Chapter 2

Face

Necropolitics and the
U.S. Imperial Photography Complex

In 1906, a writer named Charles Ray chronicled the American public’s fascination with the "Philippine campaign" in an essay, "Following a War with the Camera." He described the war in the Philippine Islands as an "insurrection"—merely a military campaign against a ragtag band of Filipino dissenters, or insurrectos. This rhetorical strategy was an example of abjection at work, which uses more neutral terms such as "campaign" and "insurrection" to describe a war between an invading imperial power and a fledgling republic struggling to keep sovereignty. Muting or excising the violence of the Philippine-American War was a common practice of American writers at the time. History books in the Philippines published by the colonial government early on in the occupation emphasized the centuries of cruelty under Spanish rule and the positive introduction of modernity by the United States. In the United States, Americans were being persuaded to forget the war's brutality by academics and writers who rewrote the war as a civilizing implement that opened the Islands to American education and culture. These acts of revising history aside, what visibly remains of the period are photographic images taken by unnamed photographers.

An artifact of imperial modernity that Charles Ray discussed in detail is the stereoscopic card, or stereograph as it was commonly known: a mounted photograph viewed through a device called a stereoscope, which gave it a three-dimensional effect. Stereographs were popular diversions for middle-class white Americans to view and experience, among others, the Philippine campaigns and to gaze at the United States' new "marvelous possessions." Americans could order stereo cards or "stereo views" through catalogs, view them at home at their leisure, and acquire a 3-D perspective of their colony (Ray 477).
While “war sketches” or artist’s depictions of war scenes were popular visual mediums, the lifelike depth of stereo cards allowed one to see, not mere artist’s drawings, but “facades” of real scenes. This facsimile of reality through a photographic image was also accompanied by a caption, so that viewing an image included a specific interpretation of an event. The meaning of an image, after all, is dependent on its context, which includes information from the caption, as well as on the nature of the publication as a “channel of transmission.” For example, Ray’s essay was accompanied by different photographs from the Underwood and Underwood Company, with captions lauding the benevolent and civilizing mission of the United States. Ray described the “United States blue-jackets” as valiant soldiers who were fighting bravely despite being thousands of miles away from home. Another caption narrated the ethical treatment of Filipino insurgents cared for by American doctors in makeshift U.S. military hospitals (Ray 486). The photographer and the war correspondent, according to Ray, were heroic men who braved the dangers of war to fulfill their duty, “which is to get the very latest incidents” for the war-hungry American public (Ray 486). In all, the photographs and captions functioned similarly to Ray’s euphemistic use of “campaign” and “insurrection” in which abjosition provides an extenuating cover to the violence of the U.S. war of occupation in the Philippines. By identifying and analyzing abjosition in these imperial images, one can therefore uncover the bloodier and more baneful aspects of American colonial expansion that were excised from the U.S. nation’s myths.

**FACES OF DEATH AND THE IMPERIAL SELF**

Historically, the creation of photographic images of dead soldiers after battles is an American documentary tradition dating from the Civil War. The corpse is the ultimate icon of abjosition. While it is “the most sickening of wastes,” the corpse of a soldier slain on the battlefield was nonetheless a meaningful image to the national imagination. For much of Civil War photography, the images of dead white soldiers taken after battle were more than just scenes of death but were scenes of American nationhood. As Alan Trachtenberg reminds us, Civil War images “participate by proposing the visual terms on which victory and healing—the remembrance of sacrifice—might be conceived.” (23) I would add that the visual terms of victory and healing rested on race and gender, specifically through the sanctified bodies of white male American soldiers. Civil War photographs transformed the savagery of war, in particular the nation’s memories of the deaths of hundreds of thousands of mostly white American soldiers, into martyrdom and the sacred. By elevating the carnage of war—such as through the iconic Civil War photograph entitled *The Harvest of War*—into a “sacred emblem” of sacrifice, violent war photographs ironically preserved the peace of mind and equanimity of the white, American, middle-class viewer (Trachtenberg 10).

It was during the “Indian wars” of the late nineteenth century that American stereo views and postcards featured images of “new” dead photographic subjects—Native Americans. The face of death was now a brown face, the savage enemy’s face. Since the early explorations of the New World, Westerners have recorded images of native peoples for purposes that ranged from the “anthropological to the (romantic)” (Wexler 194–95). But it is historical violence that defines the image of Native Americans in the American imagination. The history of the genocide of Native peoples committed by the U.S. Army haunts the empathetic portraits made by distinguished American photographers such as Gertrude Käsebier, Edward Curtis, and William Henry Jackson. The context of Native American portraiture, after all, is death. As contemporary Native artist Jimmie Durham put it, “All photographs of American Indians are photographs of dead people, in that their use assumes ownership of the subject, which is seen as static, completely ‘understandable.’”

By “seeing Indians” as dead enemies, American victory was understandable and Native deaths acceptable, at least for some Americans of the nineteenth century. As Susan Sontag reminds us, “To photograph people is to violate them, by seeing them as they never see themselves... It turns people into objects that can be symbolically possessed” (14). In the case of photographs of dead Native Americans, stereo views and postcards allowed a collector to celebrate American victory over the “savages” and to own a keepsake of an important historical moment. Such photographs were trophies of American military progress and Anglo-Saxon superiority. Through captions that frame the photographs interpretation, American war images from the “Indian wars” minimized the human pain and suffering of the savage enemy. In this case, the enemy’s body, dead or alive, is not a human body, but a collection of body parts—naked of sympathy or empathy, unrecognizable and unalleviated.

The popular late nineteenth-century phrase “The only good Indian is a dead Indian” was an expression of imperial abjosition that found its way to commercial postcards and stereograph images of dead Native Americans. Jokes about Native genocide were an ordinary part of fin de siècle American popular culture. The popularity of the saying was attested to by Theodore Roosevelt in 1886, when he said: “I don’t go so far as to think that the only good Indians are dead Indians, but I believe nine out of ten are.” Fifteen years after making this statement in a speech in New York, Roosevelt was president of the United States, proving that the coinage of the racist phrase had reached the highest office. The phrase regarding “dead Indians” as “good Indians” requires the re-
fascination of the slaughter of Native peoples into humorous entertainment, as well as into more serious discourses of "racial and social progress" (Hulndorf 47). And by the late nineteenth century, after the U.S. Army's genocidal military campaigns and conquest of Native American lands, the once-feared Indians were new "good" abject subjects—either dead or confined in reservations.

Thus, photography's protem form enables the medium to be used for and against war and empire. Inscribed in its very form is what Susie Linfield describes as the "dialectics" of photography, or its paradox: while a photographic image renders violence visible, it also "embraces" its opposite, though sometimes unknowingly. In brief, while the history of photography has shown that, more than any modern medium, it has recorded and possibly celebrated the violence of war and empire, photographs also have the opposite effect—either muting the horror and instilling apathy, or shocking the viewer and organizing protest (Linfield 33).

A central argument of the chapter, and indeed the rest of this book, is the belief that images are "like living organisms," and images from the past "have lives and desires of their own" that do not always correspond to the original creator's possibly racist or imperialist intent. As the Cherokee artist Jimmie Durham expounds:

Even the system is not completely closed. Geronimo (Apache), as an Indian "photographic subject," blew out the windows. On his own, he reinvented the concept of photographs of American Indians. At least he did so far as he could, concerning pictures of himself, which are so ubiquitous that he must have sought "photo opportunities" as eagerly as the photographers. Yet even when he was "posed" by the man behind the camera, he seems to have destroyed the pose and created his own stance. In every image, he looks through the camera at the viewer, seriously, intently, with a specific message. Geronimo uses the photograph to "get at" those people who imagine themselves as the "audience" of his struggles. He seems to be trying to see us. He is demanding to be seen on his own terms. (Hilt 104)

Durham believes in the limitless meanings of a historical photograph—that is, the photographic system is "not completely closed"—as he shows in describing the portraits of the Apache leader Geronimo after his arrest by Major General Henry Ware Lawton in 1886 (Hilt 104). Durham views Geronimo's many portraits as artifacts of agency rather than merely portraits of Native American defeat or death. He invests dignity and humanity in the portraits of an incarcerated Native American leader, suggesting that our contemporary acts of reading historical images are enabled by the paradox of photography. Thus, he argues, not just "seeing the Indian" as an object, but seeing him as a historical agent, an actual, living individual who might have posed intentionally and created "his own stance."

Photographs thus provoke and disturb us into thinking of imperial abjection as both absence and presence. Philippine-American War photographs register multiple forms of absence: the invisibility or the abject status of the Philippine-American War in the American popular imagination as well as in its official history, and the absence of a reliable accounting of the deaths during the war. In other words, there is no mourning or melancholia for this forgotten American war. The Filipino colonial photographs are literal representations of abject icons of death: that is, the images of Filipino cadavers after battle (abject bodies), and the American soldiers who were perpetrators and witnesses to the horror of a colonial war (agents of abjection). But while most war photographs are traditionally read as "spaces of death," other observers, like Durham, have described colonial images as spaces of presence, as artifacts of subject-making even under the most dehumanizing, brutal, and impossible conditions. The critical act of reading photographs of war demands that we account for the actual lives recorded in a visual image and reflect on what W. J. T. Mitchell describes as the paradox of a photographic image: "that it is alive—but also dead; powerful—but also weak; meaningful—but also meaningless" (Mitchell 11).

An example of a Philippine photograph that records and reveals the violence of empire can be found in the booklet of war photographs by E. Tennyson Neely entitled Fighting in the Philippines (1899). The book shows a photograph of dead Filipinos in a trench, surrounded by American soldiers looking on (figure 3). The caption states, "After the battle of Santa Ana, February 5, 1899." More than a dozen American soldiers surround the trench littered with corpses, a heap of undistinguishable human bodies in soiled clothes and straw hats. Some of the white American soldiers stare into the camera, while the others look at the dead, all framed by a tropical backdrop of banana trees. The Anti-Imperialist League republished this same photograph for another purpose—as the frontispiece of a book Liberty Poems: Inspired by the Crisis of 1898-1900 (1900), a collection of antiwar poems penned by members and supporters of the League. The different political uses for the same photograph suggest the paradoxical power of the photographic image, and how photographs can celebrate as well as expose the violence of colonialism and war. While this photograph circulated in different publications and with different political messages at the turn of the twentieth century, the passing of time has rendered the photograph as abject, and its use as a polemic against power and war as having greater resonance and agreement. As Mitchell reminds us, "We need to account for not just the power of images but their powerlessness, their impotence, their abjection" (Mitchell 11).
1898, there were "276 photographers in the Philippines," suggesting that photography was very much in demand and part of late nineteenth-century Filipino life.16

Soon after the victory of Admiral George Dewey over the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay and the mock battle staged by Spain and the United States to cover up the negotiated transfer of the Philippines from one to the other, stereo photographers arrived to document scenes of Philippine life.17 Before long, they were taking photographs of another war. The resulting stereo views of the Philippine-American War were quickly put on sale by companies such as Underwood and Underwood, Keystone, Kilburn, and H. C. White (Walcksmit 157). Gruesome images of dead Filipinos after battle with the U.S. Army became easily available to curious viewers (Walcksmit 157). Such war scenes were not only popular entertainment but educational. Public schools around the country bought "boxed sets," series of stereo views "sold in special containers as a unit" (Walcksmit 173). By 1901, Underwood and Underwood was producing and selling almost twenty-five thousand stereographs per day: "Thousands of sets were sold to schools and public libraries and larger churches for Sunday school lessons" (Walcksmit 174). In 1924, the Keystone Company produced sets of one thousand stereo views with accompanying handbooks.18 These visual aids were seen by millions of American children in schools and in churches.

The American camera thus brought brown and black bodies into popular culture, when Asian, Pacific, and Caribbean images were introduced to the public as by-products of the Spanish-American War. Magazines such as Leslie's Weekly and Harper's Weekly ran advertisements that offered "war pictures" for framing or an album of a photographic history of "America's war with Spain," which included Philippine scenes.

The image of the Filipino thus entered the American "visual terrain" mapped by race, nation, and abjection. For this chapter, we look at two sources of Philippine photographs: the National Archive's photographic collection (from the records of the Bureau of Insular Affairs and the War Department) and the Library of Congress's commercial stereograph collection. The National Archive's Records of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, General Photographs of the Philippine Islands 1898–1935 have alphabetical designations that correspond to a colonial taxonomy. The catalog begins with "agriculture," moves on to "education," "forestry," "mines and mining," "prisons and penal colonies," and Filipino immigrants in Hawai'i. The inclusion of Filipino migrant workers in Hawai'i with colonial photographs is a piece of a diasporic puzzle highlighting what other critical Filipino studies scholars have argued: empire and diaspora define the experience of Filipino communities who live and settle in North America.

Most Philippine colonial images do not cite the name of the photographer.
and, in some cases, the names were blocked out, particularly for the more graphic views after a battle. There is also very little information about the human subjects who posed for the camera. Rather than viewing these images as an "authorless archive" (Morris 26), which is often the case for most photographs of colonial Southeast Asia, we consider the American colonial state as the author and the distributor of these Philippine images. More than a hundred years ago, the photographs were used for army surveillance but were later circulated in magazines, newspapers, journals, books, and other forms of mass culture, and then became popular texts that would heighten support for American imperial expansion by "erasing the violence of colonial encounters in the very act of portraying them" (Wexler 7). These photographic images are images of not only physical or actual death, but also social death and the psychic violence of abjection. The paradox of visibility will remain a central theme of much of this book—that by the very act of representing the Filipino colonial subject in American popular texts, the violent circumstances of her or his visibility are erased. These Philippine colonial photographs—whether they are stereographs sold for commercial profit or albums kept by an institution such as the Bureau of Insular Affairs or the War Department—then transform images of war into units of data that produce "sequential regularity" (Trachtenberg 5) and produce the enunciability of empire as a "way of life" for early twentieth-century Americans.  

From the time of the Spanish-American War onward, the star of the American empire burned bright. In magazines and journals of the time, advertisements for "war views" and pictorial books were published alongside ads for breakfast cocoa and cough drops (figures 4 and 5). The popularity of war photographs, stereoscope viewers, and illustrated journals can be read as the public's support for American expansion. It can also be read as the fascination for what were then new imperial "technologies of vision." The violence of a war of conquest was viewed at a safe distance in the comfort of Victorian homes, what the late scholar Jim Zwick has called the "war from the parlor." Turn-of-the-century Americans saw violent photographs of the war, such as that of Filipino corpses in trenches taken after battles, that were published in newspapers of the time, but the captions on the photographs emphasized the military victory of the U.S. Army and not the violence (Best 213). These visual technologies that focused on victory over violence underscore the importance of abjection in the creation of an American imperial ideology. An American empire in the Pacific was not only instituted through violence, but was also created through photographic images that excised the violence of war or framed violence as American victory. An army of unknown American photographers, scholars, journalists, artists, and writers formed the lie of blood of the American empire and produced what Lanny Thompson calls an "imperial archipelago," which compiled knowledge, such as visual imagery of the Philippine colony, for military and ideological purposes. Photographic images served the U.S. empire's need for "serviceable information" that enabled military strength, produced consent at home, and silenced dissent in the Philippines and in the United States (McCoy 45).

For example, W. M. Goldthwaite's book The United States of the World (1902)
WAR PICTURES TO FRAME.
On Heavy Plate Paper. The Finest Half-Tone Engravings.
From Drawings Made at the Seat of War by the Famous War Artists of Leslie's Weekly.
Price, 10 cents Each, or the Series of 6 for 50 cents.

SUBJECTS.
- Commodore Schley on the deck of the Brooklyn
- Admiral Sampson on the Bridge of His Flagship, New York
- Admiral Dewey at the Scene of the Great Battle of Manila
- The Spanish Flag Burning by the Order of the Court of Spain
- The Marine Band and the Most Recently Captured Spanish Vessel
- The Recently Captured Spanish Vessel

ADDRESS ARKELL PUBLISHING CO., 110 Fith Avenue, NEW YORK.

Fig. 5. Imperial visual culture. An advertisement for "war pictures" included photographs of Admiral George Dewey fighting in the mock battle of Manila Bay. Circa 1898.

begins with a poem that romanticizes war and the colonization of the Philippines as the imperial destiny of the United States: "Not Westward now alone, but to the sun— Full Eastward—must our Star of Empire run." The verse summarizes westward imperial expansion as a natural process. The global reach of the U.S. nation must not be limited to the conquest of the continent, with the occupation of the Southwest and Native American lands, but "full Eastward" (actually, westward) to lands of the East, and to immortality or "to the sun." Geddie's book contains several colorized photographs of war battles between the American military forces and the Philippine revolutionary army. The photographs illustrate the verse's romantic and naturalized description of empire-building, where imperial war is reduced to a visual spectacle that glosses over the messy reality of carnage, corpses, wounded Filipinos, grieving widows, and orphans.

To create consent and support for the forced occupation of the Philippine Islands, photography took on the ideological work of representing the pleasures of empire-building through necropolitics, a rhetoric of imperial abjection. As Achille Mbembe observes, necropolitics is the supreme exercise of the power to kill, to allow to live, or to expose to death certain persons. Necropolitics is a logic of American imperial abjection that visualizes American imperialism as both an aggressive violence and a "tender violence" that includes gentle forms of social death such as everyday life under military rule and colonial discipline through education. In the late nineteenth century, American discourses on domesticity were coded with the necessity of violence for the abject subjects of American modernity (Weiner 52-53), and we trace these discourses of tender violence and racial sentiment in Philippine colonial photographs. Filipino colonial photographs produce and disseminate the "sensory conditions" that rendered American imperial modernity visible and legible. Photography takes part in war by documenting those who are the agents of abjection, or icons and symbols of U.S. imperial power (the colonizer), and those who are the abject groups, or persons who must be subjected to the terror of U.S. colonial rule (the colonized Filipino native).

In this framework, the "colony," and earlier in history the "frontier," is the location par excellence" of necropolitics (Mbembe 24) and abjection. American visual culture of the late nineteenth century romanticized the idea of the Philippine colony as the new American frontier in the Pacific. A colony is "the zone where the violence of the state of exception is deemed to operate in the service of "civilization" (Mbembe 24). This is exactly the logic of American necropolitics after 1899: to civilize the Filipino savages through violence and colonial rule. By creating the legal fiction of American sovereignty over the islands (Kramer 88) and by transforming Filipino "rebels" into criminals, the colonial camera enabled this state of exception by projecting savagery and criminality onto the Filipino body.

As artifacts of American imperial abjection, photographs contributed to the success of U.S. empire-building in two ways. First, they reproduced American imperial abjection by their very form. Through the "aestheticizing tendency" of photography, Filipino suffering (the war) and Filipino otherness (racialization and eroticization) are reduced to visual spectacle, to mere images, thus minimizing the carnage of war and the trauma of occupation and racism, while offering reliable witness and justification to the triumph of American progress. When these photographs show proof of a winnable war to a young and brash nation ready to become a world power, such as the United States after the
Spanish-American War, they build consent among the public for the imperial enterprise.

Second, photographs reproduced imperial abjection through their inherently objective, dehumanizing documentary function. By reducing complex Filipino histories and realities into war documentation and colonial surveillance, photography transformed Filipino subjects into raw data—the disembodied bearers of anthropological information. This science of the "natural world" would be incorporated into the science of counterinsurgency in the succeeding decades of U.S. military rule in the Philippines. The relationship of photography to counterinsurgency will be discussed in the final chapter of this study.

Philippine colonial photographs from the turn of the twentieth century thus make up the American imperial photography complex, the archive that helped shape the reception of events and ideas associated with U.S. imperial expansion. In the succeeding discussion, I trace the various articulations of abjection through three visual themes: white American imperial masculinity, death, and docility.

**WHITE IMPERIAL MASCULINITY**

In the mid-nineteenth century, European photographs operated through a double system of representation that functioned both "honorifically and repressively." The honorific function of photography dates back to the origins of portraiture in seventeenth-century Europe, when portraits of the upper classes provided the "ceremonial presentation of the bourgeois self" (Sekula 345) and served as moral exemplars to the citizenry. The repressive function of photography, on the other hand, emerged from the requirements of sciences such as medicine, anatomy, and criminology to understand disease and human deviation. Bodies represented in the imperial archive are therefore mostly those of the nation's heroes, leaders, and upper classes and of the nation's marginalized deviant Others: "the poor," "the criminal," the nonwhite, the female, and all other embodiments of the unworthy" (Sekula 347).

Photographs of American soldiers in the Philippine-American War exemplify the honorific function of photography by reconstructing idealized images of white imperial masculinity and heterosexuality. Soldiers' photographs reproduce what Radhika Mohanram describes as a white imperial masculinity that compels "the social, cultural, and juridical injunctions of capitalism and colonialism." Through their manliness and whiteness, American agents of abjection and empire cut honorable masculine figures. In figure 6, a photograph of General Arthur MacArthur, father of General Douglas MacArthur, presents...
an imperial Adamic figure as the commander of the American army in the Philippines. His immaculate officer's uniform heightens his imperial whiteness, contrasted against the dark background of tropical foliage. The caption at the back of the photo says, "appears to be taken in the Philippines," again proving that the circumstances behind these early photographs are seldom known with certainty, even by sources close to the very famous figure in the photograph. General MacArthur has the stern yet serene pose of a leader in charge of superior forces, confident of victory. Yet he was at the same time one of the early advocates of surveillance and counterintelligence, even before the guerrilla phase of the Philippine-American War (McCoy 27), which would indicate that he understood the difficulty of jungle warfare even against an inferior foe.

In figure 7, MacArthur poses with his staff. The formal portrait of General MacArthur and his staff presents empire-building as a masculine task undertaken by the true sons of empire. Thirty-three men pose with MacArthur in front of two large American flags that serve as the backdrop. MacArthur sits with his higher-ranking officers as they hold their scabbard and swords with gloved hands, their hats on their laps. This photograph of white imperial manhood recalls similar photographs of the conquest of the American West, primarily because the officers and soldiers sent to the Philippine Islands in 1899 were the same men who fought and subjugated the American Indians during the "Indian wars." In this image, the histories and ideologies connected to "Indian fighting" are continued: the Philippines was the new "West" or frontier that had to be conquered and won. The confident poses repeat the heroicic representation by European portraiture and photography of capable soldiers of a Western colonial power who are peacefully civilizing savages yet are really pursuing the same brutal campaigns that have been used by white nations against the darker races. In this photograph, the officers personify superior Adamic figures, the noble sons doing the work of U.S. empire-building in the Philippine colony. The heterosexualization and racialization of conquest thus defined the American military images from the period, when imperialism was seen as an expression of American manhood, the unavoidable and logical future of a vigorous, young nation that cannot be held back by the past or "legislative traditions" (Hoganson 158). The gendered idealization of an emergent American world power was much utilized by U.S. imperialists, who argued that the nation was a virtue young man who "should not be confined to the domestic sphere."

The photograph of General MacArthur and his staff is especially interesting because of two of the officers pictured therein. (All the officers were identified at the back of the original photograph.) The first officer of interest is Lt. James H. Blount (third row, far left), who would later serve as a judge in the Philippines and would publish a critical account of the war in his book The American Occupation of the Philippines (1912). Blount's book revealed, among other things, censorship by the military, particularly by General Elwell Otis, and the racism of colonial administrator Dean C. Worcester, whose "Kodak" images of Philippine "savages" will be discussed in the final chapter. James H. Blount would also later support independence for the Philippines.

The second officer of note is Capt. John Roger Meigs Taylor (top row, third from right), who was assigned to write an official history of the Philippine "insurrection" as a way to silence those who were critical of American military
atrocities committed against Filipinos. For four years, Taylor and his staff examined more than two hundred thousand documents in Spanish and Tagalog, captured from the Filipino revolutionary government and shipped to Washington, DC, in 1902. By 1906, Taylor had completed his five-volume manuscript, *The Philippine Insurrection Against the United States: A Compilation of Documents with Notes and Introductions*, which discussed only around fifteen hundred documents out of the “three tons of material” he and his staff had looked at (Farrell 393). The galley proofs of his book were sent to then secretary of war and president-elect William Howard Taft. Influenced by a lengthy negative review of the manuscript by a rival historian (and former assistant of both Worcester and Taft) named James LeRoy, Taft decided that Capt. Taylor’s manuscript was too controversial, since it revealed some embarrassing facts. Among other things, it exposed that some former Filipino revolutionary leaders were now collaborators working for the American colonial government in 1906, and that Philippine independence had significant support from many sectors, including Democratic anti-imperialists (Farrell 58). As a result, the War Department would suppress the publication of Taylor’s manuscript for half a century; Taylor in fact never saw his manuscript published and retired in obscurity. It wasn’t until 1957 that the galley proofs were given to the Philippine government, and the book was later published in the Philippines in 1971, with an introduction by Filipino nationalist historian Renato Constantino. Given the brutal nature of the U.S. military campaign, it is perhaps not surprising that at least two of the thirty-four officers in the photograph later criticized their country’s conduct. Yet, taken at face value, this photograph—and countless other similarly posed photographs—seemingly shows nothing other than a united front of single-minded warriors. No one viewing the photograph would even think that any of these men would ever question their country’s integrity. The concept of abjection encourages us to be aware of, and examine and understand, the fissures that can exist behind such apparently unambiguous images.

The stereo image in figure 8, copyrighted in 1899, seems to be of an armed encounter where the circumstances are not very clear but whose outcome the caption (“For the Stars and Stripes!—Death in the ranks of the Kansans”) forcefully summarizes, emphasizing how the “dead” soldier, in the bottom right of the stereo views, had given up his life for the American nation. In truth, most of the encounters between American and Filipino fighters were one-sided, as the latter tended to be ill-equipped and poorly trained. This seems to have been corroborated by the photograph, which (despite the melodrama of the caption) shows that the disciplined American troops continued to fire back, in full standing formation without breaking rank, with an officer behind them directing, while one of their numbers ministered to their fallen comrade. Such
Fig. 10. Imperial domestic image from a stereograph. Caption: "A welcome to Uncle Sam's protection—three Filipinos entering American lines, Pasay, P. I. [Philippine Islands]." Copyright 1909. From the Library of Congress online collection.

supreme confidence under fire could only have been mustered by troops completely assured of their superior firepower.

Figures 9 and 10 are stereo images of American soldiers interacting with Filipino civilians. The photographs can be classified as "imperial domestic images" used as propaganda (Wexler 21), with soldiers engaged not in combat as in the previous photograph, but in nonaggressive, even humanitarian, activity. In figure 9, the caption on the stereo card points out the benevolence of American soldiers ("Filipino Women Seeking Help from American Soldiers," no year). Four soldiers surround two Filipinas, one holding an infant in her arms. In the far background, more soldiers are looking on. One Filipina on the left claps her hands with a distraught look on her face, as she seems to be addressing the soldier in the foreground. The woman with the baby also seems worriedly focused on this soldier. Another soldier stands directly behind the women, with a strange smile on his face. It may well be, as the caption claims, that the women were seeking help from the soldiers. The photograph clearly shows that the configuration of power—white military masculinity set against brown feminine frailty—is completely skewed; only the soldiers are in any position to provide assistance, yet it appears from their expressions and body language that they are not feeling much solicitude toward the women. The soldier in front still has his rifle, even though he is resting on it. Two soldiers at the back have their arms crossed, which does not suggest empathy. Yes, it may very well be that the caption states the truth, yet absent any other information about the photograph, it would not be wrong to imagine a different scenario taking place here, such as that of an interrogation being conducted by the soldiers on the civilian women. At any rate, regardless of what the actual situation was, the one undeniable "domestic" scene being depicted in this photograph is that of a country at war with the United States, with the faces and bodies of the Filipino civilians suggesting the wretched conditions of war and occupation.

In figure 10, the caption reads: "A welcome to Uncle Sam's protection—three Filipinos entering American lines, Pasay, P. I. [Philippine Islands]." This caption is more believable than the one in the previous photograph if one compares the proximity between the American soldiers and Filipino civilians in both images. In figure 9 the Filipinos are standing more than an arm's length away from the Americans. It may be that the soldiers were following Victorian propriety in keeping a respectful distance between the sexes, but as stated earlier, their body language suggests instead an apathetic divide. In contrast, figure 10 shows Americans and Filipinos bunched together, shoulder to shoulder, a closeness that does not appear to be ironical or farcical, even though the soldiers seemed to have been enjoying a light moment while taking a break from hostilities (two of the soldiers are drinking from goblets; three are smoking). One soldier has even sought to enhance his proximity by crouching down so he is nearer in height to the Filipino beside him. This photograph was likely used to point out how American troops have been protecting helpless Filipino civilians caught in the crossfire, yet the three Filipinos pictured here do not seem too comfortable surrounded by their supposed protectors. The Filipino male, in particular, is downcast and submissive, unable to look at his new guardians or even at the camera, unlike the Filipina beside him. The photograph seems to show that despite American efforts to welcome them into their lines, the Filipinos are uneasy to be in this situation, which tends to be consistent with the psychology of many early colonial encounters.

Technological prowess is a proven fuel to colonization. Advances in naval and military technology, for instance, facilitated the colonial expansion of many European nations, who used long-range ships, cannons, and muskets to subjugate peoples who had none of those technologies. The United States,
Although a latecomer to empire, was no exception, as it relied on a modern communications technology, the telegraph (figure 11), and on more effective killing machines, such as the Gatling gun (figure 12), to quickly defeat organized resistance and set up a colonial government in the Philippines. In figure 11, a young American soldier transcribes telegraph messages as other American soldiers look on. The telegraph allowed Americans to move troops quickly, first in pursuit of retreating Filipino forces under Aguinaldo and later to wage war and to secure conquered territory against Filipino guerrillas who continued their resistance. The telegraph was so essential to U.S. military efforts that Filipinos took to cutting telegraph lines to hinder American troop mobility and make them more vulnerable to guerrilla attacks. Thus, although the soldier transcribing the telegraph message appears to be performing a relatively benign activity, he was nonetheless a significant figure of imperial modernity and masculinity.

There is no such doubt about the manhood being displayed in figure 12, where five American soldiers pose almost nonchalantly beside a Gatling gun. The gun’s terrible potential for “mass slaughter” had given U.S. forces great superiority in firepower as well as some psychological advantage over Filipino troops (McCoy 29). As an effective weapon for quelling resistance against U.S. rule, the Gatling gun was an object of imperial masculinity. The soldiers posing next to the gun are agents of imperial abjection who compel the regime of empire through the terror of the Gatling gun. The casual poses of the soldiers on the left and the right, their arms resting on the gun’s wheel mounts, highlight their confident virility, and the manliness of war is suggested by the phallic barrels of the Gatling gun.

The telegraph and the Gatling gun were first tested on Native Americans during the last of the Indian wars and were later exported to the Philippines to reprise their effective empire-building roles. The photographs of white soldiers posing with these technologies are imperial honorific portraits of U.S. agents of abjection, which were created at the same time that ethnographic images of the naked Filipino savage were being disseminated. Not coincidentally perhaps, the same dissemination of photographs of honorific white and savage Native American subjects had taken place during the Indian wars to provide a rationale for western expansion. “Seeing whiteness,” particularly white imperial masculinity, reverses the gaze of the colonial camera by focusing on the spectacular male bodies that mythologize empire through race and masculinity. As photographs of abjection, these images do not have to depict actual scenes of violence or carnage, but instead represent indices of violence through the visual representation of objects of imperial warfare.

DEATH

Given the surreptitious nature of guerrilla warfare, the U.S. Army could not distinguish between civilians and rebels, and could not definitively tell who was amigo or insurrecto. A common racist phrase among soldiers, again borrowing similar saying from the Indian wars, was “The only true Amigo is the dead Amigo.” It is quite probable that many soldiers were soon making good on this saying or had simply given up on trying to tell the difference between a combatant and a civilian, because Filipino civilian casualties far outnumbered combat deaths. Guerrilla war, because its morality is so contingent and its outcome so irascible, can unnerve the nation that enjoys the superior firepower. American journalist Stephen Bonsal, who visited the Philippines for three months in 1902 during the guerrilla phase of the Philippine-American War, writes in his account that, despite American government reports, the rebellion was “chronic” and that the Filipino guerrillas were “winning” through strategies of “subterfuge and disguise” even though there were still fifty thousand U.S. troops in the Philippine Islands after the official end of the war. He describes with frustration what was then called amigo warfare: “When a band of insurgents in Batangas is hard pressed by our soldiers, when they have hush-hushed an army train, shot down teamsters, cut to pieces a small detachment, or murdered a lonely signal-corps man ... they store their guns in bamboo logs, put on amigo clothes, and once beyond the borders of Batangas, amuse themselves with cock-fighting and fiaskas, like all the other hombres” (Bonsal 431).

To help manage disquieting news from the Philippines and to calm national anxieties regarding the constitutionality of war and imperialism, American publications regularly displayed dead Filipino bodies. Stereograph companies even sold photographs of dead “Filipino amigos,” using the phrase as a caption for the stereoscopic cards. Viewed by turn-of-the-century Americans through the racial and gendered frames of abjection, empire’s violence was muted and even mooted by the imperative for American victory. If abjection is the symptom (the monstrous) and the sublime (the magnificence) of empire, images of the slain Filipino “enemy” are both the symptom and the sublime of empire, in photographs that are both violent and celebratory. The Filipino cadaver, rebel or civilian, becomes a sign of American nationhood and victory, an emblem of the American imperial sublime.

This sublime is very much in evidence in the photograph of numerous Filipino corpses in a ditch (figure 13) captioned, “After a skirmish, Singalong.” Singalong is part of the district of Santa Ana in Manila, where much fighting occurred during the early months of the war. There is scant detail, apart
Fig. 11. White imperial masculinity: manhood and technology. No date. From the National Archives collection of the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

Fig. 12. White American imperial masculinity: the Gatling gun as object of masculinity. No date. From the National Archives collection of the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

Fig. 13. After a battle in Singalong, a town near the district of Santa Ana. No date. Original photograph taken from the National Archives collection of the Bureau of Insular Affairs.
from the photograph, about this little "skirmish" that resulted in an impressive number of enemy dead. The photograph itself is found in a National Archives folder labeled "Records of U.S. Army Overseas." The photo was then published in the illustrated book *Fighting in the Philippines* (1899) with the caption: "The American Artillery did wonderful execution in the battles with the insurgents. In a trench at Santa Ana the Tagal [sic] dead lay in piles. The group shown in the picture consisted of thirty-eight bodies" (Figure 14). Apart from the admirable diligence someone must have employed in painstakingly counting the number of corpses in the trench (stacked on top of each other, the dead bodies are almost impossible to tell apart in the photograph), there is also much to admire in the unabashed triumphalism of the caption. Indeed, artillery will do a "wonderful execution" of any enemy unfortunate enough to be in its range. The term "Tagal" is a misspelling of the term *Tagalog*, which was used interchangeably to refer to natives from the central region of Luzon island that includes Manila. The placement of this photograph alongside the one showing a large troop of Americans looking at stacks of railroad iron from an unfinished rebel barricade seems to imply (perhaps unwittingly) a parallelism: those who dare to stand up against Americans will end up lying dead in piles at their feet.

Figures 15 and 16 are stereo cards showing scenes taken after battle, circa 1899. In figure 15, two dead Filipino rebels lie contorted on the ground while three American soldiers look on. The Americans are in the upper half of the
frame, a visual suggestion of their status as victors; the Filipino corpses occupy the lower half of the frame, suggesting their subaltern/abject status. The caption reads: "A sacrifice to Aguinaldo's ambition: belittling the death of the Filipinos as damage collateral to Aguinaldo's foolish and vain ambition to remain president of the independent Philippine Republic. The caption shifts the blame for the deaths—and, by extension, the entire war—to one man, Aguinaldo, disregarding the fact that his anticolonial ambition to live in a free country was shared by most Filipinos, and that Aguinaldo himself was an ally in the earlier U.S. war against Spain, which was partly waged to liberate Spain's colonies from its grasp.

It must be noted that the logic of abjection is often articulated in the captions of the photographs, where the visual elements—such as those of death and destruction—are interpreted so that the suffering of the enemy is minimized and the benefit to the victors is substantiated and maximized. The im-
age delivers the spectacle of American victory while the imperial caption palliates whatever feelings of discomfort the spectacle might produce. The image of enemy corpses can produce an imperial "pleasure" that helps manage the nation's fear of losing the Philippine "insurrection," similar to the equanimity offered by Civil War photographs of dead Confederacy soldiers. As object visuals, therefore, the Philippine-American War photographs articulate the monstrosity and magnifiency of empire. They can disturb and fascinate the viewer, often at the same time. In figure 16, the caption reads: "The ending of two Filipino Sharp-shooters—a rice field in Lumis, Philippines." Two Filipino corpses, bodies twisted, lie side by side, with the fighter on the right holding what appears to be a rifle above his head. The caption tries to glorify the object situation by portraying both men as "sharp-shooters," hence as dangerous enemy assets who needed to be neutralized. The captioner perhaps cannot be faulted for taking both Filipino fighters as sharpshooters—Filipino forces were so poorly equipped, and rifles and bullets so short in supply, that anyone with a rifle must surely be a sharpshooter. Neither man was even wearing a military uniform, so we have only the caption's assurance that these men, so pathetically arrayed in death, were really enemy combatants.

Figure 17, captioned "Insurgent Trenches at Bag-Bag River," shows a deep ditch, presumably dug by the "insurgents," filled with corpses of Filipino soldiers. There is a fence, possibly made of bamboo, over the trench, which makes it likely that this was a fortified position where the Filipinos apparently made their last stand. The Bag-Bag River is in Bulacan, a province just north of Manila and part of the Tagalog region, which was the center of early Filipino resistance. The photograph is imprinted with the seal of the "Chief Engineering Office of the Philippines," but the name of the photographer who took the image has oddly and literally been covered up. Unlike in the U.S. Civil War and Indian wars, no American photographers became famous, or at least were noted, for their photographs of the Philippine "insurrection." It must have made sense that a war that received critical attention from an articulate organization such as the Anti-Imperialist League would have its chroniclers and documenters remain anonymous, especially if they had been witnesses to this kind of carnage. Indeed, as protests and criticisms against the conquest and occupation of the Philippine Islands continued even after the declaration of the end of the Philippine-American War in 1902, censorship by the United States became increasingly active.

American journalists protested the censorship of the war as early as August 1899, when a correspondent from the Associated Press wrote that one censor told him he was instructed to "shut off everything that could hurt McKinley's administration." Another journalist, Oswald Garrison Villard, published his memoir Fighting Years: Memoirs of a Liberal Editor, which included a photograph from the undeclared "second phase" of the Philippine-American War, fought after 1902 in many parts of occupied Philippines, particularly in the Muslim Mindanao region. The photograph (figure 18) shows the infamous aftermath of the 1906 "Battle of Bud Dajo" in Jolo, Sulu Province, fought by American forces under General Leonard Wood against Tausug Muslims. In the photograph, dead bodies of dozens of Tausug Muslims, mostly women and children, are piled up in an extinct volcano crater, where a thousand Tausugs sought refuge but were massacred by Wood's troops. In his memoir, Villard writes that an unnamed but high-ranking American official "accidentally" destroyed the negative (Villard "frontis" 156). Fortunately, a copy of the photograph was eventually reprinted in American newspapers (Kramer 220). Looking back at his years as an editor and journalist for the Nation, Villard wrote that there was an "official repression of facts" about the war (Villard 139), citing as example the American official's attempt to suppress the Bud Dajo photograph.

Such censorship notwithstanding, anonymous photographers still managed to record images of great devastation. Figures 19 and 20 are images of decimated towns after battles between American and Filipino forces. The caption for figure 19 ("Burned district of Cavite") mentions the city of Cavite, an important port on Manila Bay and later the seat of U.S. naval forces in the Philippines. It is also right next to the town of Kawit, which was the birthplace and headquarters of General Aguinaldo, over which the flag of the independent Philippine Republic was first raised. The battle for such a historical and strategic location reduced the city to rubble; the photograph shows that only the ruins of houses and scorched tree trunks were left standing. In figure 20, a lone soldier walks through the razed town of Calumpit, Bulacan, "after American troops had passed thru" it, according to the caption.

Besides those of death and destruction, photographs of public hangings during the war were reprinted as postcards, perhaps to remind viewers of the state's power to discipline its subjects, but also to reinforce the depiction of the Philippine colony as a zone of abolition. The caption on figure 21 describes the execution of three Filipino "ladrones," the Spanish term for "bandits" or "thieves." The date, "Dec. 28, 1900," is marked on the photograph. Given the censorship by the American military authorities and the lack of information regarding the subjects of most colonial photographs in the Philippines, we could question the labelling of the three Filipinos as bandits. For one thing, we see a phalanx of American soldiers standing in front of the gallows. The sizable contingent of U.S. soldiers present during the execution might suggest that the Filipinos who were being hanged were not just petty thieves, but persons of considerable repute or notoriety.
One important ideological achievement of the photographs in this section is that they created what Virginia Dominguez describes as a taxonomy of enemies and allies. The images during and after battle articulate the American imperial sublime by depicting death as the inevitable consequence of racial inferiority: U.S. soldiers standing upright and triumphant as they pose next to multiple brown cadavers, usually shown as a tangle of bodies or a tattered row of nameless dead, their humanity unrecognizable. By producing a visual taxonomy of the enemy in death, Americans manufactured their own imperial and racial lessons through the American photography complex — our war is just and our war is winnable.

For many viewers, these were not images of horrific violence but were images of American modernity claiming victory over Filipino savagery. Photography brings forth the argument that the increasing destructiveness of war is, like photography itself, nothing other than an advancement of science. American
soldiers and civilians who saw these war images were able to adopt a new "military morality" that absolves the perpetrators, since war is presented as a science enabled by technology and therefore part of the improvement of the "civilized" or Western race. This might explain why President Theodore Roosevelt sent a telegram to General Wood to congratulate him for his "brave feat of arms" for the American flag a week after the publication of the photograph of the massacre of one thousand Taungs, including women and children, at Bud Dajo (Kramer 220).

But despite the racial and imperial ideologies at work in the photographs and American popular culture, which promoted what Kirstin Hoganson describes as the "white American "man's ideal" and the "jingoist desire" for war," these photographs still disturbed the peace and fueled criticisms of the Philippine War. W. J. T. Mitchell, paraphrasing Marx, writes that pictures "have lives and desires of their own" and that the meanings produced by photographic or visual images "do not always do it in the same way, nor under conditions of their own choosing." In other words, war photographs do not always deliver the "correct" imperialist message or condone the violence of war under a celebratory rhetoric. Critics of the Philippine-American War in fact interpreted these war images differently. Members and supporters of the Anti-Imperialist League read these photographs not just as evidence of the atrocities committed in the service of American empire-building, but as proof of the social problem resulting from the crisis of white American masculinity being threatened by the "imperial degeneracy" of a war of conquest. To help refute these anti-imperialist arguments, the complex had to produce other images that showed Filipino docility and domesticity as benevolent consequences of American imperialism.

**DOCILITY**

In November 1899, when Filipino forces shifted to guerrilla warfare, American military officials, policymakers, and soldiers viewed this irregular form of warfare as a mark of the Filipinos' primitive state, since a "civilized people" would surely observe the protocols of Western warfare (Kramer 90). Facing annihilation by the Americans, poorly equipped Filipino forces had no choice but to retreat, hide in the mountains and jungle, or blend in among villagers and peasants in rural communities. Aguinaldo ordered small guerrilla units to conduct local attacks against American camps (Kramer 130). The Filipinos fought a "war of the flea," a contemporary American military term in counterinsurgency studies for guerrilla warfare, which comes from the analogy between a flea and a guerrilla, and the ability of the smaller, agile flea to exhaust, weaken, or at least...
harass the larger dog. In a guerrilla war, the once visible body of an enemy soldier, now in disguise as an amigo or ally or even just a noncombatant, could no longer be identified, and the American army saw this subterfuge as a betrayal of civilized warfare. Filipino guerrilla warfare became one of the grounds for racializing Filipinos as guapos, referring to the Tagalog term for the coconut-oil shampoo that Filipinos typically used, and suggesting the American soldier’s perception of the slippery, oily, and wily character of the Filipino “insurgent”
(Kramer 127). Since Filipinos chose to wage a guerrilla war, American soldiers viewed Filipinos as savages and used racial terms such as "gugu" and "nigger" in their letters and diaries (Kramer 139).

So in a time of guerrilla war and the treacherous "invisibility" of the Filipino insurgent, the image of the Filipino male—unless he was dead or a child or a member of a primitive indigenous tribe—dropped from circulation. In its place, two images of Filipino abjectness were widely and popularly disseminated: the naked Filipino savage and the docile clothed colonial. The naked Filipino savage, in many ethnographic photographs taken by the colonial administrator Dean C. Worcester and others, visually recalled for American spectators the success of both the physical and "tender violence" of Progressive Era projects, which included domesticating or pacifying Native bodies through genocidal war and colonial incarceration in reservations and boarding schools. The image of the naked savage also reiterated the justness and appropriateness of America's colonial mission, which was of course to civilize him.

The second image, the clothed Filipino child or woman, references the dark or nonwhite body of American imperial modernity, continuing the long line of images of Native and black schoolchildren in institutions such as the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, and images of black slaves posing in the homes of slave owners (Wedler). The image of the nonthreatening Filipino "enemy," as a naked savage or docile colonial, was produced at a time when accounts of U.S. military atrocities were being published in American newspapers. Thus the cultural work of staging Filipino savagery and docility through popular photographs, along with actual censorship of the news, rendered the brutality of American military strategies invisible and unknowable. Allan Sekula writes that photographs function metonymically as visual texts that "stand for a contextually related object or event." He cites the example of how, in the nineteenth century, "solemn portraits of American Indians were made as the race was exterminated" (39). In the case of naked or clothed Filipino subjects, their solemn, scowling visages were being photographed while the Filipino race was experiencing a war of similar genocidal proportions.

Images of Filipino savagery and docility were published in dozens of illustrated travel books after 1898. The most commercially successful travel book published during the Philippine-American War was José de Olivarres's Our Islands and Their People, as Seen with Camera and Pencil (1902), edited by William S. Bryan (Thompson 2). De Olivarres was a native of California and a journalist for the Globe Democrat of Saint Louis. Published as two oversized texts, Our Islands and Their People was an imperial racial spectacle that featured twelve hundred black-and-white photographs along with nineteen hand-colored photographs. The book was a commercial success, was republished in 1905, sold four hundred thousand copies, and launched an industry of illustrated books on the "insular possessions" of the United States after 1898 (Thompson 3-4).

In de Olivarres's book, some photographs of naked Filipino women were displayed alongside the clothed images of lowland, or "Hispanized," Filipinas and Cuban and Puerto Rican women. These contrasting images—the clothed female colonial versus the naked Filipino—visually defined the Filipino race as a savage people in the minds of American readers, and also morphologically feminized the Philippine homeland and made it ripe for conquest. Yet it seems that the land and the women would not be as submissive and feminized as their depictions would have it, which de Olivarres himself remarks in this unflattering passage on Filipino women.

In the first place, she is the unloveliest of women... After seeing Porto [sic] Rican and Cuban maidens, a man entering Manila will expect to be thrilled again by great, lustrous, dark eyes; but the glance of the Filipino woman will never thrill you. Her eyes are not large, but they are black and beady and unreadable. Very often hunger looks out at you; often hatred, but it is not passionate hatred... She cannot understand why these white men with guns intrude upon her ancient customs. She doesn't like the white man anyway. Her eyes tell him so and she wishes he were back in his own land. (590-91)

One can understand de Olivarres's preference for Puerto Rican and Cuban women since he has race, culture, and history in common with them. But he definitely was not imagining the hunger and hatred he saw in Filipinas's eyes, because she was truly hungry and she really hated—and de Olivarres was again right in ascribing the cause of her hunger and hatred to the white man with the gun. Yet he gets it wrong when he says that she doesn't like the white man anyway, conflating a colonial misfortune (white men with guns) into a bias against all white men. Applying a flawed racial logic, he fails to see that war and occupation would turn any female caught in their grip into the unloveliest of women.

Elsewhere, de Olivarres writes:

They are a dark people—some are distinctively black—and our soldiers have fallen into the habit of calling them "niggers"... For all the practical purposes of civilization, the mirthful, easy-going African is superior to these treacherous and blood-thirsty hybrid Malays. (599)

De Olivarres was a Californian of Mexican descent. He probably did not have a profound comprehension of the troubled relationship between whites and
blacks, since California did not have, during his time, a large population of 'Africans.' What California did have was a sizable number of Asians, for whom the state was the principal disembarkation of their Pacific crossing. Racial tensions among California's Asian, Mexican, and white populations had risen greatly in the late nineteenth century, and de Oliavres may have been influenced by this knotty state of affairs in his characterization of Filipinos, who—being hybrid Malays with beady unreadable eyes—were decidedly Asian.

Yet these Asians were to be America's new wards even as a guerrilla war was raging in the islands, and as wards of an emerging world power that prided itself on its democratic ideals, they needed to be educated. U.S. soldiers served as the earliest schoolteachers; in 1901, even before the official end of the Philippine-American War, the first American civilian teachers arrived in Manila. In the colonial archive, images of Filipino schoolchildren stage the pacification of the Philippines as good or docile subjects of American imperial modernity, with their white teachers automatically reprising roles of racial superiority formerly assumed by soldiers. It could be said that the military colonial government and the public education system were twin institutions that came into being almost simultaneously. Figures 22–25 are photographs and stereographs of Filipino schoolchildren taken during the first decade of U.S. rule. The large, airy classroom in figure 22 features capiz shell-tiled window panels that are distinctively Filipino, thus marking its Philippine setting. The schoolboys are bent over their desks, reading and writing. Western-style hats stacked on benches in front of the desks. What seem to be arithmetical equations are on blackboards on two walls of the classroom. In front of the class is the schoolteacher, a white American woman in a light long-sleeved blouse with a high-necked collar and a long skirt. The teacher is at her desk, surveying her seemingly overcrowded classroom as eight boys stand along two sides, perhaps having no desk to sit in. It's difficult to figure out the boys' ages, but some appear to be at or near puberty, and therefore able to wield a weapon in a few years. Hence, the urgency to get them into a classroom and instill American values, and not least a good amount of docility, in them so they will not turn into guerrilla fighters in the future.

Figure 23 is a photograph of an even larger "Assembly Room of San Andres Primary School, Malate, Manila." This time, rows of schoolgirls are reading their schoolbooks with hands folded on their laps, an image of discipline and concentration. An impression one might be left with is that of row upon row of neatly braided or beribboned dark hair of the schoolgirls, yet one girl on the far left has her long, shiny hair falling past her shoulders. Is this defiance or independence? It is hard to spot the teacher, who appears partly hidden in front, with two girls facing her and at least two standing behind. Although she seems to be fully occupied attending to the standing students, she still has full control over her class, who continue reading diligently. The statement being made by these images seems to be that order reigns in the new colony, indicating submission and docility among people still presumably at war with the United States.

In figure 24, young boys in simple cotton shirts and pants pose in front of a nipa hut, a traditional structure built from dried cogan grass leaves and wood, being used, according to the caption, as a "Native School house." This image, like figure 22, manages pro-expansionist fears regarding the danger of young Filipino males who could grow up to become insurgents. The image suggests that American education and colonial tutelage will eliminate the Philippine insurgency even in remote areas where makeshift structures had to suffice as schoolhouses. The stereo card was printed in 1903 when the guerrilla war was still in full swing.

In figure 25, young Filipinas are learning their lessons in the domestic arts—a "Class in Embroidery," as the handwritten caption on the photographic states. The women in front seem quite content and intent at their embroidery, looking down at what they're doing instead of at the camera. Such outward interest in home decorative arts bodes well for the American colonial effort, as it indicates a psychology among the women that does not discount a hopeful domestic future for them. A smoldering resentment resulting from war and occupation is not easily concealed, and if that can be upstaged by the plainness, however designed, of this setting, then it shows the effectiveness of what Vernadette V. Gonzalez describes as "kinder, gentler imperialism" at work.

The American imperial fiction of the violent Filipino fighter or criminal—dead or alive—is transformed, by the evolved role of the United States from war combattant to colonial occupier, into another imperial fiction: that of the docile, passive, clothed Filipino colonial who submits to American military rule. Both fictions present a type of Filipino that needs civilized—through war and violence for the first, education and benevolence for the latter, yet a hybrid of both kinds of persuasion could surely not be avoided when all the schooling was being conducted in the middle of a raging guerrilla war. These images of docile youth must be seen as an abiding visual form of the American empire, what the nation's memory had preferred to retain from such a monumental yet brutal American experience, the colonization of its first territory in Asia. In addition, the production of Filipino docility, through the image of the colonial ward, might have helped suppress the continuing Filipino resistance to American colonial rule.

It could be argued that imperial abjection resides almost seamlessly in the photographic images of clothed Filipina women that were circulated after the Philippine-American War. Photographs of Filipina women are more than
Orientalist souvenirs or commodified "visual scapes" kept by an American photographer to remember his sojourn to the Philippine colony. The photographs are in fact images of imperial sentimentalization that valorize the ideals of American imperialism institutionalized in "schools, hospitals, prisons" and other sites of sentimental power (Wexler 103), including that of the submissive female body. These imperial sentimental photographs insinuate forms of violence against "the dark" (Wexler 108) at a time when reports of actual violence were being withheld from the American public, who had already been told that the Philippine Islands were now pacified and under U.S. military control. To quote Wexler:

Sentimentalization was an externalized aggression that was sadistic, not masochistic, in flavor. The energies it developed were intended as a tool for the control of others, not merely as an aid in the conquest of the self. This element of the enterprise was not oriented toward white middle-class readers... Rather, it aimed at the subjection of people of different classes and races, who were compelled to play not the leading roles but the human scenery before which the melodrama of middle-class redemption could be enacted, for the enlightenment of an audience in which they were not even included. (103)

Sentimentalization—from what Laura Wexler traces in nineteenth-century American women's fiction and photography—is a logic of American imperialism that countenances a racial and class aggression against human bodies that did not conform to the notion of the proper occupants of a "middle-class white Christian home" (Wexler 103). Sentimentalization was also an imperialist narrative about bodies that lost their own homes and "traditional modes of living" after slavery and U.S. wars of conquest (Wexler 103). With the occupation of the Philippine Islands in 1898, the bodies of imperial sentiment that were brown (Native Americans), black (African Americans), and white (working-class whites or European immigrants) now included new bodies. Imperial sentimentalization thus presents colonial duplicity through new bodies, such as Filipina figures, that are posed as perfect candidates for modernity and educational advancement. At work in these photographs is the idea of learning the lessons of American modernity, without revealing war and carnage as the initial agents of change. Photographs of traditionally dressed Filipinas, and by extension Filipino schoolchildren, are abject images of empire, representing the fiction of the transformation of the Filipino "savage race" into modern subjects through American education and tutelage from largely middle-class noncombatants, who had arrived in the Philippines almost at the same time as U.S. troop reinforcements for an ongoing guerrilla war. The clandestine presence of war and occupation therefore haunts these seemingly tranquil and nonviolent images.

In one of the stereo cards (figure 26) the young girls are described as "school girls in native dress, upper garment made of hemp gauze". They are sitting in a room that appears to be the house's receiving area: potted plants, wood floors, and traditional capiz shell window and door panels evoke the interiors of lowland and Hispanized Philippine homes of the period. Dressed in the traditional barot saya (blousy tops with the gauzy butterfly sleeves—from "hemp"—and long striped skirts), with their fans on their laps, the young girls cut an elegant yet somewhat languid look. The fans mark their identities as "elspanized" Filipinas who follow the latest fashion from Mother Spain. The young women are described as "schoolgirls," suggesting youth, femininity, and the potential for modernity. The image of these two reposed women is supposed to represent people that are able to rest, finally settled after a time of conflict and uncertainty, and poised to learn the modern ways of their benevolent colonizers. Yet it could be argued that these women, based on the relatively high status evident from their surroundings, would have moved into modernity with the help of any agent, be they Spanish colonizers, American colonizers, or indeed even independent Filipinos.

Figure 27 shows a young Filipino woman ("a native maid") from Albay Province, Luzon who poses in a barot saya with a dark patadyong over her long saya. Like the two schoolgirls in Figure 26, she holds a fan in her hands, marking her status and femininity. Her long black hair is carefully coiffed, and she wears a dark velvet necklace with a pendant. This photograph was published as the frontispiece of an obscure romance novel, Oscar Coursey's The Woman with a Stone Heart: A Romance of the Philippine War (which will be discussed in the concluding chapter of the book), a novel about a cross-dressing Filipina criminal. The choice of this image as a frontispiece for the novel seems an odd one because the young woman does not embody qualities related to either cross-dressing or criminality that the woman with a stone heart is supposed to have. It could be surmised that this photograph was the best the publishers could find; perhaps its rough-hewn rustic background sufficed as a proxy for one of the novel's settings, the jungle of Aguinaldo's guerrilla army, which the woman with the stone heart had joined, posing as a man. At any rate, it is heartening to know that the book publishers could find only a marginally suitable image, from the thousands that existed, for an unsympathetic fictional character, proving that de Oliveira's claim that the Filipina is "the unloveliest of women" is nothing but an exaggeration.

Figure 28 is one of the race photographs that show a profile view of the Fil-
Fig. 27. Staging docility. Caption: "A native maid from Albay, Luzon." No date. From the National Archives collection of the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

Fig. 28. Staging docility. Caption: "Embroidery pupil, school of Household Industries, Manila 1912." From the National Archives collection of the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

The Filipina subject. Most portraits of the period show the full face and details of the woman's dress. This young woman's left profile highlights, quite artfully, her mestiza, or mixed-race, features—fine jawline, sharp nose, high cheekbones, and obvious light skin. She wears a traditional baro't saya with elaborate folds, and a full complement of jewelry: earrings, bracelet, and a ring on her left ring finger, which does not mean she is married, because Filipinos of that time, if they did wear wedding rings, wore them Spanish-style on the right ring finger. She is working on a flower embroidery, as the caption, "Embroidery pupil, school of Household Industries, Manila 1912," states. This photograph was taken later than the previous embroidery photograph in figure 25, perhaps during the first decade of American colonial rule. By that time, trade and finishing schools such as the School of Household Industries had been established in Manila to prepare new Filipina colonials for a life of peaceful domesticity. Images such as this confirm that the Philippines had entered a postwar period, and that now as a settled U.S. colony it has begun to rehabilitate itself as a modern society interested in such progressive endeavors as "household industries."
More than a century ago, stereographs produced visual mediations of “an American empire in the Orient,” of what it takes to build it, promote it, and maintain it. A Kodak advertisement from a 1904 issue of Harper’s Weekly (figure 29) offers a connection between photography and American imperial abjection. In the ad, a mustached white man in a military uniform surveys the landscape, a small notebook in hand. His mustache, uniform, and demeanor recalls the iconic look of Theodore Roosevelt the Rough Rider (and not Theodore Roosevelt, the president of the United States at the time). In the background is a rugged terrain with several mounted riders in the distance, while to his left stands a racially ambiguous, nonwhite man tending to two horses, suggesting that the latter is either a servant or guide to the white man in uniform. The ad is entitled “The Correspondent,” identifying the central figure as a journalist reporting from the remote frontline of some far-off colonial war, as the ad copy makes clear:

In war as in peace the Kodak is at the front.

In Cuba and the Philippines, in South Africa, in Venezuela, and now in Korea and Manchuria, the camera most in evidence is the Kodak.

The same qualities that make it indispensable to the correspondent make it most reliable for the tourist—simplicity, freedom from darkroom bother, lightness combined with a strength that resists the wear and tear of travel.

The ad’s primary purpose, of course, is to sell Kodak cameras, to tout their advantages as simple, lightweight, and reliable devices for tourists to record travel events the same way correspondents record events that happen in a war. War here is not the messy, violent, brutally destructive, and evil thing it actually is—the ad makes it to be something sexy, alluring, and adventurous, enumerating war zones (Cuba, the Philippines, South Africa . . .) as though they were the most exotic tourist destinations, as a travel ad would say, “Bangkok, Bali, and Beyond.”

“In war as in peace,” begins the ad, subtly making moral equivalents of peace and war. The ad’s approbation of war, it could be argued, extends to support for colonialism and imperialism. It celebrates the military correspondent as a heroic figure, yet the correspondent is nothing but an imperial agent, an employee of a newspaper published in a Western colonial power and read by citizens of that colonial power. The link between photography and imperial abjection surfaces here. Photography, as represented by the correspondent, is as ubiquitous and instrumental to the colonial enterprise as war and soldiers, because it can show racial inferiority, provide proof of victory, and build consent. In giving vi
sual form to both imperial and pedestrian adventures ("In war as in peace..."), the camera participates fully in the imperial enterprise by producing images of the American nation's heroes, its inferior and abject colonial Others, and all the different permutations of colonial encounters between these two.

Colonial photographs are "technological mediations of vision," that performed "the cultural-political labor" of the management of the Filipino natives for American viewers (Chaudhary 86–88). Colonial bodies in the archive are not only bodies under surveillance but are also imperial indices that narrate empire as "understandable": our war in the Philippine colony is a just and benevolent war. By considering necropolitics and the American photography complex, we highlight a critical reading practice that counters the romance of empire through the ideologies imbricated upon the images. Like all Western imperial cultures, the United States in the nineteenth century "revealed in the world of images" (Chaudhary 90), and U.S. empire-building required the production of an "anthology of images" (Sontag 1) to explain America's new imperial role in world affairs. By 1899, when the Filipino revolutionary armies dug in their heels for a protracted war against the United States, stereographs and photographs of the Philippine colony helped managed American anxieties over the war with the "Filipino insurgents."

Susan Sontag famously observed that the production of images "furnishes a ruling ideology" (Sontag 178), which in turn-of-the-century United States was an ideology based on imperial modernity. By imagining an Imperial archipelago (Thompson), the colonial camera silenced and rendered invisible the political and military struggle for Philippine independence. Anti-imperialist dissent, represented in the writings of Mark Twain and the rest of the Anti-Imperialist League, had dissipated by the early twentieth century with the pacification of the Islands, which coincided with the rise of photography in print culture. What emerged, for the consumption of the fin de siècle American public, was the visual spectacle of the savage and docile Filipino body. By "displaying the Filipino" through the familial and familiar tropes of savagery, docility, exoticism, and racial inferiority, these colonial photographs of the Philippine Islands visually constructed American imperial power as legitimate and legible. Through stereographs, postcards, and other photographic images from the Philippine-American War, the problematic issues of colonial violence, war, and occupation ironically disappeared.

Chapter Three

Skin

Lynching, Empire, and the Black Press during the Philippine-American War

In the mid-nineteenth century, Jim Crow laws were very much ingrained in every facet of American culture, including in the U.S. Army, which had begun opening its ranks to black soldiers. In 1866, despite opposition from some politicians, the U.S. Congress created a new black segment of the U.S. Army: two cavalry regiments, the Ninth and the Tenth; and four infantry regiments, the Thirty-Sixth, Thirty-Ninth, Forty-First, and Forty-First (Fletcher 20). By 1869, during the era of Reconstruction, the infantry regiments were consolidated, and the four black units became the Twenty-Fourth and the Twenty-Fifth Infantry (Fletcher 21). At the time, white military leaders, and indeed many Americans, had a generally negative opinion of the fighting capabilities of African American soldiers, and so racial segregation was upheld even during times of war (Fletcher 18). As one white journalist wrote, the incidents of slave revolts dating decades back and black soldiers' mutinies were proof that "colored soldiers" could not be trusted, since they were naturally violent, murderous, and had contempt toward their white officers and loyalty only to "men of their own color."

The creation of distinct and separate units based on race reproduced the culture of American abjection in the U.S. Army while the army was becoming an important apparatus of continental expansion and empire-building. In fact, the army was an intense site of imperial abjection because of the normalization of racial and gender hierarchies through military cultures.

Despite segregation, African American soldiers fought in every American war. In 1898, some ten thousand African American soldiers volunteered to fight in the Spanish-American War (Foner 84). But regardless of their show of patriotism, black soldiers suffered racial humiliation and violent assaults from white Americans. In training camps in the South, both black volunteers and