

# Articles

## “Destiny Has Thrown the Negro and the Filipino Under the Tutelage of America”: Race and Curriculum in the Age of Empire

ROLAND SINTOS COLOMA

*Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto  
Toronto, ON, Canada*

### ABSTRACT

The article brings together the fields of curriculum studies, history of education, and ethnic studies to chart a transnational history of race, empire, and curriculum. Drawing from a larger study on the history of education in the Philippines under U.S. rule in the early 1900s, it argues that race played a pivotal role in the discursive construction of Filipino/as and that the schooling for African Americans in the U.S. South served as the prevailing template for colonial pedagogy in the archipelago. It employs Michel Foucault's concept of archaeology to trace the racial grammar in popular and official representations, especially in the depiction of colonized Filipino/as as racially Black, and to illustrate its material effects on educational policy and curriculum. The tension between academic and manual-industrial instruction became a site of convergence for Filipino/as and African Americans, with decided implications for the lived trajectories in stratified racialized and colonized communities.

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.

In response to the end of the Spanish-American War that resulted in the United States occupying and governing the Philippines as its sole colony in Asia, the poet Rudyard Kipling celebrated what he deemed as the noble

© 2009 by The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

Curriculum Inquiry 39:4 (2009)

Published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc., 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA, and 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK

doi: 10.1111/j.1467-873X.2009.00454.x

enterprise of imperialism.<sup>1</sup> In “The White Man’s Burden,” a widely circulated poem published in 1899, Kipling (2007) called upon the colonizers to take responsibility for the supervision and advancement of the colonized toward modernity and civilization. He conjured the image of Filipino/as as a wild devil-child to reflect and reinforce the prevailing discourse about the colonized as culturally, intellectually, and physically underdeveloped and inferior. The devil-child image further circulated in popular media, academic scholarship, and government reports, consequently crystallizing into a powerful symbolic representation of Filipino/as in the early 1900s. As the United States entered what historian Eric Hobsbawm (1987) calls the Age of Empire (1875–1914), the figure of Filipino/as as primitive, atavistic savages provided and bolstered White supremacist and paternalistic rationalities that underpinned U.S. colonial educational policy and curriculum in the Philippines. Mass public schooling, for the colonizers, served as a resolution to the White man’s burden, and persists as a legacy of Western imperialism in many postcolonial nations.

In this article, I draw on my larger study on the history of education in the Philippines under U.S. rule, and utilize the interpretive and methodological concept of archaeology from historian-philosopher Michel Foucault (1972). Driven by archaeology’s central question of “How is it that one particular statement appeared rather than another?” (p. 27), I examine the development of the public school system in the Philippines “in the exact specificity of its occurrence; determine its conditions of existence, fix at least its limits, establish its correlations with other statements that may be connected with it, and show what other forms of statement it excludes” (p. 28). These statements constitute discourses “as practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (p. 49). The formation of discourses is embedded in “a complex group of relations that function as a rule” (p. 74), delineating regularities of inclusion and exclusion, of possibility and foreclosure. Tracing the “conditions of existence” for the emergence of public education in the Philippines enables me to suture geographically and analytically the transnational relations between the United States and the Philippines and to examine the discursive formation of a racialized curriculum for colonized Filipino/as.

I will argue that race was a significant ruling grammar that regulated both the construction of Filipino/as as colonized subjects and the transnational propagation of racially conscious U.S. educational policy and curriculum in the early 20th century. I will demonstrate how the depiction of Filipino/as paralleled, relied upon, and solidified hegemonic understandings of peoples of color as uncivilized and in need of White tutelage for advancement. I will also contend that colonial education in the Philippines was largely inflected by and patterned after the curriculum for African Americans in the U.S. South. In other words, since Filipino/as were discursively configured as “Negroes,” the schooling for African Americans became the prevailing racial template for the colonial pedagogy of

Filipino/as. Such historical connection links the colonial and racial conditions of Filipino/as and African Americans, and offers a generative empirical site for transnational and comparative analysis of race and curriculum.<sup>2</sup>

In addition, I will claim that the discursive construction of colonized Filipino/as as racially Black had material effects. In response to critiques of Foucault from historical materialist perspectives, cultural theorist Patrick McHugh (1989) argues that “there is a ‘ponderous, awesome materiality’ to discourse, an ‘incorporeal materialism’ where discourse is an event that ‘takes effect, becomes effect, always on the level of materiality’” (p. 98). He points out that “Foucault analyzes the power of discourse to shape the world. Discourse produces knowledge, and regardless of whether this knowledge is ‘true’ or ‘false’ to some material reality, it establishes privileges and priorities, makes distinctions and exclusions, organizes institutional practices, informs the machinations of the State, all on the order of material reality” (ibid.). In this article, I will demonstrate that the material effects of the discursive construction of Filipino/as manifested in educational policy and curriculum which structured what teachers taught, what students learned, and what kinds of lived trajectories were made possible.

### **TOWARD A TRANSNATIONAL HISTORY OF RACE, EMPIRE, AND CURRICULUM**

The article contributes to and brings into conversation three academic fields—curriculum studies, history of education, and ethnic studies—to chart what I call a “transnational history of race, empire, and curriculum.”

The field of curriculum studies has been moving toward an international perspective to expand North America’s scholarly engagement with curriculum research in Asia, Africa, Latin America, Australia, and Europe, and to garner insights to understand and impact national educational reforms, policies, and practices (Pinar et al., 1995). Though international in title, the conferences and publications on the internationalization of curriculum studies remain, in Bill Pinar’s (2003b) assessment, “very much situated within . . . issues that preoccupy the nations in which we do our work” (p. 2). The *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (Pinar, 2003a) that delineates the state of curriculum studies in 28 countries, including the United States and Canada, exemplifies the pervasive nation-centered emphasis. Rather than focusing on the nation or international, I suggest that *transnational* studies, those that frame research beyond the nation as their main unit of analysis, can yield rich insights regarding the imbricated inter-relatedness of nations and the border-crossing flows of people, ideas, goods, cultures, and institutions.

Following a transnational line of inquiry, for instance, Janet Miller (2005) outlines “the worldliness of American curriculum studies—that is, the spread of these studies into multiple international arenas” (p. 11). By locating U.S. scholarly productions and political actions in relation to their

global circulations and effects, Miller opens theoretical and empirical spaces to interrogate how the United States is implicated in power/knowledge relations with other countries. As “American curriculum studies” sets its scholarly sights and sites outside of the United States, I argue that it must grapple with the history and ongoing operation of U.S. imperialism and education. Without the use of empire as a relevant category of analysis, the internationalization of curriculum studies could (re)produce a dynamic of intellectual and pedagogical imperialism and neocolonialism between the United States and the rest of the world.

While curriculum studies scholars are increasingly paying attention to the internationalization of their field, as a field its theoretical and empirical inquiries regarding race have been largely disconnected (Gay, 2000; McCarthy, 1998; Pinar, 2006; Watkins, 2001; Willinsky, 1998).<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, the field of educational history faces a different set of foci and priorities. While there seems to be “[d]isinterest in international trends . . . and lack of familiarity with other educational systems [beyond the United States]” (Mahoney, 2000, p. 18), U.S. historians of education are calling for more research on race and ethnicity outside of the conventional Black–White framework and toward more *comparative* inquiries on the conditions and experiences among peoples of color. Although more research is needed in the history of Asian American education (Tamura, 2001), there is a small yet critical mass of scholars who are undertaking pioneering work in Asian American educational history (Coloma, 2004; Lim de Sánchez, 2003; Ng, Lee, & Pak, 2007; Pak, 2002; Tamura, 1994). In “New Directions in American Educational History,” Rubén Donato and Marvin Lazerson (2000) pointed out that there is “almost no synthesis or intersection across the communities [of color]; 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” (p. 8). They recommend more research that addresses the historical convergences of various communities of color and how they have impacted each other.<sup>4</sup>

Although I situate my work within curriculum studies and educational history, I am also grounded in the fields of ethnic studies and Asian American studies in particular. Central to ethnic studies inquiries is the racial formation of those who have become categorized as peoples of color. Sociologists Michael Omi and Howard Winant (1987) define racial formation as “the process by which social, economic and political forces determine the content and importance of racial categories, and by which they are in turn shaped by racial meanings” (p. 61). The category of “Asian American and Pacific Islander” (AAPI), for instance, is an “interpellation and identification that name and bring together a racialized assembly of diverse ethno-national cultural groups. In other words, the AAPI ‘race’ is something that is both imposed upon and claimed by a group of people based on political reasons and not on biological, genetic or anthropological

criteria” (Coloma, 2006, p. 8). As sociopolitical constructs, race and racial meanings are constituted by circulating discourses. The racial terms that we use and the meanings given to make sense of them are thereby embedded within particular historical, cultural, and geographical contexts.

Scholars of Asian American studies extend the conceptualization of racial formation to account for cross-racial, transnational, and postcolonial conditions. The shared, and at times conflicting, experiences of communities of color in the United States as well as the ways in which the conditions and cultures of a particular racialized group have shaped and impacted those of another are underscored in more recent cross-racial comparative projects that link Asian Americans with African American, Latino/a, Middle Eastern, and indigenous communities. For example, Asian Americanists have examined the multiethnic development of urban geographies, the labor conditions of immigrant workers, the post-9/11 demonization of peoples of color, and the settler colonialism in native lands (Chin, 2005; Fujikane & Okamura, 2008; Kurashige, 2007; Maira & Shihade, 2006). In addition, Asian American studies scholars argue that transnational connections between Asia and the United States are not only a core theme in the establishment and development of the field, but also part and parcel of the contemporary realities of diasporic movements, filial affinities, and the productions of subjects and cultures (Chuh & Shimakawa, 2001; Espiritu, 2003).

Scholars of Filipino/a studies, in particular, punctuate the trans-Pacific relations between the Philippines and the United States by foregrounding the U.S. colonial regime in the Philippines from 1898 until World War II and its ongoing neocolonial control through political, economic, and military involvement (Go, 2003; Isaac, 2006; San Juan, 2007). Thus, for researchers who work on Filipino/a studies in the Philippines, the United States, and in-between, the racialization of Filipino/as is constituted not only by the transnational flows of discourses and materials, but also more specifically by the techniques of imperialism.

### THE RACIALIZATION OF COLONIZED FILIPINO/AS

In this section, I examine U.S. visual and textual media, such as cartoons, photographs, as well as scientific and government accounts, to shed light on the ways in which representational constructions framed Filipino/as as wild devil-children who necessitated White tutelage and supervision. Literary and cultural critic Homi Bhabha (1994) maintains that “the objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction” (p. 70). I contend that the discursive legibility of Filipino/as as new subjects of the U.S. empire was construed within the hegemonic U.S. discourse of race and, in particular, through distorted depictions of African Americans. This racial discourse was embedded within the then-dominant Haeckelian notion of ontogeny

recapitulating phylogeny, which construed an individual's or group's biological and cultural development along an evolutionary scale from primitive to civilized (Gould, 1977). In spite of the ethnic, socioeconomic, spiritual, regional, and linguistic heterogeneity among Filipino/as, early 20th century, U.S. racial grammar primarily scripted Filipino/as as "Negroes." The U.S. racial framework dismissed the cultural diversity within the Philippines, thereby functioning as an exclusionary technique to foreground a particular representation for imperialist purposes.<sup>5</sup>

By exploring U.S. colonial visual culture, I intend to unpack the prevailing rationalities of race and empire, especially how racialized and colonized subjects emerge within the U.S. purview. As "sites of dense visual information" (K. Worcester, 2007, p. 225), political cartoons simultaneously encapsulate issues and events in small yet influential spaces, and convey racial imageries to promote imperialist justifications for conquest and governance (Ignacio et al., 2004). Scholars of media and policy insist that although "American media do not have a direct role in the formulation of foreign policy, [they] continue to have a growing influence in its implementation, explanation and articulation" (Hamid Mowlana, in Halili, 2006, p. 5). In fact, "media are consistently used by the government as a diplomatic forum to help set the tone, pattern and agenda for policy matters" (ibid.).

The political cartoons that appeared in U.S. newspapers and magazines at the turn of the 20th century served to convey and justify U.S. global incursions through calculated depictions of "foreign savages." For example, an 1898 cartoon entitled "Holding His End Up" in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* shows a stars-and-stripes-clad Uncle Sam balancing five dark-skinned children who are marked as the "Philippines," "Porto Rico," "Cuba," "Hawaii," and "Ladrones" (now Guam and Northern Mariana Islands). Infantilized as a child and racially construed as Black, hence visually conjuring Kipling's devil-child figure, the Filipino with bulging eyes, protruding lips, and twisted, coarse hair is displayed and held high by the United States—like the other colonized subjects—in front of well-dressed European men. The representation of the dangling Filipino with his shorts clutched by Uncle Sam who stands poised and proud on a platform marked "Army and Navy" is aligned with the pro-annexation position that the Philippines needed to be rescued and protected by the United States from other potentially imperialist aggressors. Published at the end of the Spanish-American War when the United States began colonial governance in the Pacific and the Caribbean, the cartoon captures the emergence of Filipino/as in the U.S. imaginary within the twin contexts of the comparative racialization of communities of color and the global panorama of imperialist conquest and control.

Because the education of Filipino/as was central to the 1898 "benevolent assimilation" policy of U.S. president William McKinley (Miller, 1982), colonial schooling was established as the antidote for the U.S. problem of

pacifying, disciplining, and civilizing Filipino/as.<sup>6</sup> The 1901 cover of *Judge* weekly magazine with “The American Policy” as its caption vividly links education with the agenda of imperialism. The cover shows a dark-skinned Filipino boy, dressed in loincloth and amulet, being pulled by the ear by a formally dressed Uncle Sam with a switch in his other hand. The seemingly insolent native is being dragged to the red-white-and-blue Liberty School where a smiling Miss Columbia is ringing the bell and four other boys in cultural attires signifying Native American, Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, and Cuban children are watching. This image vividly depicts the dominant imperialist trope of racialized infantilization that positioned colonized subjects under the tutelage of adult White colonizers in order for the colonized to attain developmental maturity in the Western teleology of civilization. So what happened inside the U.S. colonial school? What lessons and directions did the Filipino/as learn?

The 1899 cartoon entitled “School Begins” in the popular magazine *Puck* offers insightful perspectives into these questions. The cartoon illustrates a bewildered Filipino dressed in the Western style of long-sleeved shirt and pants and seated in the front row with three other students representing Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Cuba. All four students are looking up at the towering, bespectacled Uncle Sam who is leaning over his desk with a stick in hand. Underneath the image are the words of Uncle Sam’s stern lecture to these newly arrived students: “Now, children, you’ve got to learn these lessons whether you want to or not! But just take a look at the class ahead of you, and remember that in a little while, you will be as glad to be here as they are!”

My analysis of this cartoon suggests that Filipino/as had four options in the U.S. project of race, empire, and curriculum. The first option was they could assimilate into the U.S. norms of whiteness, represented by White teens reading silently behind the front row. The books held by these students, who seem to be maturing under Uncle Sam’s tutelage, denote California, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and Alaska, the territories that the expanding United States had previously acquired by war or purchase. The second option was Filipino/as could follow the Native American who is reading an upside-down book and sitting alone by the front door. The Native American image signifies the boarding school policy, considered an “education for extinction” (Adams, 1995), which removed and isolated indigenous students from both mainstream White America and their own communities. The third option was to be barred entry like the Chinese, standing outside of the school door, due to the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. The final option was Filipino/as could become like the African American who, due to manual-industrial training, is perched on a ladder and is washing the classroom window with a rag and a bucket of water. Since the options of whiteness, extinction, or exclusion were not completely tenable for Filipino/as in the Philippines, the last option of adhering to the policy and curriculum for African Americans in the U.S. South became the

educational template for Filipino/as across the Pacific. Through Foucault's archaeology, my analysis of this cartoon offers insights into the "correlations" and "limits" of educational possibilities for Filipino/as and into the process of how African American schooling became the only viable option.

The photographs taken by U.S. officials further reinforced the visual representation of Filipino/as as degenerate and atavistic savages in the political cartoons. In *Displaying Filipinos*, anthropologist Benito Vergara (1995) maintains that photography framed the construction and proliferation of images in the early 20<sup>th</sup>-century Philippines and served as an apparatus of U.S. imperialism. The photographs used by U.S. colonial administrator and scientist Dean Conant Worcester worked precisely to perpetuate the imperialist visualization of Filipino/as as racially Black. Considered an "American apostle to the Philippines" (Pier, 1950), Worcester was a University of Michigan zoologist who undertook two research trips in the Philippines (1887–1888 and 1890–1893) before he was appointed to serve as a member of two U.S. Philippine Commissions from 1899 to 1901 and as Secretary of Interior in the Philippine Insular Government from 1901 to 1913. His publications include *Contributions to Philippine Ornithology* (Worcester & Bourns, 1898), *The Philippine Islands and Their People* (D. C. Worcester, 1899), *The Non-Christian Tribes of Northern Luzon* (D. C. Worcester, 1906), *Slavery and Peonage in the Philippine Islands* (D. C. Worcester, 1913), and *The Philippines Past and Present* (D. C. Worcester, 1914). As a scientist from a well-regarded institution and a high-ranking government official, his descriptions of Filipino/as garnered credibility, circulation, and influence due to his status, expertise, and experience.<sup>7</sup>

Worcester's reports and publications derived from a combined governmental and scholarly interest to obtain reliable data. He indicated that because "it was obviously impossible to draft adequate legislation for the control and civilization of numerous savage or barbarous peoples without reliable data on which to base it, and as such data were not available, I had to get them for myself" (D. C. Worcester, 1914, p. 534). During his travels in the archipelago, Worcester took copious notes and, with the assistance of his colleague Frank S. Bourns, numerous photographs of his observations which appeared in annual government reports and scholarly publications.

In *The Philippine Islands and Their People*, Worcester (1899) included photographs of ethnic Tagbanuas in the west-central Palawan island whom he claimed to have derived "from a half-breed race between the Negritos (the little black aborigines in the archipelago) and some Malay tribe. At all events, they are quite dark skinned, and their hair shows a decided tendency to curl" (pp. 99–100). Throughout the book, Worcester interspersed his detailed observations of Filipino/as with photographs of other ethnic communities, like the Mangyans, whom he described as: "Their noses were very flat. Their heads were covered with great shocks of black hair, which in many instances showed a tendency to curl—due perhaps to a slight admixture of Negrito blood" (p. 410). He explained the Negritos as "a wretched,



sickly race, of almost dwarfish stature. Their skins are black, their hair is curly, their features are coarse and repulsive. . . . Mentally they stand at the bottom of the scale, and experience seems to have proved them incapable of civilization" (p. 438). In 1912 the *National Geographic* magazine published a photograph of a fully dressed Worcester in long-sleeved shirt, slacks, shoes, and hat, standing next to a Negrito woman who was about half his height and wearing only a cloth tied around her waist. The image and caption of "An Adult Negrito Woman With an American of Average Size" delivered the overarching theme in the visual and textual techniques of U.S. imperialism: Filipino/as as inferior even to "average" Americans.

Worcester was not alone in characterizing Filipino/as as culturally atavistic and racially Black. A *Washington Post* article on November 30, 1902, portrayed Filipino/as 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." U.S. educators in the Philippines referred to them as "little brownies" and "pickaninnies" (Bureau of Education, 1903/1954, p. 525; Racelis & Ick, 2001, p. 94). Since the Philippines was "remote from any great modern civilization," educator Mary Helen Fee (1910) remarked in her memoir, *A Woman's Impressions of the Philippines*, "there is no criterion by which the inhabitants can arrive at a correct estimate of their condition" (p. 145). Hence, the dominant racial grammar defined the condition of colonized Filipino/as. Popular media, official reports, and personal correspondence worked to produce and reinforce the racialization of Filipino/as through the White hegemonic and distorted imageries of African Americans.

### AFRICAN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES ON FILIPINO/AS

In this section, I foreground the perspectives of African Americans to discern their views on Filipino/as and the pervasive racial connections. As the group compared to the Filipino/as in the early 1900s, it is crucial to attend to the ways in which they participated in and/or critiqued the U.S. colonial project to illustrate a multidimensional transnational history of race, empire, and curriculum. According to historian William Gatewood (1975), African Americans took keen interest in U.S. imperialism and particularly in the Philippines from the standpoint of "a colored minority in a white-dominated society" (p. 284). They held "an affinity of complexion with the Filipinos" 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" (pp. 320, 323).

African Americans who came to the Philippines, for the most part, expressed racial sympathy toward and solidarity with Filipino/as. In 1903 T. Thomas Fortune, owner and editor of *New York Age*, the leading African American journal of news and opinion, was sent by the U.S. government "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" (*Washington Post*, April 12, 1903). Upon his return, Fortune convened a gathering of the "best colored men in the country" where he drew the parallel and shared conditions of African Americans and Filipino/as. He saw African Americans as "companions of [Filipinos], 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" (*Washington Post*, June 27, 1903).

Sojourning across the Pacific, African Americans who taught in the Philippines included Carter G. Woodson and John Henry Manning Butler. Woodson taught in the islands from 1903 to 1906, and planned on returning if his teaching and educational prospects in the United States did not materialize (Goggin, 1993). Known as the father of African American history, Woodson cofounded the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History in 1915 and established the *Journal of Negro History* in 1916. In his obituary for Butler in the *Journal of Negro History*, Woodson called him "a representative Negro" and "a distinguished American citizen who made a contribution to the modernization of the Philippines" (Woodson, 1945, p. 244). In the same article, he also mentioned other "Negro teachers who volunteered to go to that crude country immediately after pacification to give the people a modern language and develop their minds unto modern stature" (p. 243). The educators to whom Filipino/as "owe a debt of gratitude" included Frederick Bonner of Connecticut; May Fitzbutler of St. Louis, Missouri; J. F. Hart and W. H. Holder of Kansas City; and Thomas Shaffer of Kentucky (*ibid.*). In Carter G. Woodson's characterization, African Americans played an important yet unacknowledged part in "modernizing" a "crude" Philippines, inevitably positioning African Americans alongside White officials and educators in their collective mission as Americans to civilize and educate the colonized.<sup>8</sup>

Perhaps one of the longest-serving U.S. educators in the Philippines, John Henry Manning Butler began working in the Bureau of Education in 1902 by establishing schools and teaching in the northern province of Pangasinan. He rose through the ranks and became the division superintendent in the mountainous regions of Isabela and Cagayan from 1921 to 1933. After he retired from the Bureau, he continued teaching at the National Teachers College in 1933 and the Union College of Manila in 1936 (Daniel, 1937, pp. 238–239). Although he occasionally visited the United States, he spent almost all of his adult life in the Philippines where he died in 1944.

As one of the few African American educators in the islands, Butler contested the racial classification of Filipino/as as "Negroid." In a 1934 article published in the *Journal of Negro Education*, he wrote, "Only a thoughtless observer would consider the Filipino people Negroid. There

are a few tribes of pigmy-like black folks with quasi-kinky hair and other physical characteristics which cause ethnologists to classify them with the Negro race. . . . Whatever the meaning of civilization may be, the term [Negro] does not refer to these simple children of mountain and forest" (Butler, 1934, pp. 264–265). Similar to Woodson, Butler's depiction of these "pigmy-like" "simple children of mountain and forest" makes a clear demarcation between African Americans and Filipino/as, belying a sentiment of African American superiority over Filipino/as. Yet, at the end of his article, he pressed both African Americans and Filipino/as to learn more about each other's historical and contemporary conditions because "Destiny has thrown the Negro and the Filipino under the tutelage of America" (pp. 267–268).

Other African Americans were also keenly aware of the racial comparisons between them and Filipino/as. W. E. B. DuBois and Booker T. Washington took opposite positions in their views of racial solidarity and competition (Aldridge, 2008; Harlan, 1975, 1983). DuBois (1903) had a more nuanced analysis of race and empire upon which transnational solidarities were possible. He saw the calls for African American emigration, similar to the exploratory trip taken by Fortune to the Philippines, 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?" (p. 45). He perceived the United States as a capitalist and consumerist "happy-go-lucky nation which goes blundering along with its Reconstruction tragedies, its Spanish war interludes and Philippine matinees" (p. 122). He regarded industrial-manual schools as "born of slavery and quickened to renewed life by the crazy imperialism of the day" (p. 79), thereby connecting the history of African Americans with the conditions of colonized communities.

In Booker T. Washington's America, race was framed in Black and White terms. In his 1895 Atlanta Exposition address, Washington (1901) called on the "white race" to "Cast down your bucket where you are" out of concern that the post-Reconstruction South increasingly relied on Asian laborers whom he referred to as "those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits." He portrayed Asians as threats who took employment opportunities from African Americans, "the most patient, faithful, law-abiding, and unresentful people" who knew their place in the United States (pp. 220–222). In patriotic support of the Spanish-American War, he stressed that his "race . . . is willing to die for its country" (p. 255), instead of being critical of the recolonization of the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Cuba under the U.S. imperialist regime. Ultimately, through his analogy of "separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand," he offered a narrow chauvinist vision of the U.S. nation with a racialized terrain that excluded those not White or Black.

As the United States pursued global imperialism, Washington succinctly captured the politics of racial taxonomy and the plight of colonized Filipino/as. In a *New York Times* article on March 29, 1903, he commented

on the racial classification of Filipino/as: "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." Even with Washington's caution, the discursive construction of Filipino/as as racially Black, consequently, set into motion colonial policy and curriculum in the Philippines that derived from the schooling of African Americans in the U.S. South.

### **EDUCATIONAL POLICY, CURRICULUM, AND TEACHER PREPARATION**

In this section, I delineate the material effects of the discursive construction of colonized Filipino/as as racially Black by examining the development of educational policy and curriculum in the Philippines, in particular through the vision of its first General Superintendent of Public Instruction and through the various strategies of preparing Filipino/a teachers. Distinguishing itself from the limited structure and academic emphasis of schooling during the Spanish era, the U.S. plan for mass public education in the islands envisioned a curriculum that would reach more school-age children and would instruct them for practical work. I contend that the prevailing U.S. racial understanding and the dominance of manual-industrial training for African Americans in the early 1900s underpinned the curriculum transformation in the Philippines from a liberal arts foundation to one geared toward manual-industrial training. However, even though there was a decided shift toward practical work, some students navigated within and against the constraints of the instituted policy and curriculum to exert their agency and find avenues to fulfill their aspirations.

The U.S. policy for colonial education and curriculum in the Philippines derived from political and education elites. A proponent of the "benevolent assimilation" policy, U.S. president William McKinley asked Harvard University president Charles W. Eliot to recommend someone who could oversee the new educational system in the archipelago. Eliot suggested Fred W. Atkinson, a Harvard alumnus and a Massachusetts high school principal, who was subsequently appointed as the General Superintendent of Public Instruction. Prior to his departure for the Philippines in 1900, Atkinson consulted Booker T. Washington and visited Tuskegee and Hampton, the two most prominent institutions for African American industrial and teacher training. Atkinson understood that U.S. teachers in the Philippines "must beware [of] the possibility of overdoing the matter of higher education and unfitting the Filipino for practical work" (May, 1980, p. 93). He maintained that "We should heed the lesson taught us in our reconstruction period when we started to educate the negro. The educa-

tion of the masses here must be an agricultural and industrial one, after the pattern of our Tuskegee Institute at home" (ibid.).

Atkinson's conviction was in line with the prevailing view of Filipino/as as atavistic savages, which justified his administration's educational policy and curriculum. In his book *The Philippine Islands*, Atkinson (1906) traced the racial genealogy of Filipino/s from the Negritos, "the first inhabitants of the archipelago" (p. 240): "Our earliest glimpse, indeed, reveals a race of very low type . . . from which are descended the Negritos, or little negroes—small, black, extremely shy, and without fixed abodes, with closely curling hair, flat noses, thick lips, and clumsy feet" (p. 59). Marshaling both photographs and observations, he described them as "true savages . . . [who] seem to be the survival of the unfittest, and are physical and mental weaklings" (p. 241). His genealogical tracing of Filipino/as deriving from "a race of very low type" buttressed the U.S. imperialist mission to install a modern, Western educational system that would putatively advance the colonized from ignorance and backwardness to literacy, modernity, and maturity.

In addition, Atkinson intended to make the U.S. public school system in the Philippines distinct from the Spanish version that existed before. He wanted a secular and practical education that was available to more students with English as the primary language of instruction. In his 1903 annual report, Atkinson indicated that during the Spanish era, formal schooling from primary to the university was limited to Spanish, native elite, and mestizo (mixed-race) children, and was controlled by Catholic religious orders. From the onset of Spanish rule in 1465 "until 1863 no attempt whatever was made to put rudimentary instruction within the reach of the great mass of the school population" which "perpetuated among them an ignorance which was a stumbling block in the way of their advancement and a barrier to their proper appreciation of the beneficent intentions of Government and its constituted authorities" (Bureau of Education, 1903/1954, p. 230). In 1863, Spain issued a royal decree to establish elementary schools in the Philippines (Alzona, 1932). By 1886, according to Atkinson's report, there were 1,052 schools for boys and 1,091 schools for girls with an average of 40 to 50 students per school. With Spanish as the language of instruction, the primary curriculum consisted of Christian doctrine, reading and writing, geography, and mathematics (Bureau of Education, 1903/1954, p. 231).

In establishing a mass public school system in the Philippines, the Bureau of Education was successful in increasing the attendance of school-age population. In 1902, there were about 2,000 schools and about 150,000 students; by the end of the decade, there were 4,531 schools and 451,938 students, tripling the number of students since the beginning of its operations (Bureau of Education, 1910/1957, p. 306). While historical accounts of the Philippines note the expansion of educational opportunities from the Spanish to the U.S. colonial eras (Alzona, 1932; May, 1980; Rutland,

1955), the significance of race in structuring school policy and curriculum (Kramer, 2006) is under-explored. As I will further demonstrate, U.S. racial discourse and African American education, especially the tension between academic and manual-industrial instruction, inflected the colonial policy and curriculum in the Philippines. This can be discerned in the following comment from a U.S. Southern legislator quoted in the *New York Times* on January 14, 1899: the “experience of the South for the past thirty years with the negro race” would become “lessons of wisdom for our guidance in the Philippines.”

Although U.S. educators were recruited to teach in the Philippines (Racelis & Ick, 2001), it became immediately apparent to colonial officials that more Filipino/a teachers were needed to accomplish the task of developing a national public school system. The Bureau of Education aggressively recruited, and the number of Filipino/a teachers more than quadrupled from about 2,000 in 1902 to 8,275 in 1910 (Bureau of Education, 1910/1957, p. 306). The Bureau utilized four main strategies to prepare teachers: (1) after-school sessions, (2) vacation institutes, (3) normal schools, and (4) government scholarships to U.S. colleges and universities. The most common were the first two strategies: the daily one-hour classes after school and the four- to five-week vacation institutes, both conducted by U.S. educators (Bureau of Education, 1903/1954, p. 787). In these strategies of teacher preparation, local teachers often “taught during the week what they themselves had learned during the week previous” (Rutland, 1955, p. 34).

One of the widely used training texts was *The Filipino Teacher's Manual* by H. C. Theobald (1907), a Stanford University graduate and principal of the Batangas provincial high school in the Philippines. Divided into two parts, the manual's first half addressed general educational issues, such as school organization, discipline, and moral training; the teachers' relationships with students, parents, and communities; and the teachers' dispositions, habits, and outside studies. The second half focused on specific subject areas, such as English, arithmetic, geography, history, civics, nature study, industrial training, physiology and hygiene, music, penmanship, and drawing.

Although Theobald's manual emphasized a liberal arts foundation, within the first decade of the 1900s the curriculum for Filipino/a teachers became a contest between an academic and a manual-industrial emphasis, similar to the struggle of African American education in the United States (Anderson, 1988). For instance, a 1903 program for daily after-school and vacation sessions showcased the initial dominance of the academic curriculum, which focused on English (grammar, composition, and literature), math (arithmetic), social sciences (history, government, and geography), and science (plant and animal studies, physiology, and hygiene). Teachers were given supplementary instruction in school administration and classroom pedagogy as well as in agriculture, arts, and handicrafts (Bureau of

Education, 1903/1954, pp. 787–791). However, by 1908 the Bureau's courses for teachers shifted to manual-industrial training as the curricular focal point. Overshadowing the academic subjects, the course offerings 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 (Bureau of Education, 1908/1957, p. 127). While the academic subjects prevailed in the early years of educating teachers, industrial training took a more prominent position in their ensuing curriculum.

The struggles between academic and manual-industrial curriculum also manifested in the normal and secondary schools, the third strategy in preparing teachers. The Philippine Normal School in the capital city of Manila was known to offer a strong academic curriculum. Whereas graduates of intermediate schools could teach the primary grades, only those who completed normal school training could teach secondary students. The entrance requirement of the Philippine Normal School included arithmetic (through long division) and English proficiency in speaking and reading (with the *Baldwin Second Reader* as the minimum standard). Its 4-year curriculum consisted of 4 years of English, 4 years of mathematics, 3 years of geography, 3 years of science, 2 years of history, drawing and music for the first-year students, and professional training for the fourth-year students (Bureau of Education, 1903/1954, pp. 452–457). By 1905, the Normal School began to make plans for domestic science and manual instruction. With gardening for three periods per week, students grew vegetables and conducted agricultural experiments. They also examined seeds, soils, plant foods, water, harmful insects, and methods of growing and harvesting crops (Bureau of Education, 1905/1954, p. 972).

As the highest institution for teacher training, the Philippine Normal School became the most prominent public educational center in the early 1900s. Private Catholic institutions of higher learning, such as the University of Santo Tomas (founded in 1611), existed and were primarily geared toward the training of men for theology, law, medicine, and philosophy. The University of the Philippines, the country's first state institution of higher education, opened in 1908, but its College of Education was not organized until 1913 (Alzona, 1932). Many Filipino/as therefore saw the Normal School as a key that opened access to employment and status in the U.S.-controlled system.

Although the Normal School's original purpose was to produce teachers, by 1905 it enlarged its scope to prepare Filipino/as "for professional schools in general or for college courses" (Bureau of Education, 1905/1954, p. 970). By 1907, 99 men and women graduated with normal diplomas, and 4 completed the literary course. The following year, there were 344 students enrolled in various courses of study: 75 were preparing for medicine; 67 were in the course for literature, science, and history; 41 for nursing; 33 for law; 33 for engineering; 18 for agriculture; and 17 for

domestic science. Out of 344 students, only 60 were enrolled in the course for teaching. As interest in the other courses increased, U.S. officials lamented that the “fundamental purpose of the [Normal School] as a training center for teachers for the entire Archipelago [was] not being fulfilled” (Bureau of Education, 1908/1957, p. 110). The “legitimate function of the Normal School was in a measure lost sight of” and the Bureau could no longer depend on it to train teachers (Bureau of Education, 1910/1957, p. 292). Filipino/as, however, saw the expansion of the curriculum differently. From their vantage point, the varied courses of study enabled them to pursue a liberal arts or professional preparation which provided better employment opportunities and remuneration.

Many U.S. colonial administrators believed that “the quickest and surest way” for Filipino/as to “arrive at an understanding of Western civilization” was “to live among Americans in the United States and be taught in American schools” (Racelis & Ick, 2001, p. 224). By studying and living abroad, Filipino/as were “to gain knowledge of American life, education, and government.” Those selected 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.” When they returned to the Philippines, they were expected 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” (Bureau of Education, 1901/1954, p. 7). This fourth strategy of preparing teachers by sending them 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” (Bureau of Education, 1902/1954, p. 97).

The Philippine Commission passed Act No. 854 in 1903 to select and sponsor Filipino/a government scholars or *pensionado/as* to study in the United States. By 1910, a total of 207 students matriculated in U.S. colleges and universities (Bureau of Education, 1910/1957, p. 297). Although the initial objective of the policy to send Filipino/as abroad was to produce teachers who could carry out the U.S. priorities in the islands, its scope as an international education program, like that of the Philippine Normal School, expanded to include other courses of study. Noting the preference of students for more academic or liberal arts preparation, the first superintendent of Filipino/a 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” (Bureau of Education, 1905/1954, p. 797). In line with the prevailing colonial policy for “practical” courses and against any “academic” curriculum that may challenge U.S. rule, Sutherland declared that “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 be 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" (ibid.).

Articulated to serve "the greatest possible good" in the Philippines, the U.S. educational policy insisted on directing Filipino/as toward practical trades, like woodwork, carpentry, and domestic science, and toward "beneficial courses," such as agriculture, teaching, and engineering. Simultaneously it dismissed preparation for the legal, business, and even medical professions. This colonial educational agenda privileged the training and production of workers of industries, fields, schools, homes, and buildings, and marginalized the development of high-status professionals who could potentially contest the debilitating political, economic, and scientific conditions of empire in their own country. The push for a manual-industrial curriculum to racialized and colonized communities ultimately belied a seemingly benevolent yet deeply insidious agenda to keep them at the mercy of those who held the reigns of power.

### **THE DOMINANCE OF THE MANUAL-INDUSTRIAL CURRICULUM**

Although the initial educational focus was academically based on the liberal arts, manual-industrial training became the dominant curriculum halfway through the first decade of the 1900s. Out of the four main strategies used by the Bureau of Education to prepare teachers (after-school sessions, vacation institutes, normal schools, and study abroad in the United States), those who attended the after-school and vacation-institute sessions were the ones most impacted by the shift from academic to manual-industrial curriculum. Even though teachers who attended the normal schools in the Philippines and the *pensionado/as* who studied in the United States were also affected by the shift, its impact was mediated by other available options in the broadened courses of study. In addition, graduates of the normal schools often became teachers in secondary schools where the academic curriculum persisted. The U.S.-trained *pensionado/as* who entered the field of education primarily gained employment at the secondary or university settings where the liberal arts subjects dominated.

The material effects of the curricular difference between academic and manual-industrial schooling manifested in the education that the overwhelming majority of Filipino/as received. According to the Bureau of Education (1910/1957, pp. 306–326), the Philippines had a total population of over 7.2 million in 1910. Although there were over 1.2 million school-aged children between 6 and 16 years old, only 451,938 were

enrolled in the public schools. Because private parochial schools had limited enrollment, it seemed that based on these numerical data more than half of the school-aged population were not attending school and were not receiving any formal type of instruction. Out of those who were enrolled in the public schools, 95.7% were attending the primary grades of 1, 2, and 3; 3.7% were in the intermediate grades of 4, 5, and 6; and a measly 0.6% were in the 4-year secondary program.

What was the consequence of the colonial curriculum to the different students enrolled in the public school system? Since the manual-industrial curriculum was geared toward teachers working at the primary and intermediate levels (grades 1 to 6), over 99% of students in the early 1900s were principally exposed to an education for industrial and manual vocations. The very select few who reached the secondary schools and eventually obtained university degrees became members of the academic and, if not already, the social, economic, and political elite. In a highly stratified country like the Philippines, with seemingly insurmountable cleavages separating the upper class and the aspiring bourgeois from the working poor, the liberal arts academic curriculum for the privileged few and the manual-industrial curriculum for the overwhelming majority further exacerbated the gap between these segments of the population with different socio-economic structures, resources, and trajectories.

Although manual-industrial education was implemented in various degrees in all schools, Filipino/as of various standings viewed it differently. The elites and the bourgeois saw it as demeaning and useless and found ways to circumvent the tasks, for instance, by having their servants complete them (Racelis & Ick, 2001). However, others believed in its moral and economic benefits. The municipal president of Calumpit believed in its importance because “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” (Racelis & Ick, 2001, p. 199).<sup>9</sup>

The implementation of the manual-industrial curriculum worked well with the economic interest of the United States to export Philippine goods for foreign interest and consumption. The colonial government actively pursued the exposure of Philippine arts and crafts in international venues, such as the 1904 World’s Fair in St. Louis, Missouri, and the 1915 Panama Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco, California, to attract potential markets and consumers for ethnic and native goods. In the 1904 World’s Fair, the head of the Philippine exhibit displayed “what the government schools have accomplished” such as products created by manual and commercial training programs in Ilocos Sur, Pangasinan, Manila, Laguna, Iloilo, and the southern Moro region (Philippine Islands, 1904, p. 35).

The focus on marketable and commercial goods became part of the driving force in the school curricular transformation. The Bureau of Education's 1907 *Statement of Organization and Aims* indicated an increasing emphasis in manual-industrial training to be implemented in the third and fourth grades. Intermediate students were taught tool work, agriculture, and housekeeping. Aside from the academic and normal courses in high school, three vocational courses were offered (commerce, agriculture, and arts and trades). It was clear by the Bureau's 1911 *Statement of Organization and Aims* that the U.S. 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."<sup>10</sup>

By the time the United States pursued global imperialism, manual-industrial education had been a part of its school curricular structure. Tracing its history since the end of the Civil War, Herbert Kliebard (1999) suggests that manual-industrial instruction had been instituted for those who "require remedial treatment for one reason or another" (p. 13). For racialized minorities, such as African Americans, this type of curriculum was also imbued with moral and social values that stressed redemption, discipline, and the work ethic. Drawing on W. E. B. DuBois's coauthored study in 1912 entitled *The Negro American Artisan*, Kliebard (1999) notes that less emphasized in their training were technical and adaptable job skills required in changing industry and labor markets that could lead to employment flexibility and economic independence. A similar pattern could be seen in the Philippines where the majority of teachers and students worked under a curriculum geared toward the interest, consumption of and, hence, dependence upon external markets as opposed to the enrichment and sustainability of local communities. By relying on foreign external markets for Filipino/a labor and products, a culture of dependency was created, a condition that remains to haunt the Philippines to this day.

## CONCLUSION

The history of colonized nations offers somber and sobering lessons about the technologies and legacies of Western imperialism whose effects continue to regulate and constrain the lives and opportunities of the majority in the global South. By foregrounding the educational history of the Philippines under U.S. rule, I call into question the hegemonic narrative of exceptionalism in the United States that, through historical amnesia or selective interpretation of history, disavows its imperialist past and present. I also take to task the self-righteous mission of benevolent altruism among educators who defensively dismiss their complicity in colonial and neocolonial operations. My historical accounting is facilitated by a transnational unit of analysis that disrupts the rigid boundaries of geopolitical nation-states and attends to the border-crossing flows of people, ideas, goods,

cultures, and institutions, albeit not necessarily reciprocal to the same degree. A transnational perspective enables the examination of the historical and contemporary dynamics between nation-states that inquire into their convergences, interconnectivities, and relations of power. Between the United States and the Philippines, empire has structured their ordinary and ongoing relations.

In addition, empire works alongside race as organizing principles to normalize and discipline colonized subjects. Historian Eric Love (2004) underscores that “Race is and will remain a vital part of the story of American imperialism” (p. 1). By the early 1900s, the United States had developed a racial grammar based on distorted views of African Americans that inflected and were transposed upon Filipino/as. Popular media, official government reports, and personal correspondence participated in the discursive construction of colonized Filipino/as as racially Black, a powerful symbolic figure that circulated within the United States and across the Pacific. As the basis of comparison, African Americans were sympathetic toward Filipino/as in their shared racial oppression, but at times asserted their modernity and superiority as Americans in their self-assessment, inevitably reinforcing White hegemonic depictions of Filipino/as as primitive, atavistic savages. Thus, the emergence of Filipino/as within the U.S. imaginary came about through the intertwined contexts of global imperialism and comparative racialization.

The prevailing U.S. racial grammar which scripted the legibility of Filipino/as as racialized and colonized subjects dramatically shaped the U.S. colonial policy and curriculum in the Philippines. U.S. officials and educators used an existing and proven model to instruct racialized minorities in the U.S. South as a template for their experiment to educate their newly acquired subjects abroad. The transnational elaboration and implementation of the curriculum for African Americans toward Filipino/as produced a strikingly similar result: the production of a two-tiered educational program for different segments and different destinies—a liberal arts academic focus for the select few and an industrial-manual one for the majority. In the Philippines, the elites, bourgeois, and scholarship students who attended secondary schools, colleges, and universities were prepared for professional and lucrative futures, while the overwhelming majority only received rudimentary education and were geared toward manual and vocational destinies.

Finally, by mobilizing Foucault’s concept of archaeology in my transnational history of race, empire, and curriculum, I draw attention to the emergence of Filipino/as as racialized and colonized subjects as well as the conditions of existence in the development of the public school system in the Philippines under U.S. rule. Archaeology has enabled me to suture both the imperialist relations of power between the United States and the Philippines and the transnational connections of race between African Americans and Filipino/as in the early 1900s. As this article demonstrates,

race and empire colluded to produce a particular regime of truth about colonized subjects that materially structured education policy, curriculum, and lived trajectories. The discursive construction of Filipino/as not only reveals the pervasiveness of White supremacist views in U.S. domestic and imperialist spheres, but also set into motion a segmented educational program that perpetuated and buttressed sociocultural and economic disparities in highly stratified societies. In other words, how those in power construe racialized and colonized Others indelibly shapes the type of education provided to them. Discourse matters, after all.

## NOTES

Research for this article was supported by an AERA/Spencer Pre-Dissertation Fellowship and grants from The Ohio State University, Otterbein College, and Miami University. Much appreciation goes to Ken Goings, Cynthia Dillard, Judy Wu, Joe Ponce, and the Lakeside Collective for their comments on earlier versions. I also thank Dennis Thiessen and the three anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback.

1. See Miller (1982) and Kramer (2006) for historical accounts of the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars, which spanned from 1898 until the early 1910s.
2. See Paulet (2007) for the transfer of American Indian educational lessons to the Philippines.
3. In my observation, U.S. education scholars working on issues of race primarily draw on the traditions and priorities of ethnic studies, multicultural education, culturally relevant/responsive teaching and, more recently, critical race and postcolonial theories. A few engage and affiliate with the field of curriculum studies as it is currently constituted.
4. A recent study that exemplifies this direction is James D. Anderson's (2007) deconstruction of the "mythology of a color-blind Constitution" through a multiethnic history that intertwines "Blacks and Whites in the Confederate states" with "Native Americans on the Plains and Chinese on the Pacific Coast" (pp. 257, 250).
5. An examination of the official documents of the U.S.-controlled Bureau of Education indicates an awareness of the cultural diversity in the Philippines. In his 1902 annual report, Fred Atkinson included extracts from division superintendents (Bureau of Education, 1902/1954). For instance, in the northern Ilocano provinces, the majority of the inhabitants were deemed to belong into three classes: pure-blood natives, Spanish-mestizo, and Chinese mestizo. Much smaller in number were indigenous ethnic groups, such as Igorrotes and Negritos (pp. 73–74). The report also referenced socioeconomic class distinctions (a small upper-class elite, a slightly larger middle-class constituency, and a predominantly peasant and laboring class), and various religious and spiritual sectors (primarily Christian; a smaller Muslim community, mostly located in the southern part of the country; and pagan/animist believers among the indig-

enous ethnic groups). The Bureau of Education was originally constituted as 17 school divisions that spanned across the country's over 7,100 islands and over 100 languages and dialects.

6. The use of education by the U.S. government as a tool to pacify Filipino/as can be gleaned from General Arthur MacArthur's support for a substantial financial appropriation for school purposes: "This appropriation is recommended primarily and exclusively as an adjunct to military operations calculated to pacify the people and to procure and expedite the restoration of tranquility throughout the archipelago" (in Constantino, 1966/1987, p. 45).
7. In *Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault (1972) highlights the speaking subject, the institutional site, and the subject's position or status as legitimating factors in discursive formations (pp. 50–53).
8. Further research is needed to fully understand the experiences and perspectives of African Americans in the Philippines during this period.
9. A fuller treatment of the perspectives of Filipino/as during this time period will be the focus of a separate article.
10. Here I begin to point out the use and export of colonized labor and goods for foreign consumption, rather than for local sustainable development. More research is necessary to study the long-term development of manual-industrial education in the Philippines, especially as a component of U.S. imperialism and contemporary neocolonialism.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, D. W. (1995). *Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875–1928*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Aldridge, D. P. (2008). *The educational thought of W. E. B. DuBois: An intellectual history*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Alzona, E. (1932). *A history of education in the Philippines, 1565–1930*. Manila: University of the Philippines Press.
- Anderson, J. D. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the South, 1860–1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Anderson, J. D. (2007). Race-conscious educational policies versus a "color-blind constitution": A historical perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 36(5), 249–257.
- Atkinson, F. W. (1906). *The Philippine Islands*. Boston: Ginn.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bureau of Education. (1901/1954). *First annual report: Department of Public Instruction*. Manila, Philippines: Bureau of Printing.
- Bureau of Education. (1902/1954). *Second annual report: Department of Public Instruction*. Manila, Philippines: Bureau of Printing.
- Bureau of Education. (1903/1954). *Third annual report: Department of Public Instruction*. Manila, Philippines: Bureau of Printing.
- Bureau of Education. (1905/1954). *Fifth annual report: Department of Public Instruction*. Manila, Philippines: Bureau of Printing.
- Bureau of Education. (1908/1957). *Eighth annual report: Department of Public Instruction*. Manila, Philippines: Bureau of Printing.

- Bureau of Education. (1910/1957). *Tenth annual report: Department of Public Instruction*. Manila, Philippines: Bureau of Printing.
- Butler, J. H. M. (1934). New education in the Philippines. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 3(2), 257–268.
- Chin, M. (2005). *Sewing women: Immigrants and the New York City garment industry*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Chuh, K., & Shimakawa, K. (Eds.). (2001). *Orientations: Mapping studies in the Asian diaspora*. Raleigh, NC: Duke University Press.
- Coloma, R. S. (2004). Empire and education: Filipino schooling under United States rule, 1900–1910. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Coloma, R. S. (2006). Disorienting race and education: Changing paradigms on the schooling of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 9(1), 1–15.
- Constantino, R. (1966/1987). The miseducation of the Filipino. In D. B. Schirmer & S. R. Shalom (Eds.), *The Philippines reader: A history of colonialism, neocolonialism, dictatorship, and resistance* (pp. 45–49). Boston: South End.
- Daniel, W. G. (1937). Current trends and events of national importance in Negro education—Section A: National activities and general progress. *Journal of Negro Education*, 6(2), 225–240.
- Donato, R., & Lazerson, M. (2000). New directions in American educational history: Problems and prospects. *Educational Researcher*, 29(8), 4–15.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1903/1996). *The souls of Black folk*. New York: Penguin.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1912). *The Negro American artisan*. Atlanta, GA: Atlanta University Press.
- Espiritu, Y. L. (2003). *Home bound: Filipino American lives across cultures, communities, and countries*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fee, M. H. (1910). *A woman's impressions of the Philippines*. Cambridge, MA: McClurg.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon.
- Fujikane, C., & Okamura, J. Y. (Eds.). (2008). *Asian settler colonialism: From local governance to the habits of everyday life in Hawai'i*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Gatewood, W. B. (1975). *Black Americans and the White man's burden*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Go, J. (Ed.). (2003). *The American colonial state in the Philippines: Global perspectives*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Goggin, J. (1993). *Carter G. Woodson: A life in Black history*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Gould, S. J. (1977). *Ontogeny and phylogeny*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Halili, S. D. (2006). *Iconography of the new empire: Race and gender images and the American colonization of the Philippines*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Harlan, L. R. (1975). *Booker T. Washington: The making of a Black leader, 1956–1901*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harlan, L. R. (1983). *Booker T. Washington: The wizard of Tuskegee, 1901–1915*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1987). *The age of empire, 1875–1914*. New York: Pantheon.
- Ignacio, A., dela Cruz, E., Emmanuel, J., & Toribio, H. (2004). *The forbidden book: The Philippine American War in political cartoons*. San Francisco: T'boli.
- Isaac, A. P. (2006). *American tropics: Articulating Filipino America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Kipling, R. (2007). *Kipling poems*. New York: Random House.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1999). *Schooled to work: Vocationalism and the American curriculum, 1876–1946*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kramer, P. A. (2006). *The blood of government: Race, empire, the United States, & the Philippines*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Kurashige, S. (2007). *The shifting grounds of race: Blacks and Japanese Americans in the making of multiethnic Los Angeles*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lim de Sánchez, L. (2003). Crafting a Delta Chinese community: Education and acculturation in twentieth century Southern Baptist mission schools. *History of Education Quarterly*, 43(1), 74–90.
- Love, E. T. L. (2004). *Race over empire: Racism and U.S. imperialism, 1865–1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Mahoney, K. A. (2000). New times, new questions. *Educational Researcher*, 29(8), 18–19.
- Maira, S., & Shihade, M. (2006). Meeting Asian/Arab American studies: Thinking race, empire, and Zionism in the U.S. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 9(2), 117–140.
- May, G. A. (1980). *Social engineering in the Philippines: The aims, execution, and impact of American colonial policy, 1900–1913*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- McCarthy, C. (1998). *The uses of culture: Education and the limits of ethnic affiliation*. New York: Routledge.
- McHugh, P. (1989). Dialectics, subjectivity and Foucault's ethos of modernity. *boundary 2*, 16(2/3), 91–108.
- Miller, J. L. (2005). The American curriculum field and its worldly encounters. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 21(2), 9–24.
- Miller, S. C. (1982). *"Benevolent assimilation": The American conquest of the Philippines, 1899–1903*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ng, J. C., Lee, S. S., & Pak, Y. K. (2007). Contesting the model minority and perpetual foreigner stereotypes: A critical review of literature on Asian Americans in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 31(1), 95–130.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1987). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Pak, Y. K. (2002). *"Wherever I go, I will always be a loyal American": Schooling Seattle's Japanese Americans during World War II*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Paulet, A. (2007). To change the world: The use of American Indian education in the Philippines. *History of Education Quarterly*, 47(2), 173–202.
- Philippine Islands. (1904). *Official catalogue*. n. p.: Louisiana Purchase Exposition Board.
- Pier, A. S. (1950). *American apostles to the Philippines*. Boston: Beacon.
- Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (2003a). *International handbook of curriculum research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pinar, W. F. (2003b). Introduction: Toward the internationalization of curriculum studies. In D. Trueit, W. E. Doll, Jr., H. Wang, & W. F. Pinar (Eds.), *The internationalization of curriculum studies: Selected proceedings from the LSU Conference 2000* (pp. 1–13). New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F. (2006). *Race, religion, and a curriculum of reparation: Teacher education for a multicultural society*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Racelis, M., & Ick, J. C. (2001). *Bearers of benevolence: The Thomasites and public education in the Philippines*. Pasig, the Philippines: Anvil.



- Rutland, L. G. (1955). *The history of teacher education in the Philippines to 1955*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- San Juan, E., Jr. (2007). *U.S. imperialism and revolution in the Philippines*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tamura, E. H. (1994). *Americanization, acculturation, and ethnic identity: The nisei generation in Hawaii*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Tamura, E. H. (2001). Asian Americans in the history of education: An historiographical essay. *History of Education Quarterly*, 41(1), 58–71.
- Theobald, H. C. (1907). *The Filipino teacher's manual*. New York: World Book.
- Vergara, B. M. (1995). *Displaying Filipinos: Photography and colonialism in early 20<sup>th</sup> century Philippines*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Washington, B. T. (1901/1986). *Up from slavery*. New York: Penguin.
- Watkins, W. H. (2001). *The White architects of Black education: Ideology and power in America, 1865–1954*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Woodson, C. G. (1945). John Henry Manning Butler. *The Journal of Negro History*, 30(2), 243–244.
- Worcester, D. C. (1899). *The Philippine islands and their people: A record of personal observation and experience, with a short summary of the more important facts in the history of the archipelago*. New York: Macmillan.
- Worcester, D. C. (1906). *The non-Christian tribes of northern Luzon*. Manila, the Philippines: Bureau of Printing.
- Worcester, D. C. (1913). *Slavery and peonage in the Philippine islands*. Manila, the Philippines: Bureau of Printing.
- Worcester, D. C. (1914). *The Philippines past and present*. New York: Macmillan.
- Worcester, D. C., & Bourns, F. S. (1898). *Contributions to Philippine ornithology*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Worcester, K. (2007). Introduction: Symposium on editorial cartoons. *Political Science & Politics*, 40(2), 223–227.

Copyright of Curriculum Inquiry is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.