and to accept teaching positions after completing the course (BE 1903, 319).

The curriculum for Filipino teachers became primarily a contest between an academic and an industrial emphasis, a predicament that was also confronted by Black educators in the United States (Anderson 1988; Watkins 2001). For instance, a 1903 proposal to standardize the normal instruction during daily and vacation sessions showcased the initial dominance of academic instruction. The after-school sessions focused on English (grammar, composition, and literature), math (arithmetic), social

sciences (history, government, and geography), and science (plant and animal studies, physiology, and hygiene). On top of providing advanced instruction on these subject matters and professional development in school administration and classroom pedagogy, the vacation institutes also offered courses on agriculture, the arts, and handicrafts (BE 1903, 787-791). The course offerings in the 1908 Manila vacation assembly, on the other hand, highlighted the shift to industrial education as the curricular focal point.

Overshadowing the academic branches, the industrial courses included gardening and agriculture, woodworking and drawing, silk culture, the care and decoration of schoolhouses and grounds, the weaving of mats, baskets, fans and hats, and the weaving, spinning, dyeing and bleaching of cloth (BE 1908, 127). By 1910, the Filipino institute in Manila provided “practical” lessons and the industrial subjects were taught in a “more business-like manner” (BE 1910, 296). While the academic subjects prevailed in the early years of teacher training, industrial education subsequently took a more prominent position in the normal curriculum.

The struggle between academic and industrial education also manifested in the normal and secondary schools. Established on September 1, 1901, the Philippine Normal School “occupie[d] the central position in the educational movement” by supplying “thoroughly trained Filipino teachers to take charge of the schools throughout the archipelago” (BE 1902, 99).<sup>23</sup> Compared to the Spanish-run normal school which had an operating budget of \$5,525 in 1893, the American-administered version in 1912 had a

---

<sup>23</sup> A preliminary normal term was held from April 10 to May 10, 1901 under the leadership of Dr. David P. Barrows. At the end of this session, 575 teachers received certificates of completion (Lardizabal 1991, 115-116). When the school officially opened a few months later on September, Dr. Elmer B. Bryan became its principal. The institution was also initially called the Manila Normal School, and was renamed as the Philippine Normal School in 1905.

budget of \$56,476 with an additional \$224,500 for new buildings and furniture (Lardizabal 1991, 40). Although it initially shared the same building as the Manila Grammar School which held morning sessions, the Philippine Normal School eventually moved to a different location with four buildings: a main building with classrooms, a study room, and an administration office; a music hall for performances and assemblies; another building for the arts, sciences and laboratories; and a cottage for the training class (BE 1903, 450; BE 1905, 970). Like its Spanish counterpart, however, the Normal School offered strong academic preparation. The entrance requirement included arithmetic (through long division) and English proficiency in speaking and reading (with the *Baldwin Second Reader* as the minimum standard) (BE 1903, 452). The four-year curriculum consisted of four years of English, four years of mathematics, three years of geography, three years of science, two years of history, drawing and music for the first year students, and professional training for the fourth-year students (BE 1902, 100-101; BE 1903, 452-457). In addition to these academic subjects, normal students also were trained in pedagogical and administrative techniques.

Students learn to prepare and outline the lessons that they teach and to use methods and devices approved by authorities on education. They also deal with many of the problems that arise in the school, and are instructed in the mechanical features of school organization, such as care and use of materials, seating, lighting, movement of classes, record keeping, and report making. (BE 1905, 972)

By 1905, the Philippine Normal Schools began to make plans for domestic science and manual instruction. For industrial education, students had gardening for three periods per week. Each student was allotted a 5 foot by 25 foot plot to grow vegetables, such as beets, beans, cabbage, carrots, eggplants, okra, lettuce, peanuts, radishes and tomatoes,

and to conduct experiments on cotton, corn and tobacco. They also examined seeds, soils, plant foods, water, harmful insects, and methods of growing and harvesting crops (BE 1905, 972).

While the Philippine Normal School set the standard four-year course, teacher training also took place in provincial normal and secondary schools and even in some intermediate schools.<sup>24</sup> These provincial institutions provided instruction to Filipino teachers of elementary schools (Lardizabal 1991, 114). Their curriculum was a revised two-year program which focused mainly on the academic areas of English, mathematics, science, history, and professional training (BE 1905, 972). In response to the demands for more teachers and to the increasing number of students entering the primary grades, by 1909 the teaching course was offered at the intermediate level. The three-year intermediate curriculum was composed of two years of music and drawing, a year of native arts and industries, a year of agriculture and gardening or of housekeeping and hygiene, and school management and practice teaching in the third year (BE 1909, 198). Teachers from the provincial, secondary and intermediate normal programs could receive additional and advanced training through on-site supervision, correspondence study, division vacation institutes, and matriculation at the Philippine Normal School.

As the highest institution for teacher training, the Philippine Normal School became the most prominent public educational center during the first decade of American rule in the islands. Although private Catholic universities, such as the royal pontifical

---

<sup>24</sup> Eventually the Bureau of Education established a system of normal schools throughout the archipelago. The Philippine Normal School was located in the nation's capital of Manila. There were also six regional normal schools (in Ilocos Norte, Pangasinan, Albay, Iloilo, Cebu and Zamboanga) and fourteen provincial high schools with secondary normal courses. These institutions were supported by a combination of insular and provincial funds. (Rutland 1955, 48)

University of Santo Tomas, existed, they were primarily geared towards the training of men for theology, law, medicine and philosophy (Alzona 1932). The state institution of higher education, the University of the Philippines opened in 1908, but its College of Education was not organized until 1913 as a branch to prepare teachers for secondary schools (Rutland 1955; Lardizabal 1991).<sup>25</sup> Many Filipinos therefore saw the Normal School as a key that provided access to employment and status in the American-run system. Although the Normal School's original purpose was to produce teachers, by 1905 it enlarged its scope "to prepare [Filipinos] for professional schools in general or for college courses" (BE 1905, 970). During its first six years, the Normal School enrollment more than doubled; it increased from 349 students in 1901 to 809 in 1907. By 1907, 99 men and women graduated with normal diplomas and four completed the literary course. According to the June 1908 figures, there were 344 students enrolled in various secondary courses of study: 75 were preparing for medicine; 67 were in the course for literature, science and history; 60 for teaching; 41 for nursing; 33 for law; 33 for engineering; 18 for agriculture; and 17 for domestic science. "The secondary courses" were considered "very thorough, and the instruction, equipment, and standard [were] believed to be comparable with the best high schools of the United States" (BE 1908, 109-110).

As interest and enrollment in the other fields of study increased, it became apparent that the "fundamental purpose of the [Philippine Normal School] as a training center for teachers for the entire Archipelago [was] not being fulfilled" (BE 1908, 110).

---

<sup>25</sup> The University of the Philippines' College of Education was established on September 29, 1913. Its first bachelor's program in education began in 1934, and its master's program in 1947 (Rutland 1955, 53). The doctoral program in Education at The University of The Philippines was initiated in the 1970s.

By 1910, American educational officials lamented that the “legitimate function of the Normal School was in a measure lost sight of” and the Bureau of Education could no longer depend on it “for the training of native assistants” (BE 1910, 292). One major factor for the increasingly lack of interest in normal training and the high turn-over rates of Filipino teachers was salary. The local teachers’ pay was comparable to that of “a clerk who has passed the second-grade English examination” (BE 1908, 110). The Bureau had to compete with other governmental and municipal agencies that also needed English-proficient workers. The division superintendent of Ilocos Sur and Abra provided a very telling insight when he stated that

[t]he only trouble is that at present we have so few native teachers who have good pronunciation. As soon as a teacher acquires a fair pronunciation and knowledge of English he is offered more money in some civil service position, or some place in one of the military establishments, than the pueblos can pay him, and he is lost from the schools. (BE 1903, 354)

Although the Philippine Normal School provided many educational and employment opportunities, Filipinos considered the lack of financial feasibility, professional status, and advancement to higher positions in their decisions to leave the field of teaching or to utilize the enlarged scope of the Normal School in order to pursue other courses of study. Although the school system and, in particular, the Filipino children suffered from the high teacher turn-over rates, the blame could not be placed completely on the shoulders of Filipinos. The commitment of the American colonial administration to adequately fund and support the public school system should be taken into account as to why many Filipino teachers did not remain in the profession.

The funds for colonial training facilitated both the instruction of Filipino teachers in the archipelago as well as their cosmopolitan education in the United States. Many



American administrators were of the belief that “the quickest and surest way” for Filipinos to “arrive at an understanding of Western civilization” was “to live among Americans in the United States and be taught in American schools” (John Bancroft Devins, quoted in Racelis and Ick 2001, 224). By studying and living abroad, Filipinos were “to gain knowledge of American life, education, and government.” Those chosen were “promising teachers who have shown considerable capacity in learning our language and educational methods and who have appeared interested in our [U.S.] history and political institutions.” Upon their return, they were to give “lectures in the towns of their provinces, describing what our country is, what its people do, what its history is, and what America has done in rescuing them from Spain, and what it plans to do in the future” (BE 1901, 7). From the perspective of American colonial officials, sending Filipinos abroad was “not alone for the academic education which they can receive, but for the broader and more impressive education of daily life in the United States, in contact with its greatness and activity” (BE 1902, 97). The metropolitan education of Filipinos became an impetus “to stimulate interest in the public schools” (BE 1908, 103), and was tied to an imperialist operation which aimed to represent the United States as a benevolent and civilized nation that utilized Filipino teachers as its local messengers.

The Philippine Commission passed Act No. 854 on August 26, 1903, in order to select and sponsor Filipino government scholars or *pensionados* to study in the United States.<sup>26</sup> By 1910, a total of 207 students matriculated in American colleges and

---

<sup>26</sup> There were five major scholarships for Filipinos in the early years of United States rule: (a) the scholarship to the United States; (b) the Philippine Medical School scholarships (one scholar for each province); (c) the nursing scholarship (specifically for women); (d) municipal scholarships through Act No.

universities (BE 1910, 297). While the first group of 102 students had the largest cohort, the numbers decreased each year for three main reasons: the University of the Philippines was established in 1908 and provided the means for higher education in the islands; the cost of sponsoring students abroad drained the insular coffers; and many of the first groups of students were not adequately prepared to undertake college-level instruction and had “barely been fitted for entrance to first-class high schools” in the United States (BE 1905, 793).<sup>27</sup> By 1908, sixty *pensionados* had returned to the islands; two-thirds of whom entered the field of teaching. Expected to arrive that same summer were forty-three other sponsored students; six of whom completed normal or education programs (BE 1908, 104-105). Although the initial objective of the policy to send Filipino students abroad was to produce teachers who could carry out America’s mission in the islands, the scope of the *pensionado* program, like the Philippine Normal School, was expanded to include other courses of study. The first superintendent of Filipino students in the United States, William Alexander Sutherland, recommended that students should “adopt a course which, while it may not result in the most considerable future pecuniary benefit to the student himself, will in all probability result in the greatest possible good to his fellow-countrymen.” In line with the policies for “practical” instruction and against education that may challenge American colonial rule, Sutherland declared that

---

1791; and (e) advanced normal scholarships in Manila for municipal and insular teachers through Act No. 1857 (BE 1908, 103).

<sup>27</sup> Act No. 2095 ensured that subsequent government-sponsored students were rigorously prepared for university-level instruction in the United States. Only a handful of students were sponsored to travel to and study in the U.S. between 1910 and 1919. The numbers slowly increased when Dr. Walter W. Marquardt became in charge of Filipino students in the U.S. and of recruiting American teachers for the archipelago (Lardizabal 1991, 119).

Agriculture, normal and engineering courses, with perhaps the medical, but to the exclusion of the legal profession and the merely clerical or business professions, are believed to such beneficial courses. It has even been recommended by the undersigned that few or no students desiring to pursue the legal profession be sent to this country for study, and that all agree to teach, if called upon, when they return to the Philippine Islands, irrespective of the course followed in America. (BE 1905, 797)

In spite of the American intentions to regulate the types of students who entered, and the courses of study pursued in the *pensionado* program, many Filipinos navigated through the colonial education in the Philippines and the United States in order to work towards the improvement and independence of their country (Sutherland 1953; Carpio 1934; Olivar 1950; 1981).

### **Contesting Curriculum**

The American project to domesticate its empire marshaled two types of operations: (a) it familiarized itself with the conditions of “inferior races” by drawing upon available racial discourses and the management of peoples of color in the United States, particularly of African Americans; and (b) it developed various teacher training programs in order to create a cadre of local emissaries to implement its colonial mission in the Philippines. This chapter not only links the histories of Blacks and Filipinos by examining the colored complexion of the “white man’s burden” and the internal and external orders of United States imperialism, but also interrogates the contest between the academic and industrial education.

Although the curricular focus in the American-occupied Philippines was initially strongly academic, industrial education emerged to play a more significant role halfway through the first decade of the 1900s. In an official catalogue of the Louisiana Purchase

Exposition Board for the 1904 World's Fair in St. Louis, Missouri, the American chief of the Philippine education exhibit aimed to show "what the government schools have accomplished" by providing human and material displays that demonstrated "the ability and taste of the pupils, their environment, and the difficulties with which the American teachers have had to contend" (Philippine Islands 1904, 35). Among the displays were the arts and crafts produced by manual and commercial training programs in Iloilo, Ilocos Sur, Laguna, Manila, Pangasinan, and the Moro region. The Bureau of Education's 1907 Statement of Organization and Aims indicated the increasing emphasis in industrial education, which began to be implemented at the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade levels. Intermediate students were taught tool work, agriculture, and housekeeping. Aside from the academic and normal courses of study in high school, three types of vocational courses were offered (commerce, agriculture, and arts and trades). It was clear by the Bureau's 1911 Statement that the colonial government was invested in "prepar[ing] boys and girls in a practical way for the industrial, commercial, and domestic activities in which they are later to have a part." By the end of the first decade of American rule, industrial arts became a permanent curricular area, and all schools provided "at least some kind of industrial education," and nine out of ten students were engaged in basketry, farming, gardening, lace making, mat weaving, trade work, and other vocational endeavors (Lardizabal 1991, 99).

In spite of the objections and concerns against industrial education, raised particularly by Filipino elites and aspiring bourgeois, who saw manual training as backward and demeaning, there were others who recognized the benefits of industrial

education. For instance, the municipal president of Calumpit believed in the importance of industrial work

because by it the pupils get to know that by honest labor, no matter how insignificant it may be, one may get a profitable gain; they learn the dignity of labor; their hands are trained to work in harmony with their brains; and they get to know how to turn materials that otherwise would be useless into useful and marketable articles. Our farmers have made ropes of the coarsest kind of *pasao* (a weed that grows wild in the rice field), but they never dreamed of making slippers, as the pupils have done, out of its strong fibers. The Bureau of Education has not made a mistake in actively carrying on this work, and I hope that some day it may be brought to perfection which I presume is the Bureau's aim. (Quoted in Racelis and Ick 2001, 199).

The contest between academic and industrial training drew the lines between two different types of labor: intellectual versus practical, mental versus manual, rigorous versus applied, sophisticated and backward.

What took place in the Philippines in relation to the curricular contest between academic and industrial training, in many ways, reflected and was informed by what was going on in the United States regarding the training of African Americans. To restate the main contention of this chapter, the United States marshaled Black schooling as the dominant template for the education of other subjugated peoples of color in the local and global arenas. The main debate in the U.S. over Black education took place between and was embodied by Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois. Scholars have noted how the geographical and educational backgrounds of these two leaders shaped their respective positions regarding Black education (Anderson 1988). A former Southern slave, a prominent Hampton graduate, and the Tuskegee principal, Washington became the spokesperson for industrial and manual training of African Americans. On the other hand, a Northerner and the first African American to receive a doctorate from Harvard,

Du Bois advocated for intellectual training in order to develop a cadre of African American leaders who could represent and uplift the entire race.

Before making a brief and tentative articulation of the implications of the Washington - Du Bois debate within the educational system of the American-occupied Philippines, it is important to highlight their respective views on racial and transnational relations in order to reveal additional insights into the complicated nature of race, empire, and education. In Booker T. Washington's America, race was framed in black and white terms, and the possibilities for solidarity among peoples of color who shared experiences of racial exploitation were not considered. For example, in his 1895 Atlanta Exposition Address, he called on the "white race" to "Cast down your bucket where you are" since he was concerned that the post-Reconstruction South increasingly relied on Asian laborers whom he referred to as "those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits" (Washington 1901, 220). He perceived Asians as foreign threats who took opportunities from African Americans, and consequently presented Blacks as "the most patient, faithful, law-abiding, and unresentful people" who knew their role in the South (221). A few years later, he asserted the patriotic position of Blacks as genuine Americans in his speeches on the contributions of Black soldiers in the Spanish-American War. Instead of noting the re-colonization of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines under the U.S. imperialist regime, Washington focused on his "race that is thus willing to die for its country" (255). Ultimately, through his analogy of "separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand" (221-222), he gave a nationalist and chauvinistic vision of America with a racialized terrain that was primarily Black and white.

A critic of Booker T. Washington's politics of accommodation, W. E. B. Du Bois presented a more nuanced analysis of race and imperialism. He saw the calls for Black emigration for better opportunities outside America as "hopeless" based on the "course of the United States toward weaker and darker peoples in the West Indies, Hawaii, and the Philippines – for where in the world may we go and be safe from lying and brute force?" (Du Bois 1903, 45). He perceived America as a capitalist and consumerist "happy-go-lucky nation which goes blundering along with its Reconstruction tragedies, its Spanish war interludes and Philippine matinees" (122). Du Bois understood the subjugation of peoples of color within and beyond the U.S. borders, and opened the possibilities for racial and transnational solidarities against white supremacy and colonialism. Du Bois' local/global framework of anti-oppression served as the rationale for his advocacy of intellectual training for subjugated peoples of color. He regarded the industrial schools as "born of slavery and quickened to renewed life by the crazy imperialism of the day," thereby connecting the histories of African Americans and other colonized communities (79). He also questioned the logic of the dominant policy on Black instruction which focused almost all resources on common schools and not on higher education. Invested in producing high-quality Black educators for Black children, Du Bois declared that

It was not enough that the teachers of teachers should be trained in technical normal methods; they must also, so far as possible, be broad-minded, cultured men and women, to scatter civilization among a people whose ignorance was not simply of letters, but of life itself. (Du Bois 1903, 81)

Dismissing the prevailing emphasis on industrial and manual instruction, Du Bois challenged Washington's endorsement of practical and vocational education, and insisted on the mental and cultural training of African Americans for life and literacy.

Although the debates between Washington and Du Bois pitted them against each other, these men shared two fundamental points. First, at the core of their philosophies and programs were racial self-determination and economic self-reliance. They both wanted African Americans that forged their destinies and could fend for themselves. Second, their seemingly conflicting educational agendas actually complemented each other. According to historian James D. Anderson,

Despite Washington's concerns about industrial education for the masses, in actuality, both he and DuBois were seeking to educate, organize, and direct the same segment of Afro-America, the "talented tenth" or the black intelligentsia.... [A]t the 1904 "Washington-DuBois" conference, DuBois stood on a platform of "higher education of selected youths" and "industrial education for the masses." (Anderson 1988, 104)

Du Bois boldly called for the intellectual training of a highly select group, and conceded to Washington's industrial education for the rest of African Americans. Washington, on the other hand, emphasized vocational training and was more comfortable in his behind-the-scenes maneuvers to promote Black political and educational leadership.

The dilemma in the United States of academic versus industrial instruction for Black teachers and students also occurred in the American-controlled Philippines. The academic training for an elite group of Filipinos in Philippine secondary schools and colleges and as government-sponsored scholars in American colleges and universities paralleled what Du Bois advocated for. The elite's higher education in the colony and the metropolis spawned a Filipino version of the talented tenth who eventually became the country's leaders in the public and private sectors. Conversely for most Filipino teachers and students during the first decade of American rule, their curriculum placed increasing emphasis on industrial training for practical skills, employment and livelihood. In many



ways, the transnational elaboration of Black education for other subjugated peoples in American colonies produced a strikingly similar result: the production of a two-tiered educational program – an academic focus for a select few and an industrial-manual one for the majority. The *pensionados* and other elites attended high schools, colleges, and universities and were prepared for a professional and lucrative future, while most Filipinos only attained basic primary education and were geared toward manual, vocational and agricultural destinies.

In sum, this chapter has focused on the discourse of race in American imperialism and Filipino schooling in the early twentieth century by linking the histories of Filipinos and African Americans and examining the curriculum for teacher education. Chapters two and three both explore the themes of interconnection and identity – the intertwined histories of Filipinos and Americans as well as the discourses of gender and race – in empire and education. The next chapter foregrounds the theme of agency and uses a case study to investigate the ways in which a Filipino young man navigated through the socio-cultural contexts of pedagogy in the midst of colonial schooling and nationalist revolution.

## CHAPTER 4:

### DISIDENTIFYING NATIONALISM: REVOLUTON, PEDAGOGY, AND AGENCY

Representing the state of Illinois at a Midwest inter-normal oratorical competition on May 8, 1908, the nineteen year old Camilo Osias began his speech “The Aspiration of the Filipinos”<sup>28</sup> with the phrase: “All nations and individuals love liberty and independence; they hate servitude and restraint” (Osias 1908). Ten years after the United States gained control of his native country at the end of the Spanish-American War, Osias addressed the American spectators not as a mere contest participant, but as a living symbol of intellect and civility, a testimony to the Filipino capacity for self-rule. He stressed the American ideals of freedom and equality to win the hearts of the audience and the votes of the judges as well as to appeal for his country’s independence. Whereas Spain, the former imperialist ruler of the Philippines, became an emblem of cruelty and injustice, he pointed to America’s commitment to liberty through its pledge of “Philippines for the Filipinos.” The speech impressed and won over the judges who awarded him the grand prize. Demonstrating a sophisticated understanding of the tensions in the American colonial project and challenging the unequal relationship between the United States and the Philippines in the early twentieth century, Osias

---

<sup>28</sup> See Appendix C for the entire text of Camilo Osias’ speech “The Aspirations of the Filipinos.”

performed a type of nationalism which appropriated and refashioned the codes and language of the dominant in order to advocate for the sovereignty of his country.

This chapter focuses on the schooling and career of Camilo Osias (1889-1976) as a case study to explore pedagogy and agency in the context of colonial schooling and nationalist revolution. Pedagogy is broadly defined as teaching and learning engagements which occur both in the formal school settings and in informal non-school environments. Osias' pedagogical engagements, for instance, took place in a Spanish grammar school and an American-run high school, in government-sponsored matriculation at U.S. universities, in the Philippine educational system, and throughout the Filipino quest for self-determination. While this chapter does not portray Osias as a representative of all Filipinos during this time period, he serves as an example of how it was possible to utilize a western education yet remain committed to the nationalist struggles of his home country. His navigation of the colonial tensions enabled him to emerge as a critical figure in the educational and political history of the Philippines. A leader of the "Filipinization" movement in the public education system, he became the first Filipino school division superintendent, the highest ranking Filipino in the Bureau of Education as its assistant director, and the first Filipino school textbook author. Ultimately, Osias demonstrated how education was a contested site for anti-imperialist struggles that intersected with political mobilization, socio-cultural contestation, and subaltern strategies of resistance (Fanon 1963; Iletto 1979; Said 1993; Cabral 1994; McClintock 1995; Scott 1985).

The scholarly literature on the history on the history of relations between the Philippines and the United States reinforces the notion that imperial encounters affected

only the Philippines and not the United States, and reveals a dichotomy regarding the impact of American education in the archipelago. One side argues that the American common school system was an improvement over the private, elitist Spanish version and ushered in literacy and democracy in the country (May 1980; Karnow 1989). The other side contends that the American curriculum served as a “mis-education” since it depicted the U.S. as a benevolent hero that rescued the country from Spanish theocracy and native primitivism, yet concealed its ulterior military, economic and political motives in Asia (Constantino 1966). This chapter participates in this historiographic debate and situates Filipino education under U.S. rule as neither western / assimilationist nor indigenous / separatist. It shows, instead, how Camilo Osias navigated between these two competing forces and created a third space of possibility that utilized the dominant symbols and rhetoric of power in order to articulate and enact the politics of the oppressed and marginalized.

In interrogating the contested spaces of education in terms of the experiences and actions of an individual, this chapter suggests that the nationalist strategy for education and self-determination under colonial conditions was more about “disidentification” (Muñoz 1999) as opposed to the more conventional processes of identification or counter-identification. To become a revolutionary educator, Osias had to first learn, then distance himself, and finally use the knowledge acquired, from Filipino peasants, Spanish clergy, American teachers, and the leaders of the Philippine sovereignty movements. The revolutionary implications of these various forms of pedagogy were realized only through the construction and performance of an identity that worked within and against the relational discourses and structures between U.S. colonialism and Filipino nationalism.

## History and Nationalism

Nationalism is a powerful revolutionary strategy against imperialist subjugation since “nations inspire love, and often profoundly self-sacrificing love” that ignites people’s pride and courage to defend their countries and fight for their freedom (Anderson 1991, 14). Benedict Anderson’s (1991) four typologies of nationalism – creole, vernacular, official, and last wave – offer a potentially relevant frame to interpret the history of the struggle for Philippine independence (Agoncillo 1990; Schirmer and Shalom 1987). The Philippine islands came under Spanish imperialist rule with the arrival of soldiers, merchants and priests by the mid-1500s. By the late 1800s, European-educated Filipino elites began to clamor for political rights, particularly for representation in the Spanish metropolitan legislature. As members of the upper class from mixed *indio*/native, Spanish or Chinese backgrounds, they occupied a dual position in the colony: as economically and politically exploited and as stabilizers of imperialist control and status quo. Dr. Jose Rizal, the country’s martyred hero, was a proponent of this *creole nationalism* that aimed for recognition and participation in the political mainstream. Imbued by contemporary liberal ideology and advocating for a gradual separation from Spain, he used the power of the plumed pen by writing novels to depict Spanish tyranny and immorality (Rizal 1886; 1891). Although Rizal wrote in Spanish and German, his translated works became metaphors for Filipino oppression and transformed revolutionary yearnings into actions. Stirred by Rizal’s writings to put an end to the Spanish regime in the Philippines, the largely peasant, secret fraternal organization *Katipunan* (translated as revolutionary brotherhood) led by Andres

Bonifacio fought with bolos and guns. Bonifacio's *vernacular nationalism* drew from the signs and beliefs of local and indigenous cultures to heighten consciousness and strengthen solidarity (Ileto 1979). With battles still raging and the country's future undecided, the revolutionaries declared independence on June 12, 1898, and established the republic of the Philippines.

The republic, unfortunately, did not last long (Storey and Lichauco 1926). While Spain fought to retain its control over the Philippine islands in the Pacific, it was also involved in a war against the United States in the Atlantic shores (Hoganson 1998). The Spanish-American War ended with the Treaty of Paris on December 10, 1898, in which Spain ceded control of the Philippines to the United States. Confronted by both pro-annexationists and anti-imperialists at home and in the archipelago, the United States had to respond to domestic and international demands that called for either the continuation of U.S. rule over the islands or the autonomy of the Philippines (Lanzar 1928; Stanley 1974). The U.S. government chose to retain the islands and instill a sense of *official nationalism* in order to create a transnational and multi-ethnic society while pursuing an imperialist agenda. U.S. President William McKinley's "Benevolent Assimilation" policy (Miller 1982), allegedly designed to democratize the Philippines and bring it under American tutelage primarily through education, was a way to stretch "the short, tight, skin of the nation over the gigantic body of the empire" (Anderson 1991, 86). In 1899 the United States officially annexed the Philippines and became the ensuing colonial master. However the struggle for independence was not over. The Philippine-American War erupted (Tan 2002), fueled by *last wave nationalism* that drew from the three other models of nationalism (creole, vernacular, and official).

While Anderson's typologies of nationalism are suggestive for understanding national self-determination in the Philippines, they are also limited both in their explanatory power and by their Eurocentric bias. Even though they have influenced numerous studies of anti-colonial movements, they have been criticized for privileging western constructs that only perpetuate imperialist dynamics and mechanisms even after national independence. Subaltern Studies historian Partha Chatterjee, for example, takes issue with Anderson's formulation of last wave nationalism. He questions what the "postcolonial world" has left to imagine if Europe and the Americas, as "the only true subjects of history, have thought out on our behalf not only the script of colonial enlightenment and exploitation, but also that of our anticolonial resistance and postcolonial misery" (Chatterjee 1993, 5). He concedes that colonialism has produced destructive and beneficial consequences in the colonies. He asserts, nevertheless, that a certain part remains within the "natives" that is untouched by colonialism, a crucial piece that sparks and sustains authentic nationalist fervor. According to Chatterjee, imperialism partitions colonized societies into two distinct domains: a material or outside realm where the western hegemony of money, politics, science and technology reigns; and a spiritual or inside realm that bears pre-colonial and indigenous cultural values. Anti-colonial nationalism develops, he argues, in the second domain where revolutionary movements thrive, sanitized from western contamination.

Whereas Anderson's typologies situate the colonized as identifying with Eurocentric models, Chatterjee's spiritual concept of nationalism locates them as counter-identifying with indigenous constructions. The process of identification (with the west) and counter-identification (with the natives) produces a binary opposition that maintains

a particular version of nationalism as a conservative / accommodationist stance and the other as liberal / oppositional. The colonized are thus limited to the choice between only two options. This opposition also raises questions about “purity” in colonial situations (Bhabha 1994; Stoler 1995). The colonizers’ anxiety about their purity is related to their capacity to retain a dominant and thereby dominating position. The apprehension of the colonized, on the other hand, is connected to their ability to hold on to their indigenous cultures, stop further colonial impositions, and have options for self-determination. To be demonstrated in the next sections through the experiences and perspectives of Camilo Osias, an educator who straddled between U.S. imperialism and Filipino sovereignty, neither the dichotomy of identification and counter-identification nor the insistence for purity is helpful. Situated at the crossroads of changing colonial regimes and nationalist uprisings, Osias embodied and performed what I conceptualize as “disidentifying nationalism,” an especially insightful framework to understand the issues, problems and patterns in identity formation, anti-imperialist resistance, and revolutionary pedagogy.

### **Revolution as Pedagogy**

Camilo Osias was born on March 23, 1889 from peasant parents, in the “typical” town of Balaoan, La Union, in northern Philippines where its approximately 8,000 inhabitants lived simply and parsimoniously (Osias 1971). The sixth out of eight children (four of whom died in infancy), he planted in the rice fields, grew vegetables, tended livestock, and fished to help his family obtain food and money. At an early age, Osias already discovered and understood the harsh realities of loss, poverty and deprivation. His first teachers were his parents who taught him the alphabet, writing, and religious



conviction. His parents' desire for their children to have a better future led them to enroll Osias in a private school where he learned Spanish grammar, Latin, geography and mathematics. Osias and his classmates considered themselves better than the students in the town's newly established *escuela publica* that merely taught reading, writing, and the catechism. Since the public school system in the Philippines under the Spanish regime only began in 1863, the private schools, mostly under the supervision of Spanish friars, provided historically formal education to Filipino children and offered a more structured system of instruction (BE 1903, 225-231; Osias 1917a; Alzona 1932; Bazaco 1939).

Osias' tremendous capacity to memorize and do well under pressure garnered him quite a favorable standing in his hometown. Proficient in Spanish and Latin, he won a grammar competition held in the central plaza. Consequently local officials selected him to deliver the welcome speech to a high-ranking Spanish judge at an inaugural celebration in the province capital. His impressive performance at the contest and at the ceremony earned him the reputation of being a diligent and bright student. No more than eight years of age, he taught reading, writing, math, catechism and grammar to twelve to fourteen kids around his age, a few even older than him, whose parents paid him as a tutor. His accomplishments brought him honor and family pride but did not make him arrogant; in fact, they made him more persistent and studious. However, the townspeople's talk about their "Balaoan boy [becoming] a La Union boy" foreshadowed Osias' ascendance to greater prominence and his exposure to more cosmopolitan ideas and settings (Osias 1971, 33).

In 1896 Osias' formal schooling was interrupted and his education under revolutionary times commenced. The uprising against the Spanish rule and for Philippine

independence broke out on August 29 of that year when Andres Bonifacio and the *Katipuneros* declared war on Spain (Karnow 1989). The fighting between the Spanish military and the Filipino guerilla “insurgents” reached Balaoan in a few months, and the colonial officials shut down the schools and used them as headquarters. The Spaniards incarcerated or executed those suspected of being sympathetic to the guerillas and forced able-bodied men, like Osias’ older brother, to enlist and join the Spanish forces. Osias’ father fled to the mountains upon learning that the Spanish parish priest wanted him captured for helping the townspeople air their grievances. From his mother, Osias found out about the garroting of three Filipino priests, Fathers Gomez, Burgos and Zamora, who challenged Spanish theocracy. From his uncle who served as a *Katipunan* lieutenant, he learned about the principles of this fraternal organization and translated them from Tagalog to Ilokano<sup>29</sup> to inspire others to fight for their country and liberty. Suspicious of misleading information, he led his friends to drive away the Spanish *bandillo* or town crier who brought news of battles with only Filipino casualties. Osias’ home and the streets, therefore, functioned as teaching sites that initiated his informal education on the nationalist struggles against colonialism. The revolution became a form of pedagogy that instilled in him a critical perspective on western authority and an ardent passion for Filipino autonomy.

When the fighting subsided, Osias’ deeply religious mother sent him to the larger town of Vigan, Ilocos Sur, to study in a seminary in order to fulfill her ambition to have a

---

<sup>29</sup> In an archipelago with over 7,100 islands and over 80 different dialects, the question of national language was in the early 1900s, and remains to this day, a highly contested issue. The majority of the people living in the country’s capital of Manila and the surrounding central-southern plains of Luzon, where the *Katipuneros* initially organized, speak Tagalog. The northern part of Luzon, the Ilokos region and La Union, where Osias was born and his family lived, predominantly uses Ilokano.

son educated for priesthood. Although his mother saw priesthood as a noble calling and a family blessing, he was aware of the material affluence and political influence of Spanish friars who made themselves “Little Gods” (Osias 1971, 57). When the revolution against Spanish control ended in 1898, it turned into another war: this time against the Americans (Storey and Lichauco 1926; Miller 1982; Hoganson 1998; Tan 2002). Filipinos felt betrayed that Americans, whom they thought came to help them oust the Spanish colonizers, were interested in keeping the Philippines. The U.S. army came to Vigan and closed all schools, thereby halting once again Osias’ schooling. His informal lessons on revolution and nationalism, nonetheless, continued. As a complicit collaborator in the more overtly armed political mobilizations of the Filipino guerillas, young Osias served as an informant, message carrier, and look-out. He utilized the subaltern strategies of resistance (Scott 1985) by befriending American soldiers to acquire information, employing gossips to seek support from local villagers, and participating in covert meetings. The ways in which he mobilized his formal and informal education to subversively aid the propagation of revolutionary consciousness and the Filipino troops fighting the Spaniards and the Americans clearly signaled the beginning of disidentifying nationalism that opened new spaces of viable empowerment and resistance for the colonized.

### **Schooling the Colonized**

Although education was part of the American program to bring literacy and progress to the country and to encourage people’s acceptance of the new colonial order, Filipinos utilized it for their own nationalist agenda. In 1901 the twelve-year old Osias

returned to his hometown and resumed his education under U.S. tutelage. The American soldiers sparked his interest, and he began to jot down phrases that he heard, such as “‘Hoyogon?’ (Where are you going?) ‘Hoyocom?’ (Where did you come from?) and ‘Hislocanachi’ (Here’s looking at you)” (Osias 1971, 68). A lieutenant noticed him taking notes and organized an English class for him and his friends, which Osias later recalled in these terms:

Day after day, after the morning drill, the soldier teacher wet with perspiration came to the class, and taught us our first English lessons. We learned fast from our teacher and from watching the soldiers play ball. We picked up words like ball, bat, run, catch, out, etc. (69)

Many U.S. soldiers initiated the first American classrooms and schools in the archipelago during and after the Philippine-American War (BE 1901; Gates 1973). Eventually civilian educators, most of whom had normal training or undergraduate degrees, replaced the soldiers (BE 1902, 206-216, 219-223; BE 1905, 750-753; Freer 1906; Lardizabal 1991; Racelis and Ick 2001; United States Embassy 2001). One of these teachers, William Rosenkrans of New York came to Balaoan, La Union, and established regular day classes and an evening class to train teachers how to instruct beginners (BE 1902, 214; BE 1905, 869-872). Osias enrolled in both and, after a few weeks, was asked by Rosenkrans to teach a beginner’s class. Within a short period of time, Osias went from learning English by listening to soldiers in their conversations and games to teaching English to other students. The change from elitist Spanish-style instruction to mass-oriented American schools was a shift not only to a new system of education, but also in the approach to neo-colonial culture and participation. Within the American regime,

Osias would find new ways to navigate through the educational system that promoted individual advancement and the general development of the Philippines.

Whereas education under the Spanish administration was reserved for the exclusive few, the United States introduced its common school model in the archipelago and created a more extensive system of schooling that was made available to more children. From 1902 to 1910, the number of schools climbed from an estimated 2,000 to 4,581 and the average daily attendance rose from roughly 150,000 to over 450,000 pupils (BE 1910, 306). The American general superintendent of schools in the Philippines proudly declared at the first division superintendents' convention in 1903 that

[s]hould the work of education in these islands prove successful, there will be no brighter page in American history than that which tells the tale of the enlightenment and uplifting of a downtrodden people[,] than that which recounts the fact that an humble people was taken from the customs of three hundred years, placed upon the highways of progress, and prepared to take its place upon a plane of equality with the other peoples of the earth. (BE 1903, 563)

Such benevolence purposely deployed dichotomous representations of two strangers on the Philippine shores: the Americans as modernizing and enlightening saviors and the Spaniards as old-fashioned and oppressive theocrats. Whereas Spanish colonialism was tied to the cross and the sword as allegories of the religious and military establishments, the Americans utilized the book as the hegemonic symbol of education to acquire people's acquiescence. In this crafted portrayal, the United States opened the gates of education, ushering in literacy, democracy and "civilization" to Filipinos.

American education undoubtedly opened new opportunities to Camilo Osias. When Rosenkrans moved to La Union's capital of San Fernando to set up the provincial high school, he asked Osias to continue his studies there. Perhaps recognizing his

passion for learning and teaching, Osias' parents allowed him to go. In the American-run high school, as recalled by Osias:

[t]he classes were not very well organized, but we had different subjects like Grammar, Arithmetic, Geography, Civics and History, Music. I liked Grammar which was in some ways like my gramatica in Spanish. I shone in parsing, in the different parts of speech, in conjugation, and in diagramming. (Osias 1971, 70)

The newly established high school of La Union suffered from initial disorganization and minimal resources (BE 1903, 365, 468; BE 1904, 618, 633; BE 1905, 871). Compared to its Spanish counterparts, however, the American school offered new and more courses. While Osias excelled in grammar and language due to his strong foundation in Spanish, he also began to identify with his American teachers and their dispositions.

My teachers were all good. I liked to see them come to school everyday in clothes clean and well pressed and shoes well-polished. I admired them and my ambition was to be a high school teacher. (Osias 1971, 70)

After meeting the principal and the division superintendent and realizing that they were in charge of teachers and schools, he decided to forego his initial ambition of becoming a teacher and, instead, chose to become an administrator. According to an American professor analyzing the Philippines at the time, education played a crucial role in Filipino participation in the U.S. colonial regime since it was the key to their preparation to pass the civil service examination which opened doors to government service (Willis 1905). Performing well in the American high school and setting his career goal to educational service were Osias' strategic moves not only to be competitive in the job market, but also to be in a position of authority that could push for changes in the system. In order to accomplish his goals, Osias realized that he had to learn from and master the American curriculum and pedagogy.

In 1905 Osias took and passed a rigorous test that assessed his knowledge of English grammar, geography, U.S. history, arithmetic, and physiology, and became one of the select few who was sent to study in the United States (BE 1904, 680-683; BE 1905, 791-794). Through the *pensionado* program established by the governing Philippine Commission, cohorts of first-rate Filipino students became government-sponsored scholars that pursued higher education abroad (Osias 1925; Carpio 1934; Olivar 1950). While the program's initial goal was to train Filipino teachers infused with a comprehensive knowledge of American life, education and government that could be transplanted to their native country, it expanded the scope to include the fields of agriculture, engineering, business and medicine (BE 1901, 7; BE 1905, 797). Demographically, the *pensionados* were mostly men and from well-to-do families with political connections to the colonial government as well as financial resources to enroll their children in superior schools. Although the first cohort of 1903 had the largest contingency of 102 *pensionados*, by 1910 the Philippines had sent a total of 207 students to the United States, eight of whom were women (BE 1910, 297). When Osias expressed interest in the area of pedagogy, the superintendent of Filipino students in America, William Sutherland, enrolled him in Western Illinois State Normal School along with five other Filipinos. Osias received his normal diploma at Western Illinois in 1908 and took summer courses at the University of Chicago. He then completed a bachelor's degree in Education and a certificate in School Administration and Supervision at Teachers College of Columbia University in 1910. Years later, both institutions accorded him their highest honors. The March 3, 1965 issue of *Western Courier* showcased Osias as the recipient of Western Illinois' first Distinguished Alumnus Award, and during

Columbia University's 175<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration in 1929 Osias received the University Medal for Public Service (Miller 1929).<sup>30</sup> These awards testified to the impact that Osias had on American people and institutions.

Osias' five years in the United States were extremely productive and enriching. He spent many hours in the libraries and often slept only three to four hours each night. One of his professors remarked that he "worked so hard as to memorize the lessons on Shakespeare and the commentaries" (quoted in Osias 1971, 80). At Western Illinois, Osias was highly involved in extra-curricular activities. He regularly attended Protestant church services and was chairman of the campus YMCA, a significant change of religious affinity rooted in his criticism of Spanish Catholicism and his interest in American Protestantism that started in the Philippines (Osias and Lorenzana 1931; Osias 1965). Various issues of the normal school's weekly newspaper *Western Courier* highlighted Osias as an active member of the Platonian literary society who competed in debates and oratorical contests. In the 1908 yearbook *Sequel*, he was dubbed "The Patrick Henry of the Philippines" who "talks like thunder and sings like a nightingale." In addition, his versatility ranged from performing in a German comedy and singing with a Filipino musical quartet to being the tennis doubles champion and the substitute quarterback in football. Like many *pensionados* who saw themselves as their country's representatives and whose education, demeanors and small number did not pose a threat to the majority, he and the other Filipino students were noted for their "good manners and faithful attention to their work" and were welcomed by their American peers (Black 1905,

---

<sup>30</sup> For more information on the history of Western Illinois University and Teachers College at Columbia University, see Hallwas (1999) and Cremin, Shannon, and Townsend (1954).



24). In Illinois, he heard Booker T. Washington give a talk which inspired and guided his eventual policies and programs in industrial and rural education in the Philippines (Osias 1921). At Teachers College in Columbia University, he took courses from leading progressive scholars, such as John Dewey, Paul Monroe, Edward Thorndike, David Snedden, and George Strayer (his adviser), whom he credited as “excellent teachers and professors” that “left an indelible imprint of their ideas and principles upon my life and character” and “helped cultivate my passion for my faith in and my devotion to education” (Osias 1971, 110; 1914; 1940; 1954).

Prior to his graduation in New York and in preparation for civil service in the Philippines, Osias took the superintendency exam which had been only reserved for Americans and became the first Filipino to pass it. His decision to take the administrative test punctuated his shift in attitude toward American culture in general and education in particular. Even though he desired to learn from and utilized his American education in the Philippines and in the United States, he began to disengage from this dominant structure during his stay in the U.S. He demonstrated his increasing dissatisfaction with the colonial order that continued to subjugate him and the people of his country through his delivery of the highly patriotic speech “The Aspiration of the Filipinos” which called for his country’s independence and through his rejection of the teacher civil service exam that was relegated by Americans to Filipinos. Both actions emphasized his awareness of the unequal power dynamics in Filipino/American imperial encounters and his ability to assert choices that resisted further cooptation. His identification with U.S. ideals and lifestyle juxtaposed with his counter-identification with the oppressed conditions in the

Philippines produced a disidentifying nationalism that worked within and against the American system to bring about progressive change for his country.

As a hybrid approach to deconstructing the majority's language, power and operations, disidentifying nationalism serves as a bridge between western and indigenous affinities. It invokes a third space that avoids the pitfalls of the either/or strategy and deploys the *potential* usefulness of the both/and as a revolutionary tool to bring together seemingly contradictory elements in moments of tension and ambivalence. According to performance studies scholar José Esteban Muñoz:

disidentification scrambles and reconstructs the encoded message of a cultural text in a fashion that both exposes the encoded message's universalizing and exclusionary machinations and recircuits its workings to account for, include, and empower minority identities. (Muñoz 1999, 31)

Operating as a three-part mechanism undergirded by the notion that culture can be read and interpreted like a text, disidentification first names and specifies the symbols and codes of cultural materials. These materials, like policy documents, school textbooks, photographs, or people's outfits and behaviors, are resources and representations that offer insights regarding an individual, institution or community within particular socio-historical contexts. It then unpacks the meanings of these cultural symbols to reveal the ways in which they privilege majority values and marginalize minority perspectives. Finally, it reconfigures and recycles these codes in order to represent "a disempowered politics or positionality that has been rendered unthinkable by the dominant culture" (Muñoz 1999, 31).

In potentially revolutionary moments, disidentifying nationalism provides a way for minority subjects to assert their agency. What has been unthinkable to the people in

power becomes a source of hope and justice to the oppressed. Within anti-colonial movements, disidentifying nationalism valorizes the values and influences of neither the metropole nor the periphery. It appropriates from both, in different degrees, at various times, and for multiple strategic purposes. Osias displayed his commitment to the struggle for Filipino self-determination within the imperial encounters of pedagogical engagements in his colonized country and in the United States. These encounters in classrooms, extra-curricular activities, and even civil service exam, had tremendous revolutionary significance since they provided the arenas for Osias to enact his nationalist resistance and set the foundation for his career in education and politics.

### **From Potentiality to Actuality**

Navigating the complex and often problematic in-between spaces within imperial encounters is akin to moving between a rock and a hard place. The return of the *pensionados* to the Philippines was greeted by a mixture of awe, admiration, intrigue and envy. Even though they were recruited and placed in white-collar employment and accorded a special status, they also faced socio-cultural and professional challenges. Osias became “somewhat of a curiosity” in his hometown (Osias 1971, 123). People referred to him as an “American boy” partly due to his wearing a long woolen suit in such a tropical and agricultural place. According to a daughter of another *pensionado*, the American-educated scholars also faced “race prejudice” from white Americans (Olivar 1950, 83). For instance, within a few weeks of teaching in San Fernando, Osias was disliked by some of his American colleagues since the American principal set him as an example to be followed by the entire staff. Regardless how hard he worked, however,

he was not compensated at the same rate as American teachers. With a bachelor's degree and an administration certificate from Columbia University and a civil service qualification for superintendency, he received a salary of 1,080 pesos a year. By contrast, an American teacher with only a normal education or a bachelor's degree was paid 4,000 pesos a year. Osias, like many *pensionados*, occupied a precarious position and had to prove to both Filipinos and Americans that he was still a Filipino and as good as any American in order to earn their trust and confidence.

Despite his initial setbacks, Osias immediately rose in the educational ranks and gained prominence among American and Filipino officials. Within the first three years, he became a supervisor of teachers in San Fernando, San Juan, and Bacnotan, and then an academic supervisor in the country's capital of Manila with the largest city school system. In 1915, at the age of twenty-six, he accomplished another breakthrough by becoming the first Filipino division superintendent of schools in the Philippines. After two years as a superintendent of Bataan, Mindoro, and Tayabas, he was promoted to an assistant directorship in the Bureau of Education, thereby becoming the highest ranking Filipino in the department. His meteoric rise testified to his superb competence as a teacher and administrator and his exceptional ability to work through the tensions of the U.S. colonial project. These tensions included the tremendous growth in the number of public schools and attending students, the high demand for trained education personnel, and the persistent agitation for the country's independence and the Filipinization of the public sector. American trained yet still a Filipino nationalist, Osias worked within and against the dominant structures of colonial education, which bolstered his personal and

professional standing as well as the advancement of Filipino careers, politics and sovereignty.

The philosophy of “dynamic Filipinism” formed the foundation of Osias’ educational and political praxis. This “intelligent and constructive patriotism” sought “to preserve and develop what is best in Philippine culture, civilization, and philosophy, and to graft on them the best that is foreign if this grafting can be accomplished advantageously” (Osias 1940, 52-53). In his 1921 inaugural speech as the first president of the National University, he elaborated on the compatibility of nationalism and internationalism. According to Osias, if the aim of education was “to secure for humanity as a whole and for every human being the highest and fullest measure of freedom, happiness, and efficiency,” then Filipino education must serve as “an agency of harmonizing the cultures and civilizations of the East and of the West.” He called for “a Filipinism that is compatible with world progress” as “a foundation upon which the superstructure of a new humanity shall rest.” He abhorred the “traditional policy of ‘splendid isolation’” since people and cultures, he contended, were “interrelated and interpenetrating.” He encouraged a “sane Filipinization” that was by “no means an anti-foreign movement,” but one embedded in “civic responsibility” and “world consciousness” (Osias 1926, 1-20).

Osias’ dynamic Filipinism manifested in the transformation of educational curriculum, pedagogy and administration. As a curriculum pioneer, he wrote the *Philippine Readers* series for grades one to seven that contained Filipino and western stories, folklores, biographies, and historical events (Osias, et. al., 1927; 1932a; 1932b; 1932c; 1932d; 1959; 1932e). Although the first edition was published in the early 1920s,

subsequent editions became affectionately known as “Osias Readers” to honor the first Filipino author of Philippine school textbooks. As an innovative pedagogue, he showcased model classrooms and recitations, conducted training institutes for veteran teachers, created a manual on *Methods and Practical Suggestions* for novice ones, and pioneered a new course on “Good Manners and Right Conduct” (Osias 1914; BE 1913). As a community leader, he wrote *Barrio Life and Barrio Education* to address persistent literacy and vocational problems in the rural areas (Osias 1921).

In addition, he fostered the spirit of alliances without compromising his desired goals. He wrote a manual for administrators that instructed them how to supervise teachers in order to provide culturally relevant curriculum and how to work with municipal officials in order to acquire school sites and construct buildings (Osias 1918). He also established schools for the indigenous groups of Negritos in Bataan and Mangyans in Mindoro. When he was in charge of the “non-Christian” provinces, he pursued a “policy of amalgamation” that intended to unite and cultivate understanding among Christians, Muslims, and other local spiritual communities (Osias 1971, 151). Grounded in the notion of unified pluralism, Osias’ disidentifying nationalism emerged in his educational praxis which connected various communities together and celebrated the rich diversity of the Philippine nation.

When Osias became the first Filipino division superintendent of schools, he worked to Filipinize the entire educational staff. In charge of the first all-Filipino division, he knew that he had to make this experiment a “real success” since Filipino hopes and American ambivalence centered on this “Bataan Republic” (Osias 1971, 131). To demonstrate that a mixed staff could also work harmoniously under a Filipino

superintendent, he opted for a combination of Filipino and American teachers and administrators in his Tayabas assignment (Osias 1917b). However, not everyone agreed with the Filipinization policy. During an all-superintendents meeting, an American colonial official remarked, “Our [American] ways are superior and these people have to take them whether they like it or not” (quoted in Osias 1971, 138). Enraged by such arrogance and aware of his position as the sole Filipino representative in the room, Osias responded with “Americans are here to serve our people, and whosoever cannot sympathize with the customs and mores of the Filipinos has no right to be an educational official in these beautiful isles of the Pacific” (138). His educational leadership initiated and bolstered the Filipinization of educational administration and personnel since his promotion to higher positions led to the selection of mostly Filipino successors.

Osias’ promotions opened various opportunities for his career development and nationalist desires. During a trip to the United States where he observed the latest educational practices, he joined the first Philippine Independence Mission to the U.S. Congress. For Osias’ eloquent testimony to the joint Senate and House committee that oversaw American territories, Senator Warren Harding commented, “If you have half a dozen men like your Osias, you are entitled to your independence” (quoted in Osias 1971, 149). At that moment, the mere “*maestrillo*, an insignificant little teacher” became the “*Pambato de la Mision*, the pitcher or ace spokesman” (149). As prophesized by a Western Illinois classmate in the 1908 *Sequel* yearbook, his speech in the U.S. Congress would become his first of many. Elected senator to the Philippine legislature in 1925, Osias was then chosen by his colleagues to be a Resident Commissioner to the United States in 1929. With a non-voting seat in the U.S. House of Representatives, he fought

for six years for his country's freedom. From April 1932 to January 1933, he lobbied American legislators and gave compelling speeches to, first, pass the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Bill, known as the Philippine Independence Bill, and then successfully override President Herbert Hoover's executive veto (Osias and Baradi 1933). This bill preceded the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934 that eventually established a commonwealth period as a transition from colonial rule to complete political sovereignty. After the Second World War, the aspiration of Camilo Osias and other Filipinos became a reality: their beloved country became independent on July 4, 1946. Although Osias continued an illustrious career in politics that spanned until the late 1960s to serve the Filipino people in the domestic and international spheres as a senator, ambassador and diplomat, one major political gem eluded him: the presidency of the Republic of the Philippines (Bananal 1974). However, as a leader in the Filipinization movement, as the father of the Philippine modern educational system, and as one of the country's greatest statesmen, Osias left an indelible mark that could be surpassed by only a few in the history of the Philippines.

### **Lessons from a Filipino Nationalist**

The legacy of Camilo Osias lives not only through the sovereignty of the Philippines and the transformation of Filipino education in the early twentieth century, but also through his embodied pedagogy of revolution. Raised in the tumultuous era of wars and uprisings and shaped by imperialist education in his home country and the United States, Osias constructed and performed an oppositional hybrid identity that derived from his multiple experiences and backgrounds. His disidentifying nationalism



was neither complete conformity to American colonial agenda nor an invocation of separatist and essentialist nativism. It reconfigured instead the contacts with and influences of peasants, clergymen, teachers, and political leaders. His formal and informal training came from various pedagogical settings, such as Philippine and American classrooms, guerrilla actions, oratorical contests, civil service exams, publication of books and other manuscripts, and the halls of the United States Congress.

Through his schooling and career in education and politics, Camilo Osias constructed and performed a disidentifying nationalism that drew from both Filipino and American cultures, that did not support narrow and chauvinistic attitudes, and that refashioned dominant ideas and structures in order to produce what Edward Said has called “a new humanity” that uplifts all, especially the oppressed and colonized. Working in conjunction with political, socio-cultural, and subaltern strategies of resistance, the significance of disidentifying nationalism is the development and proliferation of in-between spaces and hybrid identities that infiltrate, modify and subvert mainstream discourses and structures by employing their representational and material systems against themselves. Strategically troubling and bringing into play the tensions of the colonial project, these spaces and identities focus on the dominant codes, dismantle their conventional meanings, and extend their use in order to empower the colonized and advocate for marginalized politics. They insist on “the right to see the community’s history whole” in order to “[r]estore the imprisoned nation to itself” and to reconceptualize resistance not solely as a reaction to imperialism but as a more integrative view of human history (Said 1993, 215-216).

By appropriating from and working through the tensions of dominant and subordinated cultures, the colonized can *move beyond* the dichotomy of identifying with the west and counter-identifying with the native. The oppositional power of disidentifying nationalism generates a critical awareness and praxis that marshal yet undermine the dominant culture. It also seeks to create a viable and empowering alternative that honors indigenous traditions and attends to local needs and concerns. In the context of imperial encounters and other situations with unequal power relations, revolutionary individuals and groups modify lessons learned “from the top” and adapt to the changing conditions in order to advocate for and with those “at the bottom.” Honing on the fluidity and contingency of power dynamics and identity formations, disidentifying nationalism ultimately demonstrates the revisioning of transnational history, identity and agency as well as the emergence of new revolutionary and pedagogical practices.

This chapter’s final section offers two lessons on linkages in the case study of Camilo Osias. The first lesson addresses the linkages in the themes of postcolonial and ethnic studies – interconnection, identity, and agency. The other one highlights the linkages in the socio-cultural discourses of gender, race, and nationalism. Implicit in my biographical narration and analysis of Osias’ schooling and educational career is my interest to shed light on larger themes and discourses.

Although chapters two, three and four make no obvious linkages among the themes of interconnection, identity, and agency, this section provides a more overt explanation of how the three intertwine through the experiences of educators in general and Camilo Osias in particular. The interconnection of American and Philippine histories

could be gleaned not only from the trans-Pacific crossings of U.S. educators to the colony but also from the counter-crossings of Filipino students to the metropole. The presence and contributions of Americans in the Philippines and of Filipinos in the United States demonstrate how colonial and metropolitan histories are implicated with one another. Osias' multiple trips between the two countries as a student, educator, and politician also highlight interconnection through his transnational travels and participation in metropolitan affairs, such as when Osias served as a delegate in the U.S. House of Representatives and advocated for Philippine independence. While the theme of interconnection focuses on history, the theme of identity pays attention to historical actors. Terms like colonizer, colonized, educator, and students are not generic categories that are devoid of gender, race, and nation. Chapters two and three emphasize both the gendered and racialized dynamics in imperialism and education as well as the gendered and racialized identities of the people involved. The next paragraph deals with Osias' constitutive identities and how his identities facilitated his navigation of imperial encounters. Lastly, agency as a technique to assert oneself and make changes can be seen throughout the chapters as well. I am interested in presenting a history of imperialism and education which does not solely focus on a binary of American dominance and Filipino subjugation. I aim to portray a more complicated view of history which reveals contradictions and heterogeneities. In their colonial mission, American educators were imbued with white supremacist values and a benign desire to assist and make a difference. Conversely, as recipients of American benevolence, Filipinos benefited from mass public education and increased literacy yet continued as subjects of colonial rule. For the most part, the Filipino elites benefited from U.S. imperialism since the American regime

mapped on the previous Spanish structure of socio-economic hierarchy and the American architecture of colonial education was a funnel which introduced primary schooling to the general mass yet narrowed the field to a select few at the secondary and tertiary levels. Although the Philippines eventually attained sovereignty and democracy, power was still retained by the elites. The small number of poor and working-class Filipinos who attained higher education and rose in political circles, like Osias, had to learn how to navigate within somewhat similar structures of power, albeit under the varying faces of Spanish, American and Filipino control. The hybrid agency of disidentification which straddles the dominant and subjugated spheres and subverts the codes and language of the powerful gives hope and possibilities for the oppressed to mobilize strategically what is available to them.

The second linkage that I want to tentatively explore in this section is the combination of gender, race, and nationalism in the life and career of Camilo Osias. Osias' subject positions as a male Filipino nationalist can be interrogated to unpack and comprehend how certain subjectivities position individuals in multiple and heterogeneous ways. In Osias' nationalist aspirations to be educated, albeit within the conflicting influences of American imperialism and Filipino revolution, his gendered and racial identities placed in him in various positions. Whereas his privileged gender enabled his recruitment and promotion as a student, teacher, and administrator in a male-dominated structure, his subjugated race constructed him as inferior and deficient in the context of white supremacy and colonialism. However, while conventional thinking may configure his conflicting gendered and racialized subjectivities as balancing or negating each other, Osias' life history demonstrates that his subjectivities actually worked together to situate

him strategically. Since the U.S. colonial system of education in the archipelago needed local and mostly male emissaries to undertake most of the teaching and supervising responsibilities, especially at the primary school level, his subject positions as a Filipino man facilitated his moves to occupy productive spaces within imperial encounters.

Although this chapter primarily focuses on Camilo Osias as a case study to explore the construction and performance of hybridity in the context of colonial schooling and nationalist revolution, this last section attempts to map the linkages among the axiomatic themes in postcolonial and ethnic studies (interconnection, identity, and agency) and among the major discourses (gender, race, and nationalism) which inscribed his schooling and career. The subsequent and final chapter of my dissertation takes up the mapping of these linkages further and elaborates on them through a narration and analysis of my experiences as a diasporic scholar-researcher who was raised and educated in the United States and then returned to the Philippines, my country of ancestry and birth, after seventeen years of absence. In many ways, I learned tremendously from and found connections with Camilo Osias whose life history, in some ways, paralleled mine.

## CHAPTER 5:

### RESEARCH, SUBJECTIVITY, AND DESIRE

In *Archaeology of Knowledge*, Michel Foucault maintains that discourses are “not as one might expect a mere intersection of things and words ... between a reality and a language, the intrication of a lexicon and an experience.” By unpacking the discourses of a particular historical moment, he also provides strategies for the “loosening of the embrace” of the “ordering of objects” in order to decipher and disorient the matrices of intelligibility. Because discourses consist of signs, he points out that “what [discourses] do is more than use these signs to designate things. It is this *more* that renders them irreducible to the language (*langue*) and to speech. It is this ‘more’ that we must reveal and describe” (Foucault 1972, 48-49). Although Foucault contends that enunciations, representations, and performances are contained within discursive matrices which regulate speech, thoughts, bodies, and actions, he also offers ways to disrupt and dispute these matrices. He exposes, more specifically, the fissures and contradictions in discourses which can potentially challenge the power and knowledge of what has been considered traditional, conventional or normal. He shows researchers how to illuminate the ways in which discourses organize the order of things and how subversion can take place within them.

Foucault's archaeological method helps me as a researcher to locate my dissertation on the United States empire and Filipino education within discourses which enable my work to emerge and, conversely, which my work seeks to interrupt. My study contests dominant American narratives which celebrate and defend U.S. involvements abroad in the name of democracy, civilization and benevolence. Mobilizing insights from postcolonial and ethnic studies, my dissertation provides a "darker" perspective on American world politics. In the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 "Attack on America," tensions have heightened between those who want to safeguard the United States from anti-American attacks in the forms of armed and intellectual terrorism and those who emphasize the history and legacy of U.S. imperialism within and beyond its geopolitical borders. Although my study can be considered as part of the latter camp, it is by no means a mere anti-American diatribe. It aims for a complex and multi-layered examination of America's past in order to understand the conditions of the present and imagine different futures nationally and internationally. The accusation of being anti-American functions to create the dichotomous binary of pro- and anti-American, as if one cannot be a citizen of this nation without being critical of it. It also serves to conceal the complicity of American people to local and global violence, and fails to address our responsibility to work with and advocate for colonized and other subordinated peoples. Lastly, it diverts attention away from engaging with the contradictions of history as ideological narrations of the past which help us think about and act upon contemporary dilemmas.

As the last chapter of this dissertation, my conclusion has two parts. The first part is a summary of the research, its implications, and directions for subsequent studies. The

second part is a reflexive analysis of my subjectivities as an insider and outsider researcher while undertaking the research. The chapter ends by attending to the role of desire in research, particularly in relation to onto-epistemology and methodology.

### **Summary and Implications**

The central research problems of my dissertation are: How were Filipinos inscribed by, and how did they navigate within and against, the discourses of American colonial schooling in the Philippines and the United States? Under what conditions did the inscription and maneuvering of Filipinos as subjects of colonial discourse take place? Grounded in Foucault's archaeological method and located within the fields of postcolonial and ethnic studies, my dissertation responds to these questions by situating the history of United States imperialism and Filipino education within the themes of interconnection, identity and agency.

The theme of interconnection links the histories of the United States and the Philippines by highlighting the transnational and reciprocal flows of American and Filipino peoples, materials and cultures. My project contends that, as much as Americans impacted the socio-cultural, political, economic and educational systems of the Philippines, Filipinos also played a role in shaping the American imagination, representations and structures. In the early twentieth century, Filipinos were subjected to and were subjects of discourses as America's Other. In the colony and the metropolis, American government reports, newspapers, conversations, letters, photographs, and exhibits portrayed Filipinos as uncivilized savages. It was the dominant image which gave reason to the paternalistic mission of the United States to conquer and educate the



Filipinos. Filipinos contested such depictions, in part, by working in the development of the public school system. They navigated within the colonial structures by serving as teachers, administrators, and board members, by donating money and labor, and by sending their children to American-run schools. Some even traveled to the United States in pursuit of higher education and other opportunities. As subjects of the American empire, Filipinos complicated who and what was American. The theme of interconnection shows the overlaps in the histories of both countries, thereby making it difficult to think about American history without considering its imperialist past and legacy with the Filipinos.

The theme of identity highlights cultural markers, such as gender and race, which circulate in trans-Pacific discourses. By undertaking an archaeological reading of the discursive terrains, my research reveals how gender played an important role in the educational policy of persuasion. The discourse of gender elaborated on patriarchal attitudes which ensured male dominance in colonial administration and tutelage. An examination of the Bureau of Education's annual reports, the statements of American officials, and the statistics for American and Filipino educators and students shows the privileging of men as the main architects and beneficiaries of the public school system in the Philippines. My study also points out how race was another critical factor in the operations of the United States empire. The discourse of race substantiated the expansion of white supremacy in America's westward movement. An analysis of the backgrounds and perspectives of American politicians and administrators as well as the curricula for Filipino teacher training brings to light the use of African American education in general and industrial training in particular as a template to deal with subordinated races. The

theme of identity therefore explicates the discourses of gender and race, the operations of patriarchy, and the linkages of African American and Filipino histories.

Lastly, the theme of agency emphasizes how Filipinos were not just passive victims nor opportunistic accomplices of colonial conditions. Filipinos came to understand their situation within the pedagogical context of colonial tutelage and revolutionary movements. Within that setting, they navigated the binary between imperialist and local influences in their construction and performance of a hybrid form of nationalism. They did not completely identify with the west nor did they counter-identify with the native; instead they enacted a disidentifying nationalism which appropriated and resignified the hegemonic codes in order to advocate for marginalized politics. My project highlights a Filipino product of American training in the Philippines and the U.S. who fought for the Filipinization of the educational system and for the independence of his home country. As opposed to only narrating the ways in which Filipino schooling was developed under United States rule, my dissertation also offers converging perspectives which addressed how Filipinos reacted to, adapted, and challenged the colonial system.

In summary, the three themes of interconnection, identity and agency offer a very useful framework in response to my dissertation's central questions on the discourses of American imperialism and Filipino education. My research unveils and explicates the discourses of gender, race and nation as salient factors in colonial schooling in the archipelago and the metropolis. It also highlights the educational arenas of policy, teacher training, and pedagogy as sites for discursive inscription, elaboration and navigation. And finally, it unpacks the multiple and complicated positions of Filipinos as

beneficiaries, victims and challengers of colonial conditions. Moreover, my dissertation underscores the interplay of theory and data. It works with the themes that derive from the scholarly literature of postcolonial and ethnic studies (interconnection, identity, and agency) as well as the discourses (gender, race, and nation) and sites (policy, teacher training, and pedagogy) of imperialism and education that emerge from archival analysis. Ultimately, even though my project takes a historical approach and focuses on the past, its implications have contemporary resonance.

The implications of my dissertation in relation to contemporary discussions on politics, history and education are three-fold. First, it disorients the normative view that America's involvement abroad was/is innocent and benevolent by paying attention to the history and legacy of the United States as an imperial power. Second, it envisions a different perspective of the past by linking American and Philippine histories and by emphasizing issues of gender, race and nation in imperialism. And third, it points to education as a contradictory apparatus for assistance, oppression, control, and empowerment.

### **Continuations**

Undertaking archival research and writing this dissertation are initial steps to understanding more about the discourses and operations of imperialism and education. My findings have generated questions that I am interested in pursuing as subsequent studies. I will outline in this section the additional issues that are contained within my chapters and those that will expand the scope of my study.

The overall themes of the dissertation focus on interconnection, identity and agency. I wonder what other themes can generate different insights into the discourses of imperialism and education. The framing of the study is also based on postcolonial and ethnic studies, as articulated in the first chapter. I am interested in knowing how the explicit use of other frameworks, such as feminist and queer studies, complicates and extends my current analyses. For instance, the second chapter indicates that the dominant structures and interactions in colonial education were male. How might a feminist lens interpret the American pioneering spirit of westward movement as masculine as well as the gender differences of the mostly male teachers in the Philippines and the increasingly female staff in American schools in the early twentieth century? And, how might a queer perspective help view same-sex dynamics differently and move queer theory beyond the realms of (homo)sexualities and into the operations of imperialism? In addition, although my third chapter links Black and Filipino histories, I only suggest the relevance of Native American education in colonial training. I would like to see a multi-racial comparative and transnational study that triangulates Filipino, African American, and Native American lives and experiences. Additional research is needed to find out about Black educators in the Philippines, about American teachers in the islands who returned to the United States and worked in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the impact of Native American education on the colonial schooling of Filipinos. More broadly, what are the connections among race, American national and global imperialism, and the discourses and practices of progressive education? Finally, while chapter four shows how Camilo Osias constructed and performed disidentifying nationalism, my rendition slips into the genre of hagiography. I wonder how his gender, social class, and sexuality enabled him

to navigate within colonial schooling as a student and educator. How unique were Osias' experiences? What happened to other Filipino government-sponsored scholars who studied in the United States and returned to the Philippines?

Aside from the issues explored in this dissertation, there are additional topics that are important to investigate. The other questions that I have in mind are: What basal readers were used in the Philippines to introduce English language literacy, and what were the differences between these readers and the ones used in the United States during this time period? How did athletics, physical education as well as the focus on hygiene and sanitation regulate the colonized as a disciplinary mechanism to produce more civilized bodies? How did the colonial system construct a "native Other" in the form of indigenous and Muslim Filipinos who received a different type of instruction in comparison to Christian Filipinos? Related to that is, what role did spirituality and/or organized religion play in imperialism in general and colonial schooling in particular? Finally, how was American education in the Philippines perceived and evaluated by Americans and Filipinos? Needless to say, these questions will require additional research both in the United States and the Philippines. They will also bring up issues of subjectivity and desire in researchers, issues that I had to deal with during my research trip in the Philippines last year.

Scholars and practitioners of qualitative studies have become increasingly interested in interrogating their own subjectivity, particularly how their identities, beliefs, backgrounds and experiences shape their research perspectives and practices (Denzin and Lincoln 2000). They have challenged traditional notions of objectivity which claim that one's personal interests and desires would negatively impact or contaminate research by

marshalling innovative mechanisms of validity (Lather 2001; 1993; 1986; Scheurich 1997) and by reconceptualizing objectivity from critical and deconstructive frameworks (Harding 1998; 1991; Melville 1994). Some have embraced various forms of reflexivity and self-analysis in order to describe and examine the politics, performance and representation of research (Pillow 2003; Richardson 1997; Behar 1993; 1996). And many have declared openly ideological positions in order to foreground and complicate particular issues and concerns (Lather 1991; 1997; Stanfield and Dennis 1993; St. Pierre and Pillow 2000). Therefore, instead of dismissing it, qualitative researchers employ subjectivity as a powerful standpoint to inform and guide issues related to research epistemology, methodology, and ethics (Dillard 2003; 2000; Dillard, Abdur-Rashid and Tyson 2000).

The next section outlines two dominant theories of subjectivity, compartmentalized and intersectional, and suggests that a third approach, constitutive subjectivity, is a more useful way to analyze the heterogeneous, hybrid, and multiple identities and positions that researchers have. Whereas compartmentalized subjectivity focuses on a single categorical identity or position (e.g. “Filipino,” “male,” or “queer”), intersectional subjectivity addresses the ways in which these identities and positions are linked or related. An important intervention to the single-identity approach, the application of the intersectional perspective, however, has two limitations: (a) it conceptualizes identities and positions as separate spheres that only cross at certain points or intersections; and (b) it still privileges a particular identity over others. Conversely, constitutive subjectivity frames identities and positions as *always already refracted within and through* each other. In other words, one cannot talk about race without taking

into account how that specific race is contextualized and understood within and through other prisms, such as gender, sexuality, class, and nation. To further elaborate on these ideas, in this chapter I reflect on my experiences when I undertook archival research in the Philippines from August 2002 to March 2003. I address how subjectivity plays an intricate role in the challenges and joys of navigating through the tensions of being an insider and outsider within one's own ethnic/national community. Finally, I grapple with the operations of desire in constructing one's subjectivity and sense of belonging while pursuing research in a place that I call home.

### **Insider and Outsider Subjectivities**

When I mentioned to professors and colleagues that I was traveling to the Philippines for my dissertation research, there seemed to be a general consensus that my project made a lot of sense. Since I am Filipino, my trip was perceived as a type of “going home” or “going back to my roots” in which home signifies where I came from and my roots trace my ancestral genealogy. Based on what they had seen on the news, heard from friends, or imagined as tropical or part of the “Third World,” many non-Filipinos inquired about ethnic culture and food delicacies, money exchange rates and travel destinations as well as the political revolutions and economic instability in the Philippines. While many asked out of sincere interest, I often felt that I was positioned as a native informant, a guide and representative of the Philippines. In spite of my declaration that my family and I immigrated to the United States when I was thirteen years old, that I had never gone back to my country of birth since, and that most of my knowledge of the country was based on my readings and memories, I was asked

questions as if I had been living there my entire life. In addition, although I did not encounter any opposition about traveling to the archipelago, a few confided their concerns. A Filipina community member told me to pay attention to the different aspects of local life, the customs and traditions as well as the proper demeanor, appearance and language, since I had been gone for so long. My mother even advised me to keep my mouth closed in public spaces and to grow out my hair since my American-accented Tagalog and my shaved head were easy markers that I came from abroad and may be kidnapped like some of the international tourists. As a result, prior to my departure from the United States, I was confronted with a predicament: while some considered me a “Filipino” and “local,” others perceived me as an “American” and “foreign,” a condition which called into question my researcher subjectivity as an insider or an outsider in the Philippines (Narayan 1997; Headland, Pike and Harris 1990).

### Compartmentalized Subjectivity

The theory of compartmentalized subjectivity subscribes to the separation of a researcher’s status as an insider or an outsider, and relies on essentialist and overdetermined suppositions. The categories of insider and outsider are essentialists since they invoke certain biologically or culturally based characteristics which bound one as part of a group (or not) as well as overdetermined since they serve as a classificatory schema to justify hierarchies, privileges and separatism. Within this understanding, my Filipino-ness is connected to my birth, skin color, ethnic identification, and even research interest, while my American-ness is tied to my citizenship, U.S. English inflection, behavior, and style. Fortunately many researchers have come to realize the productive



possibilities and values of occupying an insider or outsider position in any project (Manalansan 2000; Twine and Warren 2000). Being an insider allows them to share similar experiences with their participants, to have a sympathetic understanding of the communities they are working with, to sidestep cultural and linguistic barriers, and to gain entry into spaces often inaccessible to others. Being an outsider also has its own usefulness, such as providing a different perspective on cultural and community norms, asking questions that require more detailed explanations, and developing other forms of interactions and spaces often relegated to non-members. Although researchers have recognized the relevance of both positions, the question still remains: Who is an insider, and who is an outsider?

What makes the concept of compartmentalized subjectivity appealing is simultaneously its weakness: it only addresses a single identity or position. Within this notion, the lines are drawn, the researchers' place is clearly marked, and their subjectivity is defined by what it is not. Although the compartmentalized approach focuses the analysis on a particular aspect, it is limited because it constructs hierarchies, privileges and separatism. When researchers engage with only one aspect of their subjectivity, they examine the different identities and positions that they have, explicitly or implicitly prioritize what they deem to be important to foreground, and build a hierarchy and valuation of difference. In this approach, difference is both minimized and ranked in order to emphasize a single item. The ordering of difference produces what is privileged to highlight and what is separated that consequently effaces complexity and contradictions. For example, based on my country of birth, family genealogy, certain physical characteristics, and cultural values, I can claim my Filipino-ness and insider

position as a researcher in the Philippines. Such a stance, however, does not take into consideration the ways in which other experiences and identities may counter the dominant understanding of what a Filipino is in the Philippines.

### Intersectional Subjectivity

While I self-identify as a Filipino and a person of color in the United States and have been, and continue to be, critical of being an American, especially in regards to the U.S. history of racism and imperialism, I was both surprised and disturbed by the ways in which Filipinos in the Philippines perceived me. Since my dissertation project primarily utilized archival research, I spent most of my time in libraries. In order to gain access into various collections in universities, government agencies, private museums, and public libraries, I had to present an introductory letter from my advisor and a description of my research. Presenting a letter with the Ohio State insignia demonstrated that I was not from there or, at least, I was not a graduate student from a local college or university. Being both a “foreigner” and a doctoral researcher from the United States became currency in the neo-colonial economy of benefits and privileges. In a country with a long history of imperialism that consisted of over three centuries of Spanish rule and at least four decades of American control, there seems to be a pervasive, if not too openly acknowledged, notion that anything from the west is better, including education and research training. I did not realize, until it was pointed out by another Filipino, that my ability to go inside the closed reserves and to receive copies of out-of-print materials was most likely due to my status as being from the United States. My acquaintance who was

a graduate student from one of the most prestigious universities in the Philippines was never afforded this type of access, service or luxury.

Cognizant of what being an American could purchase, I endeavored to be perceived more as a Filipino, in part by speaking the national language. This attempt, however, was challenged by one of the university librarians who asked me in mixed Tagalog and English, “Ano’ng accent mo?” (“What’s your accent?”). Perhaps responding to my perplexed facial expression, he asked a more pointed question in English, “Are you American?” In a postcolonial country where being lighter-skinned is also better, as illustrated by the marketing campaigns and mass consumption of skin whitening products, and where distinctions are made among “Filipinos,” “Fil-Ams” (or Filipinos who were born or raised in the United States), and “Americans” (meaning white), my relatively lighter complexion, my Tagalog with an American intonation, and perhaps even my demeanor and attitude, facilitated a type of misrecognition or passing as a white person or someone who is bi-racial, an identity that I was often mistaken for in my travels around the country.

These two situations detail not only a couple of my experiences in undertaking archival research but also the fruitful complexity of the theory of intersectional subjectivity. An intersectional conceptualization of subjectivity underscores how various identities and positions, such as race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, education, and language, overlap and are linked. Feminists of color, in particular, have vigilantly emphasized this approach in order to call attention to the intricate connections between subjectivities and power and the limitations of single identity analyses (Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981; Hull, Scott and Smith 1982; Davis 1983; Lorde 1984; Asian Women

United of California 1989; Collins 1991; 1998; Sandoval 2000). By focusing on the conditions and experiences of women of color, they have forged intellectual and political spaces that critique the universalizing hegemony of Black (male) and (white) feminist theories, describe the individual and systemic mechanisms of domination, highlight the multiplicity of identity and jeopardy, and foreground the agency, epistemology, and methodology of the oppressed. The theory of intersectional subjectivity enables me to understand that my ethnic/national identity in the Philippines was tied to my educational status (as a researcher from an American university) and linguistic ability (who spoke with an American-accented Tagalog). Such an understanding of subjectivity elucidates that one's identity is not only based on visible social markers, such as race and gender, but also consists of non-visible indicators, such as schooling and language. It also challenges me to consider how my other identities remained unmarked and provided me with unrecognized privileges. For instance, as a man I had fewer concerns about safety when I traveled to and around the Philippines, and as someone from the United States I was given access to materials that other local researchers were not allowed to have. Even though the use of intersectional subjectivity conventionally addresses issues of multiple oppression, I was able to mobilize it in order to question my interconnected and sometimes unnamed identities, positions and privileges.

Although the theory of intersectional subjectivity serves as a powerful intervention to analyze the linkages of identities and power relations, two aspects limit its application – the use of intersections and Venn diagrams as analytical metaphors and the persistence of foregrounding one identity over others. The metaphors of a traffic intersection and a Venn diagram are usually mobilized in order to illustrate how identities

and positions are linked. Lanes and spheres represent the separate identities and positions which come into contact only in intersections and overlaps (Crenshaw 1998). Such an understanding has two problems: (a) it reduces identities into wholly contained essences; and (b) it limits the ways in which an identity shapes and impacts others. Since metaphors influence worldviews, they also affect how researchers employ the theory of intersectional subjectivity. Although scholars and practitioners of qualitative studies have worked against essentializing subjectivities by positing how identities and positions are socially constructed, some still fall into the trap of highlighting one identity over others. For instance, critical race theorists in education focus on the “counter-narratives” of peoples of color that “challenge the dominant legal, political, ideological, and epistemological thinking about race and power.” By providing “alternative visions, perspectives, and policies,” they position race and “its *partial intersections* with other areas of difference” as the central issue for social change in the American society (Parker, et. al. 1998, 5, my emphasis). Another example derives from work in multicultural and postcolonial studies in education. Although the notion of “nonsynchrony” offers a way to understand the “multi-vocal, multi-accented” and “genuinely polysemic” nature of subjectivity and power relations, it is constricted by the ways in which it separates the various identities and positions (McCarthy 1998, 66). Nonsynchrony illustrates that

different race-class-gender groups not only have qualitatively different experiences in schools but actually exist in constitutive tension, often engage in active competition with each other, receive different forms of rewards, sanctions, and evaluation, and are ultimately structured into different futures. (McCarthy 1998, 78)

Although critical race, multicultural and postcolonial scholars in education have moved a step forward in recognizing that race is linked to other identities and positions, they have

blunted their more radical potentiality by not considering the notion that race is always already refracted within and through other identities and positions. Consequently, while the theory of intersectional subjectivity has helped qualitative researchers productively complicate and move beyond singular approaches, its limitations remain imbedded within the utility of particular metaphors, the persistence of one-variable analyses, and the separation of identities. The next section explores the notion of constitutive subjectivity as a more useful possibility to understand how heterogeneous, hybrid and multiple identities and positions play out in research.

### Constitutive Subjectivity

Since identities and positions are not only constructed through and shaped by language and experiences, they also become apparent in our values, worldviews, and meaning-making. Mine became evident in a discussion with a Filipino friend about the current economic conditions in postcolonial Philippines. Like many so-called developing nations, the archipelago suffers from abject poverty, global politics, and lack of opportunities for gainful employment. At least 85% of the population live below the poverty line, and foreign investors desire highly-trained, English-speaking workers for low wages. International agencies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund provide loans and demand socio-economic structural reforms, which result in the entrance of multi-national companies, enactment of stricter export and tariff regulations, and utilization of precious natural resources – all in the name of sustainable development. Many Filipino college graduates and professionals seek opportunities abroad, a situation that resonated with my family's decision to come to the United States

and highlights the on-going manifestations of the “brain drain” syndrome. Even though immigration is not an option (or luxury) that most Filipinos have due to the levels of educational attainment, professional experience, family connection, and financial independence required by First World countries, many sign up as overseas contract workers in order to provide for their families. As the nation’s most profitable export, these workers are deemed as the new heroes since their money remittances back to the Philippines not only sustain their families, but also fuel the economy by making up a sizable portion of the annual gross national product. However, family and national concerns over their conditions, particularly those working in the Middle East, heightened when news about the then-impending war broke out. I told my friend that I saw a televised documentary which interviewed Filipinos who were working as engineers, nurses, and domestic servants in the Middle East. Even though many foreign embassies were evacuating their citizens from the Middle East, several respondents stated that they would rather confront war than face unemployment and starvation in their home country. Choosing between war and hunger seemed very difficult and risky, I remarked. Although Americans who benefit from the most powerful and privileged First World country, my friend pointedly informed me, would see working abroad as a risk, even in the midst of a war, Filipinos under dire economic circumstances would rather focus on the benefits, what they could bring back to their families, communities and, ultimately, to their country. As someone who grew up in the United States, I was reminded through this interaction that I would never be able to share or be a part of certain experiences and narratives, no matter how much I identify and empathize with certain communities (Errante 2000). I also became acutely aware of my own complicity to a form of

epistemic violence which ascribes a hegemonic western perspective over Third World and other global affairs (Spivak 1990), marking once again the tension of my insider and outsider subjectivity.

My experiences and discussions while pursuing research in the Philippines made me realize that *subjectivity is a situated negotiation of identification and interpellation that relies on the citation of discourses*. In other words, identities and positions are constructed and mediated by the dialectical process of naming that mobilizes particular discourses. My subjectivity is not only an on-going process of how I label myself and how others label me, but also dependent upon the discourses used to make sense of the identities and positions in particular contexts (Fuss 1993; Althusser 1971; Foucault 1978; Butler 1989; Haraway 1996). Although I self-identify as a Filipino, I had to contend with how “Filipino” was understood by those in the United States and in the Philippines during this particular time period. I did not and could not completely control the complex and contested meanings of Filipino as a categorical identity and position. I resisted the ways in which non-Filipinos in the United States perceived me as a native informant who had legitimate knowledge of the archipelago, its culture, people and conditions, a position that was authorized by my birth and family genealogy. Yet I was also challenged by Filipinos in the Philippines in my attempts of ethnic/national affiliation since other identities and positions, such as growing up abroad, education, language, and worldviews, rendered me more American in their perspective.

As a researcher in the Philippines, I occupied both insider and outsider positions. I was simultaneously Filipino and American, local and foreign, native and foreign, colonized and colonizer. Instead of viewing my subjectivity as compartmentalized or



intersectional, I came to understand my identities and positions as constitutive of each other. A constitutive approach to subjectivity frames identities and positions as *always already refracted within and through* each other. It extends the intersectional approach by using prism as a metaphorical analytic to view how a researcher's various identities and positions are viewed within and through each other. A constitutive framework offers the potential to refuse presenting identities as essences, to resist the separation and hierarchy of identities, to develop new spaces for more complicated, contingent and contextualized positions, and to offer a more nuanced understanding of power relations. It works with the notion of "mestizaje" (Anzaldúa 1987) that intricately takes into account the "heterogeneity, hybridity, and multiplicity" of a researcher's identities and positions (Lowe 1996). It is an intellectual, political and methodological approach that constructs new narratives, ethnographies, and histories of race, gender, sexuality, class, and nation (Eng 2001; Manalansan 2003; Wu in press). Ultimately, as a decolonizing and defamiliarizing method (Smith 1999; Kaomea 2003), it helps scholars and practitioners of qualitative studies to move beyond the insider/outsider debate and, instead, focus on the power relations (Villenas 1996) and the researcher's desires while working within one's own community.

### **Desire in Research**

By sharing my research experiences and noting the frameworks which have informed my analysis of research subjectivity, I have written this concluding chapter which may be construed as "part 'research autobiography' and part review of relevant literature" (Aldridge 2003, 25). I am certainly not the first to narrate the pain, discomfort

and anxiety in working the tensions of the insider/outsider split, especially in relation to communities that we affiliate with. Issues related to education, language, socio-economic status, geographical mobility, gender, sexual orientation, and other visible and nonvisible social markers of difference emerge. Directly or indirectly, these issues can create distance between us and the people and communities that we work with, even if we are of the same “race,” ethnic background, or national origin. I am reminded of the experiences of Filipino *pensionados*, the government-sponsored scholars who studied in the United States and then returned to transform the Philippines a hundred years ago.

The Filipino *pensionados*, of course, brought back with them the customs and practices which they had learned in the United States. They had to readjust themselves to the lower standard of living in the home country. All the new things they did appeared queer and artificial. They were looked upon with distrust, even to the extent of ridicule. They were mockingly referred to as “Americanized” or “American boys.” Their mode of dressing appeared queer. Their manner of speech, too, was criticized. People jokingly said that they spoke English like a Spaniard and Spanish like an American. Their every action was noticed, too. (Olivar 1950, 82-83)

In examining the narratives of American-educated Filipinos from almost a hundred years ago, I could not help but sympathize and relate since some of their experiences resonate with mine. So, what does it mean and what happens, then, when we “go home”?

### Pain, Pleasure, and Power

In spite, or perhaps because, of differences, we find pleasure in the communities where we live, participate, and do our work. We gain new insights and understandings about ourselves, our communities, and this enterprise called research. This convergence of pain and pleasure, where there is pleasure as pain, and pain as pleasure, through a sensuous worldview and way of knowing, through what I call an erotic onto-

epistemology, redefines the power, role and ethics of researchers. My attempts to find new ways of moving beyond binaries, examining the imperatives of desire within constitutive subjectivity, and grappling with the sensual embodiment of pain, pleasure and power led me to the literature of sadomasochism or S/M. Whereas common parlance relegates S/M in the realms of perverse and kinky sexuality, I attend instead to the generative insights of sadomasochism as an analytical framework to interrogate the role and ethics of researchers. So, what is an embodied and sensuous perspective in working with/in our own communities and doing transnational research?

In *Sadomasochism in Everyday Life*, Lynn Chancer (1992) outlines four interrelated criteria that define S/M dynamics: (1) symbiotic dependence; (2) repetitive and ritualistic interactions; (3) dialectic potentiality in which roles can be reversed; and (4) conditions of control and punishment. Many of my experiences in the Philippines as an American-raised and -educated Filipino researcher enact certain S/M dynamics. My subjectivity as a graduate researcher from the United States whose travel and other expenses were covered by foundation fellowships wielded tremendous power in terms of status, mobility, and purchase. However my inability to speak the national language well or my limited knowledge of Filipino customs and interactions led to misunderstandings, deceptions, and cultural distance. I relied on relatives and friends as local mediators to guide me through various cities and towns, negotiate access into certain holdings, serve as translators in certain transactions, and connect me to other scholars and possible oral history participants. While I gained pleasure from revisiting and relearning about my country of birth and making connections with relatives and new friends, it was also painful to be constantly reminded of my difference that created some chasm. My

symbiotic, repetitive, dialectic and controlled experiences of pain, pleasure and power are consistent with the S/M dynamics as described by Chancer. Within the framework of constitutive subjectivity, the same person is not only able to experience pleasure and pain, but also be in a simultaneous position of power and control and of less power and be controlled.

The question then comes up: Do we willingly and consciously put ourselves to be in those positions? While Chancer focuses on unconscious sadomasochism, there are theorists that address issues of consent and safety. For example, Pat Califia argues against the conventional notion of S/M as an assault. Instead he underscores that sadomasochism is a “consensual activity that involves polarized roles and intense sensations” and that is “always preceded by a negotiation in which the top and bottom decide whether or not they will play, what activities are likely to occur, what activities will not occur, and about how long the scene will last. The bottom is usually given a safe word or code action she can use to stop the scene” (Califia 2000, 171-172). This might work out well if the roles and rules were laid out and agreed upon in the beginning and if we rigidly conform to them. However, such descriptions and prescriptions are not tenable since, in many cases, roles are redefined and rules are broken. Sometimes it is history and hindsight, provided by time and distance, which point out the violence and damage done in the name of research and social justice (Villenas 1996).

As an analytical framework, sadomasochism is a “technology of self” that eroticizes power and strategic relations (Foucault 1997) that may help us address issues of subjectivity and desire, especially in relation to power and ethics in research. I call for an erotic onto-epistemology that is grounded in theories of constitutive subjectivity and

sadomasochism which celebrate fluid, non-essentialist, alterable and pleasurable research practices. As a more embodied and sensuous perspective on researching with/in our communities, erotic onto-epistemology takes perverse interest and enjoyment in putting to use what is forbidden and even painful in order to move beyond paralyzing and exhausting binaries. Reflecting on my travel and research across the ocean, to my country of birth and re-settling in one of my homes, I continue to understand how my constitutive subjectivity has put me in contingent and reversible positions of possibilities. These are positions that are not inherent, intrinsic or biological, do not bind me to a particular spot, yet depend on various contexts of strategic power relations.

In many ways, the concepts of constitutive subjectivity and erotic onto-epistemology serve as operative prisms in my theoretical frameworks and archival analyses. They coincide with the themes of interconnection, identity, and agency in postcolonial and ethnic studies. My research on American imperialism and Filipino education in the early twentieth century takes into account the interconnected histories of the Philippines and the United States, particularly the ways in which the discourses of gender, race and nation shaped enunciations and performances. Filipinos during that time period had to contend with the educational policies, teacher training programs, and pedagogical contexts in their home country and abroad. Although the power of American imperialism considerably shaped the establishment, development and implementation of the national public school system in the Philippines, Filipinos played multiple and often conflicting roles in colonial education. The notions of constitutive subjectivity and erotic onto-epistemology provide a prism to view the refractions of histories and identities and the embodied contradictions of colonial agency.

Fast forward to my situation as a diasporic Filipino researcher who returned to my country of birth for the first time after seventeen years of absence. I had to contend with the various interconnections of being Filipino and American, local and foreign, colonized and colonizer. Through my interactions and discussions in the Philippines, I became more cognizant of my various subjectivities and the ways in which my identities and positions informed my research. I am also very aware that this dissertation is only a preliminary step in my journey, along with other scholars and activists working in postcolonial and ethnic studies, to interrogate the operations of research, subjectivity, and desire. Inspired and challenged by the pains and pleasures of “going home” or continuing to work with/in my communities, I know that my trip back to the Philippines won’t be my last.

## APPENDIX A

### STATISTICS FOR THE PHILIPPINE SCHOOL SYSTEM, 1902-1910

Table A.1. Total Population, School Population, and School Attendance (1909)

National Population	7,293,997	
Possible School Population	1,215,666	determined as 1/6 of national population
Targeted School Attendance	405,222	determined as 1/3 of school population

Table A.2. Students, Schools, and Teachers (1902-10)

School Year	Number of Students	Number of Schools	Filipino Teachers	American Teachers
1902-03	150,000	2,000	3,000	928
1903-04	227,600	2,285	3,654	723
1904-05	311,843	2,864	4,086	835
1905-06	325,554	3,263	4,719	861
1906-07	335,106	3,687	6,141	727
1907-08	359,738	3,932	6,504	820
1908-09	437,735	4,424	7,889	825
1909-10	451,938	4,581	8,275	732

Table A.3. Education Staff by Race and Gender (1910)

Race	Males	Females	Total
America	493 (67.3%)	239 (32.7%)	732
Filipino	5,832 (70.5%)	2,443 (29.5%)	8,275
Total	6,325 (70.2%)	2,682 (29.8%)	9,007

Table A.4. Student Enrollment by Course and Gender (1910)

Course of Study	Males	Females	Total
Primary	262,459 (60.7%)	170,126 (39.3%)	432,585
Intermediate	13,179 (78.0%)	3,719 (22.0%)	16,898
Secondary	2,037 (83.0%)	418 (17.0%)	2,455
Total	277,675 (61.4%)	174,263 (38.6%)	451,938

Sources: Bureau of Education annual report (1910, pp. 306-326); Lardizabal (1991)

## APPENDIX B

### “THE WHITE MAN’S BURDEN” by Rudyard Kipling (1899)

Take up the White Man's burden -  
Send forth the best ye breed -  
Go bind your sons to exile  
To serve your captives' need;  
To wait in heavy harness,  
On fluttered folk and wild -  
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,  
Half-devil and half-child.

Take up the White Man's burden -  
In patience to abide,  
To veil the threat of terror  
And check the show of pride;  
By open speech and simple,  
An hundred times made plain  
To seek another's profit,  
And work another's gain.

Take up the White Man's burden -  
The savage wars of peace -  
Fill full the mouth of Famine  
And bid the sickness cease;  
And when your goal is nearest  
The end for others sought,  
Watch sloth and heathen Folly  
Bring all your hopes to nought.

Take up the White Man's burden -  
No tawdry rule of kings,  
But toil of serf and sweeper -  
The tale of common things.

The ports ye shall not enter,  
The roads ye shall not tread,  
Go mark them with your living,  
And mark them with your dead.  
Take up the White Man's burden -  
And reap his old reward:  
The blame of those ye better,  
The hate of those ye guard -  
The cry of hosts ye humour  
(Ah, slowly!) toward the light: -  
"Why brought he us from bondage,  
Our loved Egyptian night?"

Take up the White Man's burden -  
Ye dare not stoop to less -  
Nor call too loud on Freedom  
To cloke your weariness;  
By all ye cry or whisper,  
By all ye leave or do,  
The silent, sullen peoples  
Shall weigh your gods and you.

Take up the White Man's burden -  
Have done with childish days -  
The lightly proffered laurel,  
The easy, ungrudged praise.  
Comes now, to search your manhood  
Through all the thankless years  
Cold, edged with dear-bought wisdom,  
The judgment of your peers!

Source: Elleke Boehmer, ed. 1998. *Empire Writing: An Anthology of Colonial Literature, 1870-1918*, 273-274. Oxford, UK and New York: Oxford University Press.



## APPENDIX C

### “THE ASPIRATION OF THE FILIPINOS” by Camilo Osias (1908)

All nations and individuals love liberty and independence; they hate servitude and restraint. Men have been subjected to slavery by conquest; but no people worthy of freedom has remained permanently in bondage. The stately march of history has evolved the axiomatic truth, that the power of a colonizing country invariably wanes, while the colonies wax in strength and influence. If the American Republic, “conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal,” violates this fundamental principle of national life, she must fall.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, a tidal wave of imperialism swept over Spain. Attracted by the everlasting verdure, the abundant resources, and the fertility of the soil, the Philippine archipelago became the victim of her colonization. She exploited but did not develop. She conquered but was unable to hold. Her banner was the emblem of cruelty and injustice; her spires, of tyranny and superstition. Like the primrose among the briars of the mountain side, liberty grew in the hearts of the Filipinos amidst the thorns of Spanish oppression. The storm of persecution called forth its heroes. Brave men, again and again, rose in insurrection only to be slaughtered. Thus, stained with the blood of many patriots, the Spanish government continued its oppression.

When freedom was unattainable thru war, the hero was he who could avert its calamity and, with a supreme faith in the all-conquering power of peace, meet the issues of the day and face the problems of his country with courage and integrity. Such a one was Jose Rizal. Thos this illustrious reformer, a high tribute is due. To learn the civilization of the Occident, he traveled in America and studied in Europe. He mastered seven languages and became familiar with the theory of representative government. Responsive to the call of his country, he returned to devote his life to her service. In apocalyptic vision, he “dipt into the future far as human eye could see” and there held the possibilities of his country. To him, the need was clear; the remedy, plain. Her salvation lay in evolution, not in revolution; in developing the arts of peace, not those of war. Adopting peace as his motto and truth as his guiding star, he faced his patriotic task. The bloodthirsty rulers interpreted his conduct as inciting to war, and brought against him a groundless charge of crime. Tho clad in spotless garb of innocence, he was subjected to the merciless torture of imprisonment. Tho seeking only justice for the poor, equality for the subject, and fraternity for all, his precious blood was made to drench his native soil. The patriot, the martyr, the hero of peace thus perished, but not the aspiration of his people.

That Spain wrought much evil, there is no doubt; that she was the author of much good, there is positive proof. From the opening chapter to the closing paragraph, her sovereignty was crowned with the virtues of education and religion thru the patient efforts of the men of God on whom rested the solemn “vows of holiness, chastity, and poverty.” Some may declare that Spain’s occupation of the archipelago has been fruitless; but none can deny that she made her subjects the only Christian people of the

East. The Japanese looks to Buddha, the Chinese to Confucius; both without hope of Eternity. The Filipino looks to a living Savior, who exalts his life by Christian virtues and enriches it by a high respect for truth.

Ten years ago, as a result of the grand victory of America in our waters, the long centuries of Spanish dominion came to an end. Our people believed that the new victors were God's chosen deliverers of an oppressed people upon whom they would confer the boon of national freedom. In the ardor of this belief, the Filipinos espoused their cause. With the ratification of the treaty, two questions of supreme importance confronted the American people: Should America seek territorial expansion beyond the sea, or should she allow the Filipinos to work out their destiny? Questioning the capacity of the Filipinos for self-government, the United States made the only Christian nation in Asia a subject people. Fearing the American policy was tending toward imperialism, the natives once friendly became alarmed and finally hostile. The war which followed was of short duration. Struggling as long as reason deemed prudent, they succeeded only in making their love of liberty manifest. The insurrection was raised not to gratify personal ambition but to satisfy the aspiration of the people.

Since then, one of the greatest tasks ever entrusted to mortal stewardship has confronted [t]he eight million islanders. It is the acquisition of a foreign tongue, the establishment of a new system of government, the education of the people, and the development of their material resources. Believing that our salvation lay in popular education, America sent hundreds of her leading educators to our shores. Grand and praiseworthy have been the achievements of those who came to our relief. All honor to the nation who thus generously extended her helping hand to the needy! Every step she

took is a proof that her prime purpose was to speed the development of a small Republic founded on her own governmental principles.

There is little true knowledge among the American people of the condition of the Filipinos. Of the eight million islanders seven and one-half are civilized, enjoying the opportunities of education, and capable of self-government. They are a temperate and virtuous people. After seven years' residence in the Philippines, the Governor-General Ide declares that Manilla [*sic*] has fewer crimes than any other city of its size under the American flag. Ten years ago, practically none could speak the English language. In less than a decade of intimate relationship with the American people, twenty per cent of the inhabitants speak the new language. What an achievement! It is not with the savage Igorrote nor the heathen Negrito that you have to do, but with the enlightened and Christian Malay. Today, you are dealing with a people foremost in the Orient in the approach to religious truth; a people superior to all Eastern races in morals and education; a people united by the bonds of Christian brotherhood and a lofty aspiration for political independence.

The American occupation of the Philippines has not been entirely spotless. Cruelty frequently tarnished your fair name as lovers of justice. Your army executed natives without trial, devastated provinces, and tortured men in reconcentration camps. Some of your officers embezzled our public funds. Moreover, you ignore the fact that your success in the archipelago lies primely in economic development. The high tariff imposed upon our products has been a great obstacle to our prosperity. You have denied us freedom of trade – a privilege we enjoyed even under the hateful rule of Spain. The abolition of the Dingley tariff is a prime necessity. Yet, in spite of our petitions, you

have persistently refused to perform this act “so necessary and wholesome to our public good.” These things together with the high salaries paid American officials, the uncertainty of the political future of our country, as well as the injustice of the tariff, have combined to make our people dissatisfied with American control.

On the other hand, the dissatisfaction in America over the possession of the archipelago is very great. The retention of the islands is a weighty burden. Already, it has cost you uncounted millions. It will continue to require an enormous expenditure of both energy and treasure to remain there. The distance of the Islands from this continent is a source of weakness. Moreover, they are inhabited by a people of different blood, language, and customs, thus making the problems all the more complex by giving it a racial as well as a political aspect. The policy of colonization is contrary to the American instinct. It is a violation of the spirit of the Declaration of Independence which declares that just government can be founded only upon the consent of the governed. Strange that a nation loving liberty for itself should take away the liberty of another. Viewed geographically, economically, morally, and politically, the retention of the Philippines is a menace to your great Republic.

Past achievements, present dissatisfaction, and future dangers make the solving of this problem imperative. What shall be its ultimate solution? Some say annexation to the United States. But the location of the archipelago makes this plan impracticable. Others say that the islands should be sold to one of the great powers. Should such a plan be adopted, it would mean a rebellion. Christian sympathy and national honor so proudly possessed by the American people forbid the solution of this national problem upon a financial basis. Others propose a continuation of American supremacy. Our long history

of blood, of misery, and of rebellion speaks with eloquence: We do not want retention. American may retain there. She may be instrumental in our progress or in our decadence; in our aggrandizement or in our exploitation; but she will never succeed in extinguishing the redeeming flame of our aspiration for independence.

One more possibility remains – the granting [o]f our complete autonomy. In light of this plan you foresee danger. You anticipate the possibility of invasion by other nations. You can remove this by securing a treaty similar to that which gave Switzerland and Belgium the position they now enjoy. Overlook this plan and the country will become “an apple of discord” in the society of nations. Our people demand independence. Some demand it immediately; others are patient and willing to wait a few years; but all look to it as the ultimate solution. This is the only plan which appeals to the fundamental ideas of both Americans and Filipinos. It recognizes your principles of government and is in harmony with our aspirations. Moreover, it will be a fulfillment of the promise early made us – “The Philippines for the Filipinos.” The God of Justice holds you responsible for that solemn promise whose performance “you owe to us, to yourselves, and to the world at large.”

Peace and capacity are the two great requisites for independent national life. Today peace reigns thruout the archipelago. The Philippine Assembly recently established marks a new era in our history. The work of this body won the admiration of thinking statesmen and disappointed the prophets of failure. Education was made supreme and the public schools and libraries now established will become the gravestones of crime and ignorance. Those who doubt our capacity for independence fail to conceive the true character of our social, political and educational institutions; fail to

understand the high degree of civilization existing in the Philippines. They forget that capacity for self-government is not only an attainment but also an inherent quality of a people; they forget that time is requisite for the evolution of a successful government; they forget that patriotism stimulates lethargy into activity; they forget that patriotism develops persons qualified to carry onward the national evolution of a race.

To you, American citizens, is entrusted the destiny of our nation. We appeal to you for a more altru[i]stic spirit and for a great breadth of view in responding to the clamoring voices across the sea. We implor[e] you for the sake of humanity, for the uplifting of a race, for the safety of the American Republic, to make the establishment of a Philippine Republic the ultimate solution of this Oriental problem. Let the nations of the earth, Oh! citizens of America! behold and admire your attitude toward humanity! Let the day star of our independence arise in your hearts! Satisfy our longings for that bright future awaited for centuries! Then shall the Filipino people, chanting the praises of America, take their proud position in the galaxy of nations as they sweep onward toward that "far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves," having one God, one Savior, and one Celestial Home.

Source: Camilo Osias. 1908. "The Aspiration of the Filipinos." *Western Courier* 5, no. 20 (May 28): 162-166.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Categories: Government Documents  
Camilo Osias  
Newspapers, Magazines, and Yearbooks  
Journal Articles and Chapters from Edited Volumes  
Books and Edited Volumes  
Theses, Dissertations, and Other Unpublished Papers

### Government Documents

- Bureau of Education. 1901. *First Annual Report: Department of Public Instruction*. Reprint, Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing, 1954.
- . 1902. *Second Annual Report: Department of Public Instruction*. Reprint, Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing, 1954.
- . 1903. *Third Annual Report: Department of Public Instruction*. Reprint, Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing, 1954.
- . 1904. *Fourth Annual Report: Department of Public Instruction*. Reprint, Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing, 1954.
- . 1905. *Fifth Annual Report: Department of Public Instruction*. Reprint, Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing, 1954.
- . 1906. *Sixth annual report: Department of Public Instruction*. Reprint, Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing, 1957.
- . 1907a. *Seventh annual report: Department of Public Instruction*. Reprint, Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing, 1957.
- . 1907b. *Statement of Organization and Aims*. Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing.
- . 1908. *Eighth Annual Report: Department of Public Instruction*. Reprint, Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing, 1957.



- . 1909. *Ninth Annual Report: Department of Public Instruction*. Reprint, Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing, 1957.
- . 1910. *Tenth Annual Report: Department of Public Instruction*. Reprint, Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing, 1957.
- . 1911. *Statement of Organization, Aims and Conditions of Service*. Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing.
- . 1913. *Good Manners and Right Conduct: For Use in Primary Grades*. Manila, Phils.: Bureau of Printing.

Department of Education and Culture. 1976. *The Philippine Educational System, 1901-1976*. Manila, Phils.

McKinley, William. 1900. *Instructions of the President to the Philippine Commission*. April 7.

Philippine Islands. 1904. *Official Catalogue*. Louisiana Purchase Exposition Board.

United States Embassy. 2001. *To Islands Far Away: The Story of the Thomasites and their Journey to the Philippines*. Manila, Phils: Public Affairs.

### **Camilo Osias**

- Osias, Camilo. 1908. "The Aspiration of the Filipinos." *Western Courier* 5, no. 20 (May 28): 162-166.
- . 1914. *Syllabus on Educational Methods and Practical Suggestions for Teachers*. Manila, Phils.: Fajardo's Printing.
- . 1917a. *Education in the Philippines under the Spanish Regime*. Manila: Philippine Education.
- , comp. 1917b. *Division of Tayabas Circulars*. n.p.
- . 1918. *Notes on Supervision*. Manila, Phils.: n.p.
- . 1921. *Barrio Life and Barrio Education*. New York: World Book.
- , comp. 1925. *Philippine School Laws, 1900-1925*. Manila: Phils.: n.p.
- . 1926. *Our Education and Dynamic Filipinism: Speeches and Materials*. Manila, Phils.: n.p.

---. 1940. *The Filipino Way of Life: The Pluralized Philosophy*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Co.

---. 1954. *Life-Centered Education*. Quezon City, Phils.: Bustamante.

---. 1965. *Crusade for the Separation of Church and State*. Manila, Phils.: National Senate.

---. 1971. *The Story of a Long Career of Varied Tasks*. Quezon City, Phils.: Manlapaz.

Oσίας, Camilo, and Mauro Baradi. 1933. *The Philippine Charter of Liberty*. Baltimore, MD: French-Bray.

Oσίας, Camilo, and Avelina Lorenzana. 1931. *Evangelical Christianity in the Philippines*. Dayton, OH: United Brethren Publishing.

Oσίας, Camilo, et al. 1927. *The Philippine Readers, Book 1*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Co.

---. 1932a. *The Philippine Readers, Book 2*. Revised ed. Boston, MA: Ginn and Co.

---. 1932b. *The Philippine Readers, Book 3*. Revised ed. Boston, MA: Ginn and Co.

---. 1932c. *The Philippine Readers, Book 4*. Revised ed. Boston, MA: Ginn and Co.

---. 1932d. *The Philippine Readers, Book 5*. Revised ed. Boston, MA: Ginn and Co.

---. 1932e. *The Philippine Readers, Book 7*. Revised ed. Boston, MA: Ginn and Co.

---. 1959. *The Philippine Readers, Book 6*. Revised ed. Boston, MA: Ginn and Co.

### **Newspapers, Magazines, and Yearbooks**

*New York Times*

*Teachers College Records*

*Washington Post*

Black, Eric. 2001. "Hatred of America Springs from Religious, Cultural, Economic Sources." *Minneapolis - St. Paul (Minnesota) Star Tribune*. September 16.

Black, Plummer. 1905. "The Filipinos." *Western Courier*, November 15.

Ford, Peter. 2001. "Why Do They Hate Us?" *The Christian Science Monitor*.  
September 27.

Pinkerton, James P. 2003. "Important History Lessons for the President." *Newsday*,  
October 21.

### **Journal Articles and Chapters from Edited Volumes**

Alridge, Derrick P. 2003. "The Dilemmas, Challenges, and Duality of an African-  
American Educational Historian." *Educational Researcher* (December): 25-34.

Burstyn, Joan N. 1987. "History as Image: Changing the Lens." *History of Education  
Quarterly* 27, no. 2: 167-180.

Butchart, Ronald E. 1988. "'Outthinking and Outflanking the Owners of the World': A  
Historiography of the African American Struggle for Education." *History of  
Education Quarterly* 28, no. 3: 333-366.

Cabral, Amilcar. 1994. "National Liberation and Culture." In *Colonial Discourse and  
Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*, edited by Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, 53-  
65. New York: Columbia University Press.

Campomanes, Oscar V. 1995. "The New Empire's Forgetful and Forgotten Citizens:  
Unrepresentability and Unassimilability in Filipino/American Postcolonialities."  
*Critical Mass: A Journal of Asian American Cultural Criticism* 2, no. 2: 145-200.

Coloma, Roland Sintos. 2003. "Que(e)r(y)ing Nationalism: History, Nation, and  
Imperialism." *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 19, no. 3: 51-70.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1998. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black  
Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist  
Politics." In *Feminism and Politics*, edited by Anne Phillips, 314-343. Oxford, UK  
and New York: Oxford University Press.

de la Cruz, Enrique B., ed. 1998a. "Essays into American Empire in the Philippines: Part  
I - Legacies, Heroes, and Identity." *Amerasia* 24, no. 2.

---, ed. 1998b. "Essays into American Empire in the Philippines: Part II - Culture,  
Community, and Capital." *Amerasia* 24, no. 3.

Dillard, Cynthia B. 2000. "The Substance of Things Hoped for, the Evidence of Things  
Not Seen: Examining an Endarkened Feminist Epistemology in Educational Research  
and Leadership." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 13, no. 6:  
661-681.

- . 2003. "Cut to Heal, Not to Bleed: A Response to Handel Wright's 'An Endarkened Feminist Epistemology?'" *Identity, Difference and the Politics of Representation in Educational Research.* *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 16, no. 2: 227-232.
- Dillard, Cynthia B., Daa'lyah Abdur-Rashid, and Cynthia A. Tyson. 2000. "My Soul is a Witness: Affirming Pedagogies of the Spirit." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 13, no. 5: 447-462.
- Donato, Rubén, and Marvin Lazerson. 2000. "New Directions in American Educational History: Problems and Prospects." *Educational Researcher* 29, no. 8: 4-15.
- Errante, Antoinette. 2000. "But Sometimes You're Not Part of the Story: Oral History and Ways of Remembering and Telling." *Educational Researcher* 29, no. 2: 16-27.
- Fujikane, Candice, and Jonathan Y. Okamura, eds. 2000. "Whose Vision?: Asian Settler Colonialism in Hawai'i." *Amerasia* 26, no. 2.
- Goodenow, Ronald K. 1981. "The Southern Progressive Educator on Race and Pluralism: The Case of William Heard Kilpatrick." *History of Education Quarterly* (summer): 147-170.
- Guha, Ranajit. 1982. "On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India." *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian History and Society*: 1-8.
- Haraway, Donna J. 1996. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." In *Feminism and Science*, edited by Evelyn Fox Keller and Helen E. Longino, 249-263. Oxford, UK and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Herbst, Jurgen. 1997. "Toward a Theory of Progressive Education?" *History of Education Quarterly* 37, no. 1: 45-59.
- Kaestle, Carl F. 1992. "Standards of Evidence in Historical Research: How Do We Know When We Know?" *History of Education Quarterly* 32, no. 3: 361-366.
- Kaomea, Julie. 2003. "Reading Erasures and Making the Familiar Strange: Defamiliarizing Methods for Research in Formerly Colonized and Historically Oppressed Communities." *Educational Researcher* 32, no. 2: 14-25.
- Kaplan, Amy. 1993. "'Left Alone with America': The Absence of Empire in the Study of American Culture." In *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, edited by Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease, 3-37. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

- Kipling, Rudyard. 1899/1998. "The White Man's Burden." In *Empire Writing: An Anthology of Colonial Literature, 1870-1918*, edited by Elleke Boehmer, 273-274. Oxford, UK and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kramer, Paul. 1997. "Jim Crow Science and the 'Negro Problem' in the Occupied Philippines." In *Race Consciousness: African-American Studies for the New Century*, edited by Judith Jackson Fossett and Jeffrey A. Tucker, 227-246. New York: New York University Press.
- Lather, Patti. 1986. "Issues of Validity in Openly Ideological Research: Between a Rock and Soft Place." *Interchange* 17, no. 4: 63-84.
- . 1993. "Fertile Obsession: Validity After Poststructuralism." *Sociology Quarterly* 34, no. 4: 673-693.
- . 2001. "Validity as an Incitement to Discourse: Qualitative Research and the Crisis of Legitimation." In *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., edited by Virginia Richardson, 241-250. Washington, D.C.: AERA.
- . 2004. "Foucauldian 'Indiscipline' as a Sort of Application : Qu(e)er(y)ing Research/Policy/Practice." In *Dangerous Coagulations?: The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education*, edited by Bernadette M. Baker & Katharina E. Heyning. New York: Peter Lang.
- Mahoney, Kathleen A. "New Times, New Questions." *Educational Researcher* 29, no. 8: 18-19.
- Mazumdar, Sucheta. 1991. "Asian American Studies and Asian Studies: Rethinking Roots." In *Asian Americans: Comparative and Global Perspectives*, edited by Shirley Hune, et al. Pullman: Washington State University.
- Melville, Stephen. 1994. "Color Has Not Yet Been Named: Objectivity in Deconstruction." In *Deconstruction and the Visual Arts: Art, Media, Architecture*, edited by Peter Brunette and David Wills, 33-48. Cambridge, UK and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, Clyde R. 1929. "Columbia University Observes its One Hundred and Seventy-Fifth Anniversary." *Teachers College Record* (November): 245-261.
- Narayan, Kirin. 1997. "How Native is a 'Native' Anthropologist?" In *Situated Lives: Gender and Culture in Everyday Life*, edited by Louise Lamphere, Helena Ragone, and Patricia Zavella, 23-41. New York: Routledge.
- Omatsu, Glenn. 1994. "The 'Four Prisons' and the Movements of Liberation: Asian American Activism from the 1960s to the 1990s." In *The State of Asian America*:

- Activism and Resistance in the 1990s*, edited by Karin Aguilar-San Juan, 19-69. Boston, MA: South End.
- Omi, Michael, and Dana Takagi, eds. 1995. "Thinking Theory in Asian American Studies." *Amerasia* 21, nos. 1-2.
- Osajima, Keith. 2000. "Asian Americans as the Model Minority: An Analysis of the Popular Press Image in the 1960s and 1980s." In *Contemporary Asian America: A Multidisciplinary Reader*, edited by Min Zhou and James V. Gatewood, 449-458. New York: New York University Press.
- Parker, Laurence, Donna Deyhle, Sofia Villenas, and Kristin Crosland Nebeker. 1998. "Guest Editors' Introduction: Critical Race Theory and Qualitative Studies in Education." *Qualitative Studies in Education* 11, no. 1: 5-6.
- Parry, Benita. 1994. "Resistance Theory / Theorising Resistance, or Two Cheers for Nativism." In *Colonial Discourse, Postcolonial Theory*, edited by Francis Barker, Peter Hulme, and Margaret Iverson, 172-196. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Pillow, Wanda S. 2003. "Confession, Catharsis, or Cure?: Rethinking the Uses of Reflexivity as Methodological Power in Qualitative Research." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 16, no. 2: 175-196.
- Rodgers, Daniel T. 1982. "In Search of Progressivism." *Review of American History* 10:113-132.
- Rury, John L. 1991. "Transformation in Perspective: Lawrence Cremin's *Transformation of the School*." *History of Education Quarterly* 31, no. 1: 69-76.
- Rust, Val. 1971. "Negro Schools: A Model for Nazi Colonial Education." *Journal of Negro Education* 40, no. 2: 103-107.
- Salman, Michael. 1991. "In Our Orientalist Imagination: Historiography and the Culture of Colonialism in the United States." *Radical History Review* 50: 221-232.
- San Buenaventura, Steffi. 1998. "The Colors of Manifest Destiny: Filipinos and the American Other(s)." *Amerasia* 24, no. 3: 1-26.
- San Miguel, Jr., Guadalupe. 1986. "Status of the Historiography of Chicano Education: A Preliminary Analysis." *History of Education Quarterly* 26, no. 4: 523-536.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 271-313. Basingstoke: Macmillan Education.

- Stoler, Ann Laura. 2001. "Tense and Tender Ties: The Politics of Comparison in North American History and (Post) Colonial Studies." *Journal of American History* 88, no. 3: 829-865.
- Tamura, Eileen H. 2001. "Asian Americans in the History of Education: An Historiographical Essay." *History of Education Quarterly* 41, no. 1: 58-71.
- Vecoli, Rudolph J. 1999. "Comment: We Study the Present to Understand the Past." *Journal of American Ethnic History* (Summer): 115-125.
- Villenas, Sofia. 1996. "The Colonizer/Colonized Chicana Ethnographer: Identity, Marginalization, and Co-optation in the Field." *Harvard Educational Review* 66, no. 4: 711-731.
- Wolfe, Patrick. 1997. "History and Imperialism: A Century of Theory, from Marx to Postcolonialism." *American Historical Review*: 388-420.
- Wong, Sau-ling. 1995. "Denationalization Reconsidered: Asian American Cultural Criticism at a Theoretical Crossroads." *Amerasia* 21, nos. 1 and 2: 1-27.
- Wu, Judy Tzu-Chun. 2001. "Was Mom Chung a 'Sister Lesbian'?": Asian American Gender Experimentation and Interracial Homoeroticism." *Journal of Women's History* 13, no. 1: 58-82.

### **Books and Edited Volumes**

- Adams, David W. 1995. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Agoncillo, Teodoro A. 1990. *History of the Filipino People*, 8<sup>th</sup> ed. Quezon City, Phils.: Garotech.
- Aguilar, Delia. 1998. *Toward a Nationalist Feminism*. Quezon City, Phils.: Giraffe.
- Aguilar-San Juan, Karin, ed. 1994. *The State of Asian America: Activism and Resistance in the 1990s*. Boston, MA: South End.
- Alexander, M. Jacqui, and Mohanty, Chandra Talpade, eds. 1997. *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. New York: Routledge.
- Althusser, Louis. 1971. "*Lenin and Philosophy*" and *Other Essays*. Translated by Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review Press.

- Alzona, Encarnacion. 1932. *A History of Education in the Philippines, 1565-1930*. Manila: University of the Philippines Press.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised ed. London and New York: Verso.
- . 1998. *The Spectre of Comparisons: Nationalism, Southeast Asia and the World*. London and New York: Verso.
- Anderson, Eric, and Andrew A. Moss, Jr. 1999. *Dangerous Donations: Northern Philanthropy and Southern Black Education, 1902-1930*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Anderson, James D. 1988. *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands, La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters / Aunt Lute.
- , ed. 1990. *Making Face, Making Soul = Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color*. San Francisco, CA: Spinsters / Aunt Lute.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 1992. *In My Father's House: Africa in the Philosophy of Culture*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Appleby, Joyce, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob. 1994. *Telling the Truth about History*. New York: Norton.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. 1989. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Asian Women United of California, ed. 1989. *Making Waves: An Anthology of Writings by and about Asian Women*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bananal, Eduardo. 1974. *Camilo Osias: Educator and Statesman*. Quezon City, Phils.: Manlapaz.
- Bazaco, Evergisto. 1939. *History of Education in the Philippines, Vol. 1: Spanish Period – 1565-1898*. Manila, Phils.: University of Santo Tomas Press.
- Behar, Ruth. 1993. *Translated Woman: Crossing the Border with Esperanza's Story*. Boston: Beacon.
- . 1996. *The Vulnerable Observer: Anthropology that Breaks Your Heart*. Boston: Beacon.



- Bernal, Martin. 1987. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Beverley, John. 1999. *Subalternity and Representation: Arguments in Cultural Theory*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bonus, Rick. 2000. *Locating Filipino Americans: Ethnicity and the Cultural Politics of Space*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Britzman, Deborah P. 1998. *Lost Subjects, Contested Objects: Toward a Psychoanalytic Inquiry of Learning*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bulosan, Carlos. 1946. *America is in the Heart: A Personal History*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.
- Butler, Judith. 1989. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- . 1993. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge.
- Butts, R. Freeman. 1955. *A Cultural History of Western Education: Its Social and Intellectual Foundations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Butts, R. Freeman, and Lawrence A. Cremin, 1953. *A History of Education in American Culture*. New York: Holt.
- Chan, Sucheng. 1991. *Asian Americans: An Interpretive History*. Boston, MA: Twayne.
- Chatterjee, Partha. 1993. *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Choy, Catherine Ceniza. 2003. *Empire of Care: Nursing and Migration in Filipino American History*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Chrisman, Laura. 2003. *Postcolonial Contraventions: Cultural Readings of Race, Imperialism, and Transnationalism*. Manchester, UK and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1991. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- . 1998. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minneapolis and

- London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Constantino, Renato. 1966. *The Filipinos in the Philippines and Other Essays*. Quezon City, Phils.: Malaya.
- Cooper, Frederick, and Ann Laura Stoler, eds. 1997. *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley and London, UK: University of California Press.
- Cordova, Fred. 1983. *Filipinos, Forgotten Asian Americans: A Pictorial Essay, 1763 - circa 1963*. Dubuque, IA: Kendal/Hunt.
- Cremin, Lawrence A. 1961. *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage.
- Cremin, Lawrence A., David A. Shannon, and Mary Evelyn Townsend. 1954. *A History of Teachers College, Columbia University*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cuban, Larry. 1984. *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890-1980*. New York: Longman.
- Davis, Angela. 1983. *Women, Race and Class*. New York: Vintage.
- de la Cruz, Enrique B., and Pearlie Rose S. Baluyut, eds. 1998. *Confrontations, Crossings and Convergence: Photographs of the Philippines and the United States*. Los Angeles: UCLA Asian American Studies Center and Southeast Asia Program.
- Denzin, Norman K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. 2000. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dirlik, Arif. 1997. *The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Donato, Rubén. 1997. *The Other Struggle for Equal Schools: Mexican Americans during the Civil Rights Era*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (William Edward Burghardt). 1903. *The Soul of Black Folk*. Reprint, Penguin, 1996.
- Duara, Prasenjit. 1995. *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- duCille, Ann. 1996. *Skin Trade*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ellis, Carolyn. 1995. *Final Negotiations: A Story of Love, Loss, and Chronic Illness*.

- Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Eng, David. 2001. *Racial Castration: Managing Masculinity in Asian America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Espiritu, Yen Le. 1992. *Asian American Panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- . 2003. *Home Bound: Filipino American Lives Across Cultures, Communities, and Countries*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington. New York: Grove.
- Foley, Neil. 1997. *The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. New York: Pantheon.
- . 1973. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage.
- . 1977. *Discipline and Punish: Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House.
- . 1978. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Vol. 1*. New York: Random House.
- . 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon.
- . 1997. *Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984: Volume 1 - Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth*, edited by Paul Rabinow. New York: New Press.
- Freer, William Bowen. 1906. *The Philippine Experiences of an American Teacher*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Fujita-Rony, Dorothy. 2003. *American Workers, Colonial Power: Philippine Seattle and the Transpacific West, 1919-1941*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fuss, Diana. 1993. *Identification Papers*. New York: Routledge.
- Gates, John Morgan. 1973. *Schoolbooks and Krags: The United States Army in the Philippines, 1898-1902*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Gatewood, Jr., William B. 1975. *Black Americans and the White Man's Burden, 1898-*

1903. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Edited and translated by Guintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. Reprint, New York: International Publishers, 1999.
- Guha, Ranajit. 1997. *Dominance Without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hallwas, John E. 1999. *First Century: A Pictorial History of Western Illinois University*. Macomb, IL: Western Illinois University Press.
- Harding, Sandra. 1991. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge: Thinking from Women's Lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- . 1998. *Is Science Multicultural?: Postcolonialisms, Feminisms, and Epistemologies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Headland, Thomas N., Kenneth L. Pike, and Marvin Harris, eds. 1990. *Emics and Etics: The Insider/Outsider Debate*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hirabayashi, Lane Ryo. 1998. *Teaching Asian America: Diversity and the Problem of Community*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hoganson, Kristin L. 1998. *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press.
- Hull, Gloria T., Patricia Bell Scott, and Barbara Smith, eds. 1982. *All the Women are White, All the Blacks are Men, But Some of Us are Brave: Black Women's Studies*. Old Westbury, NY: Feminist.
- Hune, Shirley, and Gail Nomura, eds. 2003. *Asian/Pacific Islander American Women: A Historical Anthology*. New York: New York University.
- Ileto, Reynaldo C. 1979. *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910*. Quezon City, Phils.: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. 2000. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters*

- Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Jenkins, Keith, ed. 1997. *The Postmodern History Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kaplan, Amy, and Donald E. Pease, eds. 1993. *Cultures of United States Imperialism*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Karnow, Stanley. 1989. *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines*. New York: Random House.
- King, C. Richard, ed. 2000. *Postcolonial America*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Kliebard, Herbert M. 1992. *Forging the American Curriculum: Essays in Curriculum History and Theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Lanning, Michael Lee. 1997. *The African-American Soldier: From Crispus Attucks to Colin Powell*. Secaucus, NJ: Birch Lane Press.
- Lardizabal, Amparo Santamaria. 1991. *Pioneer American Teachers and Philippine Education*. Quezon City, Phils.: Phoenix.
- Lather, Patti. 1991. *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy With/in the Postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Lather, Patti, and Chris Smithies. 1997. *Troubling the Angels: Women Living with HIV/AIDS*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Lee, Stacey J. 1996. *Unraveling the "Model Minority" Stereotype: Listening to Asian American Youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Leonard, Karen Isaksen. 1992. *Making Ethnic Choices: California's Punjabi Mexican Americans*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Loomba, Ania. 1998. *Colonialism-Postcolonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister Outsider*. New York: Crossing.
- Lowe, Lisa. 1991. *Critical Terrains: French and British Orientalisms*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- . 1996. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Manalansan IV, Martin F., ed. 2000. *Cultural Compass: Ethnographic Explorations of Asian America*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- . 2003. *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- May, Glenn Anthony. 1980. *Social Engineering in the Philippines: The Aims, Execution, and Impact of American Colonial Policy, 1900-1913*. Westport and London: Greenwood.
- McCarthy, Cameron. 1998. *The Uses of Culture: Education and the Limits of Ethnic Affiliation*. New York: Routledge.
- McClintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Miller, Stuart Creighton. 1982. "Benevolent Assimilation": *The American Conquest of the Philippines, 1899-1903*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Moraga, Cherrie, and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 1981. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. Watertown, MA: Persephone.
- Muñoz, Jose Esteban. 1999. *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nakanishi, Don T., and Tina Yamano Nishida, eds. 1995. *The Asian American Educational Experience: A Source Book for Teachers and Students*. New York: Routledge.
- Okihiro, Gary. 1994. *Margins and Mainstream: Asians in American History and Culture*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- . 2001. *Common Ground: Reimagining American History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pak, Yoon K. 2002. *Wherever I Go, I Will Always Be A Loyal American: Schooling Seattle's Japanese Americans During World War II*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Palumbo-Liu, David. 1999. *Asian/American: Historical Crossings of a Racial Frontier*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar. 2001. *Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration, and Domestic Work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Prashad, Vijay. 2000. *The Karma of Brown Folk*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota

- Press.
- . 2001. *Everyone was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Racelis, Mary, and Judy Celine Ick. 2001. *Bearers of Benevolence: The Thomasites and Public Education in the Philippines*. Pasig City, Phils.: Anvil.
- Rafael, Vicente L. 2000. *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ravitch, Diane. 2000. *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Richardson, Laurel. 1997. *Fields of Play: Constructing an Academic Life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Rizal, Jose. 1886. *Noli Me Tangere*. Reprint, and translated by Camilo Osias, Asian Foundation for Cultural Advancement, 1956.
- . 1891. *El Filibusterismo*. Reprint, and translated by Camilo Osias, Asian Foundation for Cultural Advancement, 1957.
- Röhrs, Hermann, and Volker Lenhart, eds. 1995. *Progressive Education Across the Continents: A Handbook*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany and New York: Peter Lang.
- Roy, Arundhati. 2001. *Power Politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End.
- Rydell, Robert W. 1984. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sadovnik, Alan R., and Susan F. Semel, eds. 2002. *Founding Mothers and Others: Women Educational Leaders during the Progressive Era*. New York: Palgrave.
- Said, Edward W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- . 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.
- Salman, Michael. 2001. *The Embarrassment of Slavery: Controversies over Bondage and Nationalism in the American Colonial Philippines*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- San Juan, Jr., E. (Epifanio). 1998. *Beyond Postcolonial Theory*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- . 2000. *After Postcolonialism: Remapping Philippines - United States Confrontations*. Lanham and Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- San Miguel, Jr., Guadalupe. 1987. *"Let all of them take heed": Mexican Americans and the Campaign for Educational Equality in Texas, 1910-1981*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 2001. *Brown, Not White: School Integration and the Chicano Movement in Houston*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
- Sandoval, Chela. 2000. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Scharlin, Craig, and Lilia V. Villanueva. 1992. *Philip Vera Cruz: A Personal History of Filipino Immigrants and the Farmworkers Movement*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Labor Center and UCLA Asian American Studies Center.
- Scheurich, James J. 1997. *Research Method in the Postmodern*. London and Washington, D.C.: Falmer.
- Schirmer, Daniel B., and Stephen Roskamm Shalom, eds. 1987. *The Philippines Reader: A History of Colonialism, Neocolonialism, Dictatorship, and Resistance*. Boston, MA: South End.
- Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scott, Joan Wallach. 1988. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University
- Scott, William Henry. 1992. *Looking for the Prehispanic Filipino and Other Essays in Philippine History*. Quezon City, Phils.: New Day.
- Shah, Nayan. 2001. *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco's Chinatown*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shaw, Angel Velasco, and Luis H. Francia, eds. 2002. *Vestiges of War: The Philippine-American War and the Aftermath of an Imperial Dream, 1899-1999*. Washington Square: New York University Press.
- Siddle Walker, Vanessa. 1996. *Their Highest Potential: An African American School Community in the Segregated South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.



- Singh, Amritjit, and Peter Schmidt. 2000. *Postcolonial Theory and the United States: Race, Ethnicity, and Literature*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Smith, Linda Tahiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1987. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York and London: Methuen.
- . 1990. *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. Edited by Sarah Harasym. New York and London: Routledge.
- . 1993. *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York and London: Routledge.
- . 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- St. Pierre, Elizabeth, and Wanda Pillow, eds. *Working the Ruins: Feminist Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Stanley, Peter W. 1974. *A Nation in the Making: The Philippines and the United States, 1899-1921*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. 1995. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- . 2002. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Storey, Moorfield, and Marcial P. Lichauco. 1926. *The Conquest of the Philippines by the United States, 1898-1925*. Reprint, Mandaluyong, Phils.: Cacho Hermanos, 1985.
- Sutherland, William Alexander. 1953. *Not by Might: The Epic of the Philippines*. Las Cruces, NM: Southwest Publishing.
- Takagi, Dana. 1992. *The Retreat from Race: Asian-American Admissions and Racial Politics*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Takaki, Ronald. 1989. *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans*. Boston, MA: Little and Brown.
- Tamura, Eileen. 1994. *Americanization, Acculturation, and Ethnic Identity: The Nisei Generation in Hawaii*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Tan, Samuel K. 2002. *The Filipino-American War, 1898-1913*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Tchen, John Kuo Wei. 1999. *New York before Chinatown: Orientalism and the Shaping of American Culture, 1776-1882*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Theobald, H. C. 1907. *The Filipino Teachers' Manual*. New York: World Book.
- Trask, Haunani Kay. 1993. *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage.
- Trinh, Minh-ha T. 1989. *Woman Native Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Twine, France Winddance, and Jonathan W. Warren, eds. 2000. *Racing Research, Researching Race: Methodological Dilemmas in Critical Race Studies*. New York and London: New York University Press.
- Tyack, David B. 1974. *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Viswanathan, Gauri. 1989. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Washington, Booker T. 1901. *Up from Slavery*. Reprint, Penguin, 1986.
- Watkins, William H. 2001. *The White Architects of Black Education: Ideology and Power in America, 1865-1954*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wei, William. 1993. *The Asian American Movement*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- White, Hayden. 1973. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore, MD and London: John Hopkins University Press.
- . 1987. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore, MD and London: John Hopkins University Press.
- Williams, Patrick, and Laura Williams, eds. 1994. *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Willinsky, John. 1998. *Learning to Divide the World: Education at Empire's End*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Winant, Howard, and Michael Omi. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.

Woodson, Carter G. 1933. *The Mis-education of the Negro*. Reprint, African American Images, 2000.

Wu, Judy Tzu-Chun. in press. *Dr. "Mom" Chung of the Fair-Haired Bastards: The Life of a Forgotten Wartime Celebrity*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Young, Robert J. C. 2001. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

### **Theses, Dissertations, and Other Unpublished Papers**

Alidio, Kimberly A. 2001. *Between Civilizing Mission and Ethnic Assimilation: Racial Discourse, U.S. Colonial Education, and Filipino Ethnicity, 1901-1946*. Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan.

Carpio, Remigia D. 1934. *A Study of the Philippine Pensionado System Abroad (1903-1928)*. Master's thesis, University of the Philippines.

Espiritu, Augustu Fauni. 2000. "*Expatriate Affirmations*": *The Performance of Nationalism and Patronage in Filipino-American Intellectual Life*. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.

Gowing, Peter G. 1977. *Moros and Indians: Commonalities of Purpose, Policy and Practice in American Government of Two Hostile Subject Peoples*. Marawi, Philipines: Dansalan Research Center.

Lanzar, Maria C. 1928. *The Anti-Imperialist League*. Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan.

Olivar, Celia Bocobo. 1950. *The First Pensionados: An Appraisal of their Contribution to the National Welfare*. Master's thesis, University of the Philippines.

Rutland, Lolita Garcia. 1955. *The History of Teacher Education in the Philippines to 1955*. Ph.D. diss., University of Florida.

Woods, Beulah Mae. 1923. *An Application to Rural India of Methods of Educating Backward Peoples Developed at Hampton Institute and in the Philippines*. Master's thesis, University of Chicago.