

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University · Loyola Heights, Quezon City · 1108 Philippines

Social Engineering in the Philippines: The Aims and Execution of American Educational Policy, 1900 - 1913

Glenn A. May

Philippine Studies vol. 24, no. 2 (1976) 135–183

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

**Social Engineering in the Philippines:
The Aims and Execution of American Educational
Policy, 1900-1913***

GLENN A. MAY

For more than four decades, American policy-makers engaged in self-conscious social engineering in the Philippines. Presidents, Cabinet officers, Congressmen and colonial administrators attempted to introduce fundamental changes in the social, political, and economic life of the archipelago. Almost all of them maintained,

*I would like to acknowledge, with thanks, grants provided me by the Council on International Relations and the Council on Southeast Asian Studies, both of Yale University, which helped to defray my research expenses in American and Philippine archives.

The following abbreviations and short forms will be used in the footnotes:

BFM	Blaine Free Moore Papers, (U.S.) Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division.
CWE	Charles W. Eliot Papers, Harvard University Archives.
DB	David Barrows Papers, Bancroft Library, University of California at Berkeley.
JPC	Philippine Islands, Legislature, Philippine Commission, <i>Journal of the Philippine Commission</i> .
NA, RG 350	Records of the Bureau of Insular Affairs (Record Group 350), U.S. National Archives.
"Present Educational Movement"	Fred Atkinson, "Present Educational Movement in the Philippines" (a typewritten manuscript probably written in early 1902), which can be found in the Bernard Moses Papers, Bancroft Library, Scrapbook 5.
PS	Minutes of Public Sessions of the U.S. Philippine Commission, Documents Department, Library of the University of California at Berkeley.
RD	Records Division, Philippine Department of Education, Manila.
RDE	Philippine Islands, Director of Education (General Superintendent of Education), <i>Report of the Director of Education</i> (title varies; Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, or Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1904-1913).
RPC	U.S., Philippine Commission, <i>Report of the U.S. Philippine Commission</i> (title varies; Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1900-1916).
WCF	W. Cameron Forbes Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University.
WHT	William Howard Taft Papers, Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division.

moreover, that the key to the success of such social engineering was education.¹

Many aspects of American colonial policy have been subjected to close scrutiny (and a good deal of criticism) in recent years. American educational reforms have not. With the exception of an impressionistic piece by Renato Constantino on the "miseducation" of Filipinos, most studies of the Filipino-American encounter accept the notion that the educational reforms introduced by the Americans were of great value to Filipinos.² In fact, however, as the following examination of educational policy during the "Taft era" (1900-1913) will show, those reforms were poorly conceived and executed. American social engineers could not agree on the type of education best suited for Filipinos, and as a consequence, pursued contradictory policies. Furthermore, while the colonial administration assigned high priority to education, the reforms did not bring marked change.

The Americans built, in part, on Spanish foundations. Beginning in the 1860's, the Spanish government had attempted to introduce public primary education in every pueblo of the archipelago. No historian has, as yet, made a thorough study of the school system established by the Spaniards, so it is difficult to evaluate its impact. Existing accounts hint that the schools achieved mixed results. In some parts of the archipelago - Cebu and Iloilo, for example - the schools apparently functioned well. Moreover, annual enrollment in the primary schools totalled approximately 200,000 in the last years of Spanish rule. Still, it is apparent that those schools suffered from signal defects: an over-emphasis on memory work and religious instruction; often-inadequate instruction in Spanish; irregular attendance.³

1. For documentation on this point, see Glenn A. May, "America in the Philippines: The Shaping of Colonial Policy, 1898-1913" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1975), pp. 87-90.

2. Renato Constantino, "The Mis-education of the Filipino." in Renato Constantino and Ernesto Y. Sibal, *Should Our Schools Turn Out More "Filipinos"?* (Quezon City: Alemar-Phoenix Publishing House, 1966), pp. 1-15. The most recent scholarly monograph on the Fil-American encounter, Peter Stanley, *A Nation in the Making: The Philippines and the United States, 1899-1921* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974), lauds the American educational program. (See p. 85 of that study.)

3. On Spanish education, see Encarnacion Alzona, *A History of Education in the Philippines, 1565-1930* (Manila: University of the Philippines Press, 1932), pp. 63-121; Evergisto Bazaco, *History of Education in the Philippines* (2d ed.; Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press, 1953), pp. 197-259; Frederick W. Fox, "Some Notes on Public Elementary Education in Iloilo Province, 1885-1889," *Philippine Studies*, II, No. 1

The first American educators were soldiers. Even before the establishment of civil government in the Philippines, the American army devoted some of its energy to educating Filipino children in "pacified" areas. The military authorities purchased more than \$100,000 worth of school supplies. District commanders delegated soldiers to serve as teachers in many pueblos. The director of the army's educational program, Captain Albert Todd, even drew up a plan for a centralized system of public instruction. But, on the whole, the army's efforts were unsystematic: most soldier-teachers knew neither Spanish nor Philippine languages and were therefore incapable of communicating with their students; and attendance fluctuated considerably from one week to the next. Furthermore, as Todd himself admitted, the primary goal of the army's teaching program was not to educate Filipinos, but rather to pacify them by convincing them of American good will. The army's schools were, in effect, a mere adjunct of its military activities. Educational reforms designed to restructure Philippine society would come only after the introduction of American civil government.⁴

In June 1900, the Second Philippine Commission, destined to become the first civil government, arrived in Manila. The five-man delegation — William Howard Taft, Luke Wright, Henry C. Ide, Bernard Moses, and Dean C. Worcester — had received instructions from President McKinley to enact legislation on a wide range of subjects, including education. Yet while the Commission legally had charge of Philippine education, it did not play a major role in the making of educational policy. For most of the period 1900–1913, it delegated responsibility to directors of the educational bureau (Fred Atkinson, 1900–1902; Elmer Bryan, 1902–03; David Barrows, 1903–09; and Frank White, 1909–1913).

EDUCATION, 1900–1902: FRED ATKINSON

McKinley's instructions to the Philippine Commission had

(March 1954), 5–19; Frederick Fox and Juan Morcader, "Some Notes on Education in Cebu Province, 1820–1898," *Philippine Studies*, IX, No. 1 (January 1961), 20–46; and May, "America in the Philippines," Chapter I.

4. John Morgan Gates, *Schoolbooks and Krags: The United States Army in the Philippines, 1898–1902* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1973) attributes great significance to the army's educational activities. I challenge that view in May, "America in the Philippines," Chapter II.

provided only general guidelines on education:

It will be the duty of the Commission to promote and extend, and, as they find occasion, to improve the system of education already inaugurated by the military authorities. In doing this they should regard as of first importance the extension of a system of primary education which should be free to all, and *which shall tend to fit the people for the duties of citizenship and for the ordinary activities of a civilized community.* (Italics mine.)

The instructions did not specify how the schools would prepare the Filipinos for the "duties of citizenship." Nor did they enumerate the "ordinary activities" of a civilized community. Obviously the directors of the educational bureau could interpret those phrases in different ways, and could favor different means to achieve the vaguely-defined ends. The early pronouncements of the Commission on education also provided little guidance. Education, it asserted, was to assist the Filipinos in achieving "popular government."⁵ What type of education?

The directors of the educational bureau faced crucial choices. Government revenues were limited, and could finance no more than a brief primary education for most children. Under such circumstances, priorities were of great importance. How much purely academic training should be provided? To what extent should the schools attempt to prepare Filipinos for useful vocations? What sort of values should the schools attempt to impart to Filipinos? Such choices, ostensibly about methods, were really about the goals of American policy in the Philippines. The schools might, on the one hand, try to create an educated citizenry, capable of self-government; on the other, they might prepare Filipinos for productive labor and help to increase their earning power. The first man to make decisions was Fred W. Atkinson.

I

Six feet four inches tall and thirty-five years old, Fred Atkinson had been principal of the high school in Springfield, Massachusetts. At first glance, he seemed to be an unlikely choice for the directorship of the Philippine educational system: almost all his experience

5. For the instructions, see Dean C. Worcester, *The Philippines: Past and Present* (2 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1914), II, 986-87. For an example of the Commission's pronouncements, see *RPC*, 1901, I, 21.

had been in secondary school education, and it was obvious that the Americans would concentrate initially on primary education. Still, he had good credentials – an undergraduate degree from Harvard, a Ph.D. from Leipzig. And he was impressive. Before they had left for the Philippines, Taft and his fellow Commissioners had interviewed Atkinson and they were struck by his “thorough preparation in the modern educational methods.” Although the young principal had never managed a system of schools, the Commission decided to take a chance on him.⁶

He arrived in the Philippines at the end of July. After a few months of investigation, he submitted the draft of an education bill, which in early January 1901 received a careful reading in executive and public sessions. On January 21, 1901 after modifying certain provisions of Atkinson’s draft, the Commission passed Act 74, establishing the Bureau of Public Instruction, with Atkinson at its head.⁷

Act 74 provided for a centralized system of public primary schools, consisting of ten (later eighteen, then thirty-six) school divisions, each under the supervision of a division superintendent; empowered the General Superintendent (Atkinson) to hire one thousand trained American teachers; authorized the division superintendents to appoint Filipino teachers for the schools within their districts; and provided for the establishment of normal, agricultural, and trade schools. The cost of the educational system was to be divided between the insular government and local authorities: from the insular treasury (which relied on customs duties for most of its revenue), the Commission would pay the salaries and transportation expenses of American teachers, purchase textbooks, and absorb all expenses of the Bureau of Public Instruction and the normal, agricultural, and trade schools; with money raised by local taxation, municipalities would build and repair schoolhouses and pay the salaries of Filipino teachers.⁸

6. *Springfield Daily Republican*, May 26, 1900; Taft to Charles W. Eliot, March 2, 1900 and March 14, 1900, CWE, Box 123, Folder 280; Taft to Charles P. Taft, April 23, 1900, WHT, Series 1, Box 31; Taft to Atkinson, April 24, 1900, and Taft to Eliot, June 16, 1900, WHT, Series 3, Box 62.

7. Atkinson submitted recommendations to the Commission on November 1, 1900, which he subsequently incorporated into the draft of the education bill. The recommendations and his draft can both be found in “Present Educational Movement,” pp. 24–45.

8. U.S., Philippine Commission, *Public Laws and Resolutions Passed by the United States Philippine Commission* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901), pp. 123–27.

Three additional features of the education bill merit extended comment: the provision for religious instruction, the establishment of English as the language of instruction, and the commitment to widespread education.

Atkinson had favored nonsectarian schools. Section 18 of his draft read: "No religious denomination shall have the right to teach its particular faith in schools partly or wholly supported by public funds."⁹ But in the weeks before the passage of the education bill, some members of the Commission began to question the wisdom of completely secularizing the schools. The public sessions substantiated their worst fears: priests and devout Catholics, most of them Filipinos, asserted that parents would boycott nonsectarian public schools. Manuel Ravago, speaking on behalf of the Centro Católico de Filipinas, presented the most extreme demands:

1. That all primary teachers throughout the Archipelago should be Catholics.
2. That as long as the Catholic religion continued to be the universal religion professed in the Philippines, it, and none other, should be taught in the schools.
3. That this religious instruction should form a part of the daily instruction which the teacher should be compelled to impart to the children who attended the school.¹⁰

Filipino opponents of religious instruction were equally obdurate. Tomas G. del Rosario, representing the Federal Party, insisted that "the schools and the church should be kept absolutely distinct." Xeresy Burgos declared that religious instruction "would engender strife and bitterness and bring to the surface again all the ills against which the Filipinos had struggled, and from which they now believed themselves free."¹¹

The Commission divided on the religious issue. Moses and Ide favored the complete elimination of religious instruction from the schools. The majority of the Commission, Taft, Worcester, and Wright, voted for a compromise provision, which prohibited teachers from discussing religion during class periods, but

9. "Present Educational Movement," p. 42.

10. Taft to Charles P. Taft, January 14, 1901, WHT, Series 1, Box 32; PS, Vol. I, 145-46. Felipe Calderon stated that, if the bill did not contain a provision allowing priests to teach in the schools, "within five days, there would not be a child in attendance" (Vol. I, 152).

11. PS, Vol. I, 134, 139.

stipulated that on three days a week, after regular school hours, a priest, minister, or designated teacher of religion could conduct religious instruction in the school building. Taft argued: "It was of the highest importance that the Filipino people should understand that the Commission did not come here to change the religion of anybody, and if they could be made to understand this . . . , then it would be worth all the inconvenience or occasional friction between over-zealous priests and tactless teachers which might possibly occur."¹² Thus, the Commission adopted the compromise section on religious instruction largely to make the public schools more attractive to Filipinos.

Section 14 of the education bill read: "The English language shall, as soon as practicable, be made the basis of all public school instruction, and soldiers may be detailed as instructors until such time as they may be replaced by trained teachers." In deciding to teach English, Atkinson and the Commission were disregarding a cardinal rule of European colonial practice in Asia. The British in India, Burma, and the Malay States, the Dutch in Java, even the French, supposedly committed to a policy of assimilation in Cochinchina, had restricted education in western languages to a small indigenous elite.

Atkinson himself had, at first, leaned toward instruction in Philippine languages.¹³ Captain Todd had, on the other hand, recommended the use of English in the schools. McKinley's instructions on the subject prescribed a middle course: initially, instruction in "the language of the people," and gradually, the introduction of English.¹⁴

After a few months in the islands, Atkinson too advocated instruction in English. He asserted, on the basis of reports submitted by military commanders, that most Filipinos were anxious to learn English. Teaching a Philippine language was impractical, in his opinion, because "it would necessitate the setting of a large corps of translators at work, putting not merely school primers but large numbers of books of every sort into all the principal

12. Taft to Root, January 13, 1901, WHT, Series 8: Philippine Commission; Taft to Charles P. Taft, January 14, 1901, WHT, Series 1, Box 32; Taft to Mrs. Bellamy Storer, January 18, 1901, WHT, Series 3, Box 64; PS, Vol. I, 173-79.

13. *Springfield Daily Republican*, May 26, 1900.

14. U.S., War Department, *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1901* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901), I, Part X, 221; Worcester, *The Philippines*, II, 987.

dialects." He ruled out Spanish because "only a small proportion of the native population understand much Spanish." The Commission agreed with Atkinson's reasoning, and as a result, the education bill provided for instruction in English.¹⁵

That decision was not universally popular. *Ilustrados* and a sizable segment of the *principalía* spoke Spanish, and before the Revolution, had sent their children to private schools run by religious orders where Spanish was the language of instruction. No doubt, the decision to use English made the American-run schools unattractive to some of the elite. In subsequent years, many *ilustrados* and *principales* continued to send their children to private schools. Yet, it should be noted that for the elite the medium of instruction was not the only objectionable feature of the public schools. Many probably opted for private schools for religious reasons — to provide their children with a Catholic education; and perhaps some chose private schools in order to keep their children out of contact with children from lower social classes.

In any case, American policy-makers could not, realistically, have chosen Spanish as the medium of instruction. It made no sense to reject English in favor of a language which only a small percentage of the population understood. What is more, it would have been too costly for the United States to hire enough qualified Spanish-speaking teachers to supervise the instruction.

The education bill provided that the General Superintendent of Public Instruction "shall establish schools in every pueblo in the archipelago where practicable, and shall reorganize those already established where such reorganization is necessary." That provision committed the insular government to a widespread system of education. Atkinson had, in fact, wanted more. In November 1900, he advised the Commission:

Primary instruction should be obligatory for all children between the ages of 6 and 12 years. Parents who fail to conform should be compelled to do so by fines. This will be hard to carry out for some time yet, but in the larger cities great effort should be made to enforce such attendance laws.¹⁶

The Federal Party had also advocated compulsory attendance at the public schools.¹⁷ But the Commission ultimately decided

15. "Present Educational Movement," pp. 28-29.

16. "Present Educational Movement," p. 30.

17. PS, Vol. I, 132-33.

against compulsion because, in January 1901, school facilities were "entirely inadequate to provide for the children of school age, if such a provision was enforced."¹⁸

II

After the passage of Act 74 the Commission played a negligible role in the making of educational policy. Technically, Bernard Moses, in his capacity of Secretary of Public Instruction, was Atkinson's direct superior, charged with supervising the activities of the Bureau of Public Instruction. But Moses had other responsibilities: attending daily sessions of the Commission, traveling with the other Commissioners on trips throughout the archipelago, investigating the tariff question. Moreover, Moses was lazy. He took little notice of Atkinson's work and left no mark on the Philippine educational system.¹⁹

The education bill authorized the General Superintendent to hire one thousand trained American teachers at monthly salaries of not less than 75 nor more than 125 dollars. Such salaries were, on the whole, higher than those earned by teachers in the United States: in 1900, monthly salaries for male teachers in rural areas averaged 54 dollars, and for female teachers in rural areas, 40 dollars; in urban areas, male teachers earned an average of 138 dollars a month, and female teachers 62 dollars a month.²⁰ By offering high salaries, the insular government was certain to attract a sufficient number of candidates.

Atkinson decided to appoint approximately half the teachers himself, and to delegate authority for appointing the rest to presidents of various colleges and normal schools in the United States and to officials in certain states. For several months Atkinson and the appointing authorities sifted through more than 8,000 personal applications and made their selections. Eighty of the appointees came from the ranks of discharged soldiers in the

18. *Ibid.*, p. 133.

19. On Moses, see Taft to Root, July 5, 1902, WHT, Series 8: Philippine Commission; David Barrows to Jesse Burks, January 27, 1903, DB, Outgoing Correspondence; and Moses to Taft, August 1, 1902, Bernard Moses Papers, Bancroft Library, University of California at Berkeley, Carton 2.

20. R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, *A History of Education in American Culture* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1953), p. 454.

Philippines. The majority came from the United States aboard army transports. The *Sheridan* arrived in June with forty-eight teachers, and a group of similar size traveled on the *Buford*. Finally, on August 21, 1901, the army transport *Thomas* entered Manila Bay with 523 teachers aboard.²¹

The *Log of the Thomas*, which contains information about 509 of the "Thomasites" (368 men, 141 women), indicates that they were a variegated lot. They came from all parts of the United States, with New York, Massachusetts, Michigan, and California providing the largest contingents. Of the 509 teachers, 31 had only high school diplomas; 121 had received normal school training; while the remainder had attended college. There were 107 with no teaching experience; 117 had 1-2 years of experience; 102, 3-4 years; 145, 5-10 years; and 38 had more than 10 years.²² A host of different motives induced them to go to the Philippines. Some were moved by missionary zeal. Others had more prosaic reasons: reunion with a husband or fiancé; the need of a job; a desire for travel or adventure.²³

By the end of September almost all the appointed teachers had arrived, received a briefing about their responsibilities, and left for their stations. Now, it seemed, real education — teaching designed to edify the Filipino, rather than pacify him, as the military authorities had tried to do — could begin in earnest.

111

From the start, critical problems threatened the educational system. In many communities, priests denounced the compromise formula on religious instruction, and accused the American teachers, most of whom were Protestants, of attempting to proselytize their pupils.²⁴ Renewed military activity or simple banditry

21. Fred Atkinson, "The Educational Problem in the Philippines," *Atlantic Monthly*, LXXXIX, No. 533 (March 1902), 364; F. W. Nash, "Education in the Philippines," *Educational Review*, XXII, No. 3 (October 1901), 220-221; "Present Educational Movement," *passim*.

22. James D. Barry, *The Log of the Thomas*, cited in Amparo S. Lardizabal, "Pioneer American Teachers and Philippine Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1956), pp. 16-22.

23. Lardizabal, "Pioneer American Teachers," pp. 22-32.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 134; Nash, "Education in the Philippines," p. 224. Exact figures on the religious affiliation of the American teachers are not available. However, it is clear that

occasionally closed the schools.²⁵ Furthermore, most of the municipalities were indigent, since agricultural production had virtually ceased during the war, and they could afford neither to pay the salaries of Filipino teachers nor to provide adequate schoolhouses.²⁶

The American teachers complained of loneliness, homesickness, the difficulties of adjustment, and they were very dissatisfied with the General Superintendent of Public Instruction. Atkinson was a poor administrator. From Atkinson's office flowed a constant stream of circulars on trivial subjects (dress, haircuts, manners) to his newly appointed teachers. Many protested that he was treating them like children.²⁷ A disagreement about salaries was a greater source of dissatisfaction. The Bureau had contracted to pay salaries in dollars, but when the teachers reached their stations, they learned that they were to be paid in the local currency, the Mexican peso, which had been depreciating at a steady rate. In addition, the Bureau was so disorganized that the teachers received their salaries several weeks late. "Atkinson is both incapable and dishonorable," wrote one teacher to his parents. Unable to secure redress from the General Superintendent, many of the teachers began to air their grievances in the pages of the *Manila Times*.²⁸

Gradually, the Commission too lost confidence in Atkinson. Taft wrote to his brother Horace in May 1901:

Confidentially, Atkinson is not what the Commission hoped for Atkinson has already begun to talk of an advance in salary above six thousand dollars, which he receives. I gently intimated to him that if I were he I would not refer such a request to the Commission until he had demonstrated his ability to control the situation by an inauguration of

an overwhelming majority were Protestants. See Sister Mary Dorita Clifford, "Religion and the Public Schools in the Philippines, 1899-1906" in Gerald H. Anderson, ed., *Studies in Philippine Church History* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1969), pp. 301-324; also, James Smith to John Ireland, November 14, 1902, James F. Smith Papers, Washington State Historical Society (Tacoma); and various enclosures in NA, RG 350, File 1534.

25. *RDE*, 1903, pp. 726, 800.

26. *RPC*, 1901, II, 531; *RPC*, 1902, II, 970-72; Atkinson to Eliot, September 25, 1901, *CWE*, Box 123, Folder 396.

27. Some of the circulars can be found in Miscellaneous Folders, BFM. See also Teachers of English to Editor, *Manila Times*, May 20, 1902.

28. *Manila Times*, May 20, June 12, and June 17, 1902; Theodore de Laguna, "Education in the Philippines," *Gunton's Magazine*, XXIV, No. 3 (March 1903), 227-28; Lardizabal, "Pioneer American Teachers," pp. 146-47; Atkinson to Eliot, June 9, 1901, *CWE*, Box 123, Folder 396; Diary Entry of May 14, 1902, BFM, Diary; Moore to parents, June 10, 1902, BFM, Correspondence.

the system of schools. I should think that such an opportunity as he has would make him think of anything but salary He lacks, it seems to me, in force.²⁹

While he should have been implementing the education bill, the General Superintendent seemed interested, most of all, in living the good life. He traveled to Hong Kong and Japan; he spent money freely; he and his wife were regulars on Manila's dinner party circuit.³⁰

The education bill authorized the General Superintendent to fix a course of study for Philippine public schools: in effect, to decide how best to fit the Filipinos "for the duties of citizenship and for the ordinary activities of a civilized community." Yet Atkinson made only minimal progress along those lines.

During his twenty-six months in the Philippines, he made four different attempts to formulate a course of study. The last one, published as a pamphlet entitled "Suggestive Course of Study," outlined a four-year primary course. In each of the four years, teachers were to provide instruction in reading, language, spelling, arithmetic, geography, nature study, drawing, sewing, physical training, hygiene, music, writing, and "rhetoricals." History (primarily the history of the United States) was to be taught in grades two to four.³¹

In fact, the course of study recommended by Atkinson for Philippine schools was not substantially different from curricula then prescribed in Massachusetts elementary schools.³² The General Superintendent apparently did not realize that certain adaptations would be necessary: that Filipino children, learning a new language, would not be able to absorb as much information as American children; that the subject matter should be geared to Filipino interests. His suggestions for classwork in third-year history began:

29. Taft to Horace Taft, May 19, 1901, WHT, Series 1, Box 33.

30. Atkinson to Eliot, March 6 and June 19, 1901, CWE, Box 123, Folder 396; Bernard Moses to Taft, March 10, 1902, WHT, Series 3, Box 70; Taft to Horace D. Taft, February 16 and May 19, 1901, WHT, Series 1, Boxes 32-33.

31. "Suggestive Course of Study: 1902," NA, RG 350, File 2618-10. Atkinson wrote it in March 1902, according to his annual report of 1902. (See *RPC*, 1902, II, 968.)

32. For a survey of courses of study in Massachusetts elementary schools, see John T. Prince, "A Preliminary Report Upon a Course of Studies for Elementary Schools," in Massachusetts, Board of Education, *Sixtieth Annual Report: 1895-96* (Boston: Wright & Potter, 1897). Prince included a table (p. 441) showing what subjects were taught in elementary schools of sixty cities, many of them in Massachusetts. The curricula generally corresponded to that of Atkinson - except on one point. In most of the schools surveyed by Prince, history was not offered until grade five or six.

Give the life story of some of the world's great men. Explain simply the most obvious effect each life has had upon the world.

Both story and explanation should be brought so clearly and simply before the child that he can readily understand them.

Such men as Washington, Lincoln, McKinley, Gladstone, and Rizal can be made living realities to the child if skillfully presented, and will serve as the basis for lessons on patriotism.³³

The textbooks which Atkinson ordered for the primary schools were poorly adapted to Philippine conditions. The *Baldwin Readers*, widely used in the United States, pictured lily-white American children and hard-working middle-class parents, living in sturdy wooden homes in prosperous American towns and cities.³⁴ Atkinson himself admitted:

The problem of selecting suitable text books for Filipino children has been a difficult one The teachers, almost without exception, found the books undesirable for the reason that they dealt with things unfamiliar to the Filipino child. The stories and pictures were those of a different environment, intended for children of a different country. Such words as "strawberry," "Jack Frost," and "fairy" possess little significance for the children of the Philippines.³⁵

He decided in 1902 that it was necessary to procure a set of primary readers "prepared expressly for the Filipinos."³⁶

IV

Atkinson made minimal progress, as well, in one area which he considered particularly important. In his first interview with the Commission, he had mentioned that education in the Philippines should be utilitarian. Shortly afterward, in a newspaper interview, he asserted that the Philippine educational system would place heavy emphasis on industrial education.³⁷

33. "Suggestive Course of Study: 1902," NA, RG 350, File 2618-10.

34. James Baldwin, *School Reading by Grades* (8 vols.; New York: American Book Company, 1897). Atkinson issued 50,000 Baldwin *Primers*, 30,000 Baldwin *First Years*, and 15,000 *Second Readers* in the school year 1901-1902 (*RPC*, 1902, II, 968).

35. *RPC*, 1902, II, 967. Teachers often commented on the inadequacy of those texts. See, for example, John C. Muerman, "Philippine Schools Under the Americans" (Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1922), p. 64.

36. *RPC*, 1902, II, 967.

37. *Springfield Daily Republican*, May 26, 1900; *Boston Record*, August 6, 1900; *Manila Times*, June 20 and June 29, 1900.

The term "industrial education" actually described two principal types of instruction: manual and vocational training.³⁸ Manual training, offered mainly in the lower grades, taught basic motor skills. Children learned to make simple objects - boxes, toy boats, and kites. In the later years of the elementary course they learned weaving, leatherwork, and other simple handicrafts. Secondary schools offered vocational training, where students could learn specific skills and trades (carpentry, metalwork, etc.).

At the beginning of the twentieth century, industrial education was in vogue. Manual training classes had first appeared in the United States in the 1830's, but the industrial education movement did not begin to blossom until the 1870's and 1880's. In 1900, 144 schools in the United States concentrated exclusively on manual and industrial education, including the Mechanic Arts High School of Springfield, Massachusetts. Thousands more offered some form of industrial work. In Massachusetts alone, primary schools in thirty-seven different cities offered manual training.³⁹ All of those schools provided potential models for the industrial training to be introduced in the Philippines.

Yet Atkinson had one particular model in mind. In April 1900 he wrote to Booker T. Washington: "Education in the Philippines must be along industrial lines and any and all suggestions from you and your work will be invaluable."⁴⁰ During the month of May he visited Tuskegee and the Hampton Institute.⁴¹ Moreover, a few months after his arrival in the Philippines, he reported to the Commission: "That the Filipinos may be taught those things for which they have a capacity, i.e., industrial and mechanical pursuits, there should be established throughout the Philippine Islands schools of agriculture. It will be necessary to send to our agricultural colleges for instructors These instructors should follow the plan of work of Hampton and Tuskegee."⁴²

38. For background on industrial education see Charles A. Bennett, *History of Manual and Industrial Education up to 1870* (Peoria, Illinois: Manual Arts Press, 1926), and *History of Manual and Industrial Education: 1870-1917* (Peoria, Illinois: Manual Arts Press, 1937).

39. U.S., Commissioner of Education, *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900* (2 vols.; Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901), II, 2437-38.

40. Atkinson to Booker T. Washington, April 8, 1900, Booker T. Washington Papers, Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Container 166.

41. Taft to Atkinson, April 24, 1900, WHF, Series 3, Box 62; *Springfield Daily Republican*, May 26, 1900.

42. "Present Educational Movement," pp. 33-34.

Founded shortly before the heyday of the industrial education movement, both Hampton and Tuskegee offered vocational and teacher training courses. Like most vocational schools, both emphasized the social and pedagogical values of industrial work. But they differed in several respects from other American industrial schools. Their students were Indians and southern Negroes, who generally entered those schools with little previous training. The courses of study at Hampton and Tuskegee placed considerable emphasis on agricultural instruction.⁴³

What also distinguished those schools from others was what white Americans thought about them. After reading some articles by Booker T. Washington in *The Outlook*, Horace Taft wrote to brother William: "If you have a chance to read them you would better do so He must be a rare man. Won't you go in for industrial education in the Philippines? Certainly there is no other education for a race like the Negroes that compares with that in its effect upon character and race deficiency."⁴⁴ White Americans found industrial education for blacks appealing, according to August Meier, because it seemed to relegate blacks to an inferior position in society.⁴⁵

Educators at those schools helped to shape the popular image. An air of missionary paternalism pervaded Hampton. General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, its founder, believed that industrial education was particularly beneficial for "backward" and "dependent" races.⁴⁶ The ideas of Booker T. Washington pervaded Tuskegee. White America knew Washington not as the complex man of many faces, described in Louis Harlan's biography, but as a black man who accepted segregation, opposed black militancy, and asserted that industrial education at Tuskegee was valuable "in teaching economy, thrift and the dignity of labor and giving moral backbone to the students."⁴⁷

43. Max B. Thrasher, *Tuskegee* (Boston: Small, Maynard & Co., 1900); Francis G. Peabody, *Education for Life: The Story of Hampton Institute* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1919); Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, *Catalogue of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, 1899-1900* (Hampton, Virginia: Hampton Institute Press, 1900); Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, *Annual Catalogue of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, 1903-1904* (n.p., 1903).

44. Horace Taft to William H. Taft, February 19, 1901, WHT, Series 1, Box 32.

45. August Meier, *Negro Thought in America: 1880-1915* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ann Arbor Paperbacks of the University of Michigan Press, 1963), p. 99.

46. *Ibid.*, p. 88.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 50. For an excellent picture of the many faces of Booker T. Washington, see Louis R. Harlan, *Booker T. Washington* (New York: Oxford University Press,

Atkinson's decision to use Tuskegee and Hampton as models was characteristic of many decisions by American policy-makers in the Philippines. The General Superintendent knew about white America's recent experience with other races; and in deciding how to educate Filipinos, he was consciously trying to avoid mistakes which, he felt, a previous generation had made. He wrote:

In this system we must beware the possibility of overdoing the matter of higher education and unfitting the Filipino for practical work. We should heed the lesson taught us in our reconstruction period when we started to educate the negro. The education of the masses here must be an agricultural and industrial one, after the pattern of our Tuskegee Institute at home.⁴⁸

Atkinson, like many other American policy-makers, came close to equating the Filipinos with America's racial minorities.

But Atkinson's accomplishments in the area of industrial education were negligible. At the end of 1902, there was only one trade school, with 149 pupils, in the entire archipelago. "Industrial education has not progressed rapidly," admitted Fred Atkinson, as he prepared to leave the Philippines.⁴⁹

It had progressed slowly, in part, because the Bureau of Education, under Atkinson's direction, was poorly prepared to carry it out. In 1901, the Bureau had difficulty in acquiring tools and appliances, and even at the end of 1902, the woodworking department of the trade school had, in Atkinson's words, "a scant outfit."⁵⁰ Equally serious was the initial indifference of many Filipinos to industrial education. Bernard Moses, Secretary of Public Instruction, asserted: "... industrial education has met, and will continue to meet with certain obstacles. The people have been accustomed under their earlier instruction to regard education as a means of putting themselves in positions where manual labor is not required."⁵¹

Atkinson made no more headway in introducing industrial education in the primary schools. The "Suggestive Course of Study" made no provision for manual training, although drawing and sewing classes were prescribed for all four years of the primary course.

1972). For a quick view of Washington's public image, see Booker T. Washington, *Up From Slavery* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1901).

48. "Present Educational Movement," p. 414.

49. *RPC*, 1902, II, 904.

50. "Present Educational Movement," p. 356.

51. *RPC*, 1902, II, 881-82; Lardizabal, "Pioneer American Teachers," p. 137.

V

By the end of the first school year (April 1902), enrollment in Philippine schools had climbed to 200,000.⁵² But that figure was deceptive. Attendance fluctuated from week to week, and it plummeted at harvest time.⁵³ What is more, the school system was not providing education to those who needed it most, children in the barrios, who had been bypassed by the Spanish educational system. Bernard Moses wrote in his report for 1902:

There are many small towns and villages in the interior of the islands which are too poor to pay Filipino teachers sufficient salaries to induce those of proper attainments to come from the larger towns to engage in teaching, and which have among their inhabitants no persons of sufficient attainments to warrant their employment in the schools. These places are not of sufficient importance to make it wise for the government to support in them American teachers.⁵⁴

A problem encountered by many of the "Thomasites" during that first school year concerned the Filipino teachers. Division superintendents had appointed more than two thousand Filipino teachers — most of them *maestros* during the Spanish period. In the orientation sessions at Manila, Atkinson told the American teachers not to usurp the position of the native teachers: Filipinos would do most of the teaching; the Americans were to teach only English, and to spend an hour a day instructing the native teachers.⁵⁵ But the "Thomasites" soon discovered that the Filipino teachers, especially the older ones, were unaccustomed to American methods of instruction. "The old teachers were strongly inclined to the traditional customs of Spanish days . . . maintaining that 'memory work was all there was to education,' that reasoning and analysis had no part in a true education." As a result, the American teachers conducted most of the classwork during that first year.⁵⁶

The American teacher's first day in a Philippine school was often a rude shock:

I went across the plaza and found two one-story buildings of stone with

52. *RPC*, 1902, II, 903.

53. Muerman, "Philippine Schools," p. 9.

54. *RPC*, 1902, II, 879.

55. Diary Entry of August 28, 1901, BFM, Diary; Muerman, "Philippine Schools," p. 54; *RPC*, 1902, II, 962-64.

56. Muerman, "Philippine Schools," p. 55; Mary H. Fee, *A Woman's Impressions of the Philippines* (Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1910), p. 84; *Manila Times*, January 23, 1902; William Edmonds to Atkinson, May 29, 1902, William Edmonds Collection, Yale University Library, Manuscripts and Archives.

an American flag floating over one, and a noise which resembled the din of a boiler factory issuing from it. The noise was the vociferous outcry of one hundred and eighty-nine Filipino youths engaged in study or at least in a high, throaty clamor, over and over again, of their assigned lessons.⁵⁷ Under the Spanish system of education, teachers had encouraged students to study aloud, even when a member of the class was reciting.

One teacher in Capiz and another in Pangasinan complained that goats were wont to wander through the classroom.⁵⁸ Many claimed that the children came late and left when they pleased.⁵⁹ "The greater part of your first year will be taken up in teaching discipline," a teacher wrote to his parents in 1902.⁶⁰

In the second school year, which began in June 1902, problems continued to plague the educational system. Teachers in the provinces ignored the Bureau's circulars and Atkinson's "Suggestive Course of Study."⁶¹ As in the first year, they concentrated almost exclusively on teaching English — with mixed results. Theodore de Laguna, stationed in Misamis, asserted that many students eventually quit the schools because they found English so difficult. Yet another teacher, assigned to Lingayen, Pangasinan, wrote to the *Manila Times*: "Most encouraging is the attitude of the young native children toward instruction in English . . . They advance rapidly, and have little trouble in mastering the pronunciation."⁶²

Clearly, the success of the American educational effort varied — and would continue to vary — from province to province. One important variable was the attitude of the American teachers. Most scholarly studies of the Philippine educational system present the "Thomasites" as hard-working and altruistic.⁶³ Certainly many

57. Fee, *A Woman's Impressions*, p. 80.

58. Fee, *A Woman's Impressions*, p. 81; Levona P. Newsom, "The Filipino at School," *The Outlook*, LXXII, No. 7 (October 18, 1902), 412.

59. Lardizabal, "Pioneer American Teachers," p. 137; Newsom, "Filipino at School," p. 412; *Manila Times*, December 14, 1901.

60. Blaine F. Moore to parents, September 9, 1902, BFM, Correspondence.

61. See, for example, Robert B. Vaile, "A Teacher's Notes on the Schools of the Philippine Islands," in U.S., Commissioner of Education, *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ending June 30, 1905* (2 vols.; Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1907), I, 363. Also, Newsom, "Filipino at School," p. 413; and Blaine F. Moore to parents, September 9, 1902, BFM, Correspondence.

62. De Laguna, "Education in the Philippines," pp. 220–21; *Manila Times*, April 1, 1902. See also "Present Educational Movement," pp. 122–23.

63. See, for example, Lardizabal, "Pioneer American Teachers;" Muerman, "Philip-

were.⁶⁴ But one disgruntled teacher claimed that his colleagues were “a regiment of carpet-baggers, come to exploit the country in their small way.”⁶⁵ An example of the latter type was Blaine Free Moore.

A “Thomasite” who taught in Philippine schools until 1906, Moore was far more interested in undertaking mining ventures than in “being shut up with a lot of little brown kids.” He wrote to his parents in August 1902: “If there was nothing but school teaching to keep me here I would leave on the next boat.” Moore was, in addition, wholly unsympathetic to the aims of the insular government: the American administration was, in his eyes, pursuing a “pernicious” policy of “teaching these people that they are as good as anybody, that this country is for them and the Americans are here only for their benefit. . .” He described his pupils in Moncada, Tarlac as “170 wriggling, squirming, talking barbarians”; his Filipino assistants were “weak on discipline”; the Filipino teachers who attended a provincial normal school in Tarlac were “brown half-savages.” Moore – and, in fact, many American teachers in the Philippines – frequently referred to Filipinos as “niggers.” He wrote home in September 1903: “If these people don’t improve it will show the absolute uselessness of this ‘benevolent’ business and prove that the only way to manage these people is the way they understand and one to which they will respond much quicker, viz, a show of force.” Despite his extensive extracurricular activities and his patent contempt for Filipinos, Blaine Free Moore rose to the post of acting division superintendent for Zambales.⁶⁶

Equally important as the attitude of American teachers was that of Filipino communities. W. H. Hilts, division superintendent for Ambos Camarines, Albay, and Sorsogon, reported that priests, hostile to the government schools, were organizing schools of

pine Schools;” and Geronima T. Pecson and Maria Racelis, eds., *Tales of American Teachers in the Philippines* (Manila: Carmelo and Bauermann, 1959).

64. John A. Larkin provides examples of such teachers in *The Pampangans: Colonial Society in a Philippine Province* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 150–57. Books written by the teachers themselves tend to be self-congratulatory, e.g., Ralph Kent Buckland, *In the Land of the Filipino* (New York: Every Where Publishing Co., 1912), and William B. Freer, *The Philippine Experiences of an American Teacher* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1906).

65. De Laguna, “Education in the Philippines,” p. 224.

66. Moore to parents, January 28, 1902; February 22, 1902; April 2, 1902; August 28, 1902; July 5, 1903; July 25, 1903; August 23, 1903; September 4, 1903; July 8, 1904, BFM, Correspondence. For another example of such attitudes, see *Manila Times*, March 30, 1903.

their own.⁶⁷ Furthermore, rival schools of a different kind were flourishing. Several division superintendents reported that *principales* were sending their children to private schools, either in the provinces or in Manila.⁶⁸ During the period June 1901 to April 1902, twenty-seven new private schools sprang up in Manila alone.⁶⁹ In the early spring of 1903, there were 1,004 private and 325 religious schools in the archipelago (compared to 1,633 public schools), with a combined enrollment of 90,023.⁷⁰

In addition, many Filipino communities were simply too poor to support the public schools. In the school year 1902-03, all the municipalities of Ambos Camarines, with a population of 229,405, contributed only 12,552 pesos for the support of the schools. Manila, with approximately the same population, contributed 221,025 pesos.⁷¹ Lower contributions meant fewer schools, inadequate schoolhouses, and poorly-paid Filipino teachers.

VI

In the late fall of 1902 Taft finally decided to dismiss Atkinson. Moses — in Taft's eyes "the least valuable member of the Commission" — was eased out of his job at the same time.⁷²

The change in personnel did not yield immediate results. Elmer Bryan, who became General Superintendent in December 1902, was a better administrator than his predecessor, but the problems which he and the entire insular administration faced in the school year 1902-1903 were staggering. Cholera and small-pox; locusts and *ladrones*; and an outbreak of rinderpest, which eventually killed ninety percent of the carabaos in the archipelago, all combined to arrest the development of the educational system.⁷³ In the spring of 1903, attendance in the public primary schools had dropped to approximately 150,000. Bryan had only

67. "Present Educational Movement," p. 141.

68. *Ibid.*, pp. 103, 156.

69. *Ibid.*, pp. 407-409.

70. *Census of the Philippine Islands, 1903* (4 vols.; Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1905), III, 671.

71. *Ibid.*, III, 692.

72. Taft to Root, July 5, 1902, WHT, Series 8: Philippine Commission; Taft to Arthur T. Hadley, November 25, 1902, and Bernard Moses to Martin Egan, December 12, 1902, WHT, Series 3, Box 74.

73. The reports by division superintendents for the school year 1902-1903 recount

begun to get the feel of the job when he was felled by a serious illness, and forced to resign.

EDUCATION, 1903-1909: DAVID BARROWS

On August 14, 1903, the Commission turned over the floundering educational bureau to David Prescott Barrows. Trained as an anthropologist (his doctoral thesis at the University of Chicago was a study of the ethnobotany of the Coahuila Indians of southern California), he had already spent three years in the Philippines, first as superintendent of schools for Manila, later as head of the Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes.⁷⁴

The new superintendent immediately set out to transform the Philippine educational system. In his first annual report, written only a month after he assumed office, he announced: "The greatest danger at present menacing the success of our schools is that, pleased with the capacity and cleverness of the youth of the cultivated class, and desirous of forwarding his success along the higher levels of education, we may forget the primary and essential importance of educating the child of the peasant." Barrows feared that an uneducated peasantry would always be subordinate to the *principalía*. "The race lends itself naturally and without protest to the blind leadership of the aristocracy." In his view, the principal aim of the American educational system, and indeed of American civil government, was the destruction of *caciquismo* (the abuse of power by members of the elite); and the first step in that direction was to extend the system of education to the *barrios*. "It is in these rural areas that the great mass of the population finds its home. These are the centers of ignorance, and they perpetuate the ignorance and poverty of the race." The goal of the Bureau of Education became "universal primary instruction for the Filipinos of all classes and every community."⁷⁵

Barrows' early pronouncements on educational policy were filled with references to *caciques* and *taos*, but while the words

the difficulties of that period (*RDE*, 1903, pp. 740-41, 748-49, 753, 755-56, 760-61, 763, 768, 789, 798-805).

74. For a sketch of Barrows' life, see *Philippine Education*, VI, No. 6 (November 1909), 12-13.

75. *RDE*, 1903, pp. 698, 704.

had a distinctly Filipino ring, the ideas were grounded in traditional American educational and political theory. David Barrows was fundamentally a Jeffersonian. Like Jefferson he believed that universal education was the necessary precondition for the success of popular government. Also like Jefferson he looked to the school system to break down class barriers, to create an educated, independent yeomanry.⁷⁶ He wrote in 1903:

I believe we should . . . seek to develop in the Philippines, not a proletariat, but everywhere the peasant proprietor Wherever we find the Filipino the possessor of his own small holding there we find him industrious and contributing largely to the productive industry of the islands Now it is with this peasant-proprietor class particularly in mind, and trusting in the outcome of our efforts to increase this class, that we must lay out our course of primary instruction.⁷⁷

Finally, in the Jeffersonian tradition, Barrows wanted to provide a predominantly "literary" education for young Filipinos — to emphasize academic subjects, at the expense of manual training. Although the new General Superintendent agreed that the tao had to learn the value of manual labor, he argued that an over-emphasis on industrial education would change the islands for the worse; that many of the Americans who advocated such training for the Filipinos — particularly American promoters and investors already in the Philippines — were anxious to create "a great body of unskilled labor, dependent for living upon its daily wage, willing to work in great gangs, submissive to the rough handling of the 'boss.'"⁷⁸

I

Barrows made three major changes in the educational system during the school year 1903–04. First, he reduced the primary course to three years. He wanted simply to give some education to more Filipinos, and he reckoned, in effect, that the facilities

76. For Jefferson's ideas on education, see Roy J. Honeywell, *The Educational Work of Thomas Jefferson* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931); Merle Curti, *The Social Ideas of American Educators* (rev. ed.; Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1959), pp. 40–47; Paul L. Ford, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (10 vols.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1892–99), II, 220–29.

77. *RDE*, 1903, p. 702.

78. *Ibid.*, pp. 701–02.

which provided four years of education to 300,000 students could provide three years to 400,000 students.⁷⁹

Second, he altered the roles of both American and Filipino teachers. Once schools were organized in the barrios, it became impossible for American teachers to conduct the actual primary instruction. Beginning in 1904, the Bureau of Education assigned them to two different kinds of work: supervising school districts; and teaching in intermediate, secondary, or vocational schools.⁸⁰ Thereafter Filipino teachers took charge of primary instruction, and the educational bureau worked overtime to attract qualified Filipinos into the teaching profession. Most of the new teachers were primary school graduates, who continued to receive regular instruction from their American supervisors and who attended summer normal institutes in the provincial capitals.⁸¹

Finally, he revised, and greatly simplified, the course of study. In line with the superintendent's predilection for literary education, the new course of study prescribed heavy doses of reading, writing, spelling, object work, and phonetics.⁸² Moreover, to assist the teachers in the literary work, the educational bureau introduced a new set of primary texts, prepared by American publishing houses and written by teachers in the Philippines expressly for Philippine schools.⁸³

79. *RDE*, 1904, pp. 11-12.

80. *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24; *The Philippine Teacher*, I, No. 1 (December 15, 1904), 2; Freer, *Philippine Experiences*, pp. 112-13; Buckland, *Land of the Filipino*, p. 145 ff; Muerman, "Philippine Schools," p. 56. It should be noted that the name of the bureau and the title of the bureau chief changed several times. Atkinson was originally General Superintendent of Public Instruction, in charge of the Bureau of Public Instruction. In October 1902, the title of the bureau chief became General Superintendent of Education; the name of the bureau was changed to Bureau of Education. In October 1905, the title of the bureau chief became Director of Education; the name of the bureau remained the same.

81. *RDE*, 1904, pp. 17-21; Barrows to Benjamin Ide Wheeler, October 5, 1904, DB, Outgoing Correspondence; "The Filipino Teacher" (Memorandum, 1905), DB, Subject Files, Carton 15. Another reason for the changing role of the American teachers was, perhaps, the Bureau's difficulty in keeping a sufficient number of American teachers in the Philippines. Many of the "Thomasites" left after their initial contract (two or three years) ran out; and the Bureau could not easily find competent replacements in the United States. See, for example, Chief Examiner, U.S. Civil Service Commission to W.L. Pepperman, March 5, 1904, NA, RG 350, File 470-96; and Charles E. Magoon to Luke Wright, June 21, 1904, NA, RG 350, File 470-135.

82. "Courses of Instruction for the Public Schools of the Philippine Islands: Prescribed by the General Superintendent of Education, June 15, 1904," NA, RG 350, File 2618-11.

83. *RDE*, 1904, pp. 74-75; *RPC*, 1905, IV, 435-36; Benigno V. Aldana, *The Philip-*

In most respects, the new "insular readers" were a decided improvement over the Baldwin series. Maria, Juan, Manuel, and Rosita were now the protagonists of the stories, and the pages were sprinkled with words and pictures familiar to the Filipino: mangoes and carabaos, carronatas and cascocs, coconuts and abaca. The texts pictured Maria and Juan much as they really were: walking barefoot to school, playing with their dogs and kites, pounding rice. Teachers quickly attested to the appeal of the new readers.⁸⁴

One phase of Filipino daily life received little attention: religion. Of the dozen readers used in the primary grades, only two mentioned the Church, even in passing; and none even alluded to the Catholic practice of *compadrazgo* (ritual coparenthood), well-established in the Philippines.⁸⁵ The texts without exception pictured the typical Filipino family as a nuclear one, consisting solely of mother, father, and children. Such omissions were, no doubt, conscious, since the educational bill prohibited teachers from discussing the subject of religion in the classroom.

The new course of study also provided for a modicum of instruction in arithmetic, designed by Barrows to provide the student with "enough knowledge of numbers and arithmetical computations to avoid being swindled and outdone in every commercial transaction in which he has a part."⁸⁶ New arithmetic texts taught Filipinos to solve problems like the following:

Gil's mother has sent him to the store for 2 spools of thread costing 8

pine Public School Curriculum (Manila: Philippine Teacher's Digest, 1935), pp. 167-69, 317-26.

84. See David Gibbs, *The Insular First Reader* (New York: American Book Company, 1904), *The Insular Second Reader* (New York: American Book Company, 1904), *The Insular Third Reader* (New York: American Book Company, 1905), *The Revised Insular Primer* (rev. ed.; New York: American Book Company, 1906), *The Revised Insular First Reader* (rev. ed.; New York: American Book Company, 1906), Mary H. Fee, Margaret A. Purcell, Parker H. Fillmore, John W. Ritchie, *The First Year Book: Teacher's Edition* (Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company, 1906, 1914); Sidney C. Newsom and Levona Payne Newsom, *Primer* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1904), *First Reader* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1904), *Second Reader* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1904); John F. Bobbitt and Sarah A. Bobbitt, *Primer* (New York: Silver, Burdett & Company, 1906), *A First Book in English* (New York: Silver, Burdett & Company, 1904, 1906), *Second Book* (New York: Silver, Burdett & Company, 1906). Regarding the appeal of the new readers, see John C. Muerman, "Philippine Schools," p. 64.

85. The Church is mentioned in Newsom and Newsom, *Primer*, pp. 43, 49; and Newsom and Newsom, *First Reader*, pp. 103-04.

86. David Barrows, "The Prospects for Education in the Philippines," *The Philippine Teacher*, I, No. 1 (December 15, 1904), 7.

centavos each. He has a 20 centavo piece to pay for the thread. How much change should he receive?⁸⁷

Another set of problems dealt with crops grown in the Philippines — abaca, coconuts, sugar, rice — in an attempt to bring the school work “into close touch with the real life of the Islands.”⁸⁸

Still another set of problems concerned tenant-landlord relations. In solving the problems, the pupils found that Juan, the independent farmer, made a sizable profit on his crop, while Pedro, the tenant, sank deeper in debt to his landlord. That set had a salient moral, which the authors of the text underlined for the benefit of the teachers: “Explain to the pupils carefully the right which the Filipinos have to take up land, and urge them to carry the information to their parents.”⁸⁹ In December 1904 Barrows asserted: “Two years of instruction in arithmetic given to every child will in a generation destroy that repellent peonage or bonded indebtedness that prevails throughout this country.”⁹⁰

Instruction in geography, given in the third year of the primary course, also aimed at increasing the independence of the tao. Barrows hoped that once the young Filipino learned more about the world, he would become “a person of far different possibilities from the man whose education never arises beyond that of the routine toil that constitutes a peasant’s life and whose range of vision scarcely passes beyond the confines of his barrio.”⁹¹

The new course of study also provided for “character training,” similar to that dispensed in American primary schools. Teachers were instructed to “emphasize the folly of falsehood and the value of truth” in their classes. “The character training should be continued throughout the year. Pupils who persist in falsehood and cheating are to be promptly suspended from the school. Rules of conduct should be memorized, inculcating truthfulness, honesty, fidelity, reverence, kindness, self-sacrifice, etc.” Although character training was not to be a formal, daily part of the class-

87. Mabel Bonsall and G.E. Mercer, *Primary Arithmetic: Part III* (rev. ed.; New York: World Book Company, 1908), p. 17. See also Mabel Bonsall, *Primary Arithmetic: Parts I and II* (rev. ed.; New York: World Book Company, 1908), and Annette L. Crocker, *Arithmetic for the Philippine Islands: Book I* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1906).

88. Mabel Bonsall and G.E. Mercer, *Primary Arithmetic: Part III*, pp. 4, 40–65.

89. *Ibid.*, pp. 113–16.

90. David Barrows, “Prospects for Education,” p. 7.

91. *Ibid.*

work, the Bureau encouraged teachers to provide such instruction whenever an appropriate occasion arose.⁹²

Occasions to discuss moral issues were bound to arise regularly, since the "insular readers" were so heavily loaded with moral lessons. The following passage from a second-grade reader was typical:

This boy did not go to school.
 He went to play in the water.
 He does not like to go to school.
 He does not like to read and write
 He does not like his teacher.
 He will not make jars and baskets.
 He will not get water for his mother.
 He will not carry the baskets for her.
 He is not a good boy.
 He is a bad boy.
 He will not be a good man.⁹³

The texts also presented short stories, familiar to American school children, with obvious morals: be honest; work hard; think for yourself; if you fail at first, try again; be kind to animals. In one primer appeared the story of "The Country Mouse and the City Mouse," with its lesson that wealth has its drawbacks, and the story of "The Little Red Hen," which underlined the value of hard work.⁹⁴ In effect, such "character training" aimed to impart American values to Filipino school children.⁹⁵

The course of study of 1904 provided for civics instruction for boys of the third grade "whose circumstances forbid their continuing their studies." The teacher was to organize them into a "club," where they would discuss: parliamentary rules of order, the organization of municipal and provincial governments, the powers and duties of elected officers, and the rights and duties of a citizen. The course of study required teachers to devote special attention to "the development of civic patriotism and a true

92. "Courses of Instruction for the Public Schools of the Philippine Islands: Prescribed by the General Superintendent of Education, June 15, 1904," NA, RG 350, File 2618-11.

93. Gibbs, *Insular First Reader*, p. 26.

94. Gibbs, *Insular Second Reader*, pp. 18-20, 24-26.

95. For example, the Indiana Department of Public Instruction required schools to teach the story of "The Country Mouse and the City Mouse" in grade four. See Indiana, Department of Public Instruction, *State Manual and Uniform Course of Study for the Elementary and High Schools* (Indianapolis: William B. Burford, 1899), p. 109.

respect for the law and the rights of the people." The boys were to commit to memory "short recitations of a patriotic character" and to recite them at the meetings of the club. Finally, toward the close of the school year, the members of the club were to organize themselves into a model municipal government, and to discuss problems relevant to the community.⁹⁶ In 1907, when the Bureau of Education again revised the course of study and re-introduced the fourth year of primary schooling, it required teachers to provide civics instruction twice a week, in grade four.⁹⁷

The civics "clubs" and classes gave the teachers an opportunity to laud democratic government, and to denounce corruption and caciquismo. *The Filipino Teacher's Manual*, designed for use by Filipino teachers and recommended by the Bureau of Education, urged teachers to emphasize that "officials are appointed by the people to act for them." "Too often," the manual commented, "the local official in the Philippines acts as if he had forgotten that his position and authority come from the votes of the people."⁹⁸

In 1907, a series of "Letters to Fourth Grade Pupils About Civics," written by Prescott Jernegan of the Manila Normal School, began to appear in *Philippine Education*, a monthly written for teachers in the archipelago and sanctioned by the Bureau of Education. The letters, outlining work to be done in the civics classes, paid particular attention to caciquismo:

Some presidents act like little kings. They seem to think that, like kings, all power comes from themselves. But it does not. The presidents are elected by the people of the municipality of which they are the presidents.⁹⁹

In other letters, Jernegan decried the practice of selling votes, explained the functions of municipal officials and the workings of the courts.¹⁰⁰

96. "Courses of Instruction for the Public Schools of the Philippine Islands: Prescribed by the General Superintendent of Education, June 15, 1904," NA, RG 350, File 2618-11.

97. "Revised Course of Study for Primary Grades," Circular 51, s. 1907, June 10, 1907, NA, RG 350, File 2618-30.

98. H. C. Theobald, *The Filipino Teacher's Manual* (New York: World Book Company, 1907), pp. 227-28.

99. Prescott F. Jernegan, "Letters to Fourth Grade Pupils About Civics: I - Where Our Rulers Get Their Power," *Philippine Education*, IV, No. 5 (October 1907), 27.

100. Prescott F. Jernegan, "Letters to Fourth Grade Pupils About Civics: II - The General Elections," *Philippine Education*, IV, No. 6 (November 1907), 29; Jernegan,

In February 1908 he devoted an entire letter to the Homestead Law:

Many of your fathers are farmers. How large is your father's farm? Does it contain 16 hectares (about 40 acres) of land? Probably not. Sixteen hectares is a large farm for most Filipinos. Very likely your father has no land of his own but works on some other man's land. If you want to be a farmer you ought to own your own farm; you will be richer and happier if the land is your own.

He informed the pupils that, if they were willing to move from their present communities and to cultivate a homestead for five years, they could obtain sixteen hectares from the government. "You must not expect to get a homestead within a few minutes walk of the church. . . . Probably to get good public land you will have to move far away from any large town. Perhaps you will have to go to another province. What of that? Do you want to be a poor man all your life? Do you want to work for someone else as long as you live?"¹⁰¹

A final component of the primary curriculum of 1904 was "Body Training" — consisting of handiwork, singing, drawing, and physical exercises — to be offered in all three grades. The "handiwork" included whittling and gardening for boys, needlework, simple embroidery, and housekeeping for girls.¹⁰² Such instruction was patently industrial education, and Barrows did not place great emphasis on it. At bottom, the superintendent believed that the primary schools should concentrate on academic subjects: "There appears to be nothing this great mass of illiterate Filipino people so much need as a knowledge of reading, writing, and ciphering, with some understanding of the great world beyond their immediate homes and the variety of life and opportunities which it affords."¹⁰³

Industrial training, Barrows believed, should be left largely to the intermediate schools. Organized by the General Superintendent in 1904, the intermediate course aimed to give primary

"Letters to Fourth Grade Pupils About Civics: III — What the Municipal Council Does," *Philippine Education*, IV, No. 7 (December 1907), 28; Jernegan, "Letters to Fourth Grade Pupils About Civics: VI — The Law and the Courts," *Philippine Education*, IV, No. 10 (March 1908), 26.

101. Prescott F. Jernegan, "Letters to Fourth Grade Pupils About Civics: V — The Homestead Law," *Philippine Education*, IV, No. 9 (February 1908), 22–23.

102. "Courses of Instruction for the Public Schools of the Philippine Islands: Prescribed by the General Superintendent of Education, June 15, 1904," p. 9, NA, RG 350, File 2618–11.

103. *RPC*, 1905, IV, 408.

school graduates "an actual fitting for life."¹⁰⁴ In grades four to six, boys were to receive advanced instruction in agriculture, carpentry, and ironwork, and girls were to learn about housekeeping. "It is in the intermediate schools, in fact, that our plan of industrial work is to be carried out. This is the proper place for it . . ." ¹⁰⁵

II

Barrows' subordinates, the American supervisory teachers, generally approved of the superintendent's innovations – except in one respect. Barrows, many felt, was not doing enough along the lines of industrial education. In July 1905, *The Philippine Teacher*, the predecessor of *Philippine Education*, printed an anonymous article which decried the emphasis on strictly academic subjects in the public schools. Later in the year, division superintendents in Albay, Abra, Cebu, Ilocos Sur, and Romblon urged the educational bureau to give more attention to primary industrial work.¹⁰⁶

The Philippine Commission as well was predisposed to industrial education. Over the years the composition of the Commission had changed: Moses left in 1902, Taft in 1903, Wright in 1905, and Ide in 1906. Thus, by 1906, Worcester was the only member of the original Commission left in the islands. James Smith, who became Governor-General in September 1906, pledged in his inaugural address that "the facilities for securing a practical education will be enlarged and extended as far as the financial resources of the Government will permit."¹⁰⁷ W. Morgan Shuster, Secretary of Public Instruction from September 1906 until March 1909, and W. Cameron Forbes, who joined the Commission in 1904, were equally interested in providing a more utilitarian brand of education.¹⁰⁸

Under constant pressure, Barrows reluctantly modified his position. In 1906, he announced that the Bureau of Education was

104. *RDE*, 1904, p. 28.

105. Barrows, "Prospects for Education," p. 9.

106. "Industrial Work," *The Philippine Teacher*, II, No. 2 (July 1905), 22; *RPC*, 1905, IV, 466, 489, 493, 545.

107. *Manila Times*, September 20, 1906.

108. On Shuster, see *Manila Times*, January 15, 1907. On Forbes: Forbes to Nathan B. Scott, August 30, 1905, WCF, fMS Am 1366, Vol. III; and Forbes to T. N. Perkins, May 5, 1906, WCF, fMS Am 1366, Vol. IV.

planning to lengthen the primary course to four years, and that industrial education would be "strongly emphasized" during the last year and a half.¹⁰⁹ On June 10, 1907, while Barrows was in the United States on vacation, Acting Director of Education Gilbert Brink issued an outline of the new primary course of study.¹¹⁰

The new course, summarized in Table I, still emphasized language work, and devoted attention to arithmetic and geography. But manual training now played a substantial role in the primary curriculum: in grades one and two, it consumed fifty minutes out of the four hours of class time; in grade three, one hour out of five; and in grade four, one hundred minutes out of five hours. Significantly, in grade four, more time was apportioned to manual work than to language instruction. The graduate of the primary school, asserted Acting Director Brink, "should have acquired a fair knowledge of some simple trade or handicraft."¹¹¹

The development of educational policy in the Philippines had taken an ironic turn. After June 10, 1907, Barrows, the Jeffersonian, was director of a school system which placed inordinate weight on manual training. Yet, while Barrows acceded to the modification of the primary curriculum, he never became a convert to industrial education. "The great spiritual experience in the life of every little boy and every little girl is learning to read," he declared in 1908, at the annual convention of division superintendents.¹¹² In his annual report for that year, Barrows wrote: "To those who advocate 'practical instruction,' I reply that the most practical thing obtainable for men is a civilized community, and their most desirable acquisition is literacy."¹¹³

III

The Philippine public school system made substantial progress

109. Bureau of Education, "A Statement of Organization and Aims Published for General Information" (pamphlet, printed in 1906, filed at the Bureau of Insular Affairs on December 27, 1906), p. 4, NA, RG 350, File 470-279. The words "By Dr. Barrows" appear, handwritten, on the cover of the pamphlet. See also *RDE*, 1906, p. 18; and Barrows to Henry A. Cooper, December 22, 1906, NA, RG 350, File 470-after 279.

110. "Revised Course of Study for Primary Grades," Circular 51, s. 1907, June 10, 1907, NA, RG 350, File 2618-30.

111. *Ibid.*

112. David Barrows, Speech to the Annual Convention of Division Superintendents (1908), DB, Subject Files, Carton 15.

113. *RDE*, 1908, p. 15.

Table I. Primary Curriculum Prescribed on June 10, 1907^a

Grade I (4 hours)	Grade II (4 hours)	Grade III (5 hours)	Grade IV (5 hours)
Language (conversation, reading, writing, spelling) 120 ^b	Language (conversation, reading, spelling) 100	English (reading, spelling, language) 75	English (reading, language) 60
Numbers 40	Arithmetic 40	Arithmetic 50	Arithmetic 40
Handiwork 40	Handiwork 40	Industrial Work 60	Industrial Work 100
Opening exercises and Music 20	Opening exercises and Music 20	Opening exercises and Music 25	Opening exercises and Music 25
Physical exercises and Recess 20	Physical exercises and Recess 20	Physical exercises and Recess 30	Physical exercises and Recess 20
	Drawing and Writing 20	Drawing and Writing 20	Nature study and Civics ^c 25
		Geography 40	Geography 30

^aCircular 51, s. 1907, June 10, 1907 ("Revised Course of Study for Primary Grades"), NA, RG 350, File 2618-30; and Aldana, *Public School Curriculum*, p. 64.

^bThese numbers indicate the length of recitation periods in minutes.

^cNature study, three times a week; Civics, twice a week.

under Barrows' direction. As Table II indicates, during those six years, the number of primary schools and Filipino teachers increased almost threefold, and average daily attendance more than doubled.

Teachers, division superintendents, and provincial governors all attested to the growing popularity of the public schools, and the declining opposition of the clergy. The division superintendents reported, moreover, that the schools were following the courses of study — that, in fact, the educational system was becoming standardized.¹¹⁴

114. See, for example, *RPC*, 1905, IV, 466, 480, 493, 498, 500.

Table II. Public Schools in the Philippines, 1903–1909^a

School Year	Number of Schools			Filipino Teachers	Monthly Enrollment (March)	Average Daily Attendance (March)
	Primary	Other	Total			
1902–03	1593	40	1633	2882		150,000 ^b
1903–04	2233	52	2285	3500 ^b	227,600 ^c	
1904–05	2727	137	2864	4500 ^b	311,843 ^c	
1905–06	3108 ^d	155	3263 ^d	4719	375,554 ^c	
1906–07	3435	252	3687	6141	350,000 ^b	279,977
1907–08	3701	231	3932	6804	374,600	298,600
1908–09	4194	230	4424	7949	434,735	354,574

^aCompiled from *RDE*, 1903–1909; and *Census: 1903*, IV, 656–94.

^bEstimated.

^cBarrows mistakenly cited those figures as statistics of attendance. There were no statistics of attendance for those years.

^dExcluding the Moro Province from 1906 on.

However, some of the reports and statistics were not so encouraging. While the number of Filipino teachers increased impressively during the period 1903–09, many were unqualified to teach. According to statistics released by the Bureau of Education in 1909, less than half of them had received, or attained the equivalent of, a sixth-grade education in the Philippine public schools; and almost half were unable to teach beyond the second grade.¹¹⁵ The Bureau appointed a number of Filipino teachers to supervisory positions, but on the whole they performed poorly. The American division superintendent of Bulacan reported in 1909:

The Filipino supervisors are willing workers, but they do not possess the executive and organizing ability to supervise a district successfully. They also lack knowledge of school management and the theory and practice of teaching. They cannot guide, lead, and instruct their municipal teachers.¹¹⁶

The reports of the division superintendents revealed sizable variations in attendance from one month to the next. In June

115. *RDE*, 1909, pp. 48–49.

116. U.S., Philippine Commission, *Manuscript Report: 1909*, Vol. IV, Appendix A (Excerpts and Summaries from Division Superintendents' Reports), 2004, NA, RG 350, Library of the Bureau of Insular Affairs. For other reports regarding the deficiencies of Filipino supervisors, see, in that same volume, pages 1994, 2010, 2015, 2017, 2029, 2030, 2057, 2063.

1906, 145,614 pupils attended the public schools; in July, 224,077; in October, 284,379; in December, 140,121; in February 1907, 286,540; and in March 1907, 279,977. As in the past, high rates of absence generally occurred during sowing and harvest seasons, when the children worked with their parents.¹¹⁷

An even more serious problem, resulting partly from irregular attendance, was the low rate of promotions. During the school year 1907-08, 63,178 pupils matriculated from grade one to grade two, 31,101 from grade two to three, and only 13,849 from grade three to four. The number of promotions for the school year 1908-09 was equally disappointing.¹¹⁸

Since the average student received one and a half years of schooling, it is doubtful that he achieved literacy in English; and it is equally doubtful that he learned enough arithmetic "to avoid being swindled and outdone in every transaction in which he has a part." Furthermore, only a small percentage of the students received civics instruction, since that work came in the last year of the primary course. "The greatest defect in the present primary school system is that it does not hold the child steadily in school until the course is completed," Barrows admitted in 1909.¹¹⁹

The figures varied not only from month to month, and from grade to grade, but also from one school division to another. During the school year 1906-07, thirty-eight per cent of the school-age children in Bohol were enrolled in public schools; forty-one per cent in Ilocos Norte, and fifty-three per cent in Nueva Ecija; but enrollment in Zambales and Cebu was only twenty per cent, and in Albay and Ambos Camarines, twenty-one per cent.¹²⁰ In some communities, private schools continued to flourish; in others, the population was too poor to support the public schools.¹²¹

117. *RDE*, 1907, p. 30. Division superintendents and provincial governors blamed harvests for periodic low attendance in *RPC*, 1905, IV, 504, 515, 528; and *RPC*, 1906, I, 186, 196. On the American teachers' problems with irregular attendance, see diary entries of August 4, 1904 and June 12, 1905, *Diary of William Thomas Townsend* (in the possession of Maryliza Townsend Shaw, Cartersville, Georgia, who permitted me to consult it).

118. *RDE*, 1908, p. 96; *RDE*, 1909, p. 38.

119. *RDE*, 1909, p. 8.

120. *RDE*, 1907, p. 27.

121. For reports about the continuing strength of private schools, see *RPC*, 1906, I, 417; *RPC*, 1907, I, 288; U.S., Philippine Commission, *Manuscript Report: 1909*, Vol. IV, Appendix A (Excerpts and Summaries of Division Superintendents' Reports), 2004, NA, RG 350, Library of the Bureau of Insular Affairs. There were regular

In fact, the most disappointing statistics of all concerned municipal revenues and expenditures for education. Municipal revenues for public primary schools came from three sources: the municipal code, enacted January 31, 1901, provided for a land tax (one-fourth of one per cent on all assessable property) to support public schools; the internal revenue law, enacted in 1904, earmarked five (later, ten) per cent of that tax for municipal schools; and in addition, municipalities occasionally appropriated money from general municipal funds. But year after year, those sources proved inadequate, particularly in 1906 and 1907, when the Commission suspended the land tax as a result of crop failures.¹²²

Even in the best years, certain communities simply were unable to provide sufficient support for the schools. In the school year 1908–09, the municipalities in the school division of Albay spent 63,722 pesos for school purposes; municipalities in the division of Bohol, which had twice as many children attending public schools, spent only 32,498.¹²³ Albay paid its municipal teachers an average monthly salary of ₱23.93; Bohol, ₱11.56.¹²⁴ Municipalities in Albay spent ₱6,128.87 to build new schoolhouses; Bohol spent ₱1,723.17.¹²⁵ “The present municipal school fund is barely more than half sufficient,” Barrows wrote in his annual report for 1908.¹²⁶

In Barrows’ eyes, the Philippine Commission was largely responsible for the “deplorable inadequacy” of municipal school revenues. He wrote to James LeRoy in June 1908:

The American Government set out here to establish a universal system of primary public schools . . . but the Philippine Commission has persistently neglected to provide anything approximating an adequate system of primary school finance . . . I have encountered the greatest ignorance, indifference and inability to see the necessity of this matter on the part of the Commission throughout the time that I have had to go to it for funds.¹²⁷

reports about shortages of funds. See, for example, *RPC*, 1905, IV, 489, 496; and U.S., Philippine Commission, Manuscript Report: 1909, Vol. IV, 1994, 2005, 2021, 2027, 2047, 2048, 2056.

122. *RDE*, 1908, p. 81.

123. *RDE*, 1909, p. 46.

124. *Ibid.*, p. 35.

125. *Ibid.*, p. 46.

126. *RDE*, 1908, p. 82.

127. David Barrows to James LeRoy, June 29, 1908, DB, Outgoing Correspondence. See also Barrows to Major Frank McIntyre, June 19, 1908, NA, RG 350, File 3725-10.

IV

As time passed, Barrows grew increasingly disenchanted with the Commission. He wrote to a friend in November 1908: ". . . the Commission does not take as broad and, I think I may say, as spiritual a view of our work here as this body did when differently constituted in former years . . ." ¹²⁸ He believed that the colonial administration was placing far too much emphasis on road-building and other public works projects, at the expense of education; and he realized that W. Cameron Forbes, Secretary of Commerce and Police, was primarily responsible for that re-ordering of priorities. In his annual report for 1908, he complained:

By recent legislation the sum of ₱4,750,000 has been provided for rural roads and bridges during the present fiscal year; it ought to be possible to provide ₱3,000,000 annually for a system of primary instruction which is already thoroughly organized, able to economically apply every additional dollar provided, and thoroughly supported in all quarters by the Filipino people themselves. ¹²⁹

Yet, in 1909, the Commission decided to reduce its appropriations for education by ₱360,000, and Barrows was forced to eliminate several intermediate schools. ¹³⁰

In contrast, the Philippine Assembly, inaugurated in October 1907, gave strong support to educational expansion, and Barrows continually praised its actions. The first bill which it passed was an appropriation of one million pesos for education in the barrios, and in subsequent years it passed many appropriations for education — especially for education in the barrios — which the Commission either reduced or vetoed outright. ¹³¹

In May 1909, the Assembly passed a bill which empowered municipalities to require attendance at public primary schools for

128. Barrows to Benjamin Ide Wheeler, November 30, 1908, DB, Outgoing Correspondence.

129. *RDE*, 1908, p. 82. See also Barrows to James LeRoy, September 14, 1908, DB, Outgoing Correspondence.

130. Barrows to Benjamin Ide Wheeler, March 9, 1909; Barrows to Jesse Burks, March 21, 1909, DB, Outgoing Correspondence.

131. On the Assembly's interest in education, see Isauro Gabaldon to John Muerman, January 7, 1921, reproduced in Muerman, "Philippine Schools," p. 129. Eight of the seventy acts passed by the Assembly in its first session were appropriations for public education. Also see *JPC* 1st Legis., inaug. sess., 1907-08, I, 125, 126, 373-77; *JPC*, 1st Legis., 1st and spec. sess., 1908, II, 68, 157, 196, 199, 305, 330, 331, 354; *JPC*, 1st Legis., 2d sess., 1909, III, 577-78. Barrows praised the Assembly in Barrows to James LeRoy, June 29, 1908, DB, Outgoing Correspondence; and Barrows to Major Frank McIntyre, June 19, 1908, NA, RG 350, File 3725-10.

children not enrolled in private schools — a measure which Barrows had constantly and unsuccessfully urged upon the Commission. After the Commission vetoed the bill, Barrows commented:

The reluctance to approve a law empowering municipalities to enforce attendance is not understood It was certainly desirable that such an Act should proceed from the popular house rather than from the Commission, and it is intelligible that the Commission should have desired to wait until the Filipino people themselves could inaugurate or participate in such legislation; but when the friends of the public schools in the Legislature had secured the passage of an Act through that body, there would seem to have been no further reason for indifference or opposition.¹³²

Frustrated by the Commission and very tired, David Barrows submitted his resignation in May 1909. He remained as director of the educational system until November, while the Commission decided on a successor, and then returned to the United States to begin a career in college teaching at the University of California.

Throughout the period 1903–1909, many members of the American colonial administration called David Barrows impractical and old-fashioned; and to some extent, such criticism was apt. Barrows wanted to apply eighteenth-century American educational theories to a twentieth-century Malay society. Wary of industrial education, he paid relatively little attention to an obvious need of Filipino children: preparation for useful labor. Yet, while such educational ideas were outmoded from an American point of view, they were, in a Philippine context, revolutionary. Barrows wanted the schools to undertake a restructuring of Philippine society: to create an intelligent, independent yeomanry, and to undermine the position of the elite.

Whether a school system is capable of effecting such radical social engineering is a moot point. J. S. Furnivall, the late distinguished student of British and Dutch colonial policies, was skeptical:

Educationalists, in claiming that education should or must promote the good life, or change the social order, or soften the impact of western civilization, overlook the fact that education is not something given in the school or by way of formal instruction, but is the operation of the whole environment underlying the high ideals that find expression in educational policy is the tacit assumption that these lofty aspirations can be

132. *JPC*, 1st Legis., 2d sess., 1909, III, 446–47, 473–74; *RDE*, 1909, p. 8.

realized in practice by instruction for a few years, during a few hours a day in certain subjects as set forth in text-books through teachers who often do not believe in what they teach.¹³³

But, it might be argued that in the Philippines, at least, the school system was never given a fair test. Poor attendance by Filipino pupils and irregular support by teachers and members of the Commission both undermined Barrows' attempts at social engineering. By 1907, the Jeffersonian experiment was over. Thereafter, the Commission gave more support to road-building – to projects designed to change the “environment” – than to public schools. Moreover, under the next director of the educational system, Frank R. White, Philippine schools placed an ever-increasing emphasis on industrial (rather than “literary”) education.

THE TRIUMPH OF INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION, 1910–1913

In the same month that Barrows left the Philippines, W. Cameron Forbes – Barrows' principal antagonist on the Commission – became Governor-General of the colony. Thereafter, the Philippine Commission, which for eight years had played a minor role in the making of educational policy, intervened more frequently in the work of the Bureau of Education. The new Governor-General himself dictated important changes in policy.

A member of the Commission since 1904, Forbes had been a consistent advocate of industrial education. The development of manual training was an “absolute necessity,” he asserted in 1905. “. . . the money expended by the United States in furtherance of that object will be productive of limitless results.”¹³⁴ He was unsympathetic to Barrows' penchant for literary education. A few days after Barrows resigned, Forbes wrote: “There has been a tendency, which a good many of us deplore, to run to clerical and impractical education and to economize on practical and economical education We want men taught to work with their hands; and while we do not object to their learning to read and

133. J. S. Furnivall, *Colonial Policy and Practice: A Comparative Study of Burma and Netherlands India* (1948; reprint ed., New York: New York University Press, 1956), p. 403.

134. W. Cameron Forbes to Nathan B. Scott, August 30, 1905, WCF, fMS Am 1366, Vol. III.

write, we want to see agricultural schools and arts and trades schools in greater abundance." He argued that Philippine public schools should aim primarily to improve material conditions.¹³⁵

Moreover, Forbes opposed, on fiscal grounds, Barrows' commitment to universal primary education. The insular government, with an annual income of less than ₱25,000,000, could not give adequate support to all phases of colonial policy. In Forbes' eyes, the government allocated an inordinate share of its funds to education. "I have suggested that we build roads first and schools afterwards on the basis that with roads we will have so much more money that the schools can be built in greater profusion."¹³⁶

As Governor-General, Forbes set out to change priorities. In his inaugural address, he urged Filipinos to give their "undivided attention" to the economic development of the archipelago. He called for better transportation facilities (especially, better roads) and for the introduction of more foreign capital. He wanted to see "emphasis laid upon the importance of the practical side of education and industrial education." Forbes announced, finally, that he intended to arrest, at least temporarily, the expansion of the educational system:

. . . the resources of the country have not developed to a point where I feel that we are justified in largely increasing the appropriation for education The amount of education we shall be able to accomplish in ten years will be very much greater if we devote our first money toward increasing the wealth of the people and later use the resulting increase of revenue for extending our educational facilities.¹³⁷

In his effort to effect those changes, the Governor-General enjoyed strong support from Newton Gilbert, the Secretary of Public Instruction.¹³⁸

I

On December 1, 1909, the Philippine Commission chose Frank R. White to run the Bureau of Education. Thirty-four years old at

135. Forbes to Mrs. Edward Cunningham, May 31, 1909, WCF, fMS Am 1366, Vol. VIII.

136. *Ibid.*

137. *JPC*, 1st Legis., 2d sess., 1909, III, 761-777.

138. *Ibid.*, III, 473-74; Speech of Newton W. Gilbert, *Teachers' Assembly Herald* (Baguio), II, No. 5 (April 1909), 22; *RPC*, 1910, pp. 172-74.

the time of his appointment, White had worked his way up through the ranks of the Bureau: deputy division superintendent for Tarlac during the school year 1901–02; division superintendent, 1902–03; Assistant to the General Superintendent of Education from March 1903 to October 1905; and Second Assistant Director of Education from October 1905 until his appointment as Director.¹³⁹ He was a personal friend of W. Cameron Forbes and a vocal supporter of industrial education.¹⁴⁰ White had written in January 1909:

Through practical instruction in weaving, gardening, sewing, and cooking, the children are made more familiar with useful occupations which will be of value to them individually and of inestimable commercial importance to their communities for all time to come. Yet we all know that this industrial training is in its very beginning, and that it will assume far greater importance in the life of the people when it has become fully organized and established.¹⁴¹

In line with his own predilections and with the policy articulated by Forbes, the new Director of Education took steps to improve industrial training in the public school system. He characterized as “experimental” and “tentative” the manual work of previous years, since each province, independent of assistance and supervision from headquarters, had worked out its own plans. In December 1909, he established within the Bureau of Education a department to organize, promote, and supervise all industrial instruction — to give, in White’s words, “method and purpose” to that work.¹⁴² Subsequently, the Bureau created a force of supervisors to oversee the progress of industrial education;¹⁴³ ordered division superintendents to concentrate on such instruction at the normal institutes for Filipino teachers;¹⁴⁴ issued several bulletins

139. For biographical details on White, see NA, RG 350, Personnel File 674: Frank R. White; “The New Director of Education: A Sketch,” *Philippine Education*, VI, No. 7 (December 1909), 24; *Manila Times*, August 18, 1913.

140. For evidence of their friendship, see the correspondence between Forbes and White in WCF, fMS Am 1366, Vol. VII. On White’s early support of industrial education, see Frank R. White, “The Provincial School and the People,” *Philippine Teacher*, II, No. 8 (January 1906), 3–4. In fact, Gilbert Brink, the Assistant Director of Education under Barrows, outranked White at the time of Barrows’ resignation. The Commission apparently passed him over because he had once been ordained as a clergyman in the Baptist Church, and Catholics objected to him. See Barrows to Benjamin Ide Wheeler, May 14, 1909 and June 18, 1909, DB, Outgoing Correspondence.

141. Frank R. White, “Our School System — Some Comparisons,” *Philippine Education*, V, No. 8 (January 1909), 13.

142. Frank R. White, “Organization of Industrial Instruction,” *Philippine Education*, VI, No. 8 (January 1910), 22; *RDE*, 1910, pp. 26–28.

143. *RDE*, 1911, p. 37; Circular No. 111, s. 1912, August 9, 1912, RD, General Office Circulars: 1912.

144. Circular No. 25, s. 1910, February 25, 1910, and Circular No. 159, s. 1910,

on industrial subjects (gardening, lace making, Philippine hats, etc.) to be used by teachers "in bringing their work in those special lines up to the advertised standard";¹⁴⁵ held regular conferences of industrial teachers to discuss problems of instruction;¹⁴⁶ brought each year to Manila from the provinces approximately two hundred prospective Filipino teachers to receive normal instruction, emphasizing industrial subjects;¹⁴⁷ held annual exhibits to allow division superintendents to compare the articles produced in their schools with those of other divisions;¹⁴⁸ and began to publish a monthly journal, *The Philippine Craftsman*, to inform the teaching force "of the methods employed and the results secured in every industrial experiment which is carried to successful issue in any public school."¹⁴⁹

During White's tenure as Director the Bureau of Education twice revised the primary course of study. The first revised curriculum, issued on October 20, 1910, outlined in some detail the industrial work for each primary grade. (" . . . this industrial instruction has never been definitely indicated in any previous bulletin," explained White.) In grade one, pupils were to receive daily instruction in one of two prescribed courses:

- (a) Hand weaving: The making of mats and bags from buri, caragomoi, and other similar fibers; making of fans, trays, and picture frames from a combination of buri or caragomoi with bamboo or rattan; the making of small baskets and book satchels from caragomoi, buri, coconut fiber, coconut midrib, and rattan, with nito and irao for finishing and decorating. (b) Gardening: Planting, protecting, and cultivating shrubs and flowers about

November 5, 1910, RD, General Office Circulars: 1910; Circular No. 142, s. 1912, September 26, 1912, RD, General Office Circulars: 1912.

145. Frank R. White, "Industrial Education in the Philippine Islands. Part II," *Vocational Education*, II, No. 5 (May 1913), 391; Philippine Islands, Bureau of Education, *School and Home Gardening*, Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 31-1910 (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1910); Philippine Islands, Bureau of Education, *School and Home Gardening for Use in Primary Grades*, Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 31 (Revised)-1913 (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1913); Philippine Islands, Bureau of Education, *Lace Making and Embroidery*, Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 34 (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1911); Hugo H. Miller, *Philippine Hats*, Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 33-1910 (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1910).

146. *RDE*, 1911, p. 37.

147. *Ibid.*, pp. 28, 37.

148. Circular No. 110, s. 1911, August 16, 1911, RD, General Office Circulars: 1911; Circular No. 136, s. 1912, September 23, 1912, RD, General Office Circulars: 1912.

149. White, "Industrial Education," p. 329. The Bureau began publication of *The Philippine Craftsman* in July 1912. White indicated as early as August 1910 that he planned to publish such a journal. (See Frank White to David Barrows, August 3, 1910, DB, Outgoing Correspondence.)

the yard, care being taken to develop a sense of good taste in the order of arrangement.¹⁵⁰

For the later primary grades, the Bureau of Education outlined courses in woodworking, clay modeling, sewing, lace making, embroidery, basketry, bamboo and rattan work, loom weaving, pottery, domestic science, and poultry raising. The course of study required that by the end of grade three pupils be able to produce "some serviceable, artistic, and usually salable article." Industrial work in the final primary grade was to be "so practical in character that the year's work will in some measure prepare every boy and girl for earning a living or making a home."¹⁵¹

Using the outline as a guide, division superintendents were to design a program of instruction for each municipality in their division. "They will designate the native art or arts to be adopted, the matter being determined usually by the character of the materials available in the community." The Bureau checked regularly on the industrial work in each division.¹⁵²

The next revised primary curriculum, issued on July 23, 1913, increased significantly the amount of time devoted to such instruction. In grade one, teachers were to devote one hour out of a four and one-half hour school day to industrial work; in grade two, one hour out of five; in grade three, eighty minutes out of five hours; and in grade four, ninety minutes out of five hours.¹⁵³

Statistics compiled by the Bureau of Education, summarized in Table III, indicate that by 1913 virtually every child in Philippine public primary schools (ninety-four per cent for the month of March 1913) received instruction in some branch of industrial work. Throughout the period 1910-13, hand weaving (including basket making, mat making, etc.), gardening, and housekeeping were the principal courses of that type offered by the primary schools.¹⁵⁴ In his annual report of 1913, White could boast: ". . . every school in the Philippines, except the 37 schools offering secondary instruction, gives industrial work in one form or another.

150. "Outline of Courses of Study, Revised," Circular No. 142, s. 1910, October 20, 1910, RD, General Office Circulars: 1910.

151. *Ibid.*

152. *Ibid.*; U.S., Philippine Commission, Manuscript Report: July 1, 1913 to December 31, 1914, Vol. VI, 178-181, NA, RG 350, Library of the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

153. "Preliminary Outline of Primary Course of Study," Circular No. 108, s. 1913, July 23, 1913, RD, General Office Circulars: 1913.

154. *RDE*, 1913, pp. 38, 92-93.

The results secured by the constant following of the industrial program during the last three years are most satisfactory."¹⁵⁵

Table III. Industrial Education in Philippine Public Primary Schools, 1910–1913^a

Year	Monthly Enrollment ^b	Number of Primary Pupils Engaged in Industrial Work ^b	Percentage of Enrolled Primary Pupils Engaged in Industrial Work
1910	428,818	366,134	85
1911	418,852	375,657	90
1912	348,087	319,127	92
1913	277,681	261,229	94

^aCompiled from *RDE*, 1910–13.

^bFigures on monthly enrollment and on the number of pupils engaged in industrial work are for the months of: February 1910, February 1911, February 1912, and March 1913.

The Governor-General was equally pleased. "Only recently have we had a man at the Bureau of Education who is at all practical," he wrote in October 1911. "The Bureau of Education is now doing really fine work . . ." ¹⁵⁶

II

"While instruction along purely academic lines is now considered as being of relatively less importance than formerly, still the work of giving the people a primary education in the English language will continue to be the chief function of this Bureau," wrote Frank White. ¹⁵⁷ The courses of study of 1910 and 1913 continued to prescribe reading, language, spelling, rudimentary arithmetic, music, geography, and civics. White also retained most of the textbooks which Barrows had adopted: thus, there was no significant change in the content of the academic subjects. ¹⁵⁸ However, in both new courses of study the Bureau directed teachers to devote less class time to English and arithmetic. The primary cur-

155. *Ibid.*, p. 37.

156. Forbes to Henry L. Stimson, October 16, 1911, WCF, fMS Am 1366. 1, Vol. I.

157. *RDE*, 1910, p. 27.

158. Aldana, *Public School Curriculum*, pp. 339–340.

riculum of 1913 prescribed only eighty minutes of language work in grade one – forty minutes less than the time allotted in the course of study of 1907. The curriculum of 1913 prescribed thirty minutes of daily arithmetic instruction for every primary grade. That of 1907 required forty minutes for grades one, two, and four; fifty minutes for grade three.¹⁵⁹

During White's directorship, Philippine primary schools steadily placed more emphasis on "character training." In October 1910, the Bureau of Education issued an "outline for the teaching of manners and right conduct." Teachers were to provide instruction on cleanliness, "conduct at school," "conduct in public," "duty toward lower animals," table manners, and the like. Again, the Bureau refrained from making character training a formal course, but it instructed teachers to devote approximately half an hour a week to it.¹⁶⁰

In June 1913, the Bureau of Education issued a bulletin entitled *Good Manners and Right Conduct*, which outlined in greater detail the work to be done along those lines, and recommended that sixty minutes a week be devoted to the subject in each primary grade.¹⁶¹ The Bureau prepared dialogues and pictures which were to serve as the basis of discussion. In grades three and four, students were required to learn a "monthly motto":

January: 'Work with the heart and work with the brain,
Work with the hands and work with the will.'

February: 'Work while you work,
And play while you play.
That is the way,
To be happy and gay.'¹⁶²

A later directive from the Bureau of Education required that the bulletin "be used in all grades of the primary course in correlation with the language work."¹⁶³ Character training became, in effect, a regular feature of the primary curriculum.

159. "Preliminary Outline of Primary Course of Study," Circular No. 108, s. 1913, July 23, 1913, RD, General Office Circulars: 1913.

160. "Outline for the Teaching of Manners and Right Conduct," Circular No. 143, s. 1910, October 20, 1910, RD, General Office Circulars: 1910.

161. Philippine Islands, Bureau of Education, *Good Manners and Right Conduct for Use in Primary Grades*, Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 47-1913 (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1913), pp. 21, 40, 66.

162. *Ibid.*, pp. 69-71.

163. "Preliminary Outline of Primary Course of Study," Circular No. 108, s. 1913, July 23, 1913, RD, General Office Circulars: 1913.

III

During White's superintendency, the Bureau of Education abandoned the ideal of universal primary education. Forbes had argued in his inaugural address that governmental revenues were inadequate to permit a further expansion of the school system. White went even further. "Without additional funds there must be an actual reduction in school attendance if the work undertaken is to be done right," he wrote in 1910. "The annual cost per capita for each child in school will, by reason of the increased attendance in the higher grades and the introduction of industrial instruction, be greater in the future than in the past, and with similar resources the number of teachers employed must necessarily be diminished."¹⁶⁴ He maintained, moreover, that under his predecessor, the Bureau had concentrated too much on "numbers" (statistics of enrollment) and not enough on "quality" (the value of the education received). In his annual report of 1911, he announced a change in policy:

Insistence is now being placed upon regularity of attendance and the closer grading of work. Heretofore large numbers of pupils have been admitted to the public schools who, by reason of inferior instruction and too little emphasis upon the necessity of securing substantial results, have actually carried away with them little of lasting value. We are now adopting the rule, and shall hereafter insist upon its strict observance, that all pupils who will not attend school regularly shall be excluded from school privileges.¹⁶⁵

Total annual enrollment in Philippine public schools dropped from 610,493 in the school year 1910-11 to 529,665 in the school year 1911-12. Primary education sustained all the losses: almost eight hundred primary schools were closed, and annual enrollment fell from 582,115 to 496,801. White minimized the importance of that decline. "There is nothing discouraging in these figures; the loss is more apparent than real. In every case the most efficient teachers have been retained and the schools that have been closed were the most unsatisfactory." He pointed out that a larger percentage of the enrolled pupils were actually attending school (83 per cent for 1911-12 compared to 80 for 1910-11), and concluded that "more really effective work was done during the past year."¹⁶⁶

164. *RDE*, 1910, p. 10.

165. *Ibid.*; *RDE*, 1911, p. 12.

166. *RDE*, 1912, pp. 10-11, 43.

At the same time, enrollment in intermediate schools steadily increased — from 21,304 in the school year 1909–1910 to 24,974 in 1910–11 to 28,755 in 1911–12. The number of intermediate schools rose in that period from 198 to 283. Since their creation in 1904, intermediate schools had concentrated largely on industrial and vocational training. Beginning in 1909, they offered, in addition to a general course, specialized instruction in farming, teaching, housekeeping, tool work, and business.¹⁶⁷

White's willingness to expand intermediate education at the expense of primary education was another indication of how much the Bureau had changed since Barrows' departure. Faced with a reduction of appropriations in 1909, Barrows had chosen to eliminate intermediate schools rather than barrio schools. White cited two reasons for assigning a higher priority to intermediate education. First, the country "needed a large number of well-trained young men and women as teachers and workers along similar lines." Second, "the people who have had a voice in affairs" wanted intermediate schools more than primary schools. That second reason was suspect. The Philippine Assembly had, since its creation in 1907, sponsored legislation which allocated more than two million pesos for barrio schools.¹⁶⁸

In the school year 1912–13, total enrollment dropped to 440,050. White attributed the retrenchment to the increasing costs of education: the necessity of paying better salaries to better-qualified Filipino teachers; the added expenses of industrial education; the high cost of constructing permanent school buildings. Since neither the municipal governments nor the insular government had increased appropriations for education, White had decided — with the approval of Newton Gilbert, Acting Governor-General while Forbes was on leave — to close about a thousand barrio schools. In that same school year, enrollment in intermediate schools rose to 31,529, and the Bureau opened thirteen new schools of that type.¹⁶⁹

Forbes, who learned about the retrenchment when he returned to the Philippines early in 1913, was appalled. He had wanted

167. *RDE*, 1910, p. 49; *RDE*, 1911, p. 56; *RDE*, 1912, p. 42. On the changes in the intermediate curriculum, see Aldana, *Public School Curriculum*, pp. 14–15, 75–77; *Teachers' Assembly Herald*, II, No. 21 (May 1909), 88–89; "Announcement of the Intermediate Course of Study," July 16, 1909, NA, RG 350, File 2618–38.

168. *RDE*, 1913, p. 12; *RPC*, 1911, p. 163.

169. *RDE*, 1913, pp. 9–12, 55–56.

only to arrest the expansion – not to permit the reduction – of primary education. To remedy that “serious situation,” he authorized a special allotment from the insular treasury to open 1000 additional primary schools, which could accommodate 100,000 more children. “No such reduction of school facilities will be allowed again,” Forbes wrote in June 1913.¹⁷⁰

Many of the old problems persisted during White’s superintendency. The rate of promotions in Philippine primary schools continued to be disappointing. In the school year 1912–13, 43 per cent of the first grade pupils were promoted to the second grade. As before, pupils generally received no more than two years of schooling.¹⁷¹

Private schools continued to educate a large number (over 100,000, according to the Census of 1918). Beginning in March 1910, the Bureau attempted to standardize instruction in those schools. To receive “government recognition” (which entitled schools to issue diplomas and certificates), private schools had to adopt a prescribed curriculum and fulfill other requirements. By 1913, 36 schools, with approximately 10,000 pupils, had received recognition. But most of the private institutions – small religious schools, often with incompetent teachers – did not try to meet the Bureau’s standards.¹⁷²

White’s last days as Director of Education were unhappy. Forbes was angry with him for closing the barrio schools. In May 1913 White’s health began to fail. Doctors diagnosed his problem as pulmonary tuberculosis. Three operations followed, and he died on August 17, 1913.¹⁷³

IV

In thirteen years, the Bureau of Education had undergone

170. Forbes to Henry L. Stimson, April 12, 1913, WCF, fMS Am 1366.1, Vol. II; Forbes to Rudyard Kipling, June 4, 1913, and Forbes to Luke Wright, July 11, 1913, WCF, fMS Am 1366, Vol. XVII; Forbes to Woodrow Wilson, May 19, 1913, NA, RG 350, File 3725–48.

171. *RDE*, 1913, p. 67.

172. *Census of the Philippine Islands: 1918* (4 vols.; Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1921), IV, Part II, 5–8, 532; U.S., Philippine Commission, Manuscript Report: 1911, Vol. IV, 232–265, NA, RG 350, Library of the Bureau of Insular Affairs; U.S., Philippine Commission, Manuscript Report: 1913, Vol. V, 3905–3931, NA, RG 350, Library of the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

173. On White’s final days, see NA, RG 350, Personnel File 674.

several shifts in policy: from Atkinson's fondness for Booker T. Washington's educational ideas, to Barrows' commitment to "literary," universal primary education, to White's advocacy of industrial and intermediate education. Underlying the disagreement about educational methods was a disagreement about the ends of Philippine education. Barrows wanted education to prepare Filipinos for citizenship and to undermine the power of the elite. Atkinson and White wanted primarily to prepare Filipinos to earn a living. In the absence of supervision by the Commission, educational policy could, and did, shift radically.

To evaluate American educational policy in the Philippines, one can apply many yardsticks. Compared to other colonial powers, American policy seemed praiseworthy. In Burma, 3.3 per cent of the population were enrolled in schools in 1900; in Netherlands India, approximately 1 per cent in 1907; in the Philippines, about 7 per cent in 1907.¹⁷⁴ The Bureau of Education had extended a system of graded primary, intermediate, and secondary education throughout the archipelago, introduced new textbooks, supervised the construction of thousands of new schoolhouses, trained thousands of Filipino teachers, and educated hundreds of thousands of children.

If, however, one evaluates the educational system on the basis of its stated aims — to make Filipinos literate, to train them for productive labor — its marks were lower. Philippine schools suffered from serious defects which prevented pupils from achieving literacy in English. Despite the efforts of the Bureau of Education, only slightly more than half of the Filipino teachers in the school year 1912–13 had received the equivalent of an intermediate school education.¹⁷⁵ Few of them had a command of English. Najeeb Saleeby wrote of the Filipino teachers in 1924 (at a time when most had received at least some high school training):

... their vocabulary and literary field are so limited, that they can hardly be regarded as fit themselves to adopt the English language and use it as a common medium of speech for all social requirements. Much less should

174. All figures are for both public and private schools. See J. S. Furnivall, *Educational Progress in Southeast Asia* (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1943), p. 56, and J. S. Furnivall, *Netherlands India: A Study of Plural Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1944), pp. 366–68.

175. *RDE*, 1913, pp. 48, 75.

we expect them to teach it so effectively as to impress it on their pupils firmly enough to supplant their mother tongue.¹⁷⁶

The next year, a survey of the Philippine educational system by the Monroe Commission (so named after its chairman, Paul Monroe of Columbia Teachers' College) confirmed Saleeby's judgments: "Children cannot be taught in the English language by teachers who do not know the English language and have seldom heard it spoken by those who do."¹⁷⁷

Irregular attendance added to the difficulty of the pupils in learning English. The Monroe Commission tested 32,000 pupils in Philippine public schools, and found that after four years of instruction Filipinos had the reading ability of second-grade children in the United States. The Commission concluded:

... in the great body of Filipino schools the present methods of teaching reading are so deficient that children have so little facility in reading English on leaving school that there is little guarantee of a functional control over the language in adult life.¹⁷⁸

One might reasonably assume that in 1913, when most pupils spent less than two years in primary schools, the educational system produced a small percentage of literate Filipinos.

The Monroe Commission criticized, as well, the industrial work of the schools. Intermediate schools, it claimed, trained pupils for vocations which were not in demand. Few of the graduates of those schools engaged in the work for which they had been prepared. Industrial instruction in the primary schools merely developed hand skills, appeared to be devoid of intellectual content, and did not even teach the pupil to make products which could be sold in his community.¹⁷⁹

The educational system failed, as well, in ways that the Monroe Commission did not mention. The recent studies of developmental psychologists suggest that the essentially traditional teaching methods employed by the Americans were poorly designed to educate the Filipino child. For example, Piaget's theory of cognitive development, which posits that the child passes through clearly-defined, sequential stages of development (and is capable

176. Najeeb Mitry Saleeby, *The Language of Education of the Philippine Islands* (Manila: n. p., 1924); p. 24.

177. Philippine Islands, Board of Educational Survey, *A Survey of the Educational System of the Philippine Islands* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1925), p. 28.

178. *Ibid.*, pp. 40, 134.

179. *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61, 279-282, 287.

at each new stage of performing new mental functions), implies that successful education is possible only if the curriculum is clearly coordinated with those stages.¹⁸⁰ Some American teachers complained that texts were too difficult for Filipino children, but no changes were made.¹⁸¹

It would be unfair to criticize the directors of the educational bureau for their failure to know what they could not know. Piaget wrote long after Atkinson, Barrows, and White made policy. The directors of the educational bureau applied to the Philippines the educational theories of their own and previous generations. Yet one cannot escape the conclusion that faulty teaching methods undermined the American educational effort in the Philippines.

American educational policy in the Philippines has often been cited as an example of American "benevolence." It is true that great amounts of time, energy and money were devoted to the educational effort. But mere benevolence did not insure the success of policy. During the years 1900-1913, the directors of the educational bureau often disagreed about how to be benevolent. There was, moreover, a vast gap between policy and practice. The tragedy of the American educational effort was that, despite benevolent intentions, the Bureau of Education prepared Filipinos neither for citizenship nor for productive labor.

180. Piaget wrote an excellent short summary of his own theories in Paul Henry Mussen, ed., *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology* (2 vols., 3rd ed.; New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970), 1, 703-732. See also John H. Flavell, *The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1963).

181. David Barrows, Speech to the Annual Convention of Division Superintendents (1908), DB, Subject Files, Carton 15.