

5-1-2021

## Colonization of the Philippines: An Analysis of U.S. Justificatory Rhetoric

Johansen Christopher Pico

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), [Asian American Studies Commons](#), [Communication Commons](#), and the [Rhetoric Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

Pico, Johansen Christopher, "Colonization of the Philippines: An Analysis of U.S. Justificatory Rhetoric" (2021). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 4182.  
<https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/4182>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact [digitalscholarship@unlv.edu](mailto:digitalscholarship@unlv.edu).

COLONIZATION OF THE PHILIPPINES: AN ANALYSIS  
OF U.S. JUSTIFICATORY RHETORIC

By

Johansen Christopher Pico

Bachelor of Arts – Communication Studies  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
2018

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the

Master of Arts – Communication Studies

Department of Communication Studies  
Greenspun College of Urban Affairs  
The Graduate College

University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
May 2021



## Thesis Approval

The Graduate College  
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas

May 7, 2021

This thesis prepared by

Johansen Christopher Pico

entitled

Colonization of the Philippines: An Analysis of U.S. Justificatory Rhetoric

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts – Communication Studies  
Department of Communication Studies

Emma Bloomfield, Ph.D.  
*Examination Committee Chair*

Kathryn Hausbeck Korgan, Ph.D.  
*Graduate College Dean*

Jacob Thompson, Ph.D.  
*Examination Committee Member*

Rebecca Rice, Ph.D.  
*Examination Committee Member*

Constancio Arnaldo, Ph.D.  
*Graduate College Faculty Representative*

## **Abstract**

The term “Filipino” offers more than a call to nationality; it also recalls the genesis of colonization in the Philippines. This thesis explores the colonial interventions of the United States in the Philippines at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, homing in on the Filipino education system as the United States’ primary method of colonizing the Filipino mind. Drawing from texts by Senator Alfred Beveridge, President William McKinley, the Philippine Commission, David Barrows, and Dr. Trinidad Pardo de Tavera, I offer an ideological criticism that demonstrates a cyclical nature between both justificatory rhetoric and ideology. Working with “ideological clusters,” this thesis demonstrates how justificatory discourse was used to mobilize American colonialism, yielding both symbolic and material consequences for the Filipino people.

## Acknowledgements

Seven years ago, when I began my undergraduate studies at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, I never would have imagined that I would have been admitted to a graduate program in Communication Studies. After completing two years in this program, I have many people to express my gratitude to, because without them, this thesis would have never manifested.

First, I want to express the utmost gratitude to my committee chair, Dr. Emma Bloomfield, for seeing so much potential in me and my scholarship, as well as humanizing the process of writing and participating in academia. There were so many moments throughout these past two years where I doubted myself and my ability to pursue a career in academia; your kind words and strong mentorship helped ground me and believe in myself.

To my committee members, Dr. Rebecca Rice, Dr. Jacob Thompson, and Dr. Constancio Arnaldo: thank you for your support and kindness throughout this process of writing and research. This project would not have been possible without faculty both supporting and challenging this research to be the best that it can be; your time and flexibility working with me this past year is much appreciated.

To some of the most supportive graduate faculty I met along the way, Dr. Christine Clark, Dr. Carlos Flores, Dr. Jennifer Guthrie, Dr. Norma Marrun, Dr. Tara McManus, Dr. Natalie Pennington, and Dr. Cassandra Rodriguez: thank you for teaching the courses and having the conversations that challenged me to think more critically of the world. I would not have been able to become the scholar I am today without your instruction, guidance, and support.

To my entire cohort: this process of “becoming a grad student” would not have been the same without you all. From our late nights writing in the office, to our (sometimes rowdy)

classroom debates, I would not have wanted anything else from my grad school experience besides being with such a supportive and loving group. Thank you for everything.

To my therapists that I had the pleasure of working with at CICFC for the past few years, Allison, Caitlin, and Norma: I would not have been able to discover myself, nor understand “self-love” or “self-esteem,” without our sessions. Thank you for helping me become a more confident and loving version of myself.

To my best of friends, Alyssa, Briseida, Calvin, “Don Jon,” Emily, Jake, Javon, John, Jordan, Josh, Kenny, Raina, and Yesenia: thank you for being there and supporting me through my grad school experience. Having such a strong support system in all of you helped me continue to persist in my studies, and you all also reminded me that it was okay to take a break and to enjoy life’s moments.

To my partner, Paula: there are not enough words to express how much gratitude I have for you and all the patience and love you’ve shown me through our time together. All our talks, laughs, and all the other moments together remind me that there is always another day to look forward to. I love you.

And lastly, to my mom, my sister, my brother, and all my family both near and far, for whom I must give the most thanks: nothing today would have been possible without you. Going to school these past couple of years, being away from home for long periods of time...I know it’s been difficult; especially since Gerrard’s passing. I know that no words on a page could ever be enough, but I hope that I can express how much love and appreciation I have for each of you and for helping me become the person that I am today. Thank you, again, and I love you all.

This thesis is dedicated to my father, Gerrard S. Nieva.  
May this work honor his spirit and carry his soul through the pages.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	iii
Acknowledgements .....	iv
Introduction: The Birth of the Filipino .....	1
Chapter 1: Colonial Origins .....	23
Chapter 2: The Rhetorical Construction of the Savior-Colonizer .....	33
Chapter 3: Death of the Native / Birth of the Filipino Commodity .....	47
Conclusion .....	63
References .....	68
Curriculum Vitae .....	72

## **Introduction: The Birth of the Filipino**

Because the term *Filipino* derives from the nation of the Philippines and because the Philippines was named after King Felipe (Philip) II of Spain, identifying oneself as *Filipino* recalls the colonial subjection of the archipelago's people....It contains the history of colonization because it interpellates every Filipino as a subject of colonizing power, hails him by that name, and recognizes him as a member of the colonized. (Leonardo & Matias, 2013, p. 6)

To be Filipino is to recognize that one has been colonized. Not only did Spain colonize the Philippines for three centuries, but the United States was also able to buy the role of colonizer from Spain for the price of \$20 million after winning the Spanish-American War (Ocampo, 2016, pp. 15-19). At this point, the United States had to address these questions: What role should the United States play in the continued development of the Philippines, and how can its leaders convince the people that their decision was appropriate? In my dive into the literature, I discovered that the answer to these two questions can be best explored when considering the delicate balance that the United States needed to achieve between the Philippines' "savior" and their "colonizer." My initial literature review shows that the United States justified their colonization of the Philippines through their implementation of a widespread educational system that aimed to "save" the Filipinos from themselves and raise them as worthy participants in the global market. Additionally, the process of colonization brought about implications that distorted and molded the Filipino mind into an image deemed appropriate by their colonizer.

This study takes a critical, postcolonial approach to rhetorical criticism. Shome (1996) argues that "academic self-reflexivity" is a necessary component of postcolonial scholarship because it forces researchers to reflect on how academic practices can perpetuate and reinforce

dominant, Western ideologies (p. 45-47). One of the primary motivations for this study stems from my own identity as a Filipino American scholar. The very discourse I will criticize in this study interpellates me, not only as a rhetorical critic, but also as a member of the Filipino diaspora: a “contemporary product” of over three centuries of colonial influence. I recognize that my set of identities (i.e., Filipino American, cis-gender male, researcher, graduate student of color, etc.) has both its “advantages” and “limitations” for this research. Ganiel and Mitchell (2006) argued that the lauded objectivity of the research “outsider” has long been abandoned in favor of recognizing researcher subjectivity and how “our own cultural expectations influence the research process” (p. 4). Despite my affiliation with “Filipino,” my academic upbringing primarily stems from Western schools of thought, so I recognize that I must tread carefully to avoid essentializing experiences and identities with this research. Simultaneously, I contend that my approach offers the field new insights in problematizing (post)colonial rhetorics and their material consequences. There is a substantial gap in postcolonial communication research as it pertains to Filipino and Filipino American groups; this study is my attempt to begin filling this gap in hopes for continued, fruitful research in this area.

This study will first aim to outline the unique colonial situation of the Philippines due to their exposure to colonial influences from both Spain and the United States. Chapter One will further provide a brief historical overview of the moments leading up to the United States’ decision to claim the Philippines as their “first” colony (albeit, I argue not their first experience with exploitation), contextualizing the transition of power from Spain to the United States within the backdrop of Spanish occupation. Afterwards, I will introduce and rationalize the texts I plan to analyze in this study. Next, I will delineate my theoretical framework, which will inform my methodological choices in the final section. As this thesis will illustrate, this type of study is

essential to better understand the uses (and misuses) of communication, its role in justifying colonization and imperialism, and the lasting colonial legacies these justifications can have on the people that were subjugated in the process.

The motivation behind this thesis was informed by studies by Hsu (2013), Leonardo and Matias (2013), and Ocampo (2016): each of these sources offer some historical background that detailed some of the impacts of the three centuries of colonization that the Philippines endured. Although these studies focused more on the implications of colonization, I argue that the significance of this thesis lies in the contemporary situation for Filipinos, both those who remain in the Philippines, as well as those in the diaspora. The questions began for me as, “How did the Filipino condition get to this moment?” “How did the United States justify colonizing the Philippines after they had already been colonized for centuries?” and, “What communicative lessons should we learn to recognize when this is happening again?” These studies will help provide some context for the current study, which I will expand upon in the next sections.

The first two chapters of Ocampo’s (2016) book offered a succinct overview of the unique position that Filipino Americans hold today because of their colonial histories that have influenced their culture, and ultimately, the Filipino mind (p. 9). Leonardo and Matias (2013) describe this influence as the “colonial mentality,” where Filipino identity was, in a sense, defined in advance through the lenses of colonial rulers (p. 5). Even the ethnic label, “Filipino,” is a mark of colonial rule: the name originates from King Felipe (Philip) II of Spain, so every time a person refers to themselves as Filipino, they inherently invoke their people’s colonial past (Leonardo & Matias, 2013, pp. 6-7). The term “Filipino” also excluded native peoples, which colonial rulers referred to as *indios* or *negritos* (Leonardo & Matias, 2013, p. 6). In this study, I

will use “Filipino” to refer to the people occupying the land after Spain established their colonial rule.

Although my thesis will primarily explore the United States’ role in the colonization of the Philippines, I recognize that Spain had their own methods of colonization that overlapped with how Filipinos experienced life during the United States’ colonial rule. Catholicism was the main tool for the Spanish to culturally transform and pacify the Filipino people; much of the Filipino resistance was quelled through religious schools (Leonardo & Matias, 2013; Ocampo, 2016). In essence, Filipinos were initially subjugated through their belief that they needed to be saved (by God) and that they were inferior to their colonial rulers: the Spanish (and eventually the American) Empire.

Although the United States had their own means of colonization, both Spain and the United States shared common features in their colonial missions. Both Spain and the United States had to find the means to pacify Filipinos, but the United States decided to capitalize on the role of formalized education systems, rather than religious instruction, to pacify, and ultimately subjugate the people (Hsu, 2013, p. 42). That is not to say that religion did not play a role in American colonization of the Philippines, but rather, religion played a more covert role in the “American civil religion,” which helped support the United States’ role as “savior” (Bellah, 1967). The function of religion in U.S. colonization will further be articulated in Chapter Two.

Expanding on my decision to focus on formalized education, Leonardo and Matias (2013) argue that “education is an active process that reinforces, and sometimes challenges, institutionalized racism, sexism, class exploitation, and other existing relations of power” (p. 9). The United States took part in what Hsu (2013) described as “ideological warfare,” drawing from their previous imperialist experiences (p. 43). Hsu uses the idea of a *colonial lesson* to

frame how the United States learned from previous imperialist initiatives to continue their quest for global dominance. Hsu (2013) outlined three different colonial lessons: 1) “something learned from colonial comparison or experience,” 2) “a course of instruction,” and 3) “a teachable moment of critical interrogation” (p. 44). These colonial lessons paved the way for the United States to create and maintain control over the Philippines.

One prime example of a colonial lesson would be the United States’ tried-and-true justification of colonialism: “fixing” a global crisis. The United States used education as the means to “save” colonized bodies (Hsu, 2013; Leonardo & Matias, 2013; Ocampo, 2016). As I will articulate in Chapter One, this focus on education as the primary method of colonization stems from Louis Althusser’s (2006) essay on ideological state apparatuses (ISAs). When the United States acquired the Philippines from Spain, they framed Filipinos as savages who were not able to govern themselves: they were problematized as racialized others who needed the United States (Hsu, 2013, pp. 45-46). This was not a new position from the United States to have. They framed Native Americans as “the Indian Problem,” African Americans as “the Negro Problem,” and now enters “[t]he Philippine Problem;” each of these groups were non-white and positioned as United States’ dependents (Hsu, 2013, p. 45).

Despite this American commitment to save other countries, the Philippines and its people were exploited for their economic resources, just as other lands that the United States conquered. Here lies another colonial lesson: the United States drew from its pedagogical practices with Hawaiian public schools, segregated Black schools, and Native American boarding schools to establish schools that forced Filipinos to learn English and ultimately serve the United States’ economic interests (Hsu, 2013, pp. 54-58). The United States also began its push towards industrialization, perpetuating a gendered curriculum that taught boys construction skills, while

girls were trained in domestic work (Hsu, 2013, p. 57). Education served as a mask by which the United States was able to economically benefit for the years to come. As I will later explain in my theoretical framework, this American exploitation of the Philippines and the erasure of native life for the sake of capital can be viewed through Achille Mbembe's (2019) *necropolitics*, or, "the control of who lives and who dies" (Reyes & Chirindo, 2020, p. 2). More details about the contexts behind the United States' colonial policies, namely the baseline that was established by the Spanish Empire, will be described in Chapter One.

### **Chapter Outline and Rhetorical Artifacts**

The thesis will be three chapters long including this introductory chapter and a concluding chapter. Chapter One provides a historical overview of colonial occupation in the Philippines, briefly looking at the unique features of Spain's occupation, then illustrating the transition of power from Spain to the United States, and lastly distinguishing the two colonial powers.

Chapter Two includes my rhetorical analyses of justificatory rhetoric from United States' political discourse through the savior-colonizer ideological cluster. Chapter Two provides an analysis of discourse specifically from political leaders in the United States: in essence, those who are not specifically implementing educational policies and are only advocating for United States imperialism in the Philippines. This chapter includes an analysis of Senator Alfred Beveridge's (1887) speech, "Our Philippine Policy," President William McKinley's (1898) "Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation," as well as his "Remarks to Methodist Delegation" in 1903. These texts were chosen because of their richness in justificatory rhetoric and offer much to explore with the theoretical frameworks I outlined above. Senator Beveridge was one of the most influential imperialists at the inception of the American Empire, and his "Our Philippine

Policy” speech illustrates his innate conviction for the United States to take the Philippines under the nation’s control. Additionally, President McKinley was one of the main political leaders that advocated for the United States’ continued presence in the Philippines. His Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation in 1898 served as the springboard that showed his attitude towards colonization, which he framed as an act of “benevolence” toward the Filipino people. His remarks to a Methodist delegation in 1897, less than a decade after his initial proclamation, will serve as a text that will highlight and further reinforce the justificatory rhetoric he used to promote his “benevolent assimilation” ideal.

Chapter Three revisits the artifacts from Chapter Two but frames them within a necropolitical ideological cluster in order to draw out the material implications of the savior-colonizer ideology. This chapter also includes my rhetorical analyses of discourse from educational leaders and their suggested policies. Chapter Three serves a similar role as the previous chapter but focuses on discourse from those who were specifically involved with, or advocated for, the United States’ formation of the Filipino educational system, which as argued previously, was the primary method of subjugation implemented by the United States. This chapter includes an analysis of the initial report and observations of the Philippine Commission (S. Rep. No. 3885-1, 1900), specifically looking at their report on the Native Filipino and their observed inadequacies. I additionally analyze a report from David Barrows (1907), who was known as one of the most prominent Directors of Education for the Philippines from 1903-1909. Lastly, I will analyze selected discourse from Dr. Trinidad Pardo de Tavera’s (1921) address titled, *The Legacy of Ignorantism*, which detailed the Filipino condition, and its failures, prior to the United States’ educational reforms. Pardo de Tavera was a Filipino *ilustrado* who advocated for American imperialism. The decision to include a text from someone who was an “insider”

can also serve as justificatory discourse and further complicates the relationship between U.S. discourse and its ideological effects. This address supplements discourse offered by the Philippine Commission and Barrows, serving as a Filipino affirmation that the United States made the correct decision to take control of the Filipino educational system. These combinations of texts will help me uncover and critique the ideologies that were present in discourse pertaining to the educational system.

The conclusion chapter will summarize my findings and discuss future implications as a result of my research.

## **Theoretical Framework**

In this section, I provide an overview of the theoretical frameworks that guide my analysis in Chapters Two and Three. I first discuss my exploration of postcolonial rhetorics and its application in my study. Next, I provide an overview of justificatory rhetoric and its main features. Third, I provide a section on ideology to define my use of the term in the study, as well as its connection to rhetorical methods. Lastly, I discuss the theory behind necropolitics and its use as a guiding lens for my study and future implications of this work.

### ***Postcolonial Rhetorics***

This study is situated within a postcolonial perspective, and to understand this perspective, I will first describe what postcolonialism is and how its perspective is applied in rhetoric. Shome (1996) defines postcolonialism as “a critical perspective that primarily seeks to expose the Eurocentrism and imperialism of Western discourses” (p. 41). Shome’s (1996) article discussed the importance of taking on a postcolonial perspective when engaging in rhetorical analysis because of its ability to highlight how issues of racism and neocolonialism connect

within scholarly work, practices, and theory (p. 45). This section will continue by highlighting the features of postcolonial rhetoric through Shome's article and will end by describing how this study will take on a postcolonial perspective in its rhetorical analysis.

Shome (1996) highlights three main perspectives within postcolonialism and its implications on critical scholarship: 1) discursive imperialism, 2) hybrid and diasporic cultural identities, and 3) postcolonial academic self-reflexivity (p. 42). Discursive imperialism refers to the "(white) Western discursive practices" that represent developing countries and racially oppressed groups as inferior (Shome, 1996, p. 42). This perspective looks at how these discursive practices legitimize and reinforce Western global power structures, as well as how cultural texts reinforce Western neo-imperial political practices. In the context of my study, I analyze the United States' use of justificatory rhetoric, to be further explained in the next section, and how justificatory rhetoric illustrates discursive imperialism because of how it positions Western epistemologies and ontologies as the referent to which all others must be judged and improved upon. Describing Filipino life as "savage" and incapable of self-governance is a form of discursive imperialism that continues to reinforce Western dominance in the global status quo.

Cultural hybridity and diasporic identity refer to the liminal, intersectional spaces within cultures (Shome, 1996, p. 44). In this perspective, postcolonial critics challenge monolithic conceptualizations of culture, where traditional conceptualizations "[rearticulate] the binary of 'us' versus 'them'" (Shome, 1996, p. 44). Understanding postcolonial subjects as both within and outside of a culture is essential to understanding the position of the postcolonial subject. Instead of conceptualizing the postcolonial subject as an entity separate (othered) from the colonizer, Anzaldúa (2007) frames this idea in her conceptualization of the "mestiza consciousness," which is the consciousness of the "borderlands," or the liminal space discussed

previously by Shome (1996). Here, the *mestiza* takes on an ambiguous position where an individual transcends belonging to one culture or another and instead remains in the liminal space of the “borderlands,” unable to claim their mix (Anzaldúa, 2007, pp. 99-101). The *mestiza* consciousness refers to a consciousness that dances the line of “cultureless”: the *mestiza* is cultureless because they do not belong to a single culture, but simultaneously, they are cultured because they belong to many (Anzaldúa, 2007). The colonized are placed in the borderlands by their colonizer, but rather than viewing this as a weakness, this study conceptualizes the borderlands as an opportunity to expand beyond the deficit views of Filipinos and instead focus on the discourse that created these conditions.

Lastly, Shome (1996) discusses the importance of academic self-reflexivity in postcolonialism, where scholarly practices connect with “the larger political practices of our nations” (p. 45). To possess a self-reflexivity in academic research means to examine and recognize how academic practices (such as the issues explored in research) can perpetuate and reinforce dominant Western ideologies. This is not to say that all Western scholarship does this, but instead, Shome encourages scholars to be mindful of how academic discourse has the potential to support the overall structures that oppress marginalized peoples and unknowingly essentialize their experiences (Shome, 1996, pp. 46-47).

By integrating the features of postcolonialism in my rhetorical analysis (discursive imperialism, hybrid and diasporic cultural identity, and academic self-reflexivity), my study offers a contribution to communication studies that goes beyond “this is how the United States justified colonialism,” and it extends into, “this is what justificatory rhetoric is capable of when it is used and misused.” Additionally, I will be self-reflexive in my research to acknowledge that although I identify with Filipinos through my own heritage, I must also recognize that I have

lived a different experience through the diaspora and my voice alone should not essentialize the experiences of Filipino colonialism. Through my application of postcolonialism in this rhetorical analysis, I hope to create a springboard for my future research in better understanding the impacts of colonialism on contemporary Filipino identity. For the present study, it is important to define justificatory rhetoric that will help inform my analysis in Chapters Two and Three.

### ***Justificatory Rhetoric***

Justificatory rhetoric has been primarily framed as an extension of crisis rhetoric and is employed by political leaders to justify previous or current actions instead of advocating for a specific position (Cherwitz & Zagacki, 1986; Rasmussen, 1973). Although there is not one agreed upon definition of justificatory rhetoric in the literature, two articles help to illustrate common themes that can be used for rhetorical analysis. Cherwitz and Zagacki (1986) offer a theoretical foundation by contrasting justificatory crisis rhetoric and consummatory crisis rhetoric: the former focusing on justifying the action(s) taken to respond to a crisis, and the latter focusing on the initial response (p. 308). Rasmussen (1973), on the other hand, offers a case study of specific arguments and appeals that appear in justificatory discourse and their relative effectiveness. Both articles offer similar arguments that helped me identify the following three characteristics of justificatory rhetoric: 1) it is a direct justification of actions taken to address a crisis, 2) it serves as both deliberative and epideictic oratory, and 3) it is a call to common ideological commitments to unite the public.

To expand on the first characteristic: justificatory rhetoric does not seek permission to act; rather, it seeks to explain and rationalize decisions currently taking place or that have already been decided by the nation-state (Cherwitz & Zagacki, 1986, p. 309; Rasmussen, 1973, p. 111). Justificatory rhetoric concerns the “*effect or action*” and is “the potential end-point of crises”

(Cherwitz & Zagacki, 1986, pp. 311-312). Cherwitz and Zagacki (1986) argue that this characteristic of rhetoric “may have greater propensity to alleviate dissonance and reduce anxiety of a concerned public” (p. 311). In short, justificatory rhetoric serves as a decisive statement which aims to move forward with a specific response toward a crisis and attempts to resolve any present anxieties in the public.

The second characteristic of justificatory rhetoric builds off the first, as justificatory rhetoric serves as both deliberative and epideictic oratory (Cherwitz & Zagacki, 1986, p. 314). Cherwitz and Zagacki acknowledge that justificatory rhetoric contain both elements of deliberative and epideictic oratory (appearing as praise or blame), and they argue that “discourse transforms from epideictic to *deliberative* oratory, where official military responses of the U.S. government (both present and future) are explicated and defended” (p. 314). Therefore, justificatory rhetoric does not only aim to blame parties responsible for crises but also to explicate and outline the plan to resolve crises.

The last characteristic of justificatory rhetoric serves as a call to common ideological commitments. This invocation of ideology allows for orators to create a stronger justification; even if their audience was initially uneasy about a specific response to a crisis, justificatory rhetoric can serve as a reminder of common beliefs and values, thereby uniting audiences that may have initially been divided. My conceptualization of ideology pertaining to this third characteristic will be further defined in the following section.

Rasmussen (1973) analyzed the effectiveness of value appeals in justificatory discourse. Looking at several examples of presidential rhetoric and responses to communism, Rasmussen highlights that “the chief executives speak of preserving the peace and advancing freedom’s cause and of the dangers to national security, human life, international stability, and survival of

the United States' way of life" (p. 115). These phrases, including "preserving the peace," "advancing freedom's cause," and "the United States' way of life," invoke common American values that audience members can relate to. Even if a citizen may not agree with the war against communism, if they agree with "preserving the peace" and "advancing freedom's cause," then the citizen may be more inclined to side with justificatory discourse. Rasmussen then concludes that "placing justifications of crisis policies within an accepted value context enhances the potential success of 'justificatory' rhetoric" (p. 116).

In sum, my analysis of Cherwitz and Zagacki (1986) and Rasmussen (1973) have helped me identify that justificatory rhetoric is: 1) a direct justification of action to address a crises(es), 2) both deliberative and epideictic oratory, and 3) a call to common ideological commitments. By identifying these categories, I aim to explore the functions of justificatory rhetoric as it was employed by the United States at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in their mission to colonize the Philippines. Additionally, I expand on this explicit tie between justificatory rhetoric and ideology in the following sections. Understanding how justificatory rhetoric can be used, and abused, can help uncover harmful messages and ideologies that can be perpetuated through this type of discourse.

### ***Ideology: Lived Realities and Ultimate Terms***

Now that I have defined the characteristics of justificatory rhetoric and how it is tied to ideology, I will now define what ideology is, how it manifests in discourse, and the function that ideologies serve. First, I will briefly unpack the concept of ideology through Eagleton's (1991) introductory chapter on the multifaceted nature of ideology. Second, I will outline McGee's (1980) exploration of the material and symbolic structure of ideology. Afterwards, I will introduce Weaver's (1985) chapter on "ultimate terms" and how this will orient me to guiding

terms in my artifacts. This combination of rhetorical theory from Eagleton, McGee, and Weaver will help illuminate the ideologies perpetuated by United States' justificatory discourse in their quest to colonize the Philippines.

Eagleton (1991) argued that ideology does not have an agreed-upon definition; in fact, “ideology” has gone through several iterations of meaning over time, with theorists emphasizing different parts of its nature:

The word ‘ideology’, one might say, is a text, woven of a whole tissue of different conceptual strands; it is traced through by divergent histories, and it is probably more important to assess what is valuable or can be discarded in each of these lineages than to merge them forcibly into some Grand Global Theory. (p. 1)

Some definitions of ideology simply state that it is a set of ideas or beliefs, while other definitions emphasize the elements of power and interests at stake when people hold certain ideologies (Eagleton, 1991, pp. 28-30). From the mix of definitions that Eagleton provided, I could have simply defined ideology as a “false consciousness” that is perpetuated by the ruling class to take advantage of the lower classes for their own self-interests (Eagleton, 1991, p. 10). I could have argued that the United States used ideas of “freedom” and “liberty” to distort their real quest for power in their colonial efforts in the Philippines; however, as Eagleton reveals, ideology manifests in a more complex manner than this. The remainder of this section aims to unpack some of the several contradictions around ideology and how it manifests in discourse.

Eagleton (1991) provides ample evidence to dispute the “ideology as false consciousness” argument. When considering false consciousness, it would be misguided to assume that specific beliefs or ideas that people uphold and enact represent a false reality because individuals possess ideologies that reflect their true, lived experiences. When a person

votes for a candidate who promises freedom and security by increasing military funding, that person is voting for the inherently real, and true, sense of security that they desire. However, the emphasis lies not necessarily in the truths affirmed in the discourse, rather, what the discourse excludes (Eagleton, 1991, p. 16). Eagleton (1991) writes:

‘This land of liberty’, spoken by an American politician, may be true enough if one has in mind the freedom to practice one’s religion or turn a fast buck, but not if one considers the freedom to live without the fear of being mugged or to announce on prime-time television that the president is a murderer. (p. 16)

This reveals that there lies truth in ideology, but the truth lies more so on the individual’s lived realities rather than the truth of the ideas themselves. If a person was exposed to news media that primarily showed black men committing crime, then that person’s lived reality may perceive all black men as criminals: their lived reality, and the ideologies they may uphold, are inherently true for the person living under these conditions. Therefore, the definition of ideology as “false consciousness” is limited in scope and misleading, as ideologies are concerned with lived realities that are true for the people that hold them.

With that said, I will work with Eagleton’s (1991) final definition of ideology as it “retains an emphasis on false or deceptive beliefs but regards such beliefs as arising not from the interests of a dominant class but from the material structure of society as a whole” (p. 30). Ideologies may appear as an instrument used by the ruling class to take advantage of the lower class, but in the case of this definition, ideology is all-encompassing of every individual, which includes both hegemonic and counterhegemonic groups as ideological actors and the conditions which they live in. In the context of this study, I use this theoretical lens to uncover the false and deceptive beliefs about Filipinos that justified the United States’ perceived benevolent, noble,

and divine colonization of the Philippines. I hope to provide more nuance in the current understanding of the ideologies that fueled the United States' decision to colonize the Philippines, speaking to Eagleton's (1991) mention of "the material structure of society as a whole" (p. 30). To clarify, this study is not a justification of colonialism, but rather, it aims to depict how material conditions can lead to misguided ideologies that are invoked rhetorically to justify the act of colonization.

McGee (1980) also discussed the relationship between material relations and the symbolic in ideology. He argued that an ideology is "empirically manifested in the language which communicates it," meaning that an ideology can be analyzed and interpreted in discourse (McGee, 1980, p. 4). Not only does ideology manifest as "political language," but it also manifests in "rhetorical documents" such as laws and speeches that have material consequences (p. 5). In this sense, McGee (1980) also references a dichotomy of false consciousness and lived truth by noting that ideology has the power to "influence (if not determine) the shape and texture of each individual's 'reality'" (p. 5). Aligned with McGee's focus on rhetoric and political language, this study will attend to keywords and terms that evoke the underlying ideology behind the United States' colonial mission. McGee called these guiding terms "ideographs," which "signify and 'contain' a unique ideological commitment" where a simple word can convey a vast amount of information, identity, and influence (p. 7).

Similar to ideographs, Weaver (1985) describes "ultimate terms" by proposing a general hierarchy of rhetorical terms, which due to the phenomenon of naming, have different "potencies" throughout their histories. To better understand the origins of ultimate terms, I briefly turn to Burke's (1945) utterance of god terms in his *Grammar*, where he defines these as the "ultimate terms of motivation" (p. 74). Burke transformed the field of rhetoric by pivoting

from the traditional understanding of “rhetoric as persuasion” to “rhetoric as symbolic action,” where Burke discusses at length in several works the persuasive ability of language to move people to act. To think of Weaver’s theory in terms of McGee (1980), Weaver conducts a type of ideographic analysis, where he provides several examples of ultimate terms and illustrates their potencies throughout time. Ultimate terms, through the language of Weaver, are the “rhetorical absolutes – the terms to which the very highest respect is paid” (p. 212).

Weaver (1985) explicates three types of ultimate terms in contemporary rhetoric: god terms, devil terms, and charismatic terms. God terms refer to the “expression[s] about which all other expressions are ranked as subordinate and serving dominations and powers” (p. 212). One example that Weaver provides is the idea of “progress,” where, “if one can ‘make it stick,’ it will validate almost anything” (p. 212). “Progress,” as argued by Weaver, is an ultimate term that is uncontested. Additionally,

a concept of something bigger than himself, which he is socially impelled to accept and even sacrifice for. This capacity to demand sacrifice is probably the surest indicator of the ‘god term,’ for when a term is so sacrosanct that the material goods of this life must be mysteriously rendered up for it, then we feel justified in saying that it is in some sense ultimate. (p. 214)

The concept of god terms, as detailed by Weaver, offers much for this study. First, thinking through the lens of ideology, god terms signal to readers implicit beliefs and values (regardless of their validity) held by the speaker. Using Weaver’s example of progress in the context of this study, if colonialism was justified in the name of progress or divine right, there would not be much to contest for someone who held the ideology that progress is the ultimate term which sacrifices must be made. Sure, the government may have to quell resistance to colonization by

less-than-ideal means (e.g., enforcement of colonial policy through militarization), but these sacrifices must be made to establish progress in a land in need of saving.

Devil terms, on the other hand, are the counterparts to god terms. These are ultimate terms in the sense that they repulse certain people; there is a compulsion for a “nation to have in its national imagination an enemy” (Weaver, 1985, p. 222). Weaver (1985) argues that devil terms “defy any real analysis” because they are just “publicly-agreed-upon” (p. 223). Going back to a previous example, “*illegal* immigrants” could serve as a devil term in the United States. “Illegal” immigrants are taking American jobs; “illegal” immigrants are committing crimes on American soil;” and so on. Devil terms exist for the sake of expressing “hatred to which peoples must give vent” (Weaver, 1985, p. 222). Justificatory rhetoric can gain just as much strength from devil terms as much as they can from god terms, as both serve as ultimate ends that groups of people can rally around to make sacrifices in the name of god terms to eradicate the inherent evils invoked by devil terms.

The last ultimate term that Weaver (1985) discusses are charismatic terms, which he distinguishes from the other two ultimate terms in that they “have a power which is not derived, but which is in some mysterious way given....we cannot explain their compulsiveness through referents of objectively known character and tendency” (p. 227). Charismatic terms may not necessarily have power themselves, but they are assigned power based on a “charismatic authority,” where the terms are explained through a rhetor’s personal attributes (Weaver, 1985, pp. 227-228). Terms that normally would not have as much power on their own, such as the example provided by Weaver, “defense,” may become a charismatic term depending on whether a group of people were about to enter war. These charismatic terms may appear and act as the

other two ultimate terms discussed, so it is important to take note of the historical and situational context of the term and how they are invoked in each situation.

From here, relationships can be formed between ideology and Weaver's (1985) theory of "ultimate terms." These powerful terms can reveal underlying ideologies and are themselves the vehicles for the supporting of those ideologies, such as colonialism, that perpetuate material practices. Based on a preliminary analysis of my artifacts, I expect to focus on terms that evoke themes of piety, autonomy, progress, among others. By focusing on the guiding terms in my artifacts, I describe rhetorical strategies for the deployment and reinforcement of colonialist rhetoric that aim to justify the US as colonizer while painting them as a savior to the Filipino people.

### ***Necropolitics: Connecting Race, Gender, and Capitalism***

Considering this introductory chapter is titled, "The Birth of the Filipino," I would lastly like to introduce Mbembe's (2019) idea of "necropolitics," which was one of the most influential theory pieces that helped me identify "the birth" of the Filipino, and simultaneously, "the death" of its native people and land through the forces of colonization. Mbembe coined "necropolitics" based on Foucault's "biopower" and its relation to the politics of sovereignty; specifically, he explored the commodification of human existence "and the material destruction of human bodies and populations" (pp. 66; 68, emphasis removed). Necropolitics is a significant idea for this study because it provides the language and conceptual framework that can help describe the symbolic and material violence perpetuated by colonialism that disrupted Filipino epistemology and ontology forever.

A study from Reyes and Chirindo (2020) contextualizes Mbembe's necropolitics in rhetoric through their theorizing of race and gender in the Anthropocene. In their exploration of

the Anthropocene, or the geological period that is greatly influenced by human activity, they argue that:

race, gender and capital are coconstitutive, giving birth to both necropolitics and technoscience, modalities through which certain forms of sovereignty are exercised.

Those practices of sovereignty are organized around death, for necropolitics is the control of who lives and who dies. (Reyes & Chirindo, 2020, p. 2)

Since they position the Anthropocene as a site for necropolitics, Reyes and Chirindo offer rhetoric as a potential vehicle to address and disrupt these exercises of sovereignty, where dominant, capitalistic nations are able to sacrifice marked (black) bodies and nature to give birth to marked (black) slaves to produce the capital to create the world. Expanding on Mbembe's call for a "radical humanism" to address necropolitics, Reyes and Chirindo (2020) argue that rhetoric can help direct the world towards that call, as rhetorical studies can: 1) serve as an analytic and 2) reterritorialize gendered and racialized subjectivities through the "disruption of time" in the Anthropocene, and lastly 3) help reconceptualize race and gender beyond representationalism (pp. 10-12).

This study uses both Reyes and Chirindo's (2020) articulation of Mbembe's necropolitics, as well as their conceptualization of rhetoric as an instrumental tool to disrupt necropolitics, to guide my approach in identifying the ideologies at work in the necropolitical sphere of 20<sup>th</sup> century colonial rhetorics. In this historical moment, the United States acted as the sovereign power that decided that native (marked) bodies were to be sacrificed in order for the Filipino to be born, and thus, be commercially exploited and commodified. A rhetorical criticism of this moment, I argue, serves as an analytic that can help disrupt the gendered and racialized Filipino subjects that were created as a result of the United States' engagement in necropolitics.

Therefore, the implications brought forth by this study can help future scholars in rhetoric and beyond to reconceptualize the racialized and gendered Filipino body.

### **Study Significance**

This thesis offers an ideological criticism of political discourse used to justify the United States' colonial expansion in the Philippines after their victory in the Spanish-American War, especially as it relates to their educational policy. This moment in history offers two main points I wish to explore and critique: 1) the rhetorical strategies used by the United States to balance the savior-colonizer duality in their conquest of the Philippines and 2) the ideologies perpetuated through both justificatory discourse and the decision to move towards a widespread educational system in the Philippines.

The significance of this analysis lies in its conceptualization of justificatory rhetoric as both *informed by* and a *reinforcement of* ideology. As explored in my theoretical framework section, justificatory rhetoric has primarily been explored through U.S. presidential discourse pertaining to global crises (Cherwitz & Zagacki, 1986; Rasmussen, 1973). This thesis offers a unique contribution to the field of communication by conceptualizing how the United States' conquest of the Philippines was rhetorically justified and how this can speak to the uses and abuses of justificatory rhetoric, as well as the ideologies perpetuated and reinforced by this discourse. In my review of the literature, there have not been any studies that have explicitly linked justificatory rhetoric and Weaver's "ultimate terms" as analytical categories for rhetorical criticism nor have any rhetorical studies directly examined colonial rhetorics of the Philippines. By exploring justificatory rhetoric, as it was advanced by the American Empire and its supporters, I hope to shed light on how justificatory discourse was used ideologically to support the colonizing efforts in the Philippines.

This study serves as a necessary contribution to the field of communication because of its relevance in better understanding how justificatory discourse can be used (and misused) to advance imperialism, capitalism, and, overall, can enable nations, like the United States, to expand their empire through their engagement in necropolitics. Specifically homing in on justificatory rhetoric and its relationship with ideology provides the best method to understand the position the United States had as a colonial power over the Philippines at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. By conducting this analysis, I hope to uncover the types of justificatory discourse used to perpetuate an ideology that not only took over the United States as the colonizing body, but also explore the implications of that ideology on the Philippines as colonized people. Overall, I hope this study can contribute a type of critical, rhetorical analysis that can serve as a foundation for future studies on Filipino identity formation, as well as contribute to scholars' overall understanding of the symbolic and material relationship between colonizer and the colonized.

## Chapter 1: Colonial Origins

There is an old Filipino saying that playfully attempts to capture the history of the Philippines: “The Filipinos have spent three hundred years in the convent, and fifty years in Hollywood....”

These four centuries of Western colonial influence left indelible imprints on the economic, political, and cultural landscape of modern-day Philippine society. (Ocampo, 2016, p. 15)

By exploring history, people can learn from its events to help explain and make sense of the contemporary. The Philippines had undergone over three centuries of colonization, and an understanding of these colonial moments is an essential pre-requisite to understand the gravitas behind this thesis’ rhetorical explorations as it pertains to the United States’ role in Philippine colonization; therefore, an explication of both Spanish and American occupation of the Philippines becomes the concern of this chapter. This chapter will first situate Spanish colonial rule, as it spanned from the 1560s to the 1890s. With the conclusion of the Spanish-American War and the Treaty of Paris, colonial rule of the Philippines then transitioned from Spain to the United States at the turn of the twentieth century. The latter portion of this chapter, and the remainder of this thesis for that matter, will concern itself with the moments leading up to (as well as the immediate years proceeding) the twentieth century for the United States as they planned to expand their sovereignty over the Philippines. As this chapter will introduce, although these two colonial bodies had their own methods and goals of colonization, they both share this “savior” quality in their colonial mission. This idea of the colonial “savior” will continue to persist beyond this historical chapter and will reveal itself in the discourse to be analyzed in Chapters Two and Three.

## The Emergence of Spanish Colonial Rule

Spain first arrived in the Philippines in 1565 and was able to pacify and subjugate the native lands through militarized force (Nepomuceno, 1981, p. 63). The “Philippines” at this time did not exist; the native lands prior to Spanish occupation were not unified under a single ruler or nation and was comprised of separate, autonomous groups. Within 10 years, the Spanish Empire was able to establish their colonial presence throughout the lowlands of Luzon and majority of the Visayan islands (p. 63). With the establishment of Spanish colonial rule, the “Filipino” was born, and so began the transformation of Filipino epistemologies and ontologies through the establishment of a central government and widespread Catholicism.

Spain established their authority by implementing western forms of bureaucracy in the pronounced capital of Manila. From here, they established a hierarchy of roles, where the native Filipinos ultimately paid tribute to their newfound rulers and were forced to accept their vassalage to the king of Spain (Nepomuceno, 1981, pp. 64-66). Some of the local leadership included the *cabezas de barangay* and the *gobernadorcillos*, both of whom reported to the greater colonial power. This form of infrastructure essentially transplanted Spanish ways of governance and disrupted native ways of life; the initial rejection of these impositions by natives resulted in dislocation from their native lands and a decrease in population throughout the first decades of Spanish occupation (pp. 64-65).

While Spain continued to pour resources into the capital, Manila, the cost was paid by surrounding towns and villages that were exploited for their labor and were neglected (Nepomuceno, 1981, p. 67). However, despite Spain’s attempt to use the Philippines for economic gain, it soon became apparent that the lands did not provide quick opportunities for wealth, such as through gold mines or spices; this resulted in some settlers moving back to Spain

and those that remained focused on the galleon trade (p. 66). Additionally, colonial offices were sold to Spanish bidders, and in order for these representatives to recuperate some of their costs, they were able to complacently remain in their posts while they continued to exploit the native population by denying resources to areas outside of Manila (pp. 65-66).

In addition to the state officers, religious ministers had significant moral and political influence over the Philippines. Through the *patronato real*, Spain established a union of church and state, where religious leaders served as both a missionary and colonizer. Nepomuceno (1981) described friars as a “personified contradiction,” and he described this embodied duality thusly: friars

[functioned] in the ambience of a deep contradiction. In fact, as missionary-colonizer he was personification of that contradiction. The message he conveyed was double-edged, for conversion to Christianity meant ipso facto [sic] subjection to the colonial power....It was an engineering task that set off the process of transforming the perceptual world of the natives as it shaped and molded the various facets of their lives to fit criteria of civilization and Christianization according to the interpretation of the Spanish friar.

(Nepomuceno, 1981, p. 79)

This thesis homes in on this contradiction through my rhetorical analysis of justificatory rhetoric employed by the United States. There is an element of benevolence, where the colonizer is trying to save the Philippines and give them what they need to survive; at the same time, however, this does not take away the fact that they are still act as colonizer and have their own aims to exploit and gain from their colonial relationship. In Chapter Two, I term this the “savior-colonizer” identity, and I will argue that it prominently serves as both an ideological and justificatory tool in colonization.

One important connection to make from Nepomuceno's analysis of Spanish colonization is the idea of the "personified contradiction" and how it relates to the United States' approach to justify and implement specific educational policies in the Philippines. This thesis is guided by the notion that the "friars" never left, but instead, they took on a new form in American political rhetoric as the United States took over from Spanish rule. The next section will begin to detail the United States' own contradictions in their deliberations to colonize the Philippines.

### **The Rise of the American "Savior-Colonizer:" Addressing the Filipino "Deficit"**

May's (1980) book served as a historical documentation of the moments leading up to, and during, the United States' colonization of the Philippines at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. May argued that many policies were formed between the years of 1900 to 1913 shaped the Philippines in the American ideal, focusing on preparation of self-governance, primary education, and economic development (p. xvii). Prior to 1900, the United States had no colonial system in place despite its acquisitions of other territories (e.g., Hawaii and Alaska), meaning the United States had to decide on how they were to approach their relationship with the Philippines (p. 4). At first, however, President McKinley was able to enact initial policies in 1900 due to their present war with the Philippines, affording McKinley the privileges that come with serving as the Commander-in-Chief. As the war ended, McKinley did not want Congress alone to make the decision on what to do with the Philippines because of his belief that they were not capable of understanding the Filipino condition. Between the years of 1899-1900, he began to shift power from military to civil authorities in the Philippines and appointed the Philippine Commission to draft and secure Congress' approval for a complete plan of government for their new land (pp. 4-5).

Before discussing the implications of the Philippine Commission and its policy decisions, I will turn to a brief discussion of Elihu Root and his role in establishing the United States government in the Philippines. Root was a conservative lawyer, who McKinley appointed to serve on his cabinet in 1899, who did not know much about colonial policy (May, 1980, pp. 5-6). He attempted to remedy this by reading on British colonial systems, but they did not offer Root much guidance; eventually, he came to the conclusion “that U.S. colonial policy had to reflect U.S. principles of Government” and that “The United States would respect ‘the customs and social life of the islanders’ and would modify them ‘only when it appears to be necessary to conform to our fundamental ideas of justice’” (p. 6). From here, Root was able to devise a set of instructions for the Philippine Commission based on his understanding of the role of colonial government, where he explicitly writes “that ‘the government which they are establishing is designed not for our satisfaction or for the expression of our theoretical views, but for the happiness, peace, and prosperity of the people of the Philippines Islands’” (pp. 6-7).

Despite Root’s advocacy for Filipino autonomy, the Philippine Commission would largely go forth and implement policy initiatives informed by their racist views of the Filipino people. The Philippine Commission was initially comprised of five members: William Howard Taft (who McKinley appointed to serve as the head of the commission), Luke E. Wright, Henry Clay Ide, Dean C. Worcester, and Bernard Moses (pp. 9-10). Each of these men shared Taft’s views on the Filipino condition, where the members regarded Filipinos as naturally unfit for self-government, barbarians, and “one of the less advanced races” (p. 11). Despite these views that have been explicitly shared, Taft knew that they had to establish good social relations with Filipino people, which served as a strategy to “[gain] indigenous support for his policies” and “to convince the Filipinos that the Commission would treat them as equals” (p. 12). This is one

example of the contradiction of the friar reborn in American rhetoric: the United States had to appear as benevolent, but their benevolence came with the cost of shaping the Filipino to the American ideal.

The remainder of the selected chapters in May (1980) continue to serve as historical accounts to the formation of colonial policies in the Philippines, also discussing its major collaborators and its critics. The moment in history highlighted by May serves as a great point of interest as deliberations are made on who the Filipino people are (as decided by the American colonial rulers) and in what capacity should the United States serve in the Philippines. To summarize the goals of the United States, as outlined by May (1980), the United States aimed to: 1) train and prepare the Filipino masses to be capable of self-governance, 2) implement wide-spread primary education, and 3) develop the Filipino economy for participation in a global market.

Much of the discourse from other leaders in the United States also discussed the deficits of the Filipino people, especially as it related to the aftermath of Spanish colonial rule and how it left much of the Filipino people illiterate and incapable of self-governance. David P. Barrows (1907), the Director of Education of the Philippines from 1900-1909, wrote his account of the state of education and social progress in the Philippines, and had much to say regarding the justification of the United States' colonial rule. His essay had framed the United States' colonial occupation as it was welcomed by the Filipino people with an "open reliance," but the implicit messaging highlights his belief that the Filipino people had deficits which could only be solved by United States' intervention efforts (p. 69). He makes the distinction between two different classes of people present in the Philippines: the *gente ilustrada* (referring to the highest social class) and the *gente baja* (referring to the poorer and illiterate class). As he acknowledges that

the *gente baja* make up most of the population, he refers to them as “weak and illiterate peasants, whose life and character [the United States] must now consider” (p. 71).

Barrows (1907) outlined the social conditions of the *gente baja* as seen through his eyes, and he explains that this class of people were misguided and commercially exploited by Spain (p. 72). He believed that this exploitation stemmed from Spain’s implementation of *caciquismo*, a social structure which had an owner (or *amo*) that controlled the attitudes and held economic control over their dependents (or *dependientes*; p. 72). With the implementation of the United States’ colonial policy, Barrows hoped to dismantle *caciquismo* and give the *gente baja* control over their own lives. Overall, Barrows (1907) made it clear that Spanish colonial rule only continued to separate the rich from the poor, and he recognized the significance of the Christianization of the poor.

In January of 1900, Senator Beveridge (1887) delivered a rallying speech addressed to President McKinley with a call to action for imperial policy. It is important to note that when this speech was delivered, the United States and the Philippines were still engaged in war, and American imperialists were still met with much resistance from their anti-imperialist contemporaries (mostly Democrats at this time). McKinley’s (1887) speech during a Methodist church visit explained how he came about his decision to occupy the Philippines and attempts to address the criticism toward this decision. Despite the United States pronouncing the separation of church and state within their own borders and in the Philippines, much of the discourse by Beveridge (1887) and McKinley (1887) express this pious calling by God to save the Filipino people from themselves. Consequently, this project is interested in the theme of piety, with which religion is not only used to justify colonialism but is also used to portray their imperialist endeavors as divinely justified. This theme begins to highlight the beginnings of a rhetorical

strategy that the United States used to distract their audiences (and potentially also their critics) from their goals of economically exploiting the Philippines and to conform the people to a Western-style democracy.

Lastly, I wanted to find a Filipino voice on the United States' colonial rule as a foil to "what was said by the United States" and "what was experienced by the Filipinos. Constantino (2000) continues to frame English as an impediment to Filipino epistemology and ontology, and at the end of his essay, he calls for an educational reform that addresses both the needs and goals of the nation, which must be evaluated and addressed by Filipinos themselves, not by another nation (p. 443). This essay serves as a vital argument to illustrate the implications of the "benevolent assimilation" that President McKinley called for in 1898 (p. 432). Although the United States may have expressed good intentions in their attempts to justify their colonization of the Philippines, it brought about a barrier to the production of a unique, Filipino national identity, which can be further explored in future research. For now, I will remain in this moment in history and continue to uncover the contradictions behind the duality of both savior and colonizer.

### **Bridging Spanish and American Colonization: The Ideological State Apparatus**

As I continued to find similarities between Spanish and American colonialism in this section, I found Louis Althusser's (2006) "ideological state apparatus" an appropriate lens to frame the overall colonial project in the Philippines. Althusser's theory stems from Marxist thought on the state apparatus, and he distinguishes two separate forms: the "repressive" and the "ideological" state apparatus. Repressive state apparatuses (RSAs) refer to the apparatuses that function by violence (i.e., the army, police, prisons), while ideological state apparatuses (ISAs) are "distinct and specialized institutions" that function by ideology (Althusser, 2006, pp. 92-93).

To expand, RSAs primarily function through repression (i.e. physical), but secondarily function through ideology; on the other hand, ISAs primarily function through ideology, but also secondarily function through repression, albeit a more covert, possibly symbolic, repression (Althusser, 2006, p. 93). These apparatuses are deployed by the state to control aspects of social life in a given space, whether through more explicit forms of violence or more subtle forms of indoctrination.

Some examples of ISAs would include religious institutions, educational systems, political parties, and media. From my brief exploration of both Spanish and American colonization, I argue that both colonial powers deployed both repressive and ideological state apparatuses to exert control over the Filipino body and mind, first beginning with RSAs (i.e., militarization), then transitioning to ISAs (i.e., religion, formalized education). Understanding colonization as a product of both RSAs and ISAs can help reinforce the idea that colonization is not enforced purely through repressive nor ideological means, but rather, a combination of both that result in an ultimate control over people in both symbolic and material ways. This relationship between the symbolic and material will persist throughout my analyses in Chapters Two and Three.

## **Conclusion**

In summary, this historical review aimed to provide the context behind the motivations and rationale for this study. The Philippines has undergone several centuries of social transformation due to the colonial powers that have uprooted the lives of native Filipinos through both the Spanish and American implementations of hierarchy (i.e., *cacquisimo*) and control (i.e., religion and formal education). Because of the evidence provided in the section above, I offer the following questions to explore: 1) What function(s) did justificatory rhetoric serve in the

colonization of the Philippines, and 2) What ideologies lie behind the justificatory discourse perpetuated by political leaders and their educational policies? This study aims to answer both questions using the theoretical frameworks and methodologies I will explicate for the remainder of this thesis.

## Chapter 2: The Rhetorical Construction of the Savior-Colonizer

I preach to you, then, my countrymen, that our country calls not for the life of ease but for the life of strenuous endeavor. The twentieth century looms before us big with the fate of many nations. If we stand idly by, if we seek merely swollen, slothful ease and ignoble peace, if we shrink from the hard contests where men must win at hazard of their lives and at the risk of all they hold dear, then the bolder and stronger peoples will pass us by, and will win for themselves the domination of the world. (Roosevelt, 1899, para. 20)

This selected passage from Theodore Roosevelt's inaugural speech, "The Strenuous Life," perfectly captures the essence of the current state of American imperialism at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and more importantly, the prevalence of American exceptionalism as a guiding ideological force. Roosevelt's speech was a product of the nation that he inherited from the late President William McKinley, who was one of the main driving forces for the United States' colonial mission in the Philippines. Consequently, it holds no surprise that Roosevelt's call for a more strenuous life is rooted in the idea that it is America's responsibility to determine "the fate of many nations" in a truly capitalistic and imperialistic fashion.

This chapter will analyze some examples of political discourse that not only contextualize "The Strenuous Life," but also help illustrate the justificatory and ideological power of American exceptionalism. Drawing from texts from Senator Alfred Beveridge (1987) and President William McKinley (1987; 2017), I will demonstrate how these examples of political discourse were fueled by an *ideological cluster* of the savior-colonizer, which is justified the United States' colonial efforts in the Philippines through the American civil religion, patriarchy, and White Christian hegemony.

In this chapter, I will first define the “ideological cluster” and how it functions methodologically. The following section will then define the ideological cluster in my analysis through a brief exploration of related literature, and I will conclude the section with my analysis as it pertains to the ideological cluster. Finally, I will synthesize my findings under the umbrella of American exceptionalism and show how these discourses serve as exemplars for justificatory rhetoric.

### **Defining the “Ideological Cluster”**

Initially, I planned to conduct my ideological criticism by talking about ideological features in isolation as they appeared in the texts; however, as I continued to form my analysis, I noticed that the ideologies in question were interrelated, and it would have been a disservice to the analysis to refer to these ideological pieces as if they were isolated from each other. For example, to discuss the presence of a racist ideology, I must also discuss the ideologies that surround and uphold a racist ideology, such as: paternalism, Christianity, American civil religion, and American exceptionalism in its entirety. Racism as an ideology, in this case, cannot exist in a vacuum because of the other ideologies that reinforce and perpetuate racist beliefs and actions. Therefore, my analyses in this chapter work through ideological clusters to nod to and emphasize the intersections between the ideological features present in the texts.

This use of an ideological cluster is uncommon by name; however, Smyrl (2008), in their dissertation, makes use of ideological clusters as a primary feature for analysis in their criticism of experiential conversion rhetoric. Smyrl (2008) explains that their choice of method stems from a combination of cluster criticism and ideological criticism, where they analyze key terms “in conjunction with other terms commonly clustered around them” in order to highlight a dominant ideology within an artifact (pp. 88-90). However, my analysis differs semiotically from Smyrl’s

approach, as our uses of “cluster” differ. Smyrl analyzed discourse for clusters of key terms and their frequency to support their argument for a single dominant ideology in the discourse. My analysis, however, works under the assumption that there are several dominant ideologies at play in a given text, and the cluster of ideologies together then mobilize the justificatory discourse. Furthermore, the justificatory discourse then reinforces and makes a call to those same ideologies to create a reinforcing cycle. Methodologically, this thesis offers a nuanced approach to analyze how ideologies work together to reinforce one another and justify rhetorical and colonial choices.

This type of rhetorical criticism can further be illustrated through other critical methods, such as what Paliewicz and McHendry (2017) call an “assemblage criticism,” in which they “[map] constellations of assemblages in argumentative contexts to determine how actors create assemblages for rhetorical force” (p. 289). Originating from Deleuze’s and Guttari’s use of “assemblage,” Paliewicz and McHendry (2017) contend that assemblages are “webs or networks where multiple and different forms of rhetoric (spoken, performed, bodily, symbolic, and material) interact and connect” (p. 291). I found that their study’s use of assemblages resembles my deployment of ideological clusters: the ideologies present in my selected artifacts are interrelated, and overall, come together as a larger network.

For example, if we examine the introductory quote from Roosevelt (1899), he says, “...if we shrink from the hard contests where men must win at hazard of their lives and at the risk of all they hold dear, then the bolder and stronger peoples will pass us by, and will win for themselves the domination of the world” (para. 20). At first glance, I could identify “patriarchal” as the primary ideology for the cluster, due to the references to men, boldness, strength, and domination of others, but other ideologies such as: meritocracy, patriotism, and nationalism also emerge, thus comprising a cluster of ideologies at play in the discourse. It is important to note

that just as Paliewicz and McHendry (2017) examine, these assemblages (i.e., clusters) are not necessarily made up of tidy, fitting parts. The responsibility then falls on the critic to not only examine the individual pieces of the cluster, but also articulate the nuances and tensions that inform how the discourse operates in its totality. The remainder of this chapter will analyze the ideological clusters present in my chosen artifacts as they are deployed by the justificatory discourse. Identifying and critiquing these clusters serves a two-fold purpose: 1) it can help illuminate the cyclical relationship between justificatory rhetoric and the unique ideological clusters present in the discourse; and 2) it also serves as a disruption of the harmful ideologies that continue to persist in the symbolic and material realities for Filipinos today.

### **The Savior-Colonizer: The Ideological Cluster of American Civil Religion, Patriarchy, and White Christian Hegemony**

The “savior-colonizer” ideological cluster is made up of references to the American civil religion, the patriarchy, and White hegemony. Bellah (1967) explains that the American civil religion is a “public religious dimension” that legitimizes U.S. political offices and practices while simultaneously offering a “transcendent goal for the political process” (i.e., carrying out God’s work; p. 4). However, there is a clear distinction between the functions of American civil religion and Christianity itself.

American civil religion is not a formal religious institution, but rather, is the idea that American political discourse functions through a “collection of beliefs, symbols, and rituals with respect to sacred things and institutionalized in a collectivity (Bellah, 1967, p. 8). The American civil religion set the precedent, and even act as a justificatory tool, for American nationalism and attaining its national goals (Bellah, 1967, pp. 8-13). This can be observed through U.S. political discourse that invokes “God,” but never specifically referring to Christ. Bellah (1967) concludes

by arguing that American civil religion is still present today and that it serves as a necessary “higher judgement” that allows the United States to take “responsible action in a revolutionary world, a world seeking to attain many of the things, material and spiritual, that [the United States has] already attained” (p. 16). I argue that an American civil religion is a central concept in the “savior-colonizer” identity that serves as both an ideological and justificatory foundation for both patriarchy and a White Christian hegemony.

Buescher and Ono’s (1996) ideological criticism of Disney’s *Pocahontas* helped me conceptualize the role of patriarchy in my selected artifacts. By framing *Pocahontas* as a neocolonial text, Buescher and Ono (1996) describe how the colonial narrative in *Pocahontas* was a “civilizing process,” where European colonialists were framed as benevolent figures, and ultimately “save” Pocahontas from the Native American patriarchal order (pp. 131-33). The film created a spectacle where colonialists play a benevolent role and Pocahontas is saved from an arranged marriage, and thus, emancipating her as a woman and freeing her from tribal patriarchy (Buescher & Ono, 1996, pp. 142-44).

I extend Buescher and Ono’s (1996) analysis by contending that colonialism, itself, is a patriarchal practice: this is supported symbolically through colonial rhetorics, as well as materially, through the physical consequences of these rhetorics. I temper this argument with a definition from Clark (2004), where they explain that patriarchies “are those much larger societies where not only is there gender dominance; they are also highly class-structured, with a small powerful elite controlling the rest of society” (p. 21). In tandem with the American civil religion that dons the mantle of the “savior,” the United States patriarchy also uplifts itself as capable of wielding colonial rule over the Philippines: in doing so, its colonial mission and its justifications are gendered and emanate a Western hierarchy.

To tie this cluster together, I identified a White Christian hegemony as an ideological force that upholds both the American civil religion and patriarchy. Despite Bellah's (1967) distinction between Christianity and the American civil religion, he acknowledges that they share "much in common" and intersect in many ways (Bellah, 1967, p. 8). Beyond attending to the intersection between Christianity and the American civil religion, it is also necessary to understand how both ideologies are inherently tied to race and Whiteness. Theologist Jeannine Fletcher (2016) calls attention to the construction of Whiteness, and the overall phenomenon of racialization, to illustrate both a theological and political supremacy that is upheld by Christianity. In Fletcher's historicization of Christian hegemony in the 19<sup>th</sup> century United States, she established that the genesis of America as a White Christian nation was formed "through the genocide and conversion of Native peoples and the enslavement of Africans that accompanied the suppression of their native African religious practices" (p. 57). Henceforth, White Christianity established its dominance in the United States through a "hierarchical ordering" that othered both non-Christians and non-White Christians alike (Fletcher, 2016, p. 59).

When American civil religion, patriarchy, and White Christian hegemony are viewed in tandem, the idea of the "savior-colonizer" identity emerges, along with its nuances. There is a certain *benevolence* that comes with the idea of religion; however, when considering how each of these ideologies function together, there also lies a certain *desire* for hierarchy that both establishes and preserves Western domination. As I will demonstrate in my analysis, this interplay between both "benevolence" and "desire" will help contextualize the contradictory, yet inherent nature of the "savior-colonizer." The following section will identify and critique the

rhetorical strategies as mobilized by the “savior-colonizer” identity in my selected artifacts and will ultimately show how this ideological cluster functions as a vehicle for colonialism.

### *Analysis*

Invocations of religion, and a moral obligation for the United States to carry out “God’s mission,” remain one of the most explicit features in the texts by Beveridge (1987) and McKinley (1987; 2017). Bellah (1967) identified that these types of discourses reify the presence of a “well-institutionalized civil religion in America” (p. 1). To first show how U.S. political discourse employ American civil religion as both an ideological and justificatory vehicle, I first attend to Senator Alfred Beveridge’s (1987) opening for his speech addressed to President William McKinley, calling for the United States to claim the Philippines as their own. He claims:

The Philippines are ours forever, “territory belonging to the United States,” as the Constitution calls them. . . . We will not renounce our part in the mission of our race, trustee under God, of the civilization of the world. And we will move forward to our work, not howling out regrets like slaves whipped to their burdens, but with gratitude for a task worthy of our strength, and thanksgiving to Almighty God that He has marked us as His chosen people, henceforth to lead in regeneration of the world. (Beveridge, 1987, p. 23)

In this selection, Beveridge begins with a clear call to the same American civil religion as described by Bellah (1967), especially when Beveridge mentions that “we will not renounce our part in *the mission of our race*, trustee under God, of the civilization of the world” (p. 23, emphasis added). “The mission of our race, trustee under God...” in this case, is a signal from Beveridge to acknowledge a more transcendent purpose in their colonial mission. Their colonial mission was not simply motivated by a superficial, capitalist desire to expand and claim territory,

but it was also the United States' ultimate duty to claim the Philippines "as His chosen people, henceforth to lead in [the] regeneration of the world," thus, he simultaneously addresses this exigency and poses the initial justification for the United States' colonial mission through the American civil religion (Beveridge, 1987, p. 23).

This quotation also references "slaves whipped to their burdens" as a foil to American domination. Just as Roosevelt (1899) called Americans to rise to the occasion under "a strenuous life," Beveridge (1987) distinguishes between the "chosen" American people and the godlessness, or degeneration, of those being colonized. Not only does this signal to the American civil religion, but it also signals to the American patriarchy: there is a clear class distinction between the "howling" of "slaves whipped to their burdens" and the "gratitude" of the American people who "He has marked...as His chosen people." Furthermore, Beveridge calls on the American patriarchy to "move forward to our work...to lead in the regeneration of the world." This is a call to a communal sacrifice in the name of *progress*, which in Weaver's (1985) language, serves as a god term, while the howling of a whipped slave is reduced to a dehumanized *passivity*, a devil term. There lies a great distance between the chosen American people and the dehumanized slave, framed as incapable and unworthy of this "noble" mission. Just from this introduction alone, Beveridge's rhetoric begins to illustrate the nuances of the savior-colonizer: the ideological cluster fuels a transcendent purpose to save Filipinos from themselves by making them less Filipino and more American. In this purpose lies an inherent violence, the violence that is intertwined with colonialism and its apparatuses.

Similarly, McKinley (1987) also invoked the savior-colonizer identity during a Methodist church visit, where he had to address public concern about the United States' decision to embark on a colonial mission in the Philippines. He claims that as "the Philippines had dropped into our

laps” he “did not know what to do with them” (McKinley, 1987, p. 23). Afterwards, he shares a story of his prophetic vision, almost divinizing himself:

...I am not ashamed to tell you, gentlemen, that I went down on my knees and prayed Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night. And one night late it came to me this way – I don’t know how it was, but it came: (1) That we could not give [the Philippines] back to Spain – that would be cowardly and dishonorable; (2) that we could not turn them over to France and Germany – our commercial rivals in the Orient – that would be bad business and discreditable; (3) that we could not leave them to themselves – they were unfit for self-government – and they would soon have anarchy and misrule over there worse than Spain’s was; and (4) that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God’s grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellow-men for whom Christ also died. (McKinley, 1987, pp. 22-23)

Several ideologies are at play here, but first, I want to draw attention to the overall rhetorical form of this passage and how it affirms McKinley, and the office of the President in general, as an ultimate figure that is able to make judgments on morality and enact the will of God. Bellah (1967) explains:

Though the will of the people as expressed in majority vote is carefully institutionalized as the operative source of political authority, it is deprived of an ultimate significance. The will of the people is not itself the criterion of right and wrong. There is a higher criterion in terms of which this will can be judged.... The president’s obligation extends to the higher criterion. (p. 4)

McKinley's (1898) revelation captures him as if he were a messenger of God, and in this self-presentation, he affords himself the authority to speak on the will of God to American hegemony. McKinley's rhetorical choice holds significance for both its ideological and justificatory power. In terms of its ideological significance, the passage reifies the existence of an American civil religion and its ability to legitimate and elevate political offices; thus, highlighting a relationship between American civil religion and colonial policy. All things considered, this invocation of an American civil religion simplifies the justification for colonial rule: the ideology acts as a mask that eventually shrouds any harmful, violent practices until the only thing seemingly left is a benevolent hand extended out "to serve" the Philippines and its people.

Not only is it possible to infer the presence of an American civil religion through McKinley's (1898) rhetorical form, the White Christian hegemony explicitly appears in his final revelation, where he shares that

there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the best we could by them, as our fellow-men for whom Christ also died. (p. 23)

There really "was nothing left" for the United States to do besides fulfill its obligation to the world; they were not purposefully taking such actions but were called to do so by their sacred obligations. They needed to "educate, uplift, civilize," and notably, "Christianize" the Filipino people; Christ had also died for Filipino sins after all. It is interesting to observe McKinley's explicit invocation of Christ, especially since American civil religion did not need Christianity to function. Civil religion served to "[express] what those who set the precedents felt was appropriate under the circumstances" (Bellah, 1967, p. 8). Holding the highest office in the

United States, McKinley set the precedent: he did not need to invoke Christ, but he chose to. I argue that this choice follows from the nature of the ideological cluster: the ideologies in the cluster interact with each other, thereby strengthening the overall ideological and justificatory power of the discourse. Especially when considering his Methodist audience, it may be probable to assume that the American civil religion was not enough to justify the United States' colonial mission in the Philippines, unlike Beveridge's ability to use the more general invocations of God. This shows that even within an ideological cluster, certain ideologies may need to be emphasized depending on the rhetorical context.

Contrasting the White, Christian savior, who is committed to the progress of the world, with the people of the Philippines who were "anarchistic" and "unfit for self-government," another pair of ultimate terms emerge in the text: *progress*, again, becomes the god term that McKinley's audience can rally around, while his framing of the *incapable Filipino* that would only succumb to "anarchy" and "misrule" becomes the devil term. "Disorder" and "chaos," even on lands abroad, become enemies that need to be purified by the savior-colonizer.

There is no better exemplar of this call to "purification" other than McKinley's (2017) Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation. To start, McKinley commanded that:

It will be the duty of the commander of the forces of occupation to announce and proclaim in the most public manner that we come not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends, to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights. All persons who, either by active aid or by honest submission, cooperate with the Government of the United States to give effect to these beneficent purposes will receive the reward of its support and protection. All others will be brought

within the lawful rule we have assumed, with firmness if need be, but without severity, so far as possible. (p. 1)

Here, a strong U.S. patriarchy is established through the hierarchy symbolically constructed through the discourse. Filipinos are positioned below their colonial rulers; U.S. benevolence was conditional. Filipinos “either by active aid or by honest submission” needed to “cooperate” with U.S. forces to be protected. To the Filipino body that has been tried and subjugated by their colonial rulers for centuries prior to the United States’ arrival: there was still no way out without risk of punishment, and thus, the patriarchy sets its anchor on the shores of the Philippines.

Yet despite McKinley’s (2017) firm stance on advancing the colonial mission in the Philippines, he underscores these policies by emphasizing that the United States must “proclaim in the most public manner that we come not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends...” (p. 1). The savior’s call for “friendship” acts as a rhetorical device that obscures, and even denies, the “colonizer;” both identities, however, depend on each other for the colonial mission to actualize. By rhetorically minimizing the “colonizer,” the “savior” can strengthen the discourse’s justificatory power by appealing to the moral qualities informed by the ideological cluster. In sum, these examples serve to highlight the rhetorical contradictions and tensions surrounding the savior-colonizer identity. The following chapter will extend this analysis from the symbolic to the material, as these discourses not only serve to invoke ideologies, but also to mobilize the United States’ engagement in *necropolitics* and the material consequences that these discourses beget.

### **The Ultimate Justification: American Exceptionalism**

Beyond the savior-colonizer cluster lies a force deeper than each individual ideology, and I argue that American exceptionalism is that force. The usage of the term “exceptionalism” has

historically been relegated to academic discourse, but in the past decade, has seen more use in the public sphere as it pertains to the United States' perceived superiority over other nations (Ceaser, 2012). In his analysis of the origins and character of American exceptionalism, Ceaser (2012) states that:

the most fruitful approach to studying the meaning of exceptionalism is to examine how scholars have used it. The common denominator is a claim to uniqueness.... But the focus or content of what exactly is asserted to be unique has varied enormously.... None of its possible meanings is necessarily better or more correct but just different. In the end, it is a matter of the analyst selecting a variant that is of interest or importance for a given inquiry. (p. 8)

In the case of this thesis, the United States' *uniqueness* lies in its transcendent mission as the savior-colonizer. My analyses thus far show that the United States' perceived obligation to act as the world's savior was coupled with a symbolic violence that arose from the American civil religion, patriarchy, and White Christian hegemony. Through a combination of these ideological forces, encompassing both political and theological thought, the United States established itself as exceptional: if McKinley determined that Spain, France, nor Germany were unfit to civilize the Philippines and its people, then the only logical conclusion would be for the United States to answer God's call and to do His work.

What greater justificatory power is there than the self-righteousness that comes with exceptionalism? By rallying its people around the idea that they are "His chosen people," the United States afforded itself the power to colonize the Philippines under the banner of progress, to ultimately bring order and correct the Filipino's "barbaric" and "savage" ways. As the next chapter will illustrate, this power transformed from "justificatory" to the "necropolitical:" in its

civilizing mission, the United States secured itself the ability to determine “who lives” and “who dies.” The symbolic violence of the savior-colonizer identity manifests as material violence in the necropolitics of both political speeches and the educational system.

### **Chapter 3: Death of the Native / Birth of the Filipino Commodity**

In trying to become ‘objective,’ Western culture made ‘objects’ of things and people when it distances itself from them, thereby losing ‘touch’ with them. This dichotomy is the root of all violence.... The Catholic and Protestant religions encourage fear and distrust of life and of the body; they encourage a split between the body and the spirit and totally ignore the soul; they encourage us to kill off parts of ourselves. (Anzaldúa, 2012, p. 59)

To develop a more holistic understanding of colonialism, one must first acknowledge the vehicles by which the colonial mission is established and maintained, and then, examine both the symbolic and material consequences of this mission. In doing so, colonialism reveals its deceptive, and inherently destructive, nature. In this chapter, I find it important to revisit my inherent privilege in writing this academic work on colonialism, as the words and analyses remain situated on these pages, unlike the real people who were (and are still currently) affected as a result of these discourses and their lasting material impacts. To answer this privilege, this chapter explicitly calls out the United States as a colonial body along with its visceral, insatiable greed. For the United States’ colonial mission to succeed, there was a cost to pay, and that cost was paid by Filipino land, labor, bodies, and ultimately, the Filipino mind.

The previous chapter highlighted the existence of the savior-colonizer identity as it was mobilized through political discourse, and I discussed how this identity served as a strong ideological and justificatory force for the United States to embark on their colonial mission in the Philippines. This chapter will extend these arguments by connecting the symbolic more explicitly with the material. By working with Achille Mbembe’s (2017; 2019) *Critique of Black Reason* and *Necropolitics*, I establish a second ideological cluster, comprising of anti-Blackness,

colonialism, and capitalism, which work together to further colonial efforts in the Philippines through policy and education. Ultimately, analyzing this combination of ideologies will help me illustrate how the United States effectively sacrificed the “Native Filipino” through their implementation of a widespread education system; thus, birthing the “Filipino commodity.”

In addition to analyzing the previous chapter’s artifacts through necropolitics, this chapter will also introduce texts from David Barrows (1907), Trinidad Pardo de Tavera (1921), and the Philippine Commission (S. Rep. No. 3885-1, 1900), all of whom were major proponents of the education system as it was designed and implemented by the United States. As I described in Chapter 1, this implementation of a widespread education system functioned as an ideological state apparatus (ISA) because the United States was able to control the curriculum and pedagogical choices based on their own observations of the Filipino people and what knowledge they deemed essential to “civilize” the Philippines, thus shaping the Filipino in their image. These observations and choices, I argue, are informed by the necropolitical ideological cluster; therefore, the task of uncovering this cluster in the texts remains at the forefront of this chapter’s analysis. Through this process, I can then establish how these ideologies move from the colonizing body to their colonial subjects, leaving behind a self-regulating colonial legacy that irreparably disrupted the Filipino psyche.

### **The Necropolitical Ideological Cluster: Anti-Blackness, Capitalism, and Colonialism**

In order to examine necropolitics through its ideological manifestations in my selected artifacts, I first situate necropolitics in its intersection with sovereignty. Mbembe (2019) explains that:

The ultimate expression of sovereignty largely resides in the power and capacity to dictate who is able to live and who must die. To kill or to let live thus constitutes

sovereignty's limits, its principal attributes. To be sovereign is to exert one's control over mortality and to define life as the deployment and manifestation of power. (p. 66)

Throughout history, attempts by sovereign powers to extend its supremacy (e.g., through war or colonialism) can be viewed as an engagement in necropolitics. For example, not only can war serve as a means to sovereignty, but it also serves as a means to exercise one's right to kill (Mbembe, 2019, p. 66). Through an expression of *reason*, or "the truth" of a subject, a certain *politics* manifests through the eyes of a sovereign power (Mbembe, 2019, pp. 67-68).

Necropolitics, then, is a forceful application of *reason* as it pertains to mortality. The power of necropolitics lies in a sovereignty's ability to frame death as "taboo," thus acting as an ultimate power that exerts control over people's fear of death (Mbembe, 2019, p. 70). This power to control life and death also allows a sovereignty to control what is visible and invisible – for if death is taboo – those who are dead are rendered invisible, forgotten by the public eye.

In *Necropolitics*, Mbembe (2019) supports his theory through a modern critique of the world; in particular, his "reverse reading" of history helped inform my choice of ideologies to examine in this thesis. His reading of history emphasizes four characteristics that shaped the modern condition of the world: 1) the "narrowing of the world and repopulation of the Earth" through colonization and the African slave trade; 2) the "ongoing redefinition of the human in the framework of a general ecology and henceforth broadened geography;" 3) the "generalized introduction of tools and calculating or computational machines into all aspects of social life;" and 4) the "capacity to voluntarily alter the human species – and even other living species and apparently inert materials – and the power of capital" (Mbembe, 2019, pp. 10-14).

From my reading of these four characteristics, I was able to crystallize my ideological cluster on three fronts: anti-Blackness, capitalism, and colonialism. One of the strongest

historical examples of necropolitics stems from the African slave trade, which not only subjected an entire people to an exploitation of their bodies and labor, but it also gave birth to the “racial subject,” and therefore, Blackness itself (Mbembe, 2017). Despite the idea of Blackness being born from slavery, the term “Black” signifies both the birth (of the Black slave) and death (of the “Black Man”). As Mbembe (2017) explains in his *Critique of Black Reason*:

...to say “Black” is to evoke the absent corpses for which the name is a substitute. Each time we invoke the word “Black,” we bring out into the light of day all the waste of the world, the excess whose absence within the tomb is as strange as it is terrifying.... The term “Black” is a kind of *mnèma*, a sign for how life and death, within the politics of our world, have come to be defined so narrowly in relation to one another that it is nearly impossible to delimit the border separating the order of life from the order of death.

(Mbembe, 2017, p. 53)

Based on this passage, I argue that any engagement in necropolitics simultaneously invokes both Blackness and anti-Blackness, the former referring to the order of life and the latter referring to the order of death. My analysis does not aim to conflate or essentialize the Black experience with the Filipino experience, but rather, I call to the ideology of “anti-Blackness” which serves as an ideological and justificatory force that enables the exploitation and dehumanization of a people (in this case, the Filipino people).

All things considered, anti-Blackness creates an imagined “Other:” an empty placeholder, a person stripped of their humanity, and only useful insofar that they serve as a commodity which upholds the current political, economic, ontological, and epistemological order (Bledsoe & Wright, 2019; Mbembe, 2019). This symbolic act of “Othering” manifests itself materially through colonialism and capitalism. Colonial bodies “other” their subjects by subjecting them to

their sovereignty and exploiting them for their contributions to capitalism, thus robbing colonized subjects from both knowing *who they are* and *how to hold themselves* in the world (Mbembe, 2017, pp. 78-79).

By embarking on their colonial mission in the Philippines, the United States exercised its capacity to engage in the necropolitical ideological cluster. As I will show in the following analysis, despite the United States' stated benevolent intentions, their colonial mission killed the Native and gave birth to the Filipino commodity by: 1) marking the Filipino as barbaric and incapable of self-governance, but simultaneously, recognizing the economic value of their land; and 2) transforming the social condition of the Philippines through their implementation of a gendered, industrial curriculum, yielding a Filipino nationality in the US's likeness and image. Lastly, the analysis will also show that there is an inherent difficulty in assigning a definitive valence to this colonial mission and its overall impact on the Filipino people. However, viewing these colonial legacies through necropolitics remains a necessary endeavor because it can help uncover how certain identities, bodies, and ideologies are privileged over others. In doing so, there lies a possibility in imagining what a world could look like beyond the necropolitical and what that could mean for Filipinos today.

### ***Analysis – Revisiting Beveridge and McKinley***

I begin this chapter's analysis through a brief re-examination of artifacts from Chapter Two to demonstrate that necropolitics does not necessarily have a beginning and an end, nor does it exist solely in either the symbolic or material: it is a set of ideologies that persists symbolically in the discourse (even before the "colonial moment"), and through an enactment of colonial policy, the consequences of necropolitics then manifests in the physical world. Not only did Beveridge's (1987) and McKinley's (1987; 2017) discourse reify the savior-colonizer

identity, but their justifications for supporting the colonial mission also signified an “Othering,” or a symbolic killing, of the Philippines, its people, and those who opposed their colonial efforts.<sup>1</sup>

In revisiting Beveridge’s (1987) speech, it is important to note that he held a unique position in the Senate, as he had the opportunity to visit the United States’ battlefronts in the Philippines, which afforded him the credibility to speak on his first-hand accounts of the land (p. 23). After his introduction (that was analyzed in Chapter Two), Beveridge (1987) continues his advocacy for colonial rule by acknowledging that although it could “[prove] a mistake to hold [the Philippines],” he immediately responds by claiming that “it will be no mistake” because “The Pacific is our ocean.... The Philippines give[s] us a base at the door of all the East” in terms of trading reach (pp. 23-24). Here, Beveridge introduces his appeal to capitalism before he goes on to outline the commercial benefits that Filipino land offers. He goes so far as to tell his colleagues who oppose the colonial mission that in doing so, they:

[commit] a crime against American trade – against the American-grower of cotton and wheat and tobacco, the American manufacturer of machinery and clothing – [they fail] to put America where she may command that trade.... The Philippines command the commercial situation of the entire East.... And yet American statesmen plan to surrender this commercial throne of the orient where Providence and our soldiers’ lives have placed us. When history comes to write the story of that suggested treason to American

---

<sup>1</sup> Recall from Chapter One that the United States was also *physically* killing Filipinos in the Philippine-American War between 1899-1902. Beveridge’s (1987) “On Philippine Policy” speech was delivered in 1900. McKinley’s (1987; 2017) “Benevolent Assimilation Proclamation” was delivered during the Spanish-American 1898 and his “Remarks to Methodist Delegation” was delivered after the Philippine-American War in 1903.

supremacy and therefore to the spread of American civilization, let her in mercy write

that those who so proposed were merely blind and nothing more. (Beveridge, 1987, p. 24)

This passage not only highlights Beveridge's privileging of capitalism (e.g., his first main justification was related to the potential to accumulate capital rather than "helping" the Filipino), but it also poignantly indicates that even Beveridge's anti-imperialist contemporaries were not excluded from the necropolitical. His use of metaphor criminalizes the anti-imperialist American statesman and places them in opposition to American producer, the "American-grower of cotton...the American manufacturer of machinery and clothing" (Beveridge, 1987, p. 24). In the liminal space between the anti-imperialist "American statesman" and the "American producer" – the "harmful traitor" and the "productive citizen" – lies the necropolitical.

By criminalizing politicians who opposed American colonialism (i.e., the transcendent goal), Beveridge subjects them to a similar social death as other oppositional Filipinos, such as the revolutionary President Emilio Aguinaldo, whom Beveridge also denounced. He later argues that "American opposition to the [Philippine-American] war has been the chief factor prolonging it. Had Aguinaldo not understood that in America...[that] he and his cause were supported...his insurrection would have dissolved before it entirely crystallized..." (Beveridge, 1987, p. 25).

Beveridge's messages indicate a strong disdain for anti-imperialists, and this signals two ideas to consider. First, anybody that opposes the sovereign body, regardless of race, potentially subjects themselves to death (whether "real" or "imagined"); and second, the sovereign body has the capacity to deflect its necropolitical capacity by placing blame on others.

Both ideas also appear in McKinley's (2017) "Benevolent Assimilation," where he concludes:

...it should be the earnest wish and paramount aim of the military administration to win the confidence, respect, and affection of the Philippines.... In the fulfillment of this high mission, there must be sedulously maintained the strong arm of authority, to repress disturbance and to overcome all obstacles to the bestowal of the blessings of good and stable government upon the people of the Philippine Islands under the free flag of the United States.” (para. 4)

In this final call to action, McKinley privileges U.S. colonialism over other forces that could possibly disrupt their mission to convince the Filipino people of U.S. benevolence. He urges his military administration to “sedulously [maintain] the strong arm of authority” and to “repress” and “overcome all obstacles” to achieve their ends. Not only does the necropolitical concern itself with the death of the Other, it also is concerned with self-preservation: the sovereign power, and those who support it, must live, while the Other must die for the order to be maintained.

### ***Analysis – The Philippine Commission Report & Educational Leadership***

Now that I have demonstrated how necropolitics can serve to protect the United States’ position as a colonial body through their control of mortality, I will now turn to texts from Barrows (1907), Pardo de Tavera (1921), and the Philippine Commission (S. Rep. No 3885-1, 1900) to capture some of the material consequences of necropolitics as enacted in educational systems. The remainder of my analysis will not only frame the United States’ implementation of Filipino schools as a physical manifestation of the necropolitical ideological cluster, but I will also demonstrate how some Filipinos were able to transcend their “Othering” by burying their Native or Spanish “excess” through their participation in these schools.

To begin, I first look at the report from the Philippine Commission (S. Rep. No 3885-1, 1900). As introduced in Chapter One, President McKinley had appointed the Philippine Commission in 1899 as a political body responsible for investigating current affairs in the Philippines. After doing so, the commission had drafted a report to ultimately secure Congress' approval in their plans to implement a form of government and an education system in the Philippines: this artifact was the first volume of this report. This volume spanned 495 pages and attempted to be an exhaustive report. They begin by reporting on their attempt to quell resistance through public proclamation, and from there, they describe the current state of Filipino affairs in terms of their education, government, judicial system, physical infrastructure (such as roads, waterways, and lights), currency, and public health. Since the scope of this thesis does not allow for a complete analysis of this rich report, I will instead focus on how the Commission described the Filipino people, and, consequently, how this report set the stage for the necropolitical to physically manifest through U.S. interventions in Filipino schooling.

In Part II of this volume, the Philippine Commission offer their report on the native inhabitants of the Philippines. They first categorize the people into three races: “the Negrito race, the Indonesian race, and the Malayan race” (S. Rep. No. 3885-1, 1900, p. 11). The Commission describe each race according to their perceived physical and intellectual capacity, where the Negritos were placed at the bottom of the racial hierarchy. They state:

It is universally conceded that the Negritos of to-day are the disappearing remnants of a people which once populated the entire archipelago. They are, physically, weaklings of low stature, with black skin, closely-curling hair, flat noses, thick lips, and large, clumsy feet. In the matter of intelligence they stand at or near the bottom of the human series,

and they are believed to be incapable of any considerable degree of civilization or advancement. (S. Rep. No. 3885-1, 1900, p. 11)

This passage illuminated three observations: first, the Commission made clear the existence of a normalized, racial hierarchy with no concern for the survival of those at the bottom of this hierarchy (who are marked by Blackness); second, anti-Blackness was a prominent ideological feature, especially as they physically and intellectually described the Negrito; and third, the Commission (and the US by extension) has a clear perception of who is capable of attaining progress, and in turn, what “civilization” should look like.

To expand on my first observation, it is important to recognize that this report was not an unofficial or untrustworthy document, but rather, this was an official report by the U.S. government that was presented to Congress and is available to access in the public record. This is significant because the mere presence and acceptance of a racial hierarchy in political reports speaks to how normal and pervasive racialized and anti-Black ideologies are in U.S. politics. In their aim to gain support from Congress to advance the colonial project, the Commission, logically, would not want to employ language or ideas that would be rejected by their target audience. Therefore, the racial hierarchy established in this passage, and the ideologies surrounding it, are evidence that anti-Blackness and racial hierarchy are familiar and normalized concepts in the U.S. political sphere.

Not only is the racial hierarchy normalized in U.S. politics, but the necropolitical nature of this hierarchy is also normalized. They stated that Negritos “are the disappearing remnants of a people which once populated the entire archipelago,” and then they follow this statement with all their perceived physical and intellectual deficiencies of the Negrito (S. Rep. No. 3885-1, 1900, p. 11). Addressing my second observation, the Commission’s choice to report on the

Negrito's "deficiencies" serves a justificatory purpose, as they place blame on their physical and intellectual "shortcomings" as the reason why they are disappearing: Negritos are "weaklings of low stature," have "black skin," and "in the matter of intelligence they stand at or near the bottom of the human series." Ideologically, these language choices also invite Othering against a perceived weaker, less valuable people compared to the strength and "chosenness" of Americans, as established in Chapter 2. This also shows that the U.S. is willing to let the Negrito die, both a literal and imagined death; literal, in the sense that there is nothing for the U.S. to do in saving their physical population, as they "seem doomed to early extinction;" and imagined, as they are "incapable," serving no use towards progress, thus robbed of their humanity (p. 11).

My last observation speaks to the United States' clear vision of what civilization and progress should look like: I argue that they are informed by the ultimate terms "progress" and "deficiency." "Progress," as shown in Chapter Two, remains a god term, while "deficiency" provides a new devil term to work with in this analysis. The Commission argued that intellectually, Negritos are "incapable of any considerable degree of civilization or achievement" (S. Rep. No. 3885-1, 1900, p. 11). Compare this to how they later described the "Indonesian race," as "their skins are quite light" and that "[m]any are very clever and intelligent" (p. 12). In comparison to the Negrito, the Commission reported that none of the Indonesian race were Christianized and that some were "industrious" (p. 12). Consequently, the devil term of "deficiency" is linked to Blackness and the god term of "progress" (and who is worth saving) is linked to Whiteness.

To synthesize the analysis thus far: these three observations highlight the complex, ideological interplay that underscores the United States' affinity to necropolitics as they justify their colonial mission. It is clear that the United States values an objective, rational civilization

(hence, why the report mentioned that none of the Indonesian race was Christianized) and that being “industrious,” as opposed to being “incapable,” is preferable – if not necessary – to achieve progress and avoid death. By privileging “objectivity,” the “subjective” (i.e. spirituality) is sacrificed; likewise, by privileging the “industrious,” the “inoperative” is sacrificed. How, then, did this cycle of life and death manifest on Filipino land?

The answer lies in Filipino schooling as it was planned and enforced by the United States. In Chapter One, I introduced both the *gente ilustrada* and the *gente baja*: the *ilustrada* referring to the highest, most educated, social class, while the *baja* were the “poorer and illiterate class” (Barrows, 1907, p. 71). As the U.S.-appointed Director of Education for the Philippines, David Barrows (1907) understood the significance of schooling in its role in addressing social problems. Barrows believed that the education system needed to affect “a social transformation of the people,” those people being the *gente baja* (p. 69). His mission appeared a benevolent one, especially as he detailed the presence of *caciquismo*: the socioeconomic structure that placed the *gente baja* as exploited dependents under their masters (pp. 72-73). Despite his hopes to liberate the *gente baja* from *caciquismo*, I argue that the United States imposed a new dependency on the Filipino people. Albeit subtle, the Filipino people had no other choice but to be “born again” through U.S. curriculum and teachers; otherwise, they experience a slow death, first denounced, then eventually, completely disappearing from the discourse.

Barrows (1907) outlines the new curriculum for both primary, intermediate, and high schools, for which all students took general subjects, such as: English, math, geography, Philippine history and government, and science. However, beyond these subjects, Barrows advances several types of elective coursework, all of which were focused on a specific industry and were divided by gender. As Barrows (1907) details:

...each boy in an intermediate school has three years in agriculture, or in shop work, or divides time between these two branches.... The girls on the other hand receive three years of domestic science instruction, which embraces the care of the house, cleaning, sanitation, etc., cooking, and the care of the sick and of infants. Thus the intermediate school supplies the course of study whereby we hope directly to increase the industrial efficiency of the people and to raise the standard of living generally. (p. 79)

With this new emphasis on industrial instruction, the Filipino commodity was born. Boys were gendered to focus on agricultural work and craftsmanship, while girls were gendered to focus on housework, all in the hopes that the Philippines would achieve a more industrially efficient civilization modeled after the U.S. economic system and divisions of labor. Building from Reyes' and Chirindo's (2020) article: this was the moment that Filipino bodies became "objectified as flesh, frozen in a primordial past, sexually denuded...[they became] grist for labor, a kind of energy to be set in motion, material bodies whose sexual and gender identities were officially negated..." (p. 4). It might seem contradictory with all these newfound educational opportunities that the United States was providing the Philippines, but in establishing a gendered curriculum that focused on the Filipino people's capacity for production, the Philippines was thrust into a new, capitalistic world with no promise of turning back to how life once was.

In order for the industrial Filipino to live, the excesses of Spanish colonization and whatever was left of indigenous culture had to die. By surrendering these excesses, Filipino people were able to live under U.S. sovereignty, and thus, transcend their "Othering" and avoid death. Dr. Trinidad Pardo de Tavera (1921) was a Filipino academic who was part of the *ilustrado* class, and he gave an address in 1920 before the Teacher's Assembly on these

excesses, which he referred to as the legacy of *ignorantismo*, or ignorantism. Ignorantism refers to “the spirit of those who extol the advantage of ignorance,” and de Tavera’s (1921) address spoke in detail about how the implementation of U.S. education helped develop a “moral consciousness...forming a *public opinion which formerly did not exist*” (pp. 3-4). This artifact continues to complicate the colonial situation in the Philippines: de Tavera was Filipino himself, and this address served to defend (and to express his deepest gratitude towards) the United States’ implementation of the education system in the Philippines (i.e. the physical embodiment of necropolitics).

As I mentioned throughout my analysis, those who supported the sovereign power did not have to fear death in the necropolitical, but those who resisted and opposed this force were subjected to death by an “Othering.” Here, de Tavera (1921) denounces the opposition by proclaiming:

Those who in a great measure are guilty to their nation for the misfortunes that befell the Filipino[:] people that resorted to revolution and rebellion to free themselves from a régime opposed to their progress and happiness...they to-day wish to defend their interests in our country[,] pursuing their policy which would only produce dissension among the Filipinos. Under the pretext of interesting themselves more than we do in our own welfare, considering us to be blind and incapable to know and distinguish the good from the bad, deeming us *eternal indios* of inferior mentality...they who guide or wish to guide the indio, the eternal child who ought to allow himself to be led! (p. 6)

de Tavera continues to reinforce and perpetuate necropolitics in a similar fashion as Senator Beveridge (1987). de Tavera also frames the “people that resorted to revolution and rebellion” as “guilty to their nation for [the people’s] misfortunes” and that they are selfish because they

would rather tend to their own interests (of revolution) than care for the welfare of the people. He minimizes the revolutionary by referring to them as an “eternal child;” he invalidates their rebellion, claiming that they are only rebelling against their own “progress and happiness.” Above all else, de Tavera (1921) ultimately blames the revolutionary for internal conflict between the Filipinos while simultaneously praising the United States for the schools that he claimed, modernized Filipino thought and life (pp. 41-42). This rift between the “rebellious” and the “obedient” continues to support the existence and pervasiveness of the necropolitical in Filipino colonial life – even as the address was delivered in 1920, almost two decades after the United States had claimed sovereignty over the Philippines and its people.

### ***Beyond Necropolitics***

What, then, does this analysis of necropolitics suggest for the Filipino condition? Does it doom the Philippines and its people to a state of entrapment, a perpetual cycle of both life and death? To begin my attempt to answer these questions, I return to Mbembe’s (2019) idea of the *passant*, or passerby. The passerby is the “figure of the elsewhere...arriving from another place...moving toward other skies” (p. 186). The passerby travels around from place to place; unable to return home, but they move around with their birthplace in their periphery, thereby, “becoming-human-in-the-world” (Mbembe, 2019, pp. 186-87).

Filipinos will never be able to return home, or at least what *was* home before their colonization. Nor will Filipinos be able to undo the consequences of necropolitics, as the United States already established their colonial legacies, granting life to the Filipino commodity and death to the Native. The passerby does not seek to resolve these areas, but rather, accept both a state of “solidarity and detachment” to remove oneself from the death that colonialism brought upon the passerby’s existence (Mbembe, 2019, p. 189). In doing so grants a new life for the

Filipino: a life beyond the necropolitical, where Filipinos can start to reflect on its sustained harms, heal as a community, and build the possibility for a new world beyond the necropolitical.

## Conclusion

Colonization continues to prove itself as one of the most complex, nuanced forms of oppression and subjugation of a peoples. (Post)colonial research continues to be met with scrutiny and skepticism, often challenged and invalidated with statements such as, “Colonization could not have been that bad; look at all of the things that it brought to the people,” or “If *X* was never a colony, they never would have been as successful as they are now.” As this thesis demonstrated through my application of critical rhetorical methods and Richard Weaver’s (1985) “ultimate terms,” this type of rhetoric is not a new phenomenon, and I argue that this skepticism is strong evidence of how pervasive the “savior-colonizer” and the necropolitical ideological clusters remain today.

The United States at the turn of the twentieth century had a choice in shaping the destiny of the Filipino people for generations to come. At this moment in history, the Philippines had already undergone over three centuries of colonial influence from the Spanish Empire. The emergence of the Spanish friar and religious education not only marked the first, prominent ideological state apparatus, but also a discursive contradiction in the “missionary-colonizer” (Nepomuceno, 1981).

This contradiction remained a constant force, even after the role of colonizer was passed from Spain to the United States. Under the banner of the American civil religion, patriarchy, the White Christian hegemony, and ultimately, American exceptionalism, The United States was able to establish its own version of the Spanish friar through their deployment of the “savior-colonizer” identity, the first ideological cluster in my analysis. Speeches from Senator Alfred Beveridge (1987) and President William McKinley (1987; 2017) demonstrated how the “savior-colonizer” identity helped manifest a transcendent goal in the colonial mission. For the United

States to save the Filipino people was to don the garb of God's chosen; to lead the world in the name of *progress*. This idea of *progress* served as a God term throughout my analysis, where *progress* helped justify the United States' decision to save the Filipino from their own "inability" to govern themselves. McKinley (1987) framed this incapacity for Filipino self-governance as anarchistic, or "misrule;" this serving as a Devil term that the United States also deployed throughout its discourse to frame a common enemy for the American citizen to rally against. The savior-colonizer identity proved to be a strong justificatory and ideological force, convincing the United States that they, alone, could extend their graces to uplift the Filipino.

By propelling themselves into a position of colonial rule, the United States also afforded themselves the power to control the order of life and death in the Philippines, what Mbembe (2019) referred to as "necropolitics." The United States' ability to engage in the necropolitical allowed them, as an intervening force, to determine who lived and who died in the Philippines; these determinations were made through the necropolitical ideological cluster, consisting of anti-Blackness, capitalism, and colonialism. This engagement in necropolitics allowed for specific identities, bodies, and ideologies to be privileged over others within a normalized racial hierarchy.

In "Othering" the Filipino Native, as well as those who supported Filipino independence, the United States was able to subject the Other to death (either symbolic or literal): dehumanizing them and leaving them to fade away from public concern. The prominence of an anti-Black, racial hierarchy afforded the United States to clearly define who could achieve progress and civilization. The Native *Negrato* was framed by the Philippine Commission (S. Rep. No. 3885-1, 1900) as physically and mentally inferior to the other races on the island, such as the

Indonesian, who were “intelligent” and “industrious,” thus killing the *Negrato* and privileging the life of the industrious Indonesian (p. 12).

This privileging of certain lives over others allows for necropolitics to manifest in both the symbolic and material. This thesis showed how the Filipino education system, as implemented by the United States, both perpetuated and reinforced the necropolitical order. By establishing a gendered curriculum that focused on industrialization, the Filipino was thus born as a commodity for capital. David Barrows (1907) delineated the United States’ curriculum for the Philippines based on what the United States determined for Filipino success. There was an inherent focus on agriculture and handiwork for boys, while girls took specialized courses on housework. These choices in curriculum modified Filipino epistemologies and ontologies, where Filipinos were “born again” into an ideal, industrial civilization as imagined by the United States, leaving behind the excesses of their past.

These excesses, from Native or Spanish culture, were subject to a slow, social death. Any rebellion was met with ostracization; even Dr. Trinidad Pardo de Tavera (1921), a Filipino *ilustrado*, denounced any Filipinos that did not shed these excesses (i.e., Filipino revolutionaries) for the favorable education system that the United States bestowed upon the Philippine Islands. By shedding their excesses, Filipinos were able to avoid death under U.S. necropolitics, but as my analysis showed, this order of life and death was not under Filipino control, but it continued to remain under the United States’ control for the decades to come (and some may argue still to this day).

The implications of these findings lead me to the contemporary, especially as it concerns how Filipinos and Filipino Americans (re)construct their identities in the current neocolonial world. As this study illustrated, ideologies not only stayed within the United States as the

colonial body, but these ideologies also travelled across the Pacific: through the ISAs, the Filipino became indoctrinated with these ideologies as well. As Stuart Hall (1990) wrote:

cultural identity...is a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being.' It belongs to the future as much as to the past.... It is only from [this] position that we can properly understand the traumatic character of 'the colonial experience.' (p. 225)

This thesis, although not exhaustive, shed light on the colonial past of the Filipino through the lens of rhetorical criticism. My own hopes for future research lie in Hall's idea of cultural identity as both "becoming" and "being." In this future exploration, I hope to better articulate how Filipinos can become the "passerby," and ultimately, where rhetoric and communication can fit in it all.

To examine the critical line between savior and colonizer, life and death, this thesis leaves much more to explore in countless fields of study, especially in the fields of rhetoric, communication studies, and American Studies. As a rhetorician and communication scholar, I recognize that there are others in the field that are examining these colonial contradictions and advocating for more of this critical, rhetorical work to be done (such as Prof. Lisa Flores, Prof. Tiara Na'puti, and Prof. Raka Shome); however, despite these voices, this type of work continues to remain in the background of Western scholarship and oftentimes relegated to specific journals or academic divisions, such as *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* or the Asian/Pacific American Communication Studies Division of the National Communication Association.

This thesis not only serves as my call to further research in (post)colonialism and Filipino/Filipino American Studies in communication and rhetorical studies, but to also advocate for this type of research to be at the forefront. When Twitter hashtags such as, #COMMSOWhite

and #RhetoricSoWhite are still in use today, despite the daily violence and marginalization inflicted upon ethnic minority groups in the United States, there lies a desperate need for the discipline to ask itself: Are we attending to some of the most prominent exigencies of our time?

These prominent exigencies – including questions of race, racism, Whiteness, anti-Blackness, and more – are not just questions for researchers to ponder comfortably in front of a computer screen, either. Addressing these exigencies through research (and centering this research at the forefront of the discipline), can help expose and disrupt the forces that continue to privilege certain bodies, lives, and ideologies over others; granting some life, but for others death. This is not an easy intervention, nor one that can be solved in a day, but it is a worthwhile endeavor, especially for those still trapped within the boundaries of both life and death.

## References

- Althusser, L. (2006). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (notes towards an investigation).  
In A. Sharma & A. Gupta (Eds.), *The anthropology of the state: A reader*, (pp. 86–98).
- Anzaldúa, G. (2007). *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestiza* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Aunt Lute Books.
- Barrows, D. P. (1907). Education and social progress in the Philippines. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 30(1), 69–82.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/000271620703000108>
- Beveridge, A. J. (1987). Our Philippine policy. In D. B. Schirmer & S. R. Shalom (Eds.), *The Philippines reader: A history of colonialism, neocolonialism, dictatorship, and resistance* (pp. 23-26).
- Bellah, R. N. (1967). Civil religion in America. *Daedalus*, 96(1), 1–21.
- Bledsoe, A. & Wright, W. J. (2019). The anti-Blackness of global capital. *Society and Space*, 37(1), 8–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775818805102>
- Buescher, D. T. & Ono, K. A. (1996). Civilized colonialism: *Pocahontas* as neocolonial rhetoric. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 19(2), 127–153.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.1996.11089810>
- Burke, K. (1945). *A grammar of motives*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Ceaser, J. W. (2012). The origins and character of American exceptionalism. *American Political Thought*, 1(1), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.1086/664595>
- Cherwitz, R. A., & Zagacki, K. S. (1986). Consummately versus justificatory crisis rhetoric. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 50(4), 307–324.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10570318609374240>
- Clark, M. E. (2004). Rhetoric, patriarchy, and war. *Women and Language*, 27(2), 21–28.

- Constantino, R. (2000). The mis-education of the Filipino. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 30(3), 428–444. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472330080000421>
- de Tavera, T. H. P. (1921). *The legacy of ignorantism (ignorantismo): An address delivered before the Teachers Assembly, Baguio, April 23, 1920*. Manila Bureau of Printing.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction*. Verso.
- Fletcher, J. H. (2016). Warrants for reconstruction: Christian hegemony, White supremacy. *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 51(1), 54–79. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ecu.2016.0011>
- Ganiel, G. & Mitchell, C. (2006). Turning the categories inside-out: Complex identifications and multiple interactions in religious ethnography. *Sociology of Religion*, 67(1), 3–21.
- Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference* (pp. 222-37).
- Hsu, F. (2013). Colonial lessons: Racial politics of comparison and the development of American education policy in the Philippines. In D. C. Maramba & R. Bonus (Eds.), *The “other” students: Filipino Americans, education, and power* (pp. 39-62).
- Johannesen, R. L. (1987). Richard M. Weaver’s uses of Kenneth Burke. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 52(3), 312–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10417948709372696>
- Leonardo, Z. & Matias, C. E. (2013). Betwixt and between colonial and postcolonial mentality: The critical education of Filipino Americans. In D. C. Maramba & R. Bonus (Eds.), *The “other” students: Filipino Americans, education, and power* (pp. 3-18).
- May, G. A. (1980). *Social engineering in the Philippines: The aims, execution, and impact of American colonial policy, 1900-1913*. Greenwood Press.
- Mbembe, A. (2017). *Critique of Black reason* (L. Dubois, Trans.). Duke University Press. (Original work published 2013).

- Mbembe, A. (2019). *Necropolitics* (S. Corcoran, Trans.). Duke University Press. (Original work published 2016).
- McGee, M. C. (1980). The “ideograph”: A link between rhetoric and ideology. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 66(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638009383499>
- McKinley, W. (1987). Remarks to Methodist delegation. In D. B. Schirmer & S. R. Shalom (Eds.), *The Philippines reader: A history of colonialism, neocolonialism, dictatorship, and resistance* (pp. 22-23).
- McKinley, W. (2017). “Benevolent assimilation” proclamation 1898. In Grey House Publishing (Ed.). *Milestone documents of American leaders: Exploring the primary sources of notable American leaders* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).
- Nepomuceno, S. J. G. (1981). *A theory of development of Filipino colonized consciousness* (Order No. 8122779) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Ocampo, A. C. (2016). *The Latinos of Asia: How Filipino Americans break the rules of race*. Stanford University Press.
- Paliewicz, N. S. & McHendry, G. F., Jr. (2017). When good arguments do not work: Post-dialectics, argument assemblages, and the networks of climate skepticism. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 53(4), 287–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00028533.2017.1375738>
- Rasmussen, K. (1973). An interaction analysis of justificatory rhetoric. *Western Speech*, 37(2), 111–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570317309373778>
- Reyes, G. & Chirindo, K. (2020). Theorizing race and gender in the Anthropocene. *Women’s Studies in Communication*, 43(4), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2020.1824519>

Roosevelt, T. (1899). The strenuous life. Voices of Democracy: The U.S. Oratory Project.

<https://voicesofdemocracy.umd.edu/roosevelt-strenuous-life-1899-speech-text/>

S. Rep. No. 3885-1 (1900).

Shome, R. (1996). Postcolonial interventions in the rhetorical canon: An “other” view.

*Communication Theory*, 6(1), 40–59.

Smyrl, J. L. (2008). *An ideological cluster analysis of the experiential conversion rhetoric in the*

*preaching of Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen* (Order No. 3343437) [Doctoral dissertation, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary]. ProQuest Dissertations

Publishing.

Weaver, R. M. (1985). *The ethics of rhetoric*. Hermagoras Press.

## Curriculum Vitae

JOHANSEN C. PICO  
johansen.pico@gmail.com

### RESEARCH INTERESTS

---

Rhetorical criticism and theory, critical/cultural studies, postcolonial rhetorics, identity rhetorics, border rhetorics, rhetorics of empire

### EDUCATION

---

#### **University of Nevada, Las Vegas**

M.A. Communication Studies, 2021

Thesis Committee: Emma F. Bloomfield (chair), Rebecca Rice, Jacob Thompson, Constancio Arnaldo

Title: Colonization of the Philippines: An analysis of U.S. justificatory rhetoric

Graduate Certificate in Social Justice Studies, 2021

B.A. Communication Studies, 2018

### TEACHING EXPERIENCE

---

2020-2021

#### **Teaching Assistant**

Oral Communication (COM 101)

*Department of Communication Studies, University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Assigned to teach 6 sections for 2020-21 term, with an average of 22 students per section. Administered asynchronous course remotely during COVID-19 pandemic. Recorded weekly video lectures, evaluated course assignments and speeches, and supported student success in a virtual space.

2015

#### **Undergraduate Teaching Assistant**

Fundamentals of Life Science (BIOL 189)

*Department of Biology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Assisted graduate teaching assistant with lab section of 30 students.

Helped facilitate lab activities and weekly quizzes. Developed one lecture and lesson plan for students to complete in lab section.

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

---

2019-2020

#### **Graduate Academic Advisor**

*Greenspun College of Urban Affairs – Academic Advising Center,  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Provided academic advising for first and second-year students for students enrolled in college's academic programs. Applied knowledge of academic policies and campus resources to assist students in setting and achieving their academic goals. Assisted students at risk of probation and suspension in forming strategies to attain and remain in good academic standing.

2019

**Community Engagement & Mentorship Assistant**

*College of Liberal Arts, University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Developed assessment tools for the College of Liberal Arts to gauge current attitudes on student engagement opportunities offered by the college using Qualtrics. Collaborated with on and off-campus partners to develop leadership and professional development programming for undergraduate students. Mentored one undergraduate student worker and assisted with their implementation of a college-wide service learning program for faculty.

2018-2019

**Programming Assistant**

*College of Liberal Arts, University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Coordinated all student engagement programming for the College of Liberal Arts. Developed student engagement program through outreach methods including: coordinating and hosting registered student organization meetings with over 25 organizations, presenting involvement workshops to the college's first-year seminar courses, and distributing professional development resources. Additionally, developed and expanded on the college's student engagement mini-brand by creating marketing materials and implementing annual marketing plan.

**RESEARCH EXPERIENCE**

---

2015

**Research Assistant**

*Department of Psychology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

*Auditory Cognition and Development Lab – Dr. Erin Hannon*

Recruited and scheduled study participants, created and managed information database, and coded participant behavior using ELAN, a video annotating software.

Certifications: CITI – Social/Behavioral IRB Course

**PRESENTATIONS**

---

2018

“We Don’t Get to Mourn:” Navigating Prejudice through Conflict Management, COM 432, Qualitative Research Methods, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

2018 “Who’s Fault Is It Anyway?” The Importance of Conflict Resolution in Greek-Lettered Organizations, Greek Leadership Day, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

## SERVICE

---

### *Service to the University*

2019-2021 Advisor to UNLV Men of Color Alliance  
2019-2021 Advisor to Omega Delta Phi Fraternity, Inc.  
2018-2019 Search Committee for UNLV Fraternity and Sorority Life Program Coordinator Position  
2019 Search Committee for UNLV College of Liberal Arts Director of Student Engagement Position

### *Service to the Community*

2018-2019 **Volunteer Counselor**  
*Camp Anytown*  
Coordinated and assisted with Camp Anytown, a Las Vegas-local social justice and diversity camp geared towards high school students in Southern Nevada. Assisted with group facilitations and workshop presentations.

## AWARDS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

---

2020 Individual Academic Advisor Recognition Award  
2018 Grad Rebel Advantage Inaugural Cohort  
2016 Omega Delta Phi Fraternity, Inc. Brother of the Month  
2016 Alpha Phi Omega, National Service Fraternity Leadership Award  
2014 Kiwanis Cal-Nev-Ha Foundation Scholarship  
2014 Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship

## PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

---

National Communication Association  
Western States Communication Association