



2011

Constructing a "Good" Colonial Society: Representations of Philippine Colonial Education at the 1887 Philippine Exposition in Madrid and the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair

Erin Hardacker
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hardacker, Erin, "Constructing a "Good" Colonial Society: Representations of Philippine Colonial Education at the 1887 Philippine Exposition in Madrid and the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair" (2011). *Master's Theses*. 517.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/517

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 2011 Erin Hardacker

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

CONSTRUCTING A “GOOD” COLONIAL SOCIETY:
REPRESENTATIONS OF PHILIPPINE COLONIAL EDUCATION AT THE
1887 PHILIPPINE EXPOSITION IN MADRID AND THE 1904 ST. LOUIS
WORLD’S FAIR

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
PROGRAM IN CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES

BY
ERIN HARDACKER
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
MAY 2011

Copyright by Erin Hardacker, 2011
All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Research Topic	1
Research Question	1
Methodology	2
Organization	3
CHAPTER TWO: STATEMENT OF PROBLEM / LITERATURE REVIEW	4
The (Colonial) World of the Late Nineteenth / Early Twentieth Century	4
World's Fairs and Expositions	7
Representation	9
Gaps in Literature	13
CHAPTER THREE: SPANISH COLONIAL PHILIPPINES	15
Brief Background of Colonization	15
Colonial Education System	16
Philippine Exposition, Madrid, 1887	21
CHAPTER FOUR: AMERICAN COLONIAL PHILIPPINES	34
Brief Background of Colonization	34
Colonial Education System	36
St. Louis World's Fair, 1904	40
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION	55
Discussion	55
Future Research	63
EPILOGUE	65
APPENDIX A: LIST / ORIGIN OF AWARD-WINNING EDUCATION MATERIALS DISPLAYED AT 1887 PHILIPPINE EXPOSITION, MADRID	70
APPENDIX B: LIST / ORIGIN OF EDUCATION MATERIALS DISPLAYED AT 1904 ST. LOUIS PHILIPPINE EXHIBIT (PARTIAL)	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY	80
VITA	85

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Research Topic

World's fairs and expositions were major social, political, economic, and cultural events in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These events were places where colonial states could display their achievements in their colonies, as well as produce knowledge and organize peoples as part of / in aid of the colonial project. It is a generally agreed fact among historians that the colonial exhibits at world's fairs and expositions were often idealized representations, or even deliberate misrepresentations, of colonies and colonial projects (see Kramer, 2006; Mitchell, 1988; Rydell, 1987). In addition, world's fairs were not only sites in which to disseminate and gain knowledge, but also sites of knowledge production. Thus, examining world's fairs and expositions should shed light on how these events contributed to the development of educational policies and systems in colonies, as well as how these events represented educational efforts in the pursuit of creating a "good" colonial society that would benefit both colonizer and colonized.

Research Question

The research question for this thesis is: How did Spain envision a "good" Philippine society; how did the United States envision a "good" Philippine society—and what role was education to play in constructing these "good" societies? This question will

be answered by examining how both Spain and the United States represented its educational policies for / efforts in the Philippines at the 1887 Philippine Exposition in Madrid and the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair respectively.

Methodology

The research methodology for this thesis is historical document analysis. Primary and archival sources were the main materials examined to answer the research question. However, secondary sources also played a role, such as in helping to develop a theoretical framework and in providing leads for primary and archival sources.

Sources were initially located using an Internet search, which was followed by onsite research visits to Chicago-area libraries and repositories, most often the Edward E. Ayer Collection at the Newberry Library. Additional materials were obtained via interlibrary loan through Loyola University Library and through Google Books.

Materials were examined for information that might help answer the research question. Reading one source usually led to another, and taken together, sources complemented and corroborated details regarding the educational exhibits at the expositions under investigation. Themes began to emerge from the readings and also across time periods, as will be elaborated upon in Chapter Five. The research was purely qualitative, and all findings were gathered via document analysis by the author.

While researcher bias is a potential limitation when conducting document analysis, by triangulating sources, some of that bias should be counteracted. It is still advisable, though, to keep in mind that another researcher, if given the same materials, might come to different conclusions. That being said, the overall purpose of this thesis is

to add to the growing body of research regarding education exhibits at world's fairs and expositions.

Organization

This thesis is organized chronologically after outlining the research problem and providing a literature review. A brief history of Spain's Philippine colonization and its colonial education system precede the discussion of the 1887 Exposition in Madrid. A brief background of the United States' Philippine colonization and its colonial education system follow, leading to a discussion of the 1904 World's Fair in St. Louis. The conclusion draws connections across the two colonial states and how each represented their colonial education efforts, as well as identifies emergent themes. Finally, directions for future research are presented. Appendices include data (published in conjunction with the 1887 Exposition and 1904 World's Fair) on the peoples and materials displayed at the respective Philippine exhibits.

CHAPTER TWO

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM / LITERATURE REVIEW

The (Colonial) World of the Late Nineteenth / Early Twentieth Century

Colonial processes were to make colonies “picture-like and legible, rendered available to political and economic calculation. Colonial power required the country to become readable, like a book, in our own sense of such a term” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 33).

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, colonial states were preoccupied with creating hierarchical systems according to race and social status in their colonies (see Stoler, 2010). Or, as Rafael (1990) colorfully states, colonial states were “dynastic states in drag” (p. 592), creating a hierarchical and segregated colonial society under the guise of a “civilizing mission.” Rydell (1987) also finds that organization and categorization of colonies was of extreme interest and importance to colonial states during this time period (p. 161). World’s fairs and expositions proved prime venues for colonial states to display the civilizing missions in their colonies (Morillo-Alicea, 2005, p. 29), and also display the ways in which they organized the people therein (i.e., their colonial projects). Mitchell (1988) similarly writes, “Europe was a place where [non-Europeans were] liable to become an object on exhibit, at which people gathered and stared” (pp. 4–5). While Rydell focuses his work on the United States and Mitchell on Europe, both books are alike in some of the main points, such as the fact that colonial powers desired to categorize and compartmentalize their colonies in order to make them easier to rule

(Mitchell, 1988, p. 33). World's fairs and expositions were opportunities for colonial states to test and establish such categorizations / organizations in aid of their colonial projects.

The Philippines was a Spanish colony from the sixteenth to the late nineteenth century. By the nineteenth century, Spanish colonial society in the Philippines was highly stratified by race (Kramer, 2006, p. 39). Sánchez Gómez (2002) notes that Spain was a “weak” colonial power during the mid- to late-1800s, and that it struggled to maintain control over its colonies leading up to the Spanish-American War (p. 283). The 1887 Philippine Exposition in Madrid was a way for Spain to reassert its authority, and its colonial project (Sánchez Gómez, 2002, pp. 283–284). Sánchez Gómez continues that the main objective of Spanish colonial policy throughout its occupation of the Philippines was to “keep the indigenous population from modernization or any liberalizing processes” (p. 290), thus rendering the populace dependent on Spanish guidance and easier to rule.

Following the Spanish-American War, control of the Philippines was transferred to the United States. During this time period, a new scientific pursuit called Victorian anthropology was gaining popularity in Europe. Victorian anthropologists were “armchair” anthropologists primarily concerned with the racialization and organization of colonies and colonists—a fitting pursuit for the time period, given that European countries controlled many overseas colonial possessions. These “anthropologists” (usually men of high society) made ethnographic accounts of “primitive” life based mostly on the work of others, including scientific research, missionary accounts, and travelogues (Stocking, 1987, p. 79). Stocking's (1987) book, *Victorian Anthropology*,

provides a thorough history of the field, from its inception to its eventual exclusion from scientific pursuits. His work helps to build a more complete picture of the time period, as well as to describe the scientific racism that pervaded the Western world, and which was subsequently reflected at world's fairs and expositions. Victorian anthropologists, and the racially based cultural grades they created, often lent an "aura of legitimacy" to anthropological exhibits at world's fairs and expositions (Rydell, 1987, pp. 161 & 166). Knowledge of Victorian anthropology will help answer the research question because the field contributed to the representational practices of the time.

One of the many topics Anderson (2006) addresses in his book *Imagined Communities* were the ways in which "the colonial state imagined its dominion—the nature of the human beings it ruled, the geography of its domain, and the legitimacy of its ancestors" (p. 164). Legitimacy played a major role in the actions of colonial states. Colonizers used methods such as representation in popular media and at world's fairs and expositions as a means to legitimize their colonial efforts and policies. The United States used the guise of "moral responsibility," as seen in popular magazine articles from the time period (e.g., *National Geographic*, *Harper's*, etc.), to garner domestic support for its colonial projects, thus demonstrating that world's fairs and expositions were not the only venues in which colonial states envisioned their perfect colonial societies. Popular magazine articles in favor of colonial projects / efforts could compound the effectiveness of the representations found at world's fairs and expositions (see Tuason, 1999). Anderson's work helps establish a theoretical framework around the notion of representation, and how it was utilized by Spain and the United States in order to envision a "good" Philippine society.

World's Fairs and Expositions

Throughout the nineteenth century non-European visitors [to Europe] found themselves being placed on exhibit or made the careful object of European curiosity. The degradation they often suffered, whether intended or not, seemed nevertheless inevitable, as necessary to these spectacles as the scaffolded façades or the curious crowds of onlookers. The façades, the onlookers and the degradation seemed all to belong to the organising of an exhibit, to a particularly European concern with rendering things up to be viewed (Mitchell, 1988, p. 2).

The representation of reality was always an exhibit set up for an observer in its midst, an observing gaze surrounded and set apart by the exhibition's careful order. If the dazzling displays of the exhibition could evoke some larger historical and political reality, it was because they were arranged to demand this isolated gaze. ... The representation was set apart from the real political reality it claimed to portray as the observing mind was set apart from what it observed (Mitchell, 1988, p. 9).

World's fairs and expositions were major social, political, economic, and cultural events in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Mitchell (1988) contends that international exhibitions increased in importance and scale as Europe entered its "imperial phase" (p. 6). These events were places where colonial states could display their achievements not only in their colonies, but also in the fields of science, industry, art, and media: "Spectacles like the world exhibition ... set up the world as a picture. They ordered it up before an audience as an object on display, to be viewed, experienced and investigated" (Mitchell, 1988, p. 6). Mitchell further asserts that "what was on exhibit [at world's fairs] was the conversion of the world to modern capitalist production and exchange, and to the movements of communication and the process of inspection on which these were thought to depend" (p. 16). Rydell's (1987) thoughts on world's fairs coincide with Mitchell's: "America's expositions, while part of the American grain, were unique only in that they helped shape the increasing efforts by the United States to

manage the world from its own rapidly expanding imperial perspective” (p. 8). In other words, fairs and expositions were sites in which colonial states produced knowledge and organized peoples as part of / in aid of the colonial project.

Rydell (1987) states that fairs “reflected the imperial vision of the exposition’s promoters and was intended to shape the way fairgoers saw the world” (p. 179), thus supporting the idea of fairs creating “imagined communities” as put forth by Anderson (2006). Similarly, Mitchell (1988) believes visitors to world’s fairs “expected there to be something that was somehow set apart from ‘things themselves’ as a guide, a sign, a map, a text, or a set of instructions about how to proceed” (p. 32), which also alludes to Anderson’s notion of colonial states creating “imagined communities,” and supports the use of his notion in establishing the theoretical framework to answer the research question. Of the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair, Rydell concludes: “Above all, [it] gave a utopian dimension to American imperialism” (p. 183). The purpose of world’s fairs was to propagate the ideas and values of the fair organizers and, in turn, of the colonial states. Even though not all fairgoers agreed with what was presented at the fairs, the fairs did strike a cord with many, and left a lasting impression on all (Rydell, 1987, p. 3). For example, exhibits of nonwhite peoples often “degraded and exploited the people on display,” but anthropologists and other scientists supported the negative representations (Rydell, 1987, p. 7). Adding scientific legitimacy to colonial representations made them more believable to fairgoers (whether the representations were accurate or not). This fact supports the belief that world’s fairs and expositions are ideal events to examine to answer the research question, as the representations found there usually reflected the desires of the colonial states.

Where Rydell (1987) focuses specifically on U.S. fairs during a set time period, Morillo-Alicea (2005) focuses specifically on Spanish–Philippine relations, noting that the 1887 Philippine Exposition in Madrid was a site for the “production of racialized knowledge about the [Philippines]” and was also a site for the transmission of that knowledge to the masses (p. 37). Here we find again the notion that fairs and expositions were sites in which colonial states produced knowledge and organized peoples as part of / in aid of the colonial project. Similar to Rydell’s findings at the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair, Morillo-Alicea finds that the 1887 Philippine Exposition was used as a means to justify Spanish colonial policies in the Philippines (p. 44). The similarities between the United States and Spain in relation to their colonial projects in the Philippines become clearer when one compares the accounts of the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair and the 1887 Philippine Exposition—often found in different sources. None of the literature reviewed here makes a direct comparison between these events, however the research question will place the two colonial powers and their hopes for (and representations of) the Philippines side-by-side, thus adding a new perspective to the research topic.

Representation

[D]espite the determined efforts within the exhibition to construct perfect representations of the real world outside, the real world beyond the gates turned out to be rather like an extension of the exhibition. This extended exhibition would continue to present itself as a series of mere representations, representing a reality outside. . . . *[P]erhaps the sequence of exhibitions became so accurate and so extensive, no one ever realised that the ‘real world’ they promised was not there* (Mitchell, 1988, p. 10; emphasis added).

Rafael’s (1990) work on Filipino imagery in the nineteenth century gets at the heart of the research question when he introduces the problem of representation in

relation to colonialism: “Who has the right to speak for whom and under what circumstances” (p. 592)? Rafael continues that the rise of print culture helped colonial states to represent their colonies in the ways they saw fit (p. 593). Print culture was certainly a constant presence at world’s fairs and expositions in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, whose organizers produced images and other printed materials for fairgoers: “In order to encourage the proper objective attitude among visitors, [authorities and organizers] made a concerted effort to provide the necessary catalogues, plans, signposts, guidebooks, instructions, educational talks and compilations of statistics” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 20). Anderson (2006) also notes the increase in print capitalism as a boon to colonial states looking to (mis)represent their colonies to people at home and abroad (p. 182). Morillo-Alicea (2005) finds that “denigrating” press accounts of Filipinos were issued surrounding the 1887 Philippine Exposition. Based on the findings of the scholars above, printed materials related to the fairs would seem to be a good source to help answer the research question and discover how colonial states utilized fairs as sites of knowledge production and as a means to organize peoples in service of their colonial projects.

Anderson (2006) suggests that colonial states used books, maps, censuses, and museums (usually created by colonial officials) as tools of representation and classification—to shape their colonies into the “imagined communities” they desired them to be and to disseminate those representations to others. In addition, the museum was not only a tool of representation, it was a way in which to (re)write the “official” version of a colony’s history (Anderson, 2006, p. 163). Books, maps, censuses, and museum exhibits were displayed by colonial states at world’s fairs and aided in

envisioning “good” colonial societies and representing what colonial states wanted fairgoers to know, support, and feel about their colonial projects and colonists: “Such outlines, guides, tables and plans mediated between the visitor and the exhibit, by supplementing what was displayed with a structure and meaning” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 20). Like Anderson, Mitchell (1988) also mentions museums as a way to organize / categorize and display the world for general consumption (p. 6). Mitchell calls museum exhibits and expositions “symbolic representations of the world’s cultural and colonial order,” which rendered “history, progress, culture and empire in ‘objective’ form” (p. 7). Museums and expositions were sites of knowledge production on views of the world—representation played a key role in constructing “history, progress, culture and empire,” and thus it also plays a key role in answering the research question.

Many of the scholars reviewed here spent some time on the topic of representation and *ilustrados*. *Ilustrados* is a Spanish word meaning “enlightened ones,” and was a term certain Filipinos assigned to themselves in the latter nineteenth century (see also discussion of Propaganda Movement in Chapter Three). *Ilustrados* were Filipino elites—typically men—educated according to Western models, many with university degrees from Spain or other European countries (Sánchez Gómez, 2002, p. 284). The most well known *ilustrado* is likely Philippine national hero José Rizal, who studied medicine in Spain in the 1880s and traveled elsewhere in Europe to study art, literature, and languages. Other prominent *ilustrados* include Félix Resurrección Hidalgo, Graciano López Jaena, Marcelo H. del Pilar, and Antonio Luna—all members of Filipino families that could afford to send their sons to Europe for higher education.

The reactions of *ilustrados* to world's fairs and expositions will help to inform this research. *Ilustrados* were not represented at the 1887 Philippine Exposition, nor were they invited to participate in any of the organized events (Sánchez Gómez, 2002, p. 284). Kramer (2006) also mentions the fact that *ilustrados* were not consulted on nor invited to participate in the 1887 Philippine Exposition: "Demanding recognition, they felt themselves ignored and misrepresented" (p. 36). However, "Spanish colonial ideology would rely on imperial-indigenist representations of the Philippine population that rooted and justified Spanish rule in Filipinos' own failings" (Kramer, 2006, p. 52). Thus, it was in Spain's interest to represent the Philippines and Filipinos in whatever way best served its colonial project. This idea leads to the notion of (mis)representation, and its role in envisioning a "good" Philippine society. As Mitchell (1988) asserts, the degradation of those on display—whether intentional or not—was an inevitable effect of world's fairs and the "European concern with rendering things up to be viewed" (p. 2).

Sánchez Gómez (2002) notes that *ilustrados* believed the poor Spanish colonial education system in the Philippines to be the reason for most Filipinos' lack of intellectual aptitude—Spain purposely suppressed Filipino intellect (p. 284), then represented Filipinos in a negative, "infantile" light to others. Kramer (2006) also brings up Filipino dissatisfaction with the Spanish colonial education system, with Filipinos arguing that it cut them off from "civilizing" ideas (p. 43). Schumacher (1997) writes that the negative representations of Filipinos at the 1887 Philippine Exposition compounded Filipino anger over the quality of Spanish colonial education, and Filipinos blamed the negative representations found at the exposition squarely on Spain (pp. 76–77).

Ilustrados believed "the exhibition of Filipino natives [at the 1887 Philippine Exposition]

would be manipulated by the Spanish authorities ... with the intention of showing a primitive Filipino society, a society that was incapable of self-government, forever needing Spanish colonial guidance” (Sánchez Gómez, 2002, p. 291). *Ilustrados* were clearly opposed to the (mis)representations of Filipinos at the 1887 Philippine Exposition, and wrote extensively on the topic to each other in letters and in European-based Filipino newspapers such as *La Solidaridad* [*Solidarity*]. Kramer also mentions this point, stating that *ilustrados* were afraid of “misrepresentation” at the 1887 Philippine Exposition, and unfortunately their fears were realized (p. 71).

Gaps in Literature

A serious gap in the literature is that there is simply not enough written about the 1887 Philippine Exposition in Madrid. What is written usually entails only a chapter or section of a larger work on U.S.–Philippine relations or, less often, Spanish colonial history (e.g., Kramer’s [2006] inclusion of Spanish–Philippine relations is a chapter in his larger book on U.S.–Philippine relations; Morillo-Alicea’s [2005] inclusion of the 1887 Philippine Exposition is a section of his chapter in a larger anthology on Spanish colonialism). The 1887 Philippine Exposition literature gap becomes even more apparent when compared to the wealth of literature written on the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair. It is unclear why the gap in 1887 Philippine Exposition literature exists—whether it is a matter of too few available / useful sources or just that contemporary historians have focused their attention elsewhere up until this point. Answering the research question will help to fill the current literature gap and perhaps add to the general knowledge of Spanish colonialism in the Philippines. Similarly, no one has yet compared Philippine representations at the 1887 Exposition and 1904 World’s Fair side-by-side. In doing so,

the similarities and differences of the colonial projects of both Spain and the United States may become more apparent. While adding to the expanding scholarship on education at world's fairs and expositions, this research might also help to answer further questions on how world's fairs contributed to the development of colonial education systems, policies, and practices.

CHAPTER THREE
SPANISH COLONIAL PHILIPPINES

Brief Background of Colonization

The Philippines became a Spanish colony in the mid-1500s. After several expeditions to the archipelago (the first led by Ferdinand Magellan), Spain decided to settle in the Philippines and colonize it. The colonizers were met with little resistance from the natives, mostly due to the fact they lacked unity and a centralized form of government (Bureau of Insular Affairs, 1903, p. 168; Agoncillo, 1990, p. 74). Spain controlled the Philippines from 1565 to 1898, with the archipelago ruled by a governor general under a centralized colonial government. In all, the Philippines remained a Spanish colony for 333 years, during which time the archipelago completely transformed (and of which many vestiges to Spanish colonialism are still apparent, from the continued prevalence of Catholicism, to the architecture, to the Spanish-influenced words in the national language, Tagalog).

Religion played a major role in Philippine daily life. Spanish friars converted a large majority of Filipinos to Catholicism (Islam prevailed in the southern islands), and members of the various religious orders held positions of power in the colony—managing vast estates that produced products for export and provided them with extreme wealth; leading all aspects of religious life, and often charging exorbitant fees for religious services such as weddings, baptisms, blessings, etc.; and maintaining absolute control

over the education system, determining what subjects were taught and to whom, when they were taught, and how much was taught (Bunge, 1984, p. 13). In short, “friar influence indirectly pervaded Philippine society as a whole” (Schumacher, 1997, p. 15).

As the United States Philippine Commission (1901b) later noted when discussing the role of the religious orders in helping Spain maintain control over the Philippines:

The truth is that the whole Government of Spain in these islands rested on the friars. To use the expression of the provincial of the Augustinians, the friars were “the pedestal or foundation of the sovereignty of Spain in these islands,” which being removed, “the whole structure would topple over.” ... The friars, priests, and bishops, therefore, constituted a solid, powerful, permanent, well-organized political force in the islands which dominated policies (pp. 26–27).

The fact was that as the nineteenth century came to a close, the religious orders, and in turn the Spanish government, were losing their grip on the remaining Spanish colonies, including the Philippines. As Morillo-Alicea (2005) succinctly states, “[Spain’s] power stemmed from its controlling the whole of its empire” (p. 46).

In the face of weakening control over its remaining colonial possessions, Spain entered the Spanish-American War at a distinct disadvantage. The brief war led to the eventual loss of Spain’s remaining colonies. The Treaty of Paris, signed on 10 December 1898, required Spain to give up its rights to Cuba and the West Indies, cede Puerto Rico and Guam to the United States, and for \$20 million, transfer sovereignty of the Philippines to the United States. The United States became a world power, and Spain refocused its attention to domestic matters.

Colonial Education System

The Spanish colonial education system in the Philippines was religion-based, as one of the main goals of the government was to convert Filipinos to Christianity. The

Spanish colonial government strongly believed that Filipino children were key in both converting the archipelago to Christianity and in accepting Spanish occupation and rule. While Spain did establish a complete primary and university education system in the Philippines, “during more than two-thirds of the Spanish period higher education was not available to the Filipinos on equal terms with the Spaniards” (Schwartz, 1971, p. 208).

Friars controlled the schools, and what subjects were taught therein. Because of this, most students learned catechism, taught in the local dialects. Spanish language was not taught to the majority of Filipinos; only certain members of the elite were able to learn Spanish. The Spanish government feared that by knowing Spanish, its colonists would have access to “liberalizing” ideas from Europe. To help maintain control of its colonial possessions, Spain limited access to those subjects / knowledge it felt would empower the masses (Mendoza, 2006, p. 160). In the end, the friars held a “monopoly of education on all levels and thus their [total] control over cultural and intellectual life” (Bunge, 1984, p. 13). This monopoly over education meant a “serious education was not easy to acquire in the colony, where the Church was violently opposed to any inroads of liberalism from Madrid and controlled most schools” (Anderson, 1998, p. 198).

When sovereignty of the Philippines was transferred to the United States in late 1898, many Americans discovered that the Spanish colonial education system was much the way Filipino *ilustrados* had described it for countless years prior. The United States Philippine Commission (1901b) found:

The ineffectiveness of these schools will be seen when it is remembered that a school under the Spanish régime was a strictly sectarian, ungraded school, with no prescribed course of study and no definite standards for each year, and that they were in charge of duly certificated but hardly

professionally trained or progressive teachers, housed in unsuitable and unsanitary buildings (p. 106).

Similarly, Justice (2009) writes that the Spanish colonial education system in the Philippines “rarely met the legal standard, and functioned to maintain a large, poorly educated class of peasants” (p. 40). Though school attendance was compulsory, “local officials did not enforce it and school attendance was small” (Justice, 2009, p. 40).

Throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, many *ilustrados* decried the state of Spanish colonial education in the Philippines, describing the system and the friars in control as incompetent and repressive. Most of these protests fell under the umbrella of the larger *ilustrado*-driven Propaganda Movement. During the time that José Rizal was studying and living in Europe (1880s / 1890s), he connected with other Filipino students to form an intelligentsia, and participated in what became known as the Propaganda Movement. Sison (2005) asserts that while these students were reformists, “they served as the conveyor[s] of bourgeois liberal ideas from Europe to the Philippines” (p. 3). The Propaganda Movement first called for the assimilation of Filipinos into Spanish society, and later began to call for Philippine independence (Rafael, 1990, p. 594). One of the main aims of the Propaganda Movement was to “expose the deplorable conditions of Philippine society and demonstrate that Filipinos were as intellectually able as anyone else in art, literature, and the humanities” (Nadeau, 2008, p. 39).

Ilustrados wanted to counter the Spanish notion that it was a superior race to Filipinos. One of the best ways in which to counter Spanish racism was for Filipinos to obtain equal, if not better, educations than Spaniards (Schwartz, 1971, p. 218). The Propaganda Movement was initially a literary and cultural movement, as opposed to a

political one. Some of its specific aims were to (1) gain representation in the Spanish government; (2) secularize the clergy; (3) legalize Spanish and Filipino equality; (4) create a public school system separate from the religious orders / friars; and (5) guarantee the basic freedoms of speech and association (Bunge, 1984, p. 18). One prominent *ilustrado* and Propaganda Movement participant, Graciano López Jaena, blamed the friars and their education system for causing the deficiencies found in Filipinos. He wrote in *La Solidaridad* in 1887:

[Filipino children] acquire the ability to read and write, and even to write with elegance. *But they never learn anything practical, because they are not taught anything practical. They are taught to pray, but not to work.* In all these schools Spanish grammar is notable by its absence; there are certain vested interests, you see, which are opposed to the Indian learning Spanish. Absent, too, are the rudiments of physics, chemistry, geography, agronomy: studies which would certainly promote the improvement of the individual and the welfare of the community. On the other hand, while Philippine schools rejoice in their ignorance of these disciplines, there are never lacking the rosary, the doxology, and the one thousand and one novenas to saints, virgins and martyrs. Thus do we manage to nourish the souls, while stunting the minds, of little children (quoted in de la Costa, 1965, p. 226; emphasis added).

Later, another *ilustrado*, Encarnación Alzona, similarly asserted, “that the aim of Spanish education was to make Filipinos ‘the passive, servile and blind servants of the friars’” (quoted in Schwartz, 1971, p. 215). Again, U.S. government officials seemed to concur with *ilustrados*’ accounts:

From the beginning the schools were entirely under the supervision of the religious orders, who were disposed to emphasize secondary and higher education for a few pupils rather than to further and promote the primary education of the masses. ... *The little school instruction the average Filipino has had has not tended to broaden his intelligence or to give him power of independent thought* (United States Philippine Commission, 1901b, p. 105; emphasis added).

In sum, the Spanish government instituted a colonial education system controlled exclusively by the religious orders in which little beyond the basics of reading, writing, and religion were taught to Filipinos: “the friars taught and gave to the people what *they* thought would benefit them” (Pilapil, 1961, p. 146; emphasis added). By the end of the nineteenth century, “only the smallest minority in the Philippines spoke Spanish” (Blanco, 2009, p. 11). Nadeau (2008) also finds that by the nineteenth century, relatively few Filipinos spoke Spanish, and friars “made little effort to educate the populous” (p. 39). Anderson (1998) notes, “Till the very end of the Spanish regime no more than 5 per cent of the local population had any facility with the colonial language” (p. 195). Justice (2009) writes, “In many areas, Spanish was taught badly or even prohibited” (p. 40). Bunge (1984) finds that the “religious orders were strongly opposed to the teaching of modern foreign languages (including Spanish) and scientific and technical subjects to [Filipinos] ... and that in 1898 the University of Santo Tomás taught essentially the same courses that it did in 1611, when it was founded by the Dominican order” (p. 14).

As will become apparent in the next section, the harsh realities of Spanish colonial education in the Philippines were largely ignored at the 1887 Philippine Exposition in Madrid. While *ilustrados* continued to protest the inferior education system while under Spanish rule through their Propaganda Movement, it was not until the United States gained control of the archipelago following the Spanish-American War that the dire state of Philippine colonial education under Spanish rule became known to a wider audience (e.g., via the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair Philippine Exhibit and the countless printed materials published in the early 1900s).

Philippine Exposition, Madrid, 1887

The 1887 Philippine Exposition in Madrid was held at a time when Spain was losing control over its remaining colonial possessions and “put its largest remaining colony, rather defensively, on display before Spanish and European publics” (Kramer, 2006, p. 35; see also Sánchez Gómez, 2002). It was getting more and more difficult for Spanish colonial government officials to ignore the grumblings of its colonial subjects in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and Spain had to start making concessions in the former two colonies—primarily through granting Cuba and Puerto Rico representation in the Spanish Cortes (a government body similar to the U.S. House of Representatives). The 1887 Exposition was seen as a way for Spain to reassert its authority in the Philippines, and also remind those at home that there were financial gains to be had in the archipelago (Kramer, 2006, pp. 35–36). The Exposition was divided into eight sections, with the primary purpose of each section being to emphasize to Spaniards the countless financial and commercial opportunities in the Philippines. Sánchez Gómez (2002) writes, “The Philippine Exposition was held ... with the aim of increasing commercial and economic relations between the archipelago and the metropolis” (p. 283). Even the education section had an economic twist, with colonial education efforts represented mostly through statistics and details of school regulations and buildings, and little student work displayed (Flórez Hernández, 1887, p. 106; Catálogo, 1887, p. 39), let alone “live” exhibits of actual Filipino students.

Through the display of numbers, models, and written school procedures, exposition organizers were presenting the colonial education system “picture-like and legible, rendered available to political and economic calculation” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 33).

The Spanish colonial government needed to emphasize the commercial prospects and market profitability of the Philippines, and utilized the exposition as both a site for the “production of racialized knowledge about the [Philippines]” and as a means to transmit that knowledge to the masses (Morillo-Alicea, 2005, p. 37). Colonial education was presented as a means in which to train Filipinos to be docile and governable workers, with Spain ultimately benefiting from this productivity. The financial and economic overtones of the 1887 Exposition follows Mitchell’s (1988) argument, “what was on exhibit [at expositions] was the conversion of the world to modern capitalist production and exchange” (p. 16).

In the end, while the 1887 Philippine Exposition in Madrid was primarily a venue in which to display Spain’s continued efforts in the archipelago and lure investors to support the ongoing colonial project, the Exposition also had another, lesser motive: to show Spaniards the positive, “civilizing” impact the country’s presence had on Filipinos (Sánchez Gómez, 2002, p. 283). One Spanish journalist concluded after viewing the Exposition, “while the [colonial efforts] may go little by little, respectable is respectable, compromising with what you have to compromise, and keeping the good that is done for other generations and other times, the great work of civilization was done in those remote regions” (El Globo, 1887, pp. 205–205). Thus, even if Spain was unable to garner additional support for the financial aspects of its colonial project, based on the newspaper article quoted above, it seems some fairgoers did acknowledge that progress was made in the “civilizing” aspects of the colonial project as displayed at the Exposition. Morillo-Alicea (2005) concludes, “the exposition was regarded by both the mainstream press and [organizers] as an enormous success” (p. 46). However, if the Exposition was to succeed

in garnering the needed support for Spain's colonial project, the representations of "progress" could not go too far: as Kramer (2006) asserts, "Spanish colonial ideology would rely on imperial-indigenist representations of the Philippine population that rooted and justified Spanish rule in Filipinos' own failings" (p. 52).

Sección Octava

Sección Octava, or Section Eight, of the Philippine Exposition covered "Cultura General, Instrucción Pública, Ciencias y Artes" ["General Culture, Public Instruction, Sciences and Arts"]. The fact that education did not warrant its own section, or play a larger role in the Exposition, demonstrates the minor emphasis / importance Spain placed on it in regard to governing its colony. Section Eight included little beyond examples of students' work from various schools across the archipelago, as well as building plans, education statistics, and school regulations (see Appendix A). However, in the official catalog of the Exposition, *Catálogo de la Exposición General de las Islas Filipinas* [referred to from this point as *Catálogo*], when introducing Section Eight, it stated with confidence:

We will discuss in this Section the general culture of the Archipelago, the development of public instruction and the sciences and arts, and with this point-of-view, the Philippines no longer have any reason to be envious of the more advanced neighboring colonies, by contrast, given its material resources, which advances it a lot (Catálogo, 1887, p. 571).

Representation of Colonial Project

One of the main purposes of the 1887 Philippine Exposition was to bring the Philippines to the people of Spain, and Europe more generally (Sánchez Gómez, 2002, p. 283). In the official catalog of the Exposition, *Catálogo*, the Spanish colonial government described its desire to display "the fruit of the fertile soil—the works that reveal their

offspring's privileged aptitude for the arts and the results of the never selfishly exploited metropolis' influence on the colony" (Catálogo, 1887, p. vii), which was only known until that point among some government officials in Spain. In organizing this display, Spain was constructing what Mitchell (1988) identifies as a "symbolic representation of [Spain's] colonial order" (p. 6), an image of the Philippines that best suited its purposes. The Philippine Exposition was, if anything, meant to serve as proof of the colonial project's value to both Spaniards and Filipinos: "The inauguration of this [Exposition] is expected to mark the start of a new era of prosperity and venture for those faraway provinces" (Catálogo, 1887, p. viii).

While Spain may have represented its colonial project in a slightly more positive tone, many of the Madrid-based newspapers, including *El Globo* [*The Globe*], came away from the Philippine Exposition with a much more dour outlook on the "success" of the Spanish colonial project. One issue, which many Spaniards (and *ilustrados*) viewed as a failure on the part of the Spanish colonial government, was its inability to spread the Spanish language across the archipelago. A writer for *El Globo* (1887) mused:

What most dejected and saddened us to study [the Philippines] ... dominated and exploited by us for over three centuries ... and after immense money was spent in social regeneration, was only about 200,000 inhabitants, of seven or eight million who inhabit it, speak our language, which is the native language, which is also the official language, mandatory since 1550. We cannot understand, or explain this, given the docile, obedient and intelligent nature of those inhabitants (p. 202).

The writer went on to list the various laws passed by the colonial government that ordered schools to teach Spanish, even mandating the creation of a normal school in 1863. The writer questioned how even though "many orders [were] issued by the Government of the Metropolis, that native language is taught, and yet, just a little more

than two per 100 of [Filipinos] speak [Spanish]" (El Globo, 1887, p. 202). An official, Spanish government-produced Exposition publication also noted that colonial schools lacked order, and that "current regulation is not met, and in our view schools should be reformed significantly" (Fernández Arias, 1887, p. 340).

In the end, Spain presented its colonial project as a success, even when faced with harsh criticism by journalists and *ilustrados* (Morillo-Alicea, 2005, p. 46). The *Catálogo* (1887) concluded its description of Section Eight by stating: "One cannot rightly accuse Spain of not bringing to the Archipelago all the elements of intellectual progress that are required by the implementation of our civilizing mission, and the effect of our beneficial work is proven by the same test of this Section's display of Philippine products" (p. 573). In all the official (i.e., Spanish government-produced) materials that accompanied the Exposition, the Spanish colonial project was presented as a success for all involved, and one that deserved continued support from Spaniards—ordinary citizens, government officials, and most importantly, investors. As a Spaniard in an official Exposition publication stressed, "when ... we put ourselves in the sixteenth century, and contemplate the state of ... barbarism in which all ocean races were then, we seem to have traveled the distance in three centuries that Europe needed twenty centuries to travel" (Fernández Arias, 1887, p. 351). While this statement, made by a Spaniard, asserts that Spain accomplished much thus far in its colonial project in the Philippines, he ultimately leaves the statement open as a means to imply that even though there has been success, more work needs to be done, and Spaniards need to continue to support the ongoing Philippine colonial project.

Representation of Filipinos

Only 30 actual Filipinos were displayed at the 1887 Philippine Exposition in Madrid, and those few Filipinos caused much consternation among *ilustrados* residing in Spain and other parts of Europe. Most *ilustrados* felt that the Filipino artisans chosen for the Exposition were not accurate representations of Filipinos and their inherent abilities: “Some had predicted that such displays would be used to discredit the islands’ inhabitants in general, and especially the *ilustrados* themselves, before Spanish and broader European publics” (Kramer, 2006, p. 69). In addition, *ilustrados* objected to the display of only “backward” groups because they felt this group of 30 Filipinos was selected “deliberately to misrepresent the Philippines’ peoples and undermine their own quest for cultural and political recognition” (Kramer, 2006, p. 70).

An official Spanish government-endorsed publication that accompanied the Exposition, *Exposición General de las Islas Filipinas en Madrid, 1887*, described Filipinos as well versed in religious matters, but lacking in science and liberal arts knowledge. It also referred to the lack of Spanish language ability among the populace, but qualified the fact by stating, “And although Filipinos’ intelligence is quite limited especially for the abstract sciences, they do have some good qualities: above all, Filipinos have a great desire to educate themselves and learn [Spanish], are fond of reading ... This explains why almost all of the indigenous population read at least” (Fernández Arias, 1887, p. 337). Even though few Filipinos spoke Spanish (a finding that coincides with contemporary historians’ accounts; see Blanco [2009], Nadeau [2008], Anderson [1998]), many government officials noted that they had an innate ability for language acquisition.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, a bitter rivalry formed between members of the Spanish clergy and members of the Filipino clergy. Spain presented members of the Filipino clergy negatively in materials that accompanied the Exposition.

In one Spanish newspaper article, Filipino priests were described in the following way:

whose education is quite low, and morality doubtful, whose love of Spain is void, and whose interest and desire to spread the teachings of the Catholic religion ... never appears serious, bordering on the ridiculous, which manifests in the sacrifice of the masses. ... [Filipino priests] have no idea of the lofty mission entrusted to them for society, or of the sacred mandate of the church: the vows bind them little, their indolence is perhaps greater than that of other children in the country ... (El Globo, 1887, p. 205).

Filipino priests were hindering the Spanish civilizing mission, and were affecting the opinions of those around them: “The Indian priests have a great dislike, unquenchable hatred and ill will toward Spanish priests ... and this evil ... grows as the Indian priest class grows, spreads and extends” (El Globo, 1887, p. 205). An official Spanish publication accompanying the Exposition noted that the dispositions of *all* Filipinos, not just the influence of the Filipino clergy, were blocking “the way of Christian progress to catch up with other civilizations” (Fernández Arias, 1887, p. 349).

Filipinos were presented at the 1887 Exposition as both “simple” people and people capable of undoing all the great work Spain accomplished in the archipelago in the last 300 years. Filipinos were both capable of achieving civilization, and also capable of being duped by the wily Filipino priests:

The evil that comprises the Indian priest in the Philippines not only has its origin in low morals and lack of instruction; it is based, in nothing more, in his hatred toward Spain, hate born of ignorance, and sustained by idleness, hate that infiltrates slowly into the simple minds of his parishioners, and, from time to time, manifests (El Globo, 1887, p. 205).

Filipinos both “lack[ed] the means to learn [Spanish]” but “[were] capable of learning [Spanish] if taught from an early age” (Fernández Arias, 1887, pp. 338 & 341). The representation of Filipinos presented by Spanish writers was one of contradictions, both in newspaper articles and official government publications for the Exposition.

Representation of Colonial Education Efforts

Colonial education efforts were represented mainly through documents. There was no model school at the 1887 Exposition and no “live” exhibits concerning education. The *Crónica de la Exposición de Filipinas* [referred to from this point as *Crónica*], published in 1887 as a guide to each section of the Exposition, and accompanied by the author’s personal reflections, listed the extent of the education displays in Section Eight. Its list of displays was taken from the official catalog of the Exposition, *Catálogo*. For “Public Education,” Spain chose to exhibit “legislation and standing regulations on public education in general. Statistics of different state-supported educational institutions ... and the number of male and female students who attend [colonial-run schools]” (Flórez Hernández, 1887, p. 106; *Catálogo*, 1887, p. 39). For “Primary education,” Spain exhibited

Models and plans of boys’ and girls’ school buildings. Furniture, books, maps, blackboards, signs, samples and objects of all kinds used for instruction in all schools. Systems for corrections and rewards. Samples of crafts taught at girls’ schools. Prizes awarded in examinations. Statistics on the number of people who can read and write or just read (Flórez Hernández, 1887, p. 106; *Catálogo*, 1887, p. 39).

For “Secondary and higher education,” the exhibit included “Drawings and plans of the University of Santo Tomás and all main secondary schools. Current curriculum. Tuition fees. Textbooks. Catalogs of the physics and natural history departments. Education

statistics” (Flórez Hernández, 1887, p. 106; Catálogo, 1887, p. 39). The other main portions of Section Eight included displays on public and private works, printing, arts and sciences, and fine arts. Sánchez Gómez (2002) describes the contents of Section Eight as follows:

Some examples of Philippine journalism were exhibited, as well as publications written by members of the Spanish regular clergy and secular authors, most of them related to the study of the languages and folklore of the archipelago. Also displayed were some travel books, collections of photographs and statistics on education (p. 284).

In all, education-related displays comprised just a fraction of one section of the entire Philippine Exposition.

Another description of the education materials on display was presented in the *Catálogo* (1887), which provided a few additional details on what exactly comprised the education-related displays of Section Eight:

Public instruction appears represented by the works and statistics of the Royal University of Manila, the first teaching center of the Archipelago; that was founded on 15 August 1619 as the College of Santo Tomás ... there are also data on the organization of various diverse colleges protected by the Municipality, public and individual funds, examples of embroidery and neat works of the fair sex; a tree diagram of the provincial schools and municipalities of Manila, and an infinite amount of other details related with primary education, very spread out in the Archipelago, which can be appreciated in the overall picture in the summary of the state (pp. 572–573).

Spain’s colonial education efforts were represented entirely through artifacts—official documents, statistics, papers, plans, samples of student work, written works by both Spanish and foreign authors regarding the state of Philippine affairs, etc. There were no “live” exhibits related to Philippine education, no demonstrations of pedagogical methods and classroom techniques, and no “model school” in which Filipino students sat through

“typical” lessons with a “typical” teacher. Fairgoers learned of Spain’s colonial education efforts in the Philippines solely through the physical artifacts on display—artifacts carefully selected by exposition organizers and Spanish friars. In displaying these physical artifacts, Spain was both creating a “symbolic representation of [its] colonial order” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 7) and constructing the “imagined community” (i.e., “good” Philippine colonial society) it desired (Anderson, 2006, p. 163).

The Filipinos who were displayed at the Exposition were artisans, and did little to bolster the image of Philippine colonial education as argued by *ilustrados*. Graciano López Jaena, an *ilustrado* living in Madrid in the 1880s, objected to the selection of Philippine art on display at the 1887 Exposition, arguing that having friars involved in the Exposition planning resulted in an exhibit of inferior artwork: “the friars tried to show the most negative part of Philippine society, their objective being to demonstrate the Filipino ‘infantile condition,’” and in turn the continued need of Spanish presence in the archipelago if Filipinos ever hoped to achieve a state of civilization (Sánchez Gómez, 2002, p. 292). Based on Jaena’s argument and the general Propaganda Movement belief that Spanish friars purposely suppressed Filipino intellect (see Schumacher, 1997), one gets the sense that Filipinos felt the “degradation” experienced by non-Europeans that often resulted from expositions: “The façades, the onlookers and the degradation seemed all to belong to the organizing of an exhibit, to a particularly European concern with rendering things up to be viewed” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 2).

Though Spain chose to display little in regards to its colonial education efforts, that fact did not stop Spanish journalists (and *ilustrados*) from reporting on the state of colonial education in the Philippines. These articles were often published in conjunction

with the Exposition itself, appearing in newspapers such as the Madrid-based *El Globo*, and thus fairgoers likely read these pieces either before or after their visit to the Exposition. A Spanish journalist in Madrid noted that the state of public education in the Philippines was poor and could use improvement. Luckily, “the good news is that the Government will fix its attention on [public education] in its subsequent resolutions” (*El Globo*, 1887, p. 204). Another Spanish journalist described Filipino schoolteachers as “poor ignorant people who just teach children to recite the Lord’s Prayer in Tagalog, and read and write poorly” (*El Globo*, 1887, p. 204). One Spanish publication stated, “With schools and teachers of this nature, there is nothing strange in the fact that children do not know more” (Fernández Arias, 1887, p. 340). A lack of Spanish friars teaching in the Philippine schools was to blame for the poor state of colonial education, but again, there was hope among those writing in the Spanish press that the government would eventually address the issue. And without a more complete display of colonial education efforts at the Exposition, fairgoers had little else to guide their understanding of the colonial situation. These newspaper articles, along with other materials published by the Spanish government in conjunction with the Exposition, provided the “outlines, guides, tables and plans [that] mediated between the visitor and the exhibit, ... supplementing what was displayed with a structure and a meaning” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 20). Even with a scaled-down exposition, organizers were still working through print media to “encourage the proper objective attitude among visitors” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 20).

While the overall scale of the 1887 Philippine Exposition was small in comparison to some of the more grand world’s fairs held around the same time period (e.g., Philadelphia, 1888; Paris 1889), Spain still utilized this event to showcase its

colonial efforts in the Philippines, “draw attention to the Archipelago and to modernize ... colonial relationships” (Sánchez Gómez, 2002, p. 283). Spain was an increasingly weak colonial power in the 1880s and needed to reassert its authority in the Philippines—Morillo-Alicea (2005) finds that the 1887 Exposition was used as a means to justify Spanish colonial policies in the Philippines (p. 44). By organizing the 1887 Philippine Exposition, the Spanish colonial government was achieving two things: (1) it was “[setting] up the world as a picture ... [ordering] it up before an audience as an object on display, to be viewed, experienced and investigated” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 6); and (2) closely related to the first point, through its carefully selected displays it was realizing one of Kramer’s (2006) main arguments, that “Spanish colonial ideology would rely on imperial-indigenist representations of the Philippine population that rooted and justified Spanish rule in Filipinos’ own failings” (p. 52).

In presenting the Philippines to be viewed, experienced, and investigated by Spaniards, the Spanish government was not only producing knowledge about its colonial project, it was attempting to invoke certain feelings and sentiments in those who viewed the exhibits; or, as Mitchell (1988) asserts, through its exposition, Spain was providing visitors with a “set of instructions about how to proceed” (p. 32). Organizers and government officials wanted visitors to internalize their representations of the Philippine colonial project / colonial reality in a certain way (a way that would support the colonial project, lure investors, and ultimately help Spain to bolster its colonial presence and future colonial efforts), and thus, in addition to their displays, they also “supplement[ed] what was displayed with a structure and meaning” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 20). The result was

an exposition that “reflected the imperial vision of the exposition’s promoters and was intended to shape the way fairgoers saw the world” (Rydell, 1987, p. 179).

CHAPTER FOUR

AMERICAN COLONIAL PHILIPPINES

Brief Background of Colonization

The Philippines became a U.S. colony following the brief Spanish-American War (1898). With the Treaty of Paris, signed on 10 December 1898, Spain ceded Puerto Rico and Guam to the United States, gave up its rights to Cuba and its possessions in the West Indies, and sold the Philippine Islands to the U.S. government for \$20 million. The Spanish-American War was seen as a turning point for both the United States and Spain: for the United States, it was now recognized as a world power with global interests and colonial possessions; for Spain, it was, in the words of one scholar, “freed from the shackles of imperial ideology,” allowing it to look inward and make improvements to its own development as a modern country (de Ojeda, 2010).

The transfer of colonial power did not go smoothly, though, as the so-called “Philippine Republic” declared war on the United States in February 1899 after U.S. forces killed a Filipino soldier outside Manila (Agoncillo, 1990, p. 213). It was an uneven match from the beginning, as Filipino soldiers could do little to combat the better-equipped and experienced American forces. Justice (2009) finds that Filipinos “attempted to resist the superior American military force while attempting to convince Americans and the world that they were civilized enough to run their own affairs” (p. 36). U.S. soldiers burned villages, destroyed crops, and killed animals. In addition, a number of

U.S. officers “tortured and executed [Filipino soldiers], prisoners, and civilians without evidence or trial” (Silbey, 2007, p. 196; see also Justice, 2009, p. 45). The Philippine-American War finally ended in July 1902, but not after more than 4,200 U.S. soldiers, 20,000 Filipino soldiers, and 200,000 Filipino civilians were killed. (These figures do not include the [mostly Filipino] casualties caused by the 1902 cholera epidemic, which reached estimates between 150,000 and 200,000; see Silbey, 2007, p. 200.)

During this time, the U.S. government proceeded undaunted with its colonization efforts in the Philippines. The U.S. colonial government in the islands, led by civil governor William Howard Taft, set up a public school system and other infrastructure in its effort to bring the archipelago into the twentieth century and prepare the people for self-government. Philippine “backwardness” was not the fault of Filipinos per se. The United States Philippine Commission (1901a) reported:

The backwardness of these islands in almost all forms of industry and agriculture is due, not to lack of resources or physical conditions favorable to development in these lines, but in a large measure to the fact that little or no effort has been made to furnish these people proper tools, implements, and machinery or an effective knowledge of how to use them (p. 141).

Without overtly blaming Spain for the poor condition of the archipelago, the Commission made it clear that little effort was made by the former colonizers to help Filipinos achieve any sort of social uplift or personal improvement—hallmarks of American education.

Taft (1905) strongly believed that if Filipinos were ever to achieve a democracy, the country must have a majority of people with “intelligence enough to exercise the strong public opinion that is necessary to sustain and restrain any popular government” (p. 363).

Justice (2009) writes that the schoolhouse “served as the cornerstone of the American

effort to transform the Philippines into a modern, democratic nation-state” (p. 20). And, since at “the dawn of the twentieth century ... most American teachers shared a common ‘civilizational’ impulse” (Zimmerman, 2006, p. 18), they were seen by Taft and other U.S. government officials as the ideal candidates to send abroad to work in the new colonial schools.

The United States retained power in the Philippines until it granted the country approval for independence in 1934, with independence finally granted in 1946; it was “the first nation to voluntarily relinquish sovereignty over a colony after a little over a generation of tutelage” (Agoncillo, 1990, p. 348). Philippine independence was a peaceful, though long, political process (the process began in 1918, following a 1916 promise by the United States for independence once a “stable” Philippine government was established). During its occupation of the archipelago, the United States did what it thought best to prepare Filipinos for self-government—mostly through education efforts.

Colonial Education System

Upon gaining control of the Philippines, one of the first tasks the United States government undertook was to revamp the colony’s education system: “As soon as the Americans reached the islands, even while war was flagrant, schools were established” (Taft, 1907, p. 435). The United States Philippine Commission reported at length about the state of the colony’s schools and its plans to improve the education system and to start preparing Filipinos for eventual self-government. The United States Philippine Commission (1901b) found “there were no schoolhouses, no modern furniture, and, until the Americans came, there were no good text-books” and that “the little school instruction the average Filipino has had has not tended to broaden his intelligence or to

give him power of independent thought” (p. 105). The tone of U.S. government reports indicated both disgust with the current colonial education system in the Philippines and confidence in the country’s ability to improve upon the system (based on the American common school model):

Many of the characteristics of the Filipino schools, as established by the Spaniards, are still unchanged. It may be said that in the typical provincial school at first a kind of religious primer was read in the native language, and that later a book on Christian doctrine was taught. The text-books found in the schools were crude, and provided a large amount of religious instruction. The pupils have been obliged to learn by heart the exact words of the text-book. The teacher, with book in hand, hears one pupil at a time; the others at the same time are studying aloud, apparently doing their best to drown the voices of both the teacher and the pupil reciting. The teacher only asks the questions that are written down in the book. To the visitor the instruction as carried on by the native teachers seems tediously mechanical, noisy, and hardly effective or economical. The teachers do not have fixed daily programmes, and so the time of the school is not well distributed (United States Philippine Commission, 1901b, p. 106).

This description of conditions in the Philippines is typical of the time period, as most Americans held “popular perceptions of Filipinos as passive victims of a corrupt and tyrannical Spanish regime” (Justice, 2009, p. 35).

Because initially the majority of Americans in the Philippines were military personnel, Filipinos’ first teachers were usually soldiers or army chaplains who “served a more symbolic role than a real one” (Justice, 2009, p. 41). The U.S. government realized that these men were not trained teachers, and knew the sooner it could stabilize the situation in the archipelago, the sooner it could import trained American teachers to begin the education efforts of its colonial project. In describing the colony’s educational outlook, the United States Philippine Commission (1901b) concluded that an American-style education system would be best for Filipinos:

Undoubtedly a well-directed system of education will prove one of the most forceful agencies for elevating the Filipinos, materially, socially, and morally, and preparing them for a large participation in the affairs of government. Effort is being made to provide a system of public instruction adapted to the conditions existing in the different islands. According to the American standard, the ideal school is a nonsectarian, graded school, with a prescribed course of study and definite standards for each year, under charge of trained teachers and housed in suitable buildings. Some modification of the ideal must be allowed, however, to bring the means of instruction within the reach of the entire child population of these islands. ... Common schools must be established everywhere, and as a minimum standard every child must be taught arithmetic and to read and write the English language (pp. 106–107).

In addition, the school system would be centralized under the control of U.S. government-appointed superintendents. These superintendents (American men) would be responsible for the buildings, staff, supplies, curriculum, finances, and general supervision and management of all aspects related to the schools in their charge (United States Philippine Commission, 1901b, p. 109). However, for all the plans and procedures that U.S. officials carefully laid out, Zimmerman (2006) finds that “most American teaching [in the Philippines] did not follow the official American script” (p. 24) and Justice (2009) asserts, “the actual implementation and effect of imperial education was less important than its existence as a stated aim” (p. 30).

English was to be the language of instruction, and would be introduced gradually. In the meantime, “Teachers sent out into the provinces will be encouraged to learn the dialects of the people with whom they are associated” (United States Philippine Commission, 1901b, p. 109). Similarly, during the Spanish colonial period, friars took great pains to learn the local dialects, but continued to teach (and preach) in those dialects as opposed to gradually introducing the Spanish language (Anderson, 1998, p. 195). Many members of the United States Philippine Commission noted that more Filipinos

learned English in three years of American occupation than Filipinos learned Spanish in more than 300 years of Spanish rule (Swarthout, 1904, p. 45; Taft, 1907, p. 435). In addition to English language instruction, the United States Philippine Commission (1901b) also recommended that primary education be compulsory, though recognized that it would be difficult to enforce at first, especially in small towns and sparsely populated areas (p. 110). Another issue with compulsory school laws, which Taft (1905) later pointed out, was that “a compulsory school law is predicated on your having schools and teachers enough to teach all the youth in the community” (p. 365), and the Philippines was still lacking the necessary teachers, school buildings, and supplies to accommodate all school-age children.

In sum, the U.S. government instituted a decidedly American-style education system in the Philippines, modeled after the nation’s common school ideal. If Filipinos were to learn the benefits of democracy and the skills necessary for self-government, the U.S. government believed that Filipinos should learn by example—the best example of a great and successful democracy being the United States of America. Thus, if schools were “established in sufficient numbers and properly organized and conducted, [they would] do more than almost any other agency to put [Filipinos] in the possession of those qualities or powers which tend most directly to modernizing them and raising their standard of civilization” (United States Philippine Commission, 1901a, p. 141).

Education was essential to learning civilized / modern knowledge, the key to self-government and eventual independence: “America would school the Filipino in tapping natural resources and embracing capitalism, in creating good government, and in forming an enlightened nationalism” (Justice, 2009, p. 36). Taft (1905) summed up American

education efforts in the Philippines best in an address before the National Geographic Society: “What we are trying to do is to teach these people by object lessons, as well as by direct education in the primary schools, what is it to be a free people” (p. 366).

St. Louis World’s Fair, 1904

The 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair, also known as the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, was the largest world’s fair ever organized at the time. The sheer size of the fairgrounds dwarfed those of another well-known world’s fair held in the United States, the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago. The Philippine Exposition Board (1903) reported that the “Louisiana Purchase Exposition will be nearly twice as large as any former exposition, and will show the life and activity of the nations of the world” (p. 17). The St. Louis fairgrounds were so extensive that doctors warned visitors—especially those with medical conditions and strenuous professions—to allot multiple days, if not weeks, to see the entire fair. If visitors pushed themselves to see too much in one day, they could risk exhaustion, mental fatigue, physical collapse, or even death (Rydell, 1987, p. 157).

More than any other world’s fair, the St. Louis organizers saw the Louisiana Purchase Exposition as an educational experience on a grand scale. F. J. V. Skiff, director of exhibits, carefully classified the exhibits in support of his belief,

over and above all [the fair] is a record of the social conditions of mankind, registering not only the culture of the world at this time, but indicating the particular plans along with which different races and different peoples may safely proceed, or in fact have begun to advance towards a still higher development. . . . [The exposition was] designed to teach all—but primarily and distinctly . . . the expert working citizenry of the country and the world—in all lines of human activity (quoted in Rydell, 1987, p. 159).

In classifying the various exhibits, Skiff was constructing / organizing knowledge about man's progress, while at the same time outlining the characteristics of the ideal citizen—he was, as Mitchell (1988) believes, setting the world up as a picture “to be viewed, experienced and investigated” (p. 6). The 1904 St. Louis World's Fair was indeed an educative experience for most fairgoers, with the organizers determining what it wanted fairgoers to learn / internalize about the state of the world and America's colonies, and those who lived within. “Above all, [the St. Louis World's Fair] gave a utopian dimension to American imperialism” (Rydell, 1987, p. 183).

Philippine Exhibit

Plans for the Philippine Exhibit began three years before the actual fair, and a mere three years after the Philippines became a U.S. possession. The first civil governor of the Philippines, William Howard Taft, felt that a strong and comprehensive Philippine Exhibit was necessary in order to introduce Americans to the country's new colony and introduce Filipinos to the United States. At an April 1904 address before the New York Chamber of Commerce in which Taft outlined the situation in the Philippines and made a case for America's continued presence there, he stated:

In order to familiarize the people of the United States with the Philippines, and in order to bring the Filipinos closer to the United States, the [Philippine] commission has deemed it wise to expend about three-quarters of a million dollars in making a satisfactory exhibit at the World's Fair at St. Louis (Taft, 1904, p. 22).

In the end, the Philippine Exhibit cost well over one million dollars; but to the members of the Philippine Exposition Board and the colonial government, it was money well spent. There was a strong desire to “show the people of the United States what their new

possessions were capable of producing, and to convince them that the \$20,000,000 paid Spain for her Oriental possession was not wasted” (Swarthout, 1904, p. 44).

In many ways, the U.S. government approached the situation in the Philippines as it did with the country’s American Indian population, going so far as to call the Philippine Exhibit the “Philippine Reservation,” and place it opposite the Model Indian School in order to demonstrate that the progress made with Indians could also be made in the archipelago (Rydell, 1987, p. 167). W. J. McGee (1904), chief of the St. Louis World’s Fair Anthropology Department, described the Model Indian School as “not merely ... a consummation, but as a prophecy; for now that other primitive peoples are passing under the beneficent influence and protection of the Stars and Stripes, it is needful to take stock of past progress as a guide to the future” (p. 44). McGee went on to describe how the positioning of the model school across from the Philippine Exhibit was incredibly symbolic, as the “aim of the Model Indian School [was] to extend influence across [the fairgrounds] to the benefit of [Filipinos]” (p. 44).

Great care was taken in gathering the materials for display (see Appendix B). Gustavo Niederlein, commissioner in charge of exhibits in the Philippine Islands, sent a request to various leaders and organizations across the archipelago, expressing his hope that

every provincial government and every municipality, without exception, will be proud to contribute, to show to the world the immense natural wealth, great fertility of soil, and enormous economical opportunities of these Islands and will not lose a moment’s time in starting the highly appreciated work of collecting exhibits of all resources and conditions of their respective territories. ... We also respectfully invite every institution, corporation, or organization, every manufacturing and producing establishment, every merchant, teacher, farmer, artisan, and professional man to aid us in making the Philippines exhibit really the greatest feature

at the Universal Exhibition and a decided success for the benefit of all (Philippine Exposition Board, 1903, pp. 15–16).

Lack of adequate transportation and communication in the archipelago made the collection of exhibits difficult for members of the Philippine Exposition Board. Nevertheless, members worked tirelessly to collect what they felt were materials representative of the current conditions and progress in the Philippines, and would “encourage the proper objective attitude among visitors” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 20).

At the conclusion of the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair, the Philippine Exposition Board deemed the Philippine Exhibit a success:

While the expenditure for the exhibit has far exceeded the amount originally contemplated by the Philippine Commission ... the consensus of opinion as gathered from visitors is that it has been worth all it has cost and more, in giving to the people of the United States a more intimate knowledge of the resources and possibilities of the Philippine Islands than they could acquire other than by an actual and extended visit (Philippine Exposition Board, 1905, pp. 4–5).

The Board also stressed that while not all groups of the archipelago were represented, “the exhibit was ... an honest one” with accurate portrayals of those peoples exhibited, as well as the commercial, industrial, and social conditions (p. 5). In its opinion, the Philippine Exposition Board achieved what it set out to do when it was organized in 1902.

Representation of Colonial Project

In the introduction to the official catalog of Philippine exhibits, W. P. Wilson, chairman of the Philippine Governing Board in the United States, stressed the importance of the Philippine Exhibit in not only providing accurate information about the current situation in the Philippines, but also in convincing Americans that Philippine occupation

was in the best interest of *both* nations (similar objectives for the 1887 Exposition in Madrid): the United States would gain economic benefits and the Philippines would gain the tools necessary for eventual self-government. Thus, representation of the colonial project and the progress made was key in gaining continued support. Wilson wrote:

When the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company invited the Philippine Government to participate in this great World's Fair, that government felt it was due both to the people of the islands and to the people of the United States that as full an exhibit as was practicable should be made ... The great and earnest labor devoted to establish a government in the Philippines for Filipinos, the results accomplished and the opportunities offered—all these objects, it is hoped, will warrant the work and money spent in this Philippine participation and promote a closer sympathy and union between these two peoples (Philippine Exposition Board, 1904, p. 8).

Funding and legislation necessary to carry out the U.S. plans for the “proper” development and exploitation of the archipelago were being held back because most Americans knew very little about the Philippines and the situation there. The 1904 St. Louis World's Fair was “an opportunity to present to the people of the United States a vivid outline picture of the Philippines” and thus gain support for the continued efforts of the colonial project (Swarthout, 1904, p. 43). It was also an opportunity to display a “symbolic representation of [America's] cultural and colonial order” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 7) to fairgoers, helping to shape their sense of where the United States stood in the world in relation to other countries.

A year earlier, in 1903, the Philippine Exposition Board similarly stressed the importance of the Philippine Exhibit to represent the U.S. colonial project / efforts in the best light in order to gain the support necessary to continue the project. Representation played an essential role:

In selecting the exhibits care must be taken that they are shown to the best possible advantage. *The visitors to the Philippine exhibition must see the possibility of good investments and successful enterprises in these Islands.* All sources of wealth must be laid open to the world as a basis of future prosperity. *The purpose of the Philippine exhibit is not only to create interest and sympathy for the Philippine Islands, and to give confidence in the intelligence and capacity of the natives, but also to look for permanent profitable markets for the natural resources,* in showing and in illustrating the fertility of soil and climate and the great wealth in forest, agricultural, fishing, mining, and other products. In order to permanently attract foreign intelligence, combined with capital, perfect confidence in the economic future of the Philippine Islands has to be given and the actual conditions have to be shown, with all possibilities of improvements. Hand in hand with this argumentation go the requirements of the Jury of Awards, for the proper appreciation of the advantages and qualities of our exhibits. In the future the world will judge the quality of our Philippine exhibit in the quantity and quality of awards granted by the International Jury to the Philippine Islands (Philippine Exposition Board, 1903, pp. 29–30; emphasis added).

In carefully outlining how Philippine exhibits should be displayed and emphasizing the importance of properly displaying the exhibits, it is clear that the ways in which the colonial project was represented weighed heavily in Philippine Exposition Board members' minds. A carefully arranged exhibit was not only key to success at the 1904 World's Fair, but was also key to the long-term success of the colonial project—calculated representations would allow fair organizers and government officials to “shape” their colonies into the “imagined communities” they desired them to be and disseminate those representations to others. Because there was a large contingent of anti-imperialists at home, those in charge of the Philippine Exhibit had to emphasize the investment potential of the archipelago, much as Spain attempted to do at the 1887 Philippine Exposition in order to reaffirm its colonial project (Sánchez Gómez, 2002).

At the conclusion of the fair, many involved in the organization of the Philippine Exhibit felt that it was a success. A. R. Hager (1905), who headed the education exhibit,

felt that, at 47 acres, the Philippine Exhibit was an exposition in itself, and was an accurate representation of the U.S. colonial project and the financial potential in the archipelago:

Occupying forty-seven acres of ground and housed in one hundred and thirty buildings, with her resources and possibilities fairly and realistically shown to the people of the world, the result of the exhibit must surely be a better understanding of Philippine conditions by every visitor. In all probability there will never be another such opportunity for a thorough advertisement of the Insular resources, not another period in their history when it would be of equal benefit (p. 21).

If the United States wanted to impress fairgoers with its work in the Philippines, the sheer area and number of exhibits representing its efforts there were certain to achieve that goal.

Representation of Filipinos

U.S. government officials, both in the Philippines and at home, represented Filipinos in a variety of ways, which were at times contradictory (similar to the contradictory ways in which Spanish officials and journalists represented Filipinos in 1887). These representations could be found at the St. Louis World's Fair and in the written materials that accompanied the fair and Philippine Exhibit, as well as in publications and speeches from the time period. Filipinos were presented as both adverse to manual labor, but capable of hard work. As American sources presented things, this aversion to manual labor had been adopted from the Spanish, but the U.S. government sought to instill a decidedly American work ethic, which it would accomplish through the schools (Taft, 1907, p. 435). In describing the industrial school exhibits, the Philippines Bureau of Education (1904) noted that Filipino industrial school students should be

encouraged to help maintain their school buildings instead of considering manual labor “beneath” them:

Their pride should lead them to repair such conditions rather than to hold them aloof from manual work. The limited practical ability of the pupils will not usually permit great accomplishments, and these limits should not be lost sight of, but the pupils can learn many lessons of industrial training in doing this kind of work that will serve them well in practical life. Lessons, too, which the average man of the Filipino race needs, and needs badly (p. 50).

Here Filipinos were represented as lazy, aloof, and in need of the skills necessary for “practical life.” Theodore Roosevelt provided a typical American opinion of Filipinos and other “backward” races in the early 1900s: “I believe that the greatest good that can be done to the native must come thru teaching the native to work” (quoted in Zimmerman, 2006, p. 51). Zimmerman (2006) elaborates on Roosevelt’s statement by adding that, according to Americans, Filipinos “needed an ‘education for life’—and, especially, for labor” (p. 51). While the above representation of Filipino work habits, from a 1904 report titled, *Report of Industrial Exhibits of the Philippines Schools at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition*, was decidedly negative, it also left the impression that Filipinos were capable of learning the necessary skills to succeed in life, and for eventual self-government, if provided with the proper “practical” education.

This dual representation was also presented in the 1901 *Report of the United States Philippine Commission*, when it described the growing, though sporadic, attendance in Manila public schools: “This lack of punctuality is one of the serious obstacles to the progress of this people, and it is expected that the discipline of the school, when thoroughly established, will contribute to the correction of this evil” (United States Philippine Commission, 1901a, pp. 137–138). The report continued that trade schools

would remedy Filipinos' lazy nature and introduce modern knowledge to the backward archipelago:

Trade schools will, therefore, support the Filipinos at their weakest point, and, if established in sufficient numbers and properly organized and conducted, will do more than almost any other agency to put them in the possession of those qualities or powers which tend most directly to modernizing them and raising their standard of civilization (p. 141).

These initial opinions of Filipinos and their abilities / potential from 1901 changed very little by the time of the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair, and U.S. efforts at "practical" education were on full display at the Philippine Exhibit, where not only exhibits of students' academic work was on display, but also products of industrial work (Hager, 1905, p. 22).

E. B. Bryan (1904), former superintendent of education in the Philippines, described Filipinos as immature and implored Americans, when considering Filipinos from a religious, industrial, governmental, or educational standpoint, to "remember they are a childlike people" (p. 103). He admitted that Filipinos "excel in certain things; in certain other things they do not equal the Saxon child" (p. 103). Taft (1905) also viewed Filipinos as children, stating that under the Spanish, Filipinos were "brought up to be children constantly, in order that they might not know the wickedness of the world, and that all development was restrained" (p. 375). Bryan, like the Philippines Bureau of Education and the United States Philippine Commission, emphasized industrial education for Filipinos, with instruction in English (language acquisition being one of the few skills in which Filipinos naturally excelled).

Pilar Zamora was an instructor at the Insular Normal School in Manila, and traveled to St. Louis to teach in the model school at the Philippine Exhibit. She

represented a “success story” in American eyes: a Filipino—and female, no less—who had attained a high degree of education, and was working toward the improvement of her people. Zamora delivered an address at the 1904 meeting of the U.S. National Education Association, held in connection with the World’s Fair, in which she provided a “Filipino’s view” on the state of education in the archipelago. The conclusion of her address could not have pleased U.S. government officials more, as it directly corroborated their own argument regarding U.S. education efforts in the Philippines:

The public school is the most precious gem that a government can provide for its subjects. The success of a government, indeed, depends upon the kind of schools it provides for its people. The strongest nations are those which have the best system of education, the best schools. The Philippine Islands have never had as good an educational system as they now have. All Filipinos believe this. They found this belief on the following two facts: *Today there are more people speaking English in the islands, after five years of American control, than spoke Spanish after four hundred years of control by Spain; and the number of pupils in attendance at the different schools is ten times as large as it was before* (Zamora, 1904, p. 471; emphasis original).

It is interesting to note that Zamora equated the success of the overall U.S. government with the quality of the schools it provided its colonial possessions, instead of equating the quality of U.S. colonial schools to eventual Philippine independence.

Representation of Colonial Education Efforts

The Philippine Exposition Board (1903) explicitly outlined its requirements for education exhibits. Philippine educational exhibits were extremely detailed, and included:

copies of corresponding legislation or enactments and full description of the different educational organizations; supervision, management or administrations; methods of instruction or training; curricula or courses of study; methods of examinations; teaching materials and appliances for instruction; text-books and other educational books; equipment in furniture and school appliances; museums or collections (with catalogues); and libraries (with catalogues) ... a history of the different institutions; the

number of teachers and pupils or students, kinds of investigations and experiments made, other results obtained or work accomplished (pp. 32–33; see also Appendix B for examples of education exhibit contents).

The Philippine Exposition Board (1903) continued, “As principal exhibits we desire from every educational establishment a full collective exhibit, in duplicate, of work made by pupils or students of different classes in different matters; and photographs or illustrations of other work accomplished; models, plans, designs, or photographs of every educational establishment, in duplicate” (pp. 32–33). Based on the requirements for the educational exhibits, it is needless to say that fairgoers viewed some of the most comprehensive exhibits at the entire fair—exactly what the Philippine Exposition Board wanted.

In describing the education exhibit in particular, A. R. Hager (1904), chief of the Department of Education for the Philippine Exposition Board, stated:

The Philippine educational exhibit occupies the largest building on the Philippine Reservation. It represents the foundation work of a system of education among a people to whom modern education was four years ago unknown, and to many of whom opportunity for education had been wholly denied (p. 397).

The education exhibit itself included photographs of classroom scenes, teachers, and students, as well as student compositions and letters to American schoolchildren, which the organizers hoped would be answered and lead to an active correspondence between Filipino and American students. Drawings, written compositions, training models, and other student work were displayed from various Filipino schools at all levels, though with a special focus on elementary schools (Swarthout, 1904, p. 45). Private (i.e., Filipino-run) and U.S. government schools were represented in St. Louis. Specifically, education exhibits included:

Many specimens of written work are shown from the primary and secondary schools. The class work consists of written exercises, English composition, geography, history, arithmetic, algebra, and other branches. In composition it has been the aim to tell as much as possible regarding the customs of the people, their manner of living, folk lore, methods of work, games of the children, etc. Photographs and models of the school buildings will give some idea of the material equipment of schools (Philippine Exposition Board, 1904, p. 36).

In his education report in the official catalog of Philippine Exhibits, Hager explained:

The exhibits shown in the Philippine Educational Building are intended to give an idea of what the government schools have accomplished in the three years they have been established, and also to show the work of the private and Church schools of the island. These exhibits will tell the visitor something of the ability and taste of the pupils, their environment, and the difficulties with which the American teachers have had to contend (Philippine Exposition Board, 1904, p. 35).

Hager similarly reported to the 1904 meeting of the U.S. National Education Association (which took place in St. Louis to coincide with the World's Fair) that the

collections of work from the elementary and secondary schools thruout [sic] the provinces are representative of the largest part of the effort of the Bureau during the past three years. *An attempt has been made to show as truly as possible the actual conditions of work, the possibilities of the future, and the amount of progress that has been made.* The results shown will surprise some, and will doubtless disappoint others who forget that Rome was not built in a day. They will, of course, be clearly understood by none who has not faced and helped to solve a similar problem in education (Hager, 1904, p. 398; emphasis added).

These extensive, though carefully selected and displayed, exhibits represented the “necessary catalogues, plans, sign-posts, guidebooks, instructions, educational talks and compilations of statistics” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 20) necessary in order to instill the “imperial vision of the exposition’s promoters and ... shape the way fairgoers saw the world” (Rydell, 1987, p. 179).

While the U.S. government was eager to transform the Philippine system of education into one more closely resembling its own in order to help prepare Filipinos for eventual self-government, Hager (1904) did recognize that the education “system must be an elastic one for years to come; the schools of each district must conform to local conditions” (p. 397). Others echoed Hager’s belief that a straight education system transfer in the Philippines would not be wise. Bryan (1904) stated,

Because an educational system has been successful with a given people in a given country it does not follow that that system will be successful with another people in another country. What is needed in the Philippine Archipelago is not an attempt to dump upon it the American school system. No educational system can successfully be dumped upon a foreign people. We want an educational system there; and a system is being developed very rapidly that fits the history of these people, their traditions, their habits, their ambitions, their ideas, and their ideals (p. 104).

Nonetheless, American-style school districts were formed, superintendents were assigned, classrooms were graded, and English was instituted as the primary language of instruction, demonstrating that U.S. government officials continued to follow a Western model, even if they admitted that direct system transfer could be problematic (see Zimmerman, 2006).

The Philippine model school was a star attraction of the Philippine Exhibit, and in fact, the school consistently garnered more than one thousand visitors a day (Philippine Exposition Board, 1905, p. 14). The model school was purposely arranged so that “the school work can be easily observed by visiting students and teachers” (Swarthout, 1904, p. 45). As such, countless fairgoers sat in on lessons, and were able to view students’ work, as well as the teaching methods being implemented in the archipelago. Pilar Zamora, an instructor at the Insular Normal School in Manila, was the teacher at the

model school. Zamora not only modeled the American-style pedagogy, but also served as a representation of Filipino potential and success under U.S. colonial rule / guidance.

Hager described the model school in his 1904 report to the Philippine Exposition Board:

A Filipino School, conducted by native teachers, in a typical nipa and bamboo school house, is a feature of the exhibit that will illustrate many points what could not be shown in any other way, and to the majority of visitors will doubtless be the most interesting features of the educational exhibit. Visitors who desire to examine written work of the schools will be given access to the collection and afforded every opportunity to examine the work at their leisure (Philippine Exposition Board, 1904, p. 36).

The school held two sessions per day: the first session was composed of Visayans, considered the most civilized of the Filipinos, who varied in age from five to 20 (they were divided into two sections based on age / ability); the second session was composed of members of the “lesser” tribes, who were viewed as either semi-savage or savage (including Igorot, Tinguianes, Negritos, Bagobos, and Moros), also varying in age. Notices were prominently placed in the model school to help explain the classroom dynamics to the 1,000 to 2,000 daily visitors. A notice regarding the Visayan students stated: “These two classes of Visayans are typical of 95% of the Philippine Government schools. Members of the advanced class have attended American schools, and several have formerly attended Spanish schools” (Hager, 1905, p. 22). A notice regarding the students of the “lesser” tribes stated:

This experimental class is not at all typical of any school in the Philippines. The Moro, Igorot, and Negrito tribes from which these people come are so remote from one another that they meet here for the first time. Less than one-tenth of one per cent of these people attend school in the Philippines (Hager, 1905, p. 22).

In 1905, Hager was able to provide concrete numbers in regards to the sheer amount of fairgoers who visited the model school:

The number of visitors to the Educational Building and Model School was very large, the number visiting the school during the two and one-half hours session often being by actual count over two thousand. ... A register of visiting teachers was kept from the opening day and contains some twenty thousand names (Philippine Exposition Board, 1905, p. 14).

In an article published the same year, Hager similarly boasted, “To say that ninety-nine per cent of the World’s Fair visitors saw the Philippine Exhibit is a conservative estimate, and the great majority of these visited the educational exhibit” (Hager, 1905, p. 23).

Needless to say, Hager and other members of the Philippine Exposition Board felt that a great majority of fairgoers visited the Philippine Exhibit, and, in turn, internalized the peoples and colonial projects on display—and in the ways in which those organizing the exhibit wished. It might be argued, as Mitchell (1988) does, that given the comprehensive Philippine Exhibit, “perhaps the sequence of [exhibits] became so accurate and so extensive, no one ever realised that the ‘real world’ they promised was not there” (p. 10).

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

Discussion

Several comparisons can be made across the 1887 Philippine Exposition in Madrid and the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair. Spain and the United States both desired to put their colonial efforts on display, and in the best light possible. Both countries were facing internal criticism for their colonial projects, and utilized expositions as an opportunity to sway public opinion. In this section, some themes across the two colonial states will be identified, as well as similarities and differences in their Philippine colonial education efforts and displays. It is clear that both Spain and the United States desired to create a "good" colonial society / citizen, but the role education played in that effort was different. How did Spain envision a "good" Philippine society; how did the United States envision a "good" Philippine society—and what role was education to play in constructing these "good" societies?

Agenda

Spain and the United States had similar—though not identical—agendas leading up to their respective expositions, and it could be argued that both colonial states used their Philippine exhibits to garner domestic public support for their colonial projects as well as financial support in the form of investors. Spain and the United States presented a picture of the Philippines that would best serve their respective agendas: "They ordered it

up before an audience as an object on display, to be viewed, experienced and investigated” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 6). These colonial states needed to reassure their citizens that the work they were doing in the Philippines was both important, and would provide financial and commercial gains for the colonial power. In this way, Spain and the United States were “participating in an ... imperial tradition, the use of colonial and metropolitan resources and institutions to mount elaborate spectacles that would simultaneously advertise national glory and sovereignty and colonial goods” (Kramer, 2006, p. 35), as well as utilizing the world’s fair and exposition phenomenon to establish a colonial state’s place in the larger world order.

Education at the Fair

Education played a different role at each exposition. While Spain’s Philippine colonial education display was modest, and combined with general culture and arts and sciences, the United States had a separate education display from its main Philippine Exhibit, and created a model school that would clearly show fairgoers the great “civilizing” work it was doing in the Philippines. The different education displays could be interpreted a few ways. The fact that St. Louis included a model school in its Philippine Exhibit demonstrated the greater role education played in the U.S. colonial government and future plans for the archipelago. Spain’s lack of a model school demonstrated that education was not as high on its colonial agenda. An alternate explanation for the different displays could have been purely monetary—the United States simply had more money to spend on its Philippine Exhibit than Spain.

Another explanation could have been that the ultimate purpose of the 1887 Philippine Exposition in Madrid was to garner financial support and investors. To Spain,

“the Philippines represented potential” (Morillo-Alicea, 2005, p. 38). Spain had already controlled the Philippines for more than 300 years, and it needed money if it wished to continue its various colonial efforts in the archipelago. Thus, it emphasized the financial potential of the Philippines as opposed to its education efforts. The Philippines’ natural resources took center stage at the 1887 Exposition, while colonial education efforts were not needed in order to stress the archipelago’s investment potential. In addition, Spain did not require a highly educated populace to complete the type of work it needed as far as gathering / harvesting / processing the various natural resources of the archipelago. In fact, many colonial officials—primarily friars—believed an educated Philippine populace would be a threat to Spanish colonial rule (Mendoza, 2006, p. 160). If Spain needed more advanced work completed in the archipelago, it brought in Spaniards. Thus, since education did not play a large role in daily colonial life, it did not play a large role in the 1887 Exposition.

On the other hand, education *did* play a great role in daily life under U.S. colonial rule, and education successes needed to be on full display if the U.S. government was going to gain continued support for its colonial project in the Philippines. At the time of the St. Louis World’s Fair, the United States had only controlled the Philippines for five years; it had much more to prove than Spain in 1887. The United States prided itself on the fact that it wanted to prepare Filipinos for eventual self-government (see Justice, 2009; Kramer, 2006). It did not desire to remain in the Philippines longer than was absolutely necessary to properly educate Filipinos. Thus, it was important that the Philippine Exhibit in 1904 display U.S. education efforts and show the strides the nation was making in starting the long process of educating Filipinos in the ways of democracy

and preparing them for self-government. Taft (1902) was well known for writing that it would take at least two generations for Filipinos to reach a point in which they would be ready to govern themselves (p. 105), but the fact remained that the United States was committed to educating the populace in the ways of American-style democracy, and the best way to achieve that was to institute an American-style education system. This belief followed the “dominant educational theories of the day,” according to Justice (2009), who writes, “[colonial] schooling was a process of leading the child through the stages of civilization. By extension, mass education became a means to social evolution, whereby a whole race or nation could evolve” (p. 37).

It seems that perhaps the different education displays at the 1887 Philippine Exposition and the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair were the result of multiple factors, not least of which included available funds and the ultimate goal of the respective colonial state’s agenda (i.e., what it wished to achieve with the particular exhibit). Both Spain and the United States were attempting to create a “good” Philippine colonial society, but based on their respective exhibits, sought to achieve this good society in different ways. For Spain, investment and exploitation of natural resources was the way to create a good society, which was one that was also commercially profitable: “Officially, the purpose of the exposition was to showcase the economic, particularly agricultural, potential of the [Philippines]” (Morillo-Alicea, 2005, p. 38). For the United States, education was key to creating a good society that could eventually support itself: “It was the ‘broad and liberal methods of American education’ that would civilize the Filipino” (Justice, 2009, p. 40). Spain was not looking to let go of the Philippines; the United States was, eventually. The

role of education, and the education displays at the respective expositions, reflected the position of education in the different colonial projects.

Exhibit Contents

The two Philippine exhibits did not vary in the education displays alone. The “human” aspect of the actual exhibits varied. The United States transported hundreds of Filipinos, representing many different groups across the archipelago, to St. Louis for its exhibit; Spain chose to bring only 30 Filipino artisans to Madrid, and they were not involved in the modest education display. Instead, the contents of the 1887 Philippine Exposition consisted mostly of images, models, statistics, and artifacts to represent Spain’s colonial efforts. The exhibit contents in 1904 also included many artifacts, images, and statistics, but the human displays were emphasized as the “true” representation of both the American colonial efforts in the Philippines, and of how much work still needed to be done in the archipelago.

The St. Louis fair organizers took pride in the fact that they had Filipinos representing a wide cross-section of society, even displaying a poster that featured “The evolution of the Filipino, as shown in the Philippine Exhibit,” which arranged images of Filipinos from savage, or “the lowest type of human” (Negritos), to civilized, or “highly educated, refined” (Spanish–Filipino *mestizos*) (Swarthout, 1904, p. 48). Many *ilustrados* complained at the 1887 Philippine Exposition that the 30 Filipinos chosen to represent the archipelago were not an accurate cross-section of its inhabitants, and charged Spain with deliberately neglecting to include successful, educated Filipinos, such as themselves: “This group, which contained several animists and Muslims, was widely seen [by *ilustrados*] as a deliberate effort by Spanish colonialists—despite the promise to ‘rectify’

Spanish opinion—to promote images of the islands’ backwardness and savagery” (Kramer, 2006, p. 36). Similarly, Morillo-Alicea (2005) suggests that in the “live” Filipino exhibit at the 1887 Exposition, *ilustrados* felt “the exposition’s only real goal [was to present] the archipelago as backward and thereby [justify] the metropole’s ‘civilizing mission’” (p. 40).

Defense of the Colonial Project

In addition to garnering support for its colonial efforts, Spain and the United States both felt the need to defend their colonial projects in the Philippines to their citizens at home. The main means in which these colonial states defended their efforts was through official, government-published exposition materials, and, in the case of the United States, William Howard Taft delivered several addresses to various organizations across the country in support of U.S. colonial efforts before, during, and after the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair. In utilizing media, fair organizers in Spain and the United States attempted to “encourage the proper objective attitude among visitors [by providing] the necessary catalogues, plans, sign-posts, guidebooks, instructions, educational talks and compilation of statistics” (Mitchell, 1988, p. 20; see also Anderson, 2006, p. 182, Rafael, 1990, p. 593).

The amount of money invested in colonial government efforts seemed to be a sticking point both in Spain and the United States. Taft (1907) argued, “The Americans have given a more expensive government, because they have insisted on doing more in education, in public improvements, and in sanitation” (p. 437). He felt that based on the condition of the Philippines at the time of U.S. occupation in 1899, that Spain had invested little in the development of the archipelago. The Spanish colonial government

might have disagreed, as it stressed in its official 1887 Exposition publications that it spent much money and effort in the development and “social regeneration” of the Philippines (El Globo, 1887, p. 202).

In an earlier address, Taft (1905) even defended how the United States came into possession of the Philippines:

We blundered into colonization; we did not go into it with malice aforethought. We found ourselves in possession of the islands because we could not help it, and then we determined that we would do the best we could with them, working out a policy as nearly consistent with the principles of our own government as was possible (p. 363).

Spain could also be found defending its continued presence in the Philippines, even as it gradually lost control over its colonial possessions, arguing that its presence was necessary to continue its civilizing mission, and reminding fairgoers of the sacrifices made by Spaniards in this “sacred” mission to bring religion, wisdom, and culture to the archipelago—a region where few European countries were venturing three centuries prior (Fernández Arias, 1887, pp. 349 & 351).

While Taft was certainly an effective and prolific orator for the U.S. colonial cause / presence in the Philippines, a Spaniard writing for the government published the following moving reminder to all those who doubted Spain’s colonial project in the archipelago, describing the sacrifices of those involved in the early colonial efforts:

List, if you can, one by one, these heralds of the Almighty, these crusaders of the altar, who, braving with valor all the rage of the ocean, have been going into the arena of open battle, this time, at the end of the world, against all the power and fury unleashed from the abyss. List their journeys, their expeditions, their shipwrecks, their battles, their trophies, their persecution and martyrdom; observe their deprivation; tell the world their deeds, their devotion, their sacrifices; climb the mountains with them; penetrate countries inhabited by savage races; share, if you dare, in their dangers, their hunger, their sorrows, their offenses, their grievances,

and their prisons, and exile; collect, finally, if there is room in your heart for all their tears, all the sighs of their soul and all the sorrows of their life, and then you will understand the big problem, the real secret of this transformation so amazing, that it has taken place in the nature and the social conditions of these peoples, under the regenerative action of the Catholic missionary. We will say just once more, parodying the expression of the poet: *so hard it was to found the Christian race* (Fernández Arias, 1887, p. 352; emphasis original).

Twenty years later, one cannot find evidence of Taft using such poetic language when rallying for support of the U.S. colonial project, though he did make similar arguments for the efforts of the U.S. military personnel on the frontlines in 1898–99, the so-called “soldier teachers” who sought to teach Filipinos as opposed to overpower them with military force alone. Taft (1907) likewise presented the efforts of those on the frontlines of the U.S. colonial effort as one of danger and sacrifices, all for the greater good:

[T]he teaching of English began before civil government reached the islands; the instinct of the Americans whether they wear a military uniform or the garb of peace, to teach the youth how they should grow and to spread intelligence, led the army into the establishment of an educational system in the Philippines, and in every company of that army two or three men were detailed right in the villages where insurrection was rife to open schools and teach the little Filipinos English (p. 365).

In the end, defense of the colonial project would take precedence over success of colonial education efforts. As Justice (2009) argues, “In the case of imperial schooling ... the results are often secondary to the more immediate problem of justifying the use of force and exploitation in times of expansion” (p. 27).

1887 and 1904: One in the Same?

Both Spain and the United States utilized their respective expositions as platforms to garner domestic support for their colonial projects / efforts, gain investor interest, present their colonial efforts / colonial realities, and defend the work they had done and

were going to continue to do. The 1887 Philippine Exposition and 1904 St. Louis World's Fair served the purposes of its' organizers, and while what was displayed at the exhibits may not have been entirely accurate representations, or were perhaps even deliberate misrepresentations, of the state of colonial Philippines, Spain and the United States were continuing the tradition of utilizing world's fairs and expositions to showcase the best of their colonial achievements—education and otherwise—to the best of their abilities on the world stage. As Mitchell (1988) asserts, “Colonial power required the country to become readable, like a book, in our own sense of such a term” (p. 33). World's fairs and expositions helped colonial states achieve this readability, as they strived to create “good” colonial societies in a rapidly expanding and changing world.

Future Research

There are many possibilities for continuing this line of research. World's fairs and expositions played a major role in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, both in the United States and internationally. Well before the advent of the Internet age, these venues were the ideal ways in which to display, compare, and learn about various forms of progress—whether that progress was in science, agriculture, health, education, the arts, or politics / methods of imperialism: “Exhibitions were intended to be places of sale, platforms of wonder, sites of cultural meaning, specialised futures and catalogues of progressive action” (Lawn, 2009, p. 9). While historians have researched world's fairs and expositions for larger themes and tropes, historians of education have much to learn from the education displays. World's fairs and expositions can be viewed as “testing grounds” where nations and colonial states presented their education efforts for both praise and feedback. Rydell (1987) believes, “America's expositions, while part of the

American grain, were unique only in that they helped shape the increasing efforts by the United States to manage the world from its own rapidly expanding imperial perspective” (p. 8). One can look at how a nation’s education methods changed before and after its participation in a world’s fair, or how certain education methods and pedagogies spread across the world / different colonial contexts following a fair. One can also compare what was on display against colonial realities. The relationship between perceived and actual can be explored not only in colonial politics, but also in colonial education systems themselves. In short, world’s fairs and expositions are currently an underutilized source of exploration for educational historians, a source that can provide a wealth of research avenues in the foreseeable future.

EPILOGUE

One year after the Philippine Exposition in Madrid, several young women from the Philippine province of Malolos petitioned their parish priest for the right to learn Spanish, and for which they were willing to pay a private instructor. The parish priest rejected their petition, but undeterred, the young women wrote to the current Philippine governor general, Valeriano Weyler, in December 1888, who later approved their petition. Their letter to Weyler follows:

Most Excellent Governor General of the Philippines

Most Excellent Sir:

We the undersigned young women and some others respectfully appear before Your Excellency and expound the following: That desirous of learning the rich Spanish language, stimulated by and grateful for your generous inclination to generalize in the country the Castilian tongue, and unable to study it in the colleges at Manila, some on account of their limited funds, others on account of the pressing circumstances in their homes, nor can they do so in the daytime because they are busy with most peremptory household chores: With such purpose, we humbly pray Your Excellency to grant us a night school at the house of an elderly woman relative of ours to which we shall go accompanied by our mothers to take lessons in Castilian grammar from a professor of Latin remunerated by us, who in a short time has given proofs of aptitude for the teaching of Castilian, judging by the progress made by his pupils, while the public school teachers—without trying to harm them in their profession—have not achieved until now positive results.

We have no doubt that we shall merit this grace, considering the recognized kindness of Your Excellency whose important life may God keep many years.

Alberta Ui-Tang, Teresa Tantoco, María Tantoco, Merced Tiongson, Agapita Tiongson, Basilia Tiongson, Basilia Tantoco, Paz Tiongson, Feliciano Tiongson, and others.

Malolos, 12 December 1888 (quoted in Rizal, 1889, pp. 23–24)

The letter was later published in Barcelona in early 1889 in the Filipino-run newspaper, *La Solidaridad*. José Rizal, an *ilustrado* and later Philippine national hero, read the letter, and felt moved to write to the young women. What follows is an excerpt of his lengthy response:

To my Countrywomen of Malolos:

When I wrote the *Noli me tangere* [Rizal's famous novel on daily life / struggles in Spanish colonial Philippines, titled "Do not touch me"] I pondered long on whether or not courage was a common virtue of the young women of our country. ...

Now that you have responded to our vehement clamor for public welfare; now that you have shown a good example to your fellow young women who, like you, desire to have their eyes opened and to be lifted from their prostration, our hope is roused, now we are confident of victory. The Filipino woman no longer bows her head and bends her knees; her hope in the future is revived; gone is the mother who helps to keep her daughter in the dark, who educates her in self-contempt and moral annihilation. It is no longer the highest wisdom to bow the head to every unjust order, the highest goodness to smile at an insult, to seek solace in humble tears. You have found out that God's command is different from that of the priest, that piety does not consist in prolonged kneeling, long prayers, large rosaries, soiled scapulars, but in good conduct, clean conscience, and upright thinking. You have also discovered that it is not goodness to be too obedient to every desire and request of those who pose as little gods, but to obey what is reasonable and just, because blind obedience is the origin of crooked orders and in this case both parties sin. The head or the priest cannot say that he alone will be responsible for the wrong order because God gave each one his own mind and his own conscience so that he can distinguish between right and wrong. All men are born without chains, free, and no one can subject the will and spirit of another. Why would you submit to another your noble and free thought? It is cowardice and an error to believe that blind obedience is piety and it is arrogance to think and to reflect. Ignorance is ignorance and not goodness and honor. God, fountain of wisdom, does not expect man, created in his image, to allow himself to be fooled and blinded. The gift of reason with which we are endowed must be brightened and utilized. ...

Let us be reasonable and open our eyes, especially you women, because you are the ones who open the minds of men. Consider that a good mother is different from the one created by the friars. Raise your children close to the image of the true God—the God who cannot be bribed, the God who is not avaricious, the God who is the father of all,

who is not partial, the God who does not fatten on the blood of the poor, who does not obfuscate the intelligent mind. Awaken and prepare the mind of the child for every good and desirable idea—love for honor, sincere and firm character, clear mind, clean conduct, noble action, love for one’s fellow men, respect for God—teach this to your children. And because life is full of sorrows and perils, fortify their character against any difficulty, strengthen their hearts against any danger. *The country should not expect honor and prosperity so long as the women who raise the children are enslaved and ignorant.* Nothing can be drunk in a muddy and bitter spring. No sweet fruit can be picked from a sour seed.

Important indeed are the duties that women must fulfill in order to relieve the country of her sufferings, but they are not beyond the strength and character of the Filipino woman to perform. *Everybody knows the power and the prudence of the women in the Philippines. Hence they blind them, chain them, weaken their spirit, so sure are they that so long as the mother is a slave, all her children can be enslaved also.* This is the reason for the enslavement of Asia; the women in Asia are ignorant and oppressed. *Europe and America are powerful because there the women are free and educated, their mind is lucid and their character is strong* (Rizal, 1889, pp. 6–7, 12–13; emphasis added).

Ten years later, Spain would lose both the Spanish-American War, and its claim to the Philippines. The United States quickly implemented an American-style education system in the archipelago and instituted English as the language of instruction. Filipinos spent years fighting for the right to learn Spanish, and now Americans were willingly offering to teach everyone English, thus giving Filipinos access to “modern” ideas and knowledge—something they had long been denied under Spanish colonial rule.

Americans took note of the widespread Filipino desire to learn English, along with their natural aptitude for languages (a characteristic Spanish officials also noted at the 1887 Exposition). U.S. colonial education was on full display at the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair, and education efforts were well documented in speeches, articles, and catalogs. Those few Filipinos who knew Spanish (approximately 5% of the population according to Anderson [2006] and others) quickly forgot it, along with their long struggle

to gain access to the European language. While fairgoers wondered why so few Filipinos knew Spanish in 1887, in 1904, fairgoers were amazed at Filipinos' knowledge of English. As Stoler (2010) writes in regard to education and colonial rule, "Language was seen to provide proper content and form: the structure, idioms, ways of thinking, and cultural referents in which children's 'character formation' would take shape" (p. 121). Language acquisition brought those closer to the motherland or colonial state, and thus made it easier to instill certain values. In short, "Language was seen to fix the parameters of children's perceptions, enabling them to think certain sentiments and not others" (Stoler, 2010, p. 129).

While under Spanish colonial rule, Filipinos wanted nothing more than to be accepted by the Spanish government as equals, or at least gain the same level of recognition that those in Puerto Rico and Cuba achieved. When they realized that would not happen, Filipinos began to call for independence (see Schumacher, 1997). One is left to wonder at the simple power of language, and how language was—and can still be—used to control a population. Would Spain have been more successful in maintaining control over the Philippines had it allowed Filipinos access to Spanish language instruction? (An official, government-produced publication of the 1887 Exposition, written by a Spaniard, stated, "Things would go smoother in the Philippines by adding the grammar of the [Spanish] language" [Fernández Arias, 1887, p. 341].) Were the religious orders that controlled education in the archipelago truly to blame for weakening colonial rule by withholding Spanish language instruction and thus not instilling in Filipinos the necessary "sentiments"?

These are questions for another time, though compelling nonetheless. World's fairs and expositions were indeed venues in which colonial states displayed their achievements, but they were also venues in which colonial states withheld or misrepresented certain aspects of their colonial reality. There is much to be learned from these grand events, and from what was both presented and ignored in the construction of colonial exhibits, colonial education policies and systems, and "good" colonial societies.

APPENDIX A
LIST / ORIGIN OF AWARD-WINNING EDUCATION MATERIALS DISPLAYED
AT 1887 PHILIPPINE EXPOSITION, MADRID

Of the exhibits displayed in Section Eight (which included education exhibits) at the 1887 Philippine Exposition, the following received special recognition in the form of awards. This list of award-winning exhibits appeared in *El Globo's* [*The Globe*, a Madrid-based newspaper] (1887) compendium of articles related to the Exposition (pp. 219–220).

Exhibitors Rewarded with Honors

Section Eight

General culture. —Public Education, Sciences and Arts

Painting Academy Manila. —Several paintings.

General Administration of Communications. —*Manila.* —Plano-line postal telegraph NO., SE., South and lines and cables designed for Visayas, Luzon.

College of Santa Isabel. —*Manila.*

Township of Manila. —Several paintings, photographic views of the Manila neighborhood, supply models and two fire hydrants.

Director of Municipal School. —*Manila.* —A book manuscript describing the municipal school, a photo album of views, one with calligraphy, a collection of drawings, a model case with medals and a copy of the new regulations of that school.

The Comercio. —*Manila.* —Newspaper.

Manila Civil Government. —Two tables summarizing the provincial and municipal schools of Manila.

Public Works Inspection. —*Manila.* —General-model of Manila.

Bamboo and nipa school, model school, half-timbered and brick.

Port Works, Manila. Port-relief plans of Manila with photographic view of work and portrait of the builder of the port anchorage and the Pasig River bar; of the artificial port works and other projects.

The Oceania Spain. —*Manila.* Newspaper.

Moon and Novice (D. Juan). —Several paintings.

Ramirez and Giraudier. —*Manila.* —Luxury engraved installation, containing a volume of *The Journal of Manila*, created in 1848.

Rector of the University of Santo Tomás, Manila. —Six tables reporting on the faculties of Theology and Canon Law, Jurisprudence, Medicine, Pharmacy and secondary schools.

Rector of the Ateneo Municipal, Manila. —Notebook manuscript describing the Ateneo, views and plans of the same.

Spanish Society of Commercial Geography. —*Madrid.* —*Spanish-German conflict over Micronesia.*

Superior of the Mission of the Society of Jesus. —*Manila.* —Six plans

for the church of San Ignacio de Loyola, in Manila.

NOTE

As we are unable to publish a list of all winning exhibitors, we simply write the names of those who have received honors. We are very sorry not to offer equally to all this poor tribute of our admiration, but that points to, on one hand the genius of this work, and the other the number of those who have earned reward. All, however, are to be applauded for their patriotic contribution for the interests of our Philippine archipelago.

The education exhibits that received awards, listed above, were typical of the few education-related displays at the 1887 Philippine Exposition. The education exhibits were comprised of materials such as school plans and models, textbooks, attendance records, statistics, examples of student work, and other physical artifacts. Notably missing from the education exhibits were actual Filipino youth / students.

APPENDIX B

LIST / ORIGIN OF EDUCATION MATERIALS DISPLAYED AT 1904 ST. LOUIS

PHILIPPINE EXHIBIT (PARTIAL)

The following text describing the Philippine educational exhibit appeared in the *Report of the Philippine Exposition Board in the United States for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition*, published in 1905. Albert R. Hager, chief of the Department of Education for the Philippine Exposition Board, wrote this description, which preceded a list of the education materials displayed as well as the origins of the materials (the first few pages of the list are also included in this appendix, see below).

The educational exhibit was installed in a large well lighted building which was a miniature of the Manila Cathedral. Central walls and alcoves, covered with green burlap, were erected to provide wall space, and two hundred and twenty square meters of space were thus provided. In preparing the exhibit the first step was to enlist the co-operation of the American and Filipino Teachers in the Government schools, about two thousand in number, and as many as possible of the teachers of private schools. To this end, circulars were sent to each American teacher, and materials, uniform paper for written work, etc., were sent by the Bureau of Education, which gave every assistance possible to schools that requested such material. Letters were written to a number of educators in America requesting personal expressions as to what they would find most interesting in a Philippine educational exhibit. In response, many helpful suggestions were received.

The Educational exhibit, known as "Department A" of the Philippine Exposition Board, contained collections sent by four hundred and thirty-eight exhibitors and consisted of eight thousand five hundred and forty-two exhibits.

Those received before leaving Manila were listed in duplicate card catalogues and those received in St. Louis since that date were added to these catalogues. In one of these the cards were arranged in order of serial card numbers. In the other, the cards were divided into eight groups and sub-divided into classes corresponding to the Exposition divisions and sub-divisions of "Department A," and the various exhibitors—in most schools, were alphabetically arranged in each class. By this arrangement it was a very simple matter to locate any exhibit by number or to obtain data regarding the exhibit from any school or school division.

Labels of various sizes were freely used throughout the collection to give visitors information regarding collections and conditions of school work in the Philippines, particularly where these conditions are different from those of the United States.

Written work was displayed in flat top wall cases arranged according to school divisions, some of the typical work being shown open

under glass. These cases are so arranged that they may be opened without disturbing this displayed work to give access to other written work of the division. Notices were printed on each case as follows:

“Teachers or students who wish to examine the work contained in this case may obtain access to it for reference by applying at the office in this building.”

The industrial exhibits and photographs filled thirty glazed show cases and the wall space around these cases, and were arranged by school divisions. These show cases varied in size from 1–2 to 7 cubic meters. The photographs were placed in glazed frames screwed to the walls, each bearing exhibit numbers and descriptive labels.

The Philippine Jury of “Department A,” after careful examination of the exhibits, submitted their list of awards to the Superior Jury. The revised list of awards contained eight Grand Prizes, as follows: The Secretary of Public Instruction, and the General Superintendent of Education, on the exhibit as a whole; The Philippine Model School; Laguna High School; Liceo de Manila, secondary school; the Philippine Nautical School; the Philippine Normal School, and the University of Santo Tomas.

Thirty Gold Medals, seventy-one Silver Medals, one hundred and ten Bronze Medals, and three hundred and twenty-three Honorable Mentions were also awarded.

The Model School was in session after July 19th in a typical nipa and bamboo school house, especially arranged for exhibition purposes. It was in charge of Miss Pilar Zamora, a Tagalog teacher, who is a teacher in the Philippine Normal School. Two sessions were held daily, except Monday, the first from 9 to 10.30 for children from the Visayan Village, and from 10.30 to 11.30 for children from the villages of the non-Christian tribes. The latter included children of the Bontoc Igorot, Suyoc Igorot, Bagobo, Tinguian, Samal Moro, and Lanao Moro tribes.

The number of visitors to the Educational Building and Model School was very large, the number visiting the school during the two and one-half hours session often being by actual count over two thousand. Interest in this exhibit and the Exposition as a whole was stimulated by the distribution, early in the year, of folders descriptive of the Philippine Exposition and particularly of the educational features to some eighty thousand teachers in the States nearest St. Louis.

At the annual meeting of the National Educational Association papers on Philippine education were read by Dr. E. B. Bryan, former General Superintendent of Education, Miss Pilar Zamora, Superintendent of the Model School, and Mr. A. R. Hager.

A register of visiting teachers was kept from the opening day and contains some twenty thousand names. Many of the schools which sent exhibits included letters from the pupils to American boys and girls. These letters have been distributed to teachers who were interested and who have

agreed to see that they are answered. This promises to result in an interesting correspondence between school children in the Philippines, and those in all parts of the United States.

An interesting feature of the exhibit was a record, with data, of each Filipino student in America. The records of students sent to America at the expense of the Insular Government were furnished by Mr. W. A. Sutherland. Those of other students were obtained by writing to the directors of schools and universities concerned. In some cases these were accompanied by photographs. The visits of American teachers from the Philippines have made it possible to give interested visitors information with regard to school conditions in the Archipelago. Assistance has been given in this way to teachers desiring to go to the Philippines, to publishers in the preparation of special text-books, to correspondents, lecturers, and others.

Miss Pilar Zamora delivered an address on Philippine Education at Chautauqua, New York, on the afternoon of August 11. A letter received later from George E. Vincent states that Miss Zamora made a very favorable impression. This trip was at the expense of the Chautauqua Institution.

While the Filipino students were visiting the Exposition a number of them were on duty at all times in the Educational Building. They were instructed as to the location of the various exhibits and points of particular interest and their services in explaining these points to visitors were valuable. They made an admirable impression.

The following literature was distributed to interested visitors at the Educational Exhibit: Philippine Exposition Folder No. 1; Catalogue of "El Liceo de Manila;" Circular letter to Philippine teachers used in giving directions for work in collecting exhibits; Bulletins of the Philippine Bureau of Education; the Philippine Normal School Prospectus for 1903-04; Prospectus of the Philippine School of Arts and Trades for 1904-05; Prospectus of the Philippine Nautical School for the year 1904-05; Industrial Exhibits of Philippine Schools at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition; Courses of Instruction for the Public Schools of the Philippine Islands. A special folder "Education in the Philippines," prepared by Mr. Hager, was also distributed (Philippine Exposition Board, 1905, pp. 13-15; emphasis added).

The list of education materials displayed at the Philippine Exhibit was extensive.

Hager's detailed list spanned 11 pages, the first few pages of which are included below (Philippine Exposition Board, 1905, pp. 37-39) so as to get a sense of the comprehensiveness and magnitude of the Philippine education display.

Department A.—Education.

GROUP 1.

- Abucay Pub. School, Bataan, Luzon.**
Regular class work; Geography, Arithmetic and Language.
- Abulog Public School, Cagayan, Luzon**
Letters to American boys and girls; maps, drawing, language, arithmetic and geography.
- Agoo Public School, Union, Luzon.** Industrial work: Embroidered cushions, photographs.
- Agutaya Public School, Paragua.** Photographs.
- Alabat Public School, Tayabas, Luzon.**
Regular class work; letters.
- Alaminos Public School, Laguna, Luzon.**
Letters to American boys, for distribution at St. Louis.
- Alaminos Public School, Zambales, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; drawing, language, writing from pictures; geography, arithmetic; photographs.
- Albay Public School, Albay, Luzon.** Regular class work: Arithmetic, drawing, painting, geography; needle work, etc.
- Alimodian Public School, Iloilo, Panay.**
Letters to American boys and girls; spelling, arithmetic, geography and composition.
- Amadeo Public School, Cavite, Luzon.**
"Palmeta" from School Museum.
- American Kindergarten, Ermita, Manila.**
Drawings, paper folding, paper cutting, gift work, water color, stitching, color work, etc.
- Angeles Public School, Pampanga, Luzon.** Translations, drawing, letters to American boys and girls.
- Angono Public School, Rizal, Luzon.**
Map in color.
- Antipolo Public School, Rizal, Luzon.**
Maps of North and South America and the United States.
- Apalit Public School, Pampanga, Luzon.**
Letters to American boys and girls; text-books; miscellaneous papers, etc.
- Aparri Public School, Cagayan, Luzon.**
Large native bow, from school museum.
- Arayat Public School, Pampanga, Luzon.**
Regular class work: Maps, language, drawings, program of school.
- Argao Public School, Cebu.** Regular class work: Maps and industrial work of different kinds.
- Aringay Public School, Union, Luzon.**
Regular class work: Arithmetic, maps in color; photographs.
- Asigan Public School, Pangasinan, Luzon.** Photograph of school building and pupils.
- Atimonan Public School, Tayabas, Luzon.** Regular class work: Compositions, etc.
- Bacnotan Public School, Union, Luzon.**
Letters to American boys and girls; Arithmetic, language, maps, geography and photographs.
- Bacolod Public School, Occ. Negros.**
Text-books of Spanish Regime, letters to American boys and girls, maps, class work, and photographs.
- Bacolor Public School, Pampanga, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; language, arithmetic, drawing, painted hand screen.
- Bacon Public School, Sorsogon, Luzon.**
Regular class work.
- Bacoor Public School, Cavite, Luzon.**
Regular class work: Arithmetic, notebook exercises, text-book, etc.
- Badajoz Public School, Romblon, Let-**
ters to American boys and girls and regular class work.
- Badoc Public School, Ilocos Norte, Luzon.** Industrial work; U. S. Coat of Arms, embroidered.

- Bago Public School, Occ. Negros.** Industrial school work; model of school-house photographs.
- Baguio Public School, Benguet, Luzon.** Photographs.
- Bais Public School, Or. Negros.** Regular class work: Arithmetic, penmanship, composition and photographs; class work.
- Balanga Public School, Bataan, Luzon.** Letters to American boys; text-books, arithmetic, spelling, history, grammar; maps and drawings.
- Balaoang Public School, Union, Luzon.** School Museum; wood samples, text-books of Spanish Regime. Industrial regular class work, photographs.
- Baliuag Public School, Bulacan, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; language, industrial work, photographs and maps.
- Bangar Public School, Union, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; school museum, Spanish text-books, industrial work and photographs.
- Bangued Public School, Abra, Luzon.** Class work: compositions and letters.
- Barili Public School, Cebu.** Industrial work: Artificial flowers, etc.; spelling, geography, maps and drawings.
- Barasoain Public School, Bulacan, Luzon.** Memory exercises, arithmetic and composition.
- Basud Public School, Camarines, Luzon.** Writing from pictures; and maps.
- Batangas Public School, Batangas, Luzon.** Industrial work: Baskets, fish-traps, etc. Class work: Geography, grammar, composition, arithmetic, drawing.
- Bauan Public School, Batangas, Luzon.** Compositions, drawings, arithmetic, letters and photographs.
- Bauang Public School, Union, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls, and maps in color.
- Bayambang Public School, Pangasinan, Luzon.** Photographs of school building.
- Bayan-Bayanan Public School, Rizal, Luzon.** Program of school.
- Betis Public School, Pampanga, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; industrial work; class work.
- Bigaa Public School, Bulacan, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; maps, compositions, memory exercises.
- Binalonan Public School, Pangasinan, Luzon.** Photographs of building and pupils; geography, arithmetic, language, maps, etc.
- Binang Public School, Laguna, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; spelling, arithmetic, and drawings.
- Binangonan Public School, Rizal, Luzon.** Arithmetic, map, program of school.
- Binmaley Public School, Pangasinan, Luzon.** Photographs of building and pupils; miscellaneous papers and industrial work.
- Binondo 1st Boys' Public School, Manila.** Book of drawings.
- Binondo 1st Girls' Public School, Manila.** Book of drawings.
- Binondo 2nd Boys' Public School, Manila.** Regular class work; Arithmetic, geography, language and photographs.
- Binondo 2nd Girls' Public School, Manila.** Arithmetic, geography, letters, writing from pictures, sewing, etc.
- Boac Public School, Marinduque.** Letters to American boys and girls; compositions and photographs.
- Bocane Public School, Bulacan, Luzon.** Regular class work; map drawing, penmanship, arithmetic, etc.
- Bohol Public School, Bohol.** Regular class work.
- Bolong Public School, Mindanao.** Regular class work: Letters and arithmetic.
- Bontoc Public School, Bontoc, Luzon.** Photographs.
- Bua Public School, Benguet, Luzon.** Photographs of pupils.
- Buena Vista Public School, Zamboanga, Mindanao.** Maps.
- Bulacan Public School, Bulacan, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; maps, drawing, arithmetic, history, language.
- Bustos Public School, Bulacan, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; industrial work; essays.
- Cabanatuan Public School, Nueva Ecija, Luzon.** Language work; stories.
- Cabancalan Public School, Occ. Negros.** Industrial work: Needlework.
- Cabatuan Public School, Iloilo, Panay.** Regular class work: Geography and examination in grammar.
- Cabua Public School, Laguna, Luzon.** Regular class work: Spelling, language, geography and history.

- Cadiz, Nueva Public School, Occ. Negros.** Drawing, spelling, penmanship, language, arithmetic and maps.
- Cagayan Public School, Misamis, Mindanao.** Compositions, drawings, arithmetic, spelling, examination papers, letters and maps.
- Cagayancillo Public School, Paragua.** Photographs.
- Caggao Public School, Bangar, Union, Luzon.** Drawing of school house.
- Calamba Public School, Laguna, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; photographs and maps.
- Calapan Public School, Mindoro.** Letters to American boys and girls; maps in color.
- Calasa Public School, Cabancalan, Occ. Negros.** Pina handkerchief embroidered.
- Calasiao Public School, Pangasinan, Luzon.** Photograph.
- Caloocan Public School, Rizal, Luzon.** Program of school.
- Calumpit Public School, Bulacan, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; spelling, language, arithmetic, geography, penmanship, maps, photographs.
- Camiling Public School, Tarlac, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls.
- Candaba Public School, Pampanga, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; maps, drawings, arithmetic, language, spelling.
- Capiz Public School, Capiz, Panay.** Maps and drawings; letters to American boys and girls; examination papers and regular class work.
- Carcar Public School, Cebu.** Industrial work: Drawings.
- Castillejos Public School, Zambales, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls. text-books. Class work: Language, history, spelling, arithmetic, maps and drawings.
- Cataingan Public School, Masbate.** Regular class work: Maps, drawings and photographs.
- Cava Public School, Union, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; school museum; industrial work and class work; photographs.
- Cavinti Public School, Laguna, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls.
- Cavite Public School, Cavite, Luzon.** Regular class work.
- Cavite Viejo Public School, Cavite, Luzon.** Photographs.
- Cebu Central Public School, Cebu, Cebu.** Letters to American boys and girls; school museum; nature study; maps; industrial work and photographs.
- Cebu Recoletos Public School, Cebu.** Miscellaneous papers: Geography, history, drawing, arithmetic, language, maps, letters, nature study, chart of Spanish school, Spanish text-books and industrial work.
- Cebu San Nicolas Public School, Cebu.** Photographs, program of school, Spanish text-book, arithmetic, maps, chart, penmanship, industrial work, etc.
- Colasi Public School, Antique, Panay.** Maps, drawings, school books, examination papers and school museum.
- Concepcion Public Schools (boys and girls), Manila.** Compositions, illustrations and drawings.
- Concepcion Public Schools, Iloilo, Panay.** Regular class work: Arithmetic, language, papers and maps.
- Concepcion Public School, Tarlac, Luzon.** Letters to American boys and girls; drawings and composition; model of school house.
- Corregidor Public School, Cavite, Luzon.** Industrial work: Doll in native costume. Compositions, maps, language and arithmetic and photographs.
- Cottabato Public School, Mindanao.** Regular class work: Arithmetic.
- Cuyapo Public School, Nueva Ecija.** Regular class work: Compositions and maps.
- Cuyo Public School, Cuyo Island.** Regular class work: Drawings, map of Philippine Islands, calendars, penmanship and photographs.
- Daet Public School, Ambos Camarines.** Composition, literature, nature study, geography, history, drawings, arithmetic, map and class work.
- Dagupan Public School, Pangasinan, Luzon.** Industrial work of different kinds; libretto descriptions and programs; photos of school building; maps, drawings and class work.
- Dalaguete Public School, Cebu.** Industrial and regular class work.
- Danao Public School, Cebu.** Oil painting of school house; arithmetic, spelling, compositions and maps.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agoncillo, T. A. (1990). *History of the Filipino people* (eighth edition). Quezon City, Philippines: Garotech.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (revised ed.). London & New York: Verso.
- Anderson, B. (1998). *The spectre of comparisons: Nationalism, Southeast Asia, and the world*. London & New York: Verso.
- Blanco, J. D. (2009). *Frontier constitutions: Christianity and colonial empire in the nineteenth-century Philippines*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Bryan, E. B. (1904). Education in the Philippines. In *National Education Association: Journal of proceedings and addresses of the forty-third annual meeting held at St. Louis, Missouri in connection with the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, June 27–July 1, 1904* (pp. 100–104). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bunge, F. M. (Ed.). (1984). *Philippines: A country study*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, United States Government.
- Bureau of Insular Affairs, War Department [Washington, DC]. (1903). *Official handbook. Description of the Philippines, part I*. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.
- Catálogo de la Exposición General de las Islas Filipinas* [Catalog of the General Exposition of the Philippines]. (1887). Madrid: Ricardo Fé.
- De la Costa, H. (1965). *Readings in Philippine history*. Makati City, Philippines: Bookmark, Inc.
- De Ojeda, J. (2010). *The Spanish-American War of 1898: A Spanish view*. Retrieved from <http://www.loc.gov/tr/hispanic/1898/ojeda.html>
- El Globo (1887). *Exposición de Filipinas: Colección de artículos publicados en El Globo* [The Philippine Exposition: A collection of articles published in *The Globe*]. Madrid: J. Salgado de Trigo.

- Fernández Arias, E. (1887). *Exposición General de las Islas Filipinas en Madrid, 1887* (edición oficial) [General Exposition of the Philippines in Madrid, 1887 (official edition)]. Manila: Colegio de Santo Tomás.
- Flórez Hernández, A. (1887). *Crónica de la Exposición de Filipinas* [Chronicle of the Philippine Exposition]. Madrid: Manuel Ginés Hernández / Real Casa.
- Hager, A. R. (1905). The educational exhibit at the Philippine Exposition. *The Philippine Teacher: A Periodical for Philippine Progress* 1(3), 21–23.
- Hager, A. R. (1904). The Philippine teacher and the Philippine educational exhibit. In *National Education Association: Journal of proceedings and addresses of the forty-third annual meeting held at St. Louis, Missouri in connection with the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, June 27–July 1, 1904* (pp. 396–398). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Justice, B. (2009). Education at the end of a gun: The origins of American imperial education in the Philippines. In N. W. Sobe (Ed.), *American post-conflict educational reform: From the Spanish-American War to Iraq*. New York: Palgrave.
- Kramer, P. A. (2006). *The blood of government: Race, empire, the United States & the Philippines*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Lawn, M. (Ed.). (2009). *Modelling the future: Exhibitions and the materiality of education*. Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.
- McGee, W. J. (1904). Anthropology. In “Division of exhibits,” *World’s Fair Bulletin*, pp. 41–46.
- Mendoza, S. L. (2006). New frameworks in Philippine postcolonial historiography: Decolonizing a discipline. In J. Young & J. E. Braziel (Eds.), *Race and the foundations of knowledge: Cultural amnesia in the academy* (pp. 155–173). Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Mitchell, T. (1988). *Colonising Egypt*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Morillo-Alicea, J. (2005). Uncharted landscapes of “Latin America”: The Philippines in the Spanish imperial archipelago. In C. Schmidt-Nowara & J. M. Nieto-Phillips (Eds.), *Interpreting Spanish colonialism: Empires, nations, and legends* (pp. 25–53). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Nadeau, K. (2008). *The history of the Philippines*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

- Philippine Exposition Board. (1903). *Act No. 514, creating the Exposition Board. Circular letter of Governor Taft and information and instructions for the preparation of the Philippine Exhibit for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition to be held at St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A., 1904*. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.
- Philippine Exposition Board. (1904). *Official handbook of the Philippines and catalogue of the Philippine Exhibit* (vol. 1 & 2). Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.
- Philippine Exposition Board. (1905). *Report of the Philippine Exposition Board in the United States for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Insular Affairs, War Department.
- Philippines Bureau of Education. (1904). *Report of industrial exhibits of the Philippine schools at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition*. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.
- Pilapil, V. R. (1961). Nineteenth-century Philippines and the friar-problem. *The Americas*, 18(2), 127–148.
- Rafael, V. L. (1990). Nationalism, imagery, and the Filipino intelligentsia in the nineteenth century. *Critical Inquiry*, 16(3), 591–611.
- Rizal, J. (1889 / 1961). *Message to the young women of Malolos* (E. Alzona, trans.). Quezon City, Philippines: R. P. Garcia Publishing Company.
- Rydell, R. W. (1987). *All the world's a fair: Visions of empire at American international expositions, 1876–1916*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sánchez Gómez, L. A. (2002). Indigenous art at the Philippine Exposition of 1887. *Journal of the History of Collections*, 14(2), 283–294.
- Schumacher, J. N. (1997). *The propaganda movement, 1880–1895: The creation of a Filipino consciousness, the making of the revolution* (revised ed.). Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Schwartz, K. (1971). Filipino education and Spanish colonialism: Toward an autonomous perspective. *Comparative Education Review*, 15(2), 202–218.
- Silbey, D. J. (2007). *A war of frontier and empire: The Philippine–American War, 1899–1902*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Sison, J. M. (2005, May 7). *Ideology and religion in the Philippines* [Lecture to Filipino Catholic priests in The Netherlands, Belgium, and Austria]. Retrieved from <http://www.josemariasison.org/jumi02/inps/articles.htm>
- Stocking, G. W. (1987). *Victorian anthropology*. New York: Free Press.

- Stoler, A. L. (2010). *Carnal knowledge and imperial power: Race and the intimate in colonial rule* (revised ed.). Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Swarthout, W. N. (1904). A descriptive story of the Philippine Exhibit, World's Fair, St. Louis, U.S.A. In "The opening, Universal Exposition, 1904," *World's Fair Bulletin*, pp. 43–52.
- Taft, W. H. (1904). *The Philippine Islands: An address delivered before the Chamber of Commerce of New York, April 21, 1904*. New York: np.
- Taft, W. H. (1902). *The Philippines*. New York: The Outlook Company.
- Taft, W. H. (1905). The Philippines [Address before the National Geographic Society, May 5, 1905]. *National Geographic Magazine*, 16(8), 361–375.
- Taft, W. H. (1907). Some recent instances of national altruism: The efforts of the United States to aid the peoples of Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines [Address to the Miller's Convention in St. Louis, Mo., May 30, 1907]. *National Geographic Magazine*, 18(7), 429–438.
- Tuason, J. A. (1999). The ideology of empire in *National Geographic Magazine's* coverage of the Philippines, 1898–1908. *Geographical Review*, 89(1), 34–53.
- United States Congress. (1902). *Hearings before the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives from February 21 to March 6, 1902, inclusive. Statement of conditions on the Philippine Islands, by Hon. William H. Taft, governor of the Philippine Islands*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- United States Philippine Commission. (1901a). *Report of the United States Philippine Commission to the Secretary of War for the period from December 1, 1900, to October 15, 1901* (parts 1 & 2). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- United States Philippine Commission. (1901b). *Reports of the Taft Philippine Commission. Message from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of the Secretary of War, containing the reports of the Taft Commission, its several acts of legislation, and other important information relating to the conditions and immediate wants of the Philippine Islands*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- White, F. R. (1905). Interest in the United States in Philippine education. *The Philippine Teacher: A Periodical for Philippine Progress* 1(2), 20–22.
- Zamora, M. D. P. (1904). A Filipino's view of education in the Philippines. In *National Education Association: Journal of proceedings and addresses of the forty-third*

annual meeting held at St. Louis, Missouri in connection with the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, June 27–July 1, 1904 (pp. 468–471). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Zimmerman, J. (2006). *Innocents abroad: American teachers in the American century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

VITA

Erin Hardacker received a bachelor of arts in anthropology (cum laude) from Lawrence University in 1998, and matriculated into Loyola University Chicago's Cultural and Educational Policy Studies master's program after working for ten years as an editor in the educational publishing industry. Her primary research interests involve the history of education and colonial education systems, which naturally led to her master's thesis on representations of Philippine colonial education in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Erin will continue her studies in the history of education at the doctoral level next fall.

