

Andre Ye

Dr. Reagan

TS History

21 January 2021

In his opposition to President McKinley, Lewis H. Douglass argues that the United States was hypocritical in expanding under the cause of liberty while black people still suffered at home. Only when the United States truly adopted justice blind to race and color, would it be justified in its expansion. Meanwhile, the Missionary Department of the A.M.E. Church argue in “The Negro Should Not Enter the Army” that if black people had inferior political or social rights, they should not fight for the country that perpetuates such treatment.

Albert Beveridge argues in “On the War in the Philippines” that conquering the Philippines was justified for economic, military, and moral reasons. The Philippines provided a platform to trade with China, and the Philippines themselves had an abundance of natural resources; its location was strategic for military purposes. Perhaps most importantly, Beveridge argues, the Filipinos were a “barbarous race” incapable of self-government, partially perverted by the Spanish; thus, it was God’s will for Anglo-Saxon Americans to conquer them.

In *Race-Making and Colonial Violence in the U.S. Empire*, Paul A. Kramer argues that race was not simply “projected” from America onto the Philippine-American war, but that it was intricately involved with imperial processes. The Philippines desired to be seen as “civilized” and to eventually gain independence; to this, many motivations of war rested upon the racial characterization of Filipinos as uncivilized. As war shaped racial ideologies and racial ideologies added fuel to war, the role of race was amplified and became a central component.

Paul Kramer argues in *Race-Making and Colonial Violence in the U.S. Empire* that racial ideologies and the strategies of war “moved together in a dark, violent spiral.”¹ That is, race was used to justify war, and war shaped views on race; these two forces worked in tandem to highlight race as a central aspect of the war. However, there is complicating evidence – the very racist claims that Filipinos were incapable of self-government and civilization used to justify conquest, for instance by Albert Beveridge², were also used in opposition to war³. If the savage Filipinos were to be annexed under the United States, the argument went, such imperialism would threaten the United States’ own political and moral foundations⁴. How is it such that racist ideologies could be both taken for and against imperialism in the Philippines if these ideas were central to justification for the war? Kramer’s characterization of the dynamics of race during the Philippine War is nuanced, but to grasp racial tensions in the war more fully, it must be expanded upon and contextualized in broader discourse surrounding race. I argue that these racial ideologies were not unique to justification for the war, but instead that the conflict, and American society, was immersed in it. As such, both imperialist and anti-imperialist arguments could be made under racial ideologies. While Kramer paints rhetoric towards the Filipinos was less racial prior to war, nevertheless it was present; for instance, the term “n-----” was used, alongside other insults, often⁵. Although racial ideologies were not simply “projected” or “exported” onto the Philippine War – as Kramer himself asserts – the conflict itself was immersed in the context of American racial thinking. Racial ideologies took hold of the war’s changing tactics and strategies – a product of Filipino nationalism⁶, leading to highly racialized

¹ Paul Kramer, *Race-Making and Colonial Violence in the U.S. Empire: The Philippine-American War as a Race War* (Oxford University Press, 2006), 172.

² Albert J. Beveridge, “On the War in the Philippines” (US: McDougal Littell Inc., 1900).

³ Kramer, *Race-Making and Colonial Violence in the U.S. Empire*, 185.

⁴ Kramer, *Race-Making and Colonial Violence in the U.S. Empire*, 184.

⁵ Kramer, *Race-Making and Colonial Violence in the U.S. Empire*, 174.

⁶ Kramer, *Race-Making and Colonial Violence in the U.S. Empire*, 171.

language marking Filipinos as “uncivilized” or “animal”⁷. That such racialized language was used for *and* against the war, though, suggests that racial tensions were not unique to the justification of the war and existed in American society more broadly. Lewis Douglass supports this notion in questioning the treatment of black Americans with respect to imperialism in the Philippines⁸. That the A.M.E. Church links discussion on American slavery and U.S. control of Cuba to imperialism in the Philippines suggests the importance of contextualizing the role of race more broadly.

⁷ Kramer, *Race-Making and Colonial Violence in the U.S. Empire*, 204.

⁸ Lewis H. Douglass, “Lewis H. Douglass on Black Opposition to McKinley” (1899), 1.