

The Issue of Race in the United States' Acquisition of the Philippines*

Rowena Quinto Bailon

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that the skin color remained to be the defining factor in the “otherness” of the Filipinos that justified America’s acquisition of the Philippines. The acquisition had divided the American public at the turn of the twentieth century. Both imperialists and anti-imperialists presented a discourse that had put race at the center of the debate. While the imperialists considered the acquisition of the Philippines as a continuation of their moral obligation to civilize the world and anti-imperialists considered it as a deviation from the democratic principles and tradition of the country, both seemed to agree that the annexation was a major threat to the purity of their whiteness. Gleaning over the Anti-Imperialist League’s (AIL) minutes of the meeting, and speeches by staunch imperialists, this paper will look into how the opposing groups viewed the Filipinos in connection to the race relations that confronts the American society at that time.

* This essay is part of Chapter 1 of the dissertation of the author entitled: *Battling Destiny: Soldiers' Letters and the anti-colonial discourse in the Philippine-American War*, Doctor of Philosophy in the Humanities Major in History of Ideas, University of Texas at Dallas, May 2014.

The United States' victory in the Spanish-American War and its eventual acquisition of the Philippines inaugurated an era that pitted the United States with other colonial powers such as Great Britain, France, Germany, and The Netherlands. As the European imperial powers meted out their final thrones, the United States would emerge as a strong nation ready to take over the lead. The age of isolationism that characterized the American nation for centuries had ended. The United States became one of the most powerful nations at the turn of the twentieth century. However, it was also during this period when racial issues with African Americans, Native Americans and other immigrants confronted American society.

Hence, as the United States received international recognition for its ascension onto the world stage, it also confronted serious challenges to its "national principles." The Philippine-American War that took place from 1899 to 1902, for instance, tarnished the concept of "American Exceptionalism," the belief that the United States was a unique imperial power. It also negated the idea of President William McKinley's pacification campaign called "Benevolent Assimilation," which stated that the Americans were "friends" and not "enemies." Imperialists tied the concept to "manifest destiny," which stated that America had a moral obligation to civilize, to Christianize, and to educate the savage people of the world. Anti-imperialists, on the other hand, believed that the policy was tantamount to a declaration of war. At the center of the Anti-imperialists' discourse was the preservation of the Anglo-Saxon race. Hence, this paper will examine how race played an important role in the acquisition of the Philippines. Most studies on the United States' colonizing efforts in the Philippines focused on the political, military, economic, and religious aspects.¹ This paper will center on the racial aspect of the United States' design on the Philippine Islands. The way the American soldiers treated the Filipinos during the Philippine-American War would manifest similar experiences with the Native Americans and the African Americans. Gleaning over through the Anti-Imperialists' minutes of meetings, President McKinley's Benevolent Assimilation proclamation and some speeches of staunch imperialists, the racial issue became apparent in both the imperialists and anti-imperialists arguments.

The Benevolent Assimilation

President William McKinley's Benevolent Assimilation proclamation became the blueprint for the United States colonial experiment in the Philippines, and the Philippine-American War became the obstacle for its smooth promulgation. The war divided the American public and it created a rift in American society. It had affected the different aspects of the United States domestic and foreign affairs. Since President McKinley explicitly entrusted the execution of his policy to the Commanding General of the Army, the Benevolent Assimilation legitimized the role of the soldiers as agents of the United States imperialistic design. The war that cost thousands of American and Filipino lives had become part of the discussion on American imperialism and United States- Philippine relations.²

Thus, the United States and the Philippines had fostered a "special" relationship grounded on their shared history. They developed a mutual understanding on the political, economic, social, cultural, and military aspects based on their shared experience. This relationship was an offshoot of President William McKinley's Benevolent Assimilation program, which became the guiding principle of the United States colonial enterprise in the Philippines. The Proclamation was supposed to be a policy of attraction geared towards pacifying the area in order to promulgate the manifest destiny's principles "to civilize and to uplift." However, just as the policy was used to pacify the Native Americans, the Americans successfully subjugated the Filipino people. This resulted in the rise of protest against the colonial policy of the government, which in turn led to the emergence of anti-colonial discourse that prompted the government to put the Philippine question at the center of the legislative agenda.

Showcasing white supremacy

Economic development with massive industrialization and territorial expansion coupled with Progressivism, abolitionism, and rise of labor unionism, characterized nineteenth-century America. With the reunification of the North and the South after the Civil War, the United States began to experience economic development and technological advancement. The final construction of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 facilitated

industrialization and population growth. The invention of more advanced technology and new ways of communication, such as the telephone and telegraph, resulted in more efficient business management.

To show the world about such technological innovation, the United States hosted several expositions held in New York (1853), Philadelphia (1876), Chicago (1893), Buffalo (1901), St. Louis (1904), and San Francisco (1915). The display of different groups of “inferior and savage” people presented as the subjects of America’s manifest destiny became one of the highlights of the exposition. Although the expositions displayed the grandeur and progress in the New World, it also exposed the racial question confronting American society. The exposition was just one of the many ways, which David Brody presented, in visualizing the United States’ imperial pursuit.³ Brody broadened the scope of Servando Halili’s work on cartography, Vicente Rafael’s on census data, and Benito Vergara’s on photography to include travelogue, maps, advertisements, buildings, celebrations, and furniture in showing the extent of America’s lust for empire. Brody claimed that the “curiosity in things related to the ambiguously defined as Orient” resulted to the penchant of Americans for empire.⁴ This interest and Oriental fascination enabled the United States to think, define, and finally claim the Philippines.⁵ This confirmed Edward Said’s definition of Orientalism, which “is a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient.”⁶ Furthermore, Said believed that Orientalism was intentional. He said, “It is a will or intention to understand, in some cases to control, manipulate, even to incorporate, what is a manifestly different world.” Thus, based on this argument, the American Benevolent Assimilation policy was intended to “understand and incorporate” the Filipinos in order to later control and manipulate the whole archipelago.

As a rising new nation without any colonial ties, adhering to a neutral stand on foreign policy, the United States was able to concentrate on its domestic affairs and was able to forge good relations with other countries. With the continuing economic development came the concept of Social Darwinism, Manifest Destiny, and white man’s burden, wherein the Americans believed in the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race and in the moral duty to civilize and to spread democracy to uplift the lives not only of Americans, but also of people around the world. Politics, economics, and

religion became the major forces in the United States' pursuit of extending its realm to the whole continent and beyond.

Conquering the West

Since the Atlantic Ocean rested on the eastern side of the continent, a more obvious action was American expansion to the west. Unmindful of the different indigenous peoples already possessing the vast lands of the west, Anglo-Saxons began to encroach on these lands. With the idea of manifest destiny as their justification, spreading civilization to people they called "savages," the Americans were able to take possession of these lands belonging to Native Americans through treaties, purchases, land grabbing, and wars over the course of the nineteenth century.⁷ The process was not a peaceful one, for the Native American people believed in the sacredness of their land, defending it up to their last breath, which usually resulted to bloody encounters. Thus, the first group of people affected by the westward expansion was the Native Americans, possessing much of the Western lands. The Anglos began to impose and to introduce the "superior" culture to the Indian people, whom they considered "inferior," first through religion and later through education. However, according to Robert Berkhofer, no matter how the Anglos tried to "eliminate Indian people" and change the ways of the Native Americans, "Native American social relationship and self identification endure unto the present and earlier activities and beliefs outlasted conquest, and reservation confinement."⁸ The initial attempt to incorporate and accommodate the Indians did not succeed. Berkhofer argued that this was because the white people do not want to recognize the Indians as equals no matter how they tried to be as Christianized and as civilized as possible.⁹

After the missionaries' failure in pacifying, assimilating, and acculturating the Native Americans, the government began to use a harsher method of pacifying. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the military increasingly began to take the lead in deterring any opposition or struggle from the Native Americans. The military became the most important and powerful agents during the pacification campaign. With the government's armed superiority, all Native American resistance had ceased to exist by the end of the nineteenth-century. Nevertheless, the end of armed struggle did

not mean the Native Americans' submission to the cultures of the whites. The Indian practices and traditions continued to flourish.

Nonetheless, in the white men's desire to assimilate the Indians into their society, they began to establish boarding schools. Richard Henry Pratt introduced the concept in 1879 with the idea that it was better to train the children than the old people. However, David Wallace Adams, who did an extensive study on the boarding school system, narrated how the Indians had to choose between civilization and extinction. Pratt's principle of "kill the Indian in him and save the man" became the most popular quotation when referring to the boarding school replacing the slogan "the only good Indian is a dead Indian" popularized in the West.¹⁰ The soldiers would later use these slogans during the Philippine campaign.

Meanwhile, according to Walter Williams, the nineteenth century United States Indian policy "served as a precedent for the imperialist domination over the Philippines."¹¹ The United States government used the concept of "domestic dependent nations" making Indians as "wards" to define their protectorate position in the Philippines.¹² Not only did the Americans use the military strategy in pacifying the Native Americans, but also the educational system and civil government. Thus, it was not surprising that most of the soldiers and volunteers sent to the Philippines served during the Indian campaigns for when the Philippines came into the United States' path, the government used the same strategy in pacifying the Filipino people, whom they considered as inferior because of their skin color. Walter attested that based on the biographical data of the generals who served in the Philippines during the Philippine-American War; eighty-seven percent had experiences with Indians in the West.¹³ The Americans saw the Filipinos and the Native Americans as alike based on their concept of "savage" people.¹⁴ The imperialists used this notion to justify their expansionist stance stating that the Filipinos were not yet ready for self-government and that the acquisition would benefit the Filipino people. With the concept of manifest destiny, the United States believed that it had a moral obligation to uplift these uncivilized people. In order to accomplish this, there must be peace and order, which would mean subjugating by force. Despite the personal opinion of Admiral George Dewey about the Filipinos as "more civilized than the Cubans," the devout imperialists still viewed the Filipinos as "unfit"

and “inferior” and pursued its war of conquest when the Filipinos began to dissent.

American South

Aside from Native American issues, problems concerning the African-Americans also confronted nineteenth-century America. Like the Native Americans, the white men looked down upon the African Americans because of their skin color and their status as slaves. As C. Vann Woodward put it, “slavery was only one of the many ways by which the white man has sought to define the Negro status, his place and assure his subordination.”¹⁵ The African-Americans carried this definition all throughout their existence in the American world. W.E.B. Du Bois argued that the African-Americans were “born with a veil...which yields him to true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world.”¹⁶ The definition set by the whites had guided the white-black relationship. The African-Americans continued to live under the shadow of their masters. The whites considered them as their property.

Consequently, as more and more blacks became literate, the majority who were slaves due to their historical heritage now wanted to be free and those who were born in the land began to assert their rights. This resulted in the passage of the Emancipation Proclamation, which freed some slaves during the Civil War and the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments, which banned slavery in the land, granted citizenship and voting powers to African-Americans. However, these laws did not end the plight of the blacks. After the abolition of slavery, a new form of discrimination emerged. Jim Crow began to appear, which segregated the blacks from the whites in all places. There were designated areas for the blacks different from the whites in public places such as “churches and schools, to housing and jobs, to eating and drinking.”¹⁷ This segregation extended to “all forms of transportation, to sports and recreations, to hospitals, orphanages, prisons, asylums, funeral homes, morgues, and cemeteries.”¹⁸ This had divided the American society between the white and black sphere for decades. According to Woodward, the symbols in these establishments became a “constant reminder of his [blacks] inferior position.”¹⁹ Some of these establishments do not even allow African-Americans inside their premises. The Jim Crow laws,

which denied equal opportunities for the African-Americans, had justified this division. It marginalized the African-Americans and put a barrier that separates them from the whites. Thus, segregation resulted in race conflict and violence. As tension between the two races heightened, a more brutal type of crime and punishment called "lynching" emerged. Lynching was a form of public execution for African-American offenders. If an African-American committed a crime, the whole community witnessed the carrying out of the penalty through lynching. This type of punishment reached its height in the 1880's and 1890's.²⁰ Consequently, the black community formed civil rights organizations that tried to battle Jim Crow's inhumanity. Their battle however, would not end until the 1960's.

The inferior treatment of the African-Americans also manifested in the American dealings with the Filipinos. The soldiers who served during the Philippine-American War usually called the Filipinos "nigger." It is apparent in their letters how they viewed the Filipinos. The Anti-Imperialists had published letters of soldiers that presented American soldiers name calling to the Filipinos.²¹ An example was the letter of a Washington State Volunteer soldier of H Company that stated, "... our fighting blood was up ..., and we all wanted to kill 'niggers'".²² The soldiers viewed the Filipinos not only as Indians, but also as blacks. Hence, it was not surprising when known African-Americans and white sympathizers, called "abolitionists," who tried to help the African-Americans to win their cause, would become prominent members of the Anti-Imperialists League. Some of the prominent abolitionists²³ later joined and allied with the anti-imperialists.

Imperialism of Righteousness

It was so ironic that when the United States acquired the Philippines, it was also the rise of Progressivism in America. Hofstadter argued that the main theme of Progressivism was the restoration of "economic individualism and political democracy," as well as the return of civic purity and moral values, which the Progressives believed to have been lost.²⁴ He went on to say that, the central stage of Progressivism was not the "political campaigns, the enactments of legislatures, the decisions of the courts, nor the work of regulatory commissions, but the ideas of the participants— their conception of what was wrong, the changes they sought, and the techniques they thought

desirable."²⁵ Hence, the Progressives advocated for reforms and waged war against social evils, such as monopoly, corruption, and social injustice. Yet it was during this period when the government faced the biggest challenge of acquiring the Philippines and subjugating the Filipino people.

Progressives wanted the government to act on behalf of the people in promoting social welfare and social justice. They believed in democratic processes of election, judiciary, and legislation. Advocates of the "social gospel" invoked religious doctrine and values to demand better living conditions for the poor. They emphasized social cohesion and collective effort in understanding the society and in addressing issues pertaining to social problems. Consequently, different sectors of the society worked together in uplifting the lives of the people. This Progressivism ideal would be crucial in understanding the reaction of the Anti-Imperialist League as well as the patriotic and chauvinistic nature of the soldiers during the Philippine American War. The Anti-Imperialist League would become the mouthpiece of those opposing the acquisition of the Philippines. Although the voice of the group was not that strong, it was enough to make the government act and put the Philippines issue in the legislative agenda.

Hofstadter characterized the period from the Civil War to the 1890s as the age of "political conservatism," and as "period of industrial and continental expansion."²⁶ The United States began to shy away from global conflict and started to develop and expand internally. With the idea that the United States had a role in propagating Christianity and democratic principles, the concept of "imperialism of righteousness," wherein the duty to civilize and to teach the world lies in the hands of the white Americans, dominated American thinking during the nineteenth century. With this idea of imperialism, the United States began to spread its wings all over the continent. After clearing the Western part of the Indians through bloody battles, unequal and unfair treaties, and purchases, the United States government was able to take control of all the lands that the European superpowers such as Spain, Britain, and France used to possess. From the Louisiana Purchase to the annexation of Florida, Texas, and Oregon, the United States government continued to take California and Alaska.²⁷

Nevertheless, the United States path to empire started with the annexation of Hawaii, and a strong foothold in Latin America. With the

Monroe Doctrine, preventing other Europeans from colonizing any nation in the Americas, the United States began its duty as Big Brother to the other neighboring nations, gaining access to their internal affairs. Hawaii became the stepping-stone in the United States' eventual infiltration of Asian market. In addition, Hawaii became the United States' "first outpost in the defense of the Pacific coast."²⁸ The need for a new market for its burgeoning production enabled the government to turn its effort abroad. Thus, after Hawaii, came Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines. It was during this period when the Anti-Imperialist League started its anti-colonial campaign. It began to question the expansionist policy of the government.

Thus, economic development coupled with societal issues characterized nineteenth-century America. No matter how President McKinley insisted that Divine Providence and Manifest Destiny had guided his decision to acquire the Philippines, his critics believed that the economic and military aims prevailed. The United States acquired the Philippines through the combination of different expansionist tactics such as treaty – Treaty of Paris, purchase-twenty million dollars, and war – Philippine-American War. Hence, the question on whether to annex or not to annex the Philippines preoccupied the policy-makers in their debates. Those who favored annexation invoked their moral obligation through the Manifest Destiny while those who opposed pointed to the peoples' rights through the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

The most vocal among the imperialists was Republican Senator Albert Beveridge of Indiana who assured the American public that "the Philippine Islands are ours forever." He saw the Philippines as crucial for a possible economic venture in Asia. Furthermore, he said, "This island empire is the last land left in all the oceans. If it should prove a mistake to abandon it, the blunder once made would be irretrievable. If it proves a mistake to hold it, the error can be corrected when we will. Every other progressive nation stands ready to relieve us. But to hold it will be no mistake."²⁹ Obviously, the Senator was envious of the other European powers that have each own sphere in other parts of the globe. It was clear that what the Senator wanted was the territory and its resources. Regardless of the consequences, the United States must acquire the land. The Senator wanted the American people to believe that there was no other option but to take hold of the

Philippines otherwise other superpower would possess it. Whereas Senator Beveridge viewed the acquisition of the Philippines not as a mistake, the Anti-Imperialist League (AIL), which served as the mouthpiece of the oppositionists, saw it as a blunder. The Anti-Imperialists looked not only on the territory and natural resources but also on the nature of its inhabitants.

In the first meeting of the AIL, its President George Boutwell said, "The people of the Philippine Islands, whether they are few or many, whether they are capable or incapable, are not ours." In his statement, "capable or incapable" implied a racial slur. This was in relation to the imperialists' view about the Philippines incapacity to rule. He continued, "if the Declaration of Independence be true, then this follows as a fact regarding which there can be no mistake: the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands are to decide for themselves what the form of government shall be under which they are to live, otherwise there is no freedom."³⁰ Invoking their sacred document and tradition, Boutwell challenged the government to give freedom to the Filipino people. However, in the same meeting, Reverend Charles G. Ames, a protestant pastor AIL member, asked the people "Is there a man in America, who wishes those seven millions of Malays, Negritos, Chinamen for fellow citizens and joint rulers of this Republic?"³¹ The respected pastor was afraid of the possible incorporation of these various races into their society once the Philippine Islands becomes an American possession. Hence, while the imperialists considered the acquisition of the Philippines as a continuation of the expansion and spread of democracy and civilization, the anti-imperialists considered it as a deviation from the democratic principles and tradition of the country. However, both seemed to agree that the annexation of the Philippines became a major threat to the purity of the white race and the Philippine-American War became the biggest threat to the unity of the American public.

Conclusion

After neutralizing the Native Americans through Indian Wars and the African Americans through the Emancipation Proclamation and Constitutional Amendments, the United States at the turn of the century had yet to deal with another racial group. By virtue of the Treaty of Paris, the Spanish government had relinquished her possessions, including the

Philippine Islands, to the United States government. As such, the United States would become an imperial power possessing not only vast lands but also additional people of different stock. After the Philippine-American War that resulted in the defeat of the Philippine revolutionary forces, Americans began to take hold of the whole archipelago. President William McKinley's "Benevolent Assimilation" declaration had put the Philippines under an American military rule and later into a civil government.

Meanwhile, the United States' acquisition of the Philippines became one of the major issues that have divided the American nation. Those in favor of the conquest became known as imperialists and those against were branded as anti-imperialists. The imperialists had found "righteousness" in their decision to acquire the Philippine Islands highlighting their "civilizing mission" to "educate" the Filipinos, which they considered as "savages." The Anti-imperialists on the other hand, considered the acquisition as an encroachment on the Filipino democratic rights but with the underlying intention of preserving the purity of their race. Therefore, it was apparent that whether on the side of the imperialists or the anti-imperialists, race remained at the center of their arguments. The skin color remained to be the defining factor in the "otherness" of the Filipinos that became one of the justifications in the acquisition of the Philippines and eventual subjugation of the Filipino people.

ENDNOTES

¹ See Thomas Paterson and Stephen Rabe (Eds), *Civilization: Imperial Surge, the United States Abroad, the 1890s-Early 1900*. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C Heath and Company, 1992.

² See Paul Kramer, *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, & the Philippines* (Chapel Hill University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Paul McCartney, *Power and Progress: American National Identity, the War of 1898, and the Rise of American Imperialism* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006); Thomas Schoonover, *Uncle Sam's War of 1898 and the Origins of Globalization* (Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 2003); H.W. Brands, *Bound to Empire: The United States and the Philippines* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Stanley Karnow, *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines* (New York: Random House, 1989); David Bain, *Sitting in Darkness: Americans in the Philippines* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984); Peter Stanley, *A Nation in the Making: The Philippines and the United States, 1899-1921* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974); James Blount, *The American Occupation of the Philippines, 1898-1912* (New York: Putnam, 1913).

³ David Brody, *Visualizing American Empire: Orientalism and Imperialism in the Philippines*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010); Servando Halili Jr., *Iconography of the New Empire: Race and Gender Images and the American Colonization of the Philippines* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 2006); Vicente Rafael, *White Love and other Events in Filipino History* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2000); Benito Vergara, *Displaying Filipinos: Photography and Colonialism in the Early 20th Century Philippines* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1995).

⁴ Brody, 6.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 3.

⁷ See the works of Clyde Milner and Floyd O'Neil (Eds), *Churchmen and the Western Indians, 1820-1920* (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985); Robert Berkhofer Jr. *Salvation and the Savage: An Analysis of Protestant Missions and American Indian Response, 1787-1862* (New York: Atheneum, 1976); Vine Deloria, Jr. *God is Red* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1973); Wicomb Washburn, *Red Man's Land; White Man's Law: The Past and Present Status of the American Indians* (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971); Vine Deloria, Jr. *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (New York: Avon Books, 1969).

⁸ Berkhofer, *Salvation and the Savage*, 4.

⁹ Ibid., 159.

¹⁰ David Wallace Adams. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928* (Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1995), 52.

¹¹ Walter Williams, "United States Indian Policy and the Debate Over Philippine Annexation: Implications for the Origins of American Imperialism," *The Journal of American History* 66, no. 4 (March 1980): 810.

¹² *Ibid.*, 811.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 828.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 826.

¹⁵ C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), 11.

¹⁶ W.E.B. Du Bois, *Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches*, (Connecticut: Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1961), 16.

¹⁷ Woodward, 7.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 43.

²¹ *Soldiers' Letters: Being Materials for the History of a War of Criminal Aggression*, published by the Anti-Imperialist League, 1899.

²² *Ibid.*, 9.

²³ George Boutwell, W.E Du Bois, Jane Addams to name some

²⁴ Woodward, 43.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 3.

²⁷ For an overview of the United States imperial surge, see Thomas Paterson and Stephen Rabe, eds. *Imperial Surge: The United States Abroad, The 1890's-Early 1900's* (Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1992); William Appleman Williams, editor, *From Colony to Empire: Essays in the History of American Foreign Relations* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1972); Walter LaFeber, *The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion 1860-1898* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1963).

²⁸ Eric T. Love, *Race Over Empire: Racism & U.S. Imperialism, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 151.

²⁹ Speech of Senator Albert Beveridge in front of the Senate on the Philippine Question, January 9, 1900 found in William H. Anderson, *The Philippine Problem* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939), 41.

³⁰ *Report of the First Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League*, November 25, 1899 (Boston: New England Anti-Imperialist League, 1899), 15.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 16.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, D. W. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928*. Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1995.
- Anderson, W. H. *The Philippine Problem*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939.
- Bain, D. *Sitting in Darkness: Americans in the Philippines*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.
- Berkhofer, Jr., R., *Salvation and the Savage: An Analysis of Protestant Missions and American Indian Response, 1787-1862*. New York: Atheneum, 1976.
- Blount, J. *The American Occupation of the Philippines, 1898-1912*. New York: Putnam, 1913.
- Brands, H.W. *Bound to Empire: The United States and the Philippines*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Brody, D. *Visualizing American Empire: Orientalism and Imperialism in the Philippines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Deloria, Jr., V. *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. New York: Avon Books, 1969.
- _____. *God is Red*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1973.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. *Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches*. Connecticut: Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1961.
- Halili Jr., S. *Iconography of the New Empire: Race and Gender Images and the American Colonization of the Philippines*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 2006.
- Karnow, S. *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines*. New York: Random House, 1989.
- Kramer, P. *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, & the Philippines*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- LaFeber, W. *The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion 1860-1898*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1963.15

- Bailon, R.Q. The Issue of Race in the United States' Acquisition of the Philippines
- Love, E. T. *Race Over Empire: Racism & U.S. Imperialism, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- McCartney, P. *Power and Progress: American National Identity, the War of 1898, and the Rise of American Imperialism*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006.
- Milner, C. & O'Neil, F. (Eds). *Churchmen and the Western Indians, 1820-1920*. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985.
- Paterson, T. & Rabe, S. (Eds). *Imperial Surge: The United States Abroad, The 1890's Early 1900's*. Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1992.
- Rafael, V. *White Love and other Events in Filipino History*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2000.
- Report of the First Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League, November 25, 1899*. Boston: New England Anti-Imperialist League, 1899.
- Said, E. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.
- Schoonover, T. *Uncle Sam's War of 1898 and the Origins of Globalization*. Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 2003.
- Soldiers' Letters: Being Materials for the History of a War of Criminal Aggression*. Anti-Imperialist League, 1899.
- Stanley, P. *A Nation in the Making: The Philippines and the United States, 1899-1921*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Vergara, B. *Displaying Filipinos: Photography and Colonialism in the Early 20th Century Philippines*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1995.
- Washburn, W. *Red Man's Land; White Man's Law: The Past and Present Status of the American Indians*. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971.
- Williams, W. United States Indian Policy and the Debate Over Philippine Annexation: Implications for the Origins of American Imperialism. *The Journal of American History* 66. No. 4, March 1980
- Williams, W. A. (Ed). *From Colony to Empire: Essays in the History of American Foreign Relations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1972.
- Woodward, C. V. *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.