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AFRICAN-AMERICAN SOLDIERS AND FILIPINOS: RACIAL IMPERIALISM, JIM CROW AND SOCIAL RELATIONS

By
Scot Ngozi-Brown*

In February 1899, the Spanish Government ratified a peace treaty which “entrusted” the Philippines to the United States. Despite the success in the war with Spain, the United States military forces could not avoid conflict with another opponent in the Philippines. Emilio Aguinaldo had led a well-organized Filipino resistance to Spanish colonialism prior to the United States’ intervention, and this resistance continued after the Spanish defeat. When the peace treaty was ratified, skirmishes between Filipino nationalists and United States forces had already occurred. These conflicts evolved into full-scale, pitched battles. The Filipinos also used guerrilla warfare tactics to resist what they considered an American replacement of Spain as the oppressor.

This turn of events in the early Spring, 1899, marks the beginning of the Philippine-American war (1899-1902) — a war which quickly involved the United States Army’s African-American soldiers. All four black regiments which had previously fought in Cuba were dispatched to the Philippines in the summer of 1899. These African-American soldiers were to find themselves placed in an extremely difficult situation. They were foot soldiers for a racist ideology in which white Americans characterized Filipinos as they did African-Americans: as inferior, inept, and even sub-human. When the United States military occupied the Philippine islands, it installed a racist society which alienated both Filipino and African-American soldiers.¹

This study examines how the African-American soldiers’ social relations with Filipino civilians functioned within the broader context of racial imperialism and an imported Jim Crowism. Other works, such as Willard Gatewood’s Black Americans and the White Man’s Burden and Richard Welch’s, Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine American War, discuss how turn-of-the-century imperialism related to the oppression of African-Americans. Gatewood’s “Smoked Yankees” and the Struggle for Empire: Letters from Negro Soldiers, 1898-1902, a compilation of letters written by black soldiers to various African-American newspapers, and Michael Robinson and Frank Schubert’s article “David Fagen: An Afro-American Rebel in the Philippines, 1899-1901” are examples of significant but not definitive contributions to understanding the African-American soldier’s plight in the Pacific. Hence, the particular problem that the Philippine-American War posed for the African-American soldier has not been explored in great detail.

---

* Scot Ngozi-Brown is a graduate student at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.
The Politics of Racial Imperialism

African-American soldiers’ experiences in the Philippine-American War were affected by the ideological foundations of the United States’ quest for empire. At the close of the nineteenth century, many white scholars and political theorists asserted not only that Anglo-Saxons were generally superior to other races and ethnic groups, but that they possessed a unique capacity for self-government. Self-government was considered a racial faculty, one that political editoralist Laurence Lowell claimed the “Anglo-Saxon race was prepared for. . . by centuries of discipline under the supremacy of law.”

This racial ideology was so pervasive in American society that even the political policy-makers, members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, argued in support of or against U.S. expansion, with a logic based on the premise of Anglo-Saxon superiority. For those who supported imperialism, the expansion of United States’ borders was an Anglo-Saxon destiny and duty. “I believe in providence,” argued pro-imperialist Senator Orville Platt from Connecticut, “the same force was behind our army at Santiago and our ships in Manila Bay that was behind the landing of the pilgrims on Plymouth Rock.”

This Anglo-Saxon sense of mission inherently characterized Filipinos as inferior and lacking the intellectual development required for self-government. Colorado’s Senator Thomas Patterson, for example, wondered whether or not “the Filipino of average intelligence distinguishes between an independent government and a benevolent paternal government.” In addition to the emphasis on perceived intellectual differences between whites and Filipinos, Indiana’s Senator Albert Beveridge often added praise for the physical attributes of the Anglo-Saxon to his impassioned call for U.S. annexation of the Philippine Islands. After having toured the Philippines in 1900, he described white American soldiers in the following manner,

Everywhere the pale or gray, everywhere the tawny hair and beard. . . These thoroughbred soldiers from the plantations of the south, from the plains and farms of the west, look the thoroughbred. . . The nose is straight, the mouth is sensitive and delicate. There are very few bull-dog jaws.

There is, instead, the steel-trap jaw of the lion. . . who has always been a fine-featured, delicate nostrilled, thin-eared, and generally clean-cut man.

The most insidiously racist commentary, however, came from anti-imperialist senators and representatives who were against the idea of annexing the Philippines. They regarded the various dark-complexioned races in the Philippines as a “witch’s caldron” which posed a threat to white America’s biological purity. This xenophobia is best illustrated in a statement by Virginia’s Senator John Daniel, who cautioned that in the Philippines there are people “not only of all hegemues and colors, but there are spotted people there, and what I have never heard of in any other country, there are striped people there with zebra signs upon them.”

U.S. racial imperialism, at the turn of the century, targeted Filipinos and other peoples of color throughout the world whom white Americans considered barbaric and thus incapable of self-government. Within the borders of the United States, however, the southern political class regarded African-Americans in a similar manner. Racist senators such as Benjamin “Pitchfork” Tillman from South Carolina argued that Afri-
can-Americans had not yet acquired the intellectual capacity necessary for suffrage. The replacement of Reconstruction's civil rights gains with Jim Crowism and disenfranchisement was facilitated by the view that it was unnatural for black people to participate in the electoral process.7

The fates of African-Americans and Filipinos were bound by their common disenfranchisement. Neither was regarded to be capable of full political participation and self determination. Nor did either possess a sufficient coercive apparatus to challenge the hegemony of the powers that made decisions about their political destiny. The turn-of-the-century American quest for empire abroad occurred at a time when the specter of disenfranchisement, economic dislocation, mob violence, and terrorism plagued the black population at home in the United States. The federal government granted the Southern States the right of self-rule and, by the 1890s, southern "redeemers" had taken power in the state governments and imposed poll taxes, literacy qualifications, and discriminatory laws which practically eliminated black suffrage.8

The Army's 1898 decision to pull the black troops from isolated outposts in Utah, Montana, and even Alaska and into a conflict with the Spanish in Cuba was guided by racist assumptions about the biological make-up of African-Americans. Military experts constantly emphasized "the character and physical stamina of blacks," and actually based policies on the belief that African-Americans were "immune... from diseases incident to tropical climates."9 The War Department perceived that this ability of African-Americans to adapt to hot climates would be an important asset to the combat potential of the U.S. forces since much of Cuba's terrain was sub-tropical.10

Theodore Roosevelt's reflections on his experience as a "Rough Rider" in Cuba contributed to racist stereotypes of black soldiers. In a series of articles published in Scribner's Magazine he contended that the physical ability of African-Americans to perform on the battlefield was only useful if guided by the paternal supervision of white officers. He even claimed that African-American soldiers had an inordinate tendency to retreat and engage in "misconduct" when white officers were not present. "I attributed this trouble and fear of the darky," Roosevelt wrote, "natural in those but one generation from slavery and but a few generations removed from the wildest savagery."11 His pseudo-analysis illustrates a racist view of continental Africans and also his regard of African-Americans as crippled by an inheritance of cultural and intellectual backwardness.12

Jim Crow's Beach House in the Philippines

Roosevelt and the rest of the white military establishment believed that African-American soldiers needed extra supervision from white commanders. However, after having defeated the Spanish forces in Cuba, they felt it necessary to use the black regiments again in the Philippines. The racism within military life, coupled with a persistent racism that white merchants carried with them overseas, produced a socio-political environment with which all of the African-American soldiers in the Philippines had to grapple. They confronted racial antagonism on a daily basis. black soldiers were barred from various "white only" barber shops, restaurants, and even brothels, in Manila. Apart from their exclusion from various facilities, African-Americans endured
constant verbal abuse, and sometimes violent attacks, from their white colleagues and officers.\textsuperscript{13} “Hello nigger,”\textsuperscript{14} and “all coons look alike to me,”\textsuperscript{15} were common greetings received during off-duty time spent in Manila, and white troops would, in some cases, use these epithets to replace a salute for an African-American officer.\textsuperscript{16} Further, racial slurs often generated violent altercations. As reported in the \textit{Manila Times}, after having been told, “I don’t like a nigger nohow,” a soldier from the black 25th infantry was “seriously hurt” when an “intoxicated white soldier proceeded to beat him with a cane.”\textsuperscript{17}

Mob violence was another contemporary Americanism that found its way to the these remote islands in the Pacific. The \textit{Manila Times} reported an incident in which F.E. Green, a discharged sergeant from the 25th Infantry, narrowly escaped death when “several intoxicated members of company I, 20th Infantry” chased him into the dining room of a hotel and “picked up chairs, water decanters, and everything movable and struck him.” He would have been killed “. . . had not the sergeant of the guard arrived.”\textsuperscript{18} The tendency towards lynching was not, however, exclusive to the lower-ranking white soldiers; in large measure the lower ranks took their cues from their superiors. Thus, it is hardly surprising that Brigadier General Frederick Funston, reflecting on clashes with an African-American soldier named David Fagen who defected and led a rebellion against the U.S. military, wrote that it was “mighty well understood that if [Fagen was] taken alive by any of us, he was to stretch a \textit{Picket rope} as soon as one could be obtained.”\textsuperscript{19} Funston’s scout, Private Jack Ganzhorn, boasted about an instance when the General ordered two Filipino prisoners lynched, without a trial or hearing. “At a crisp order from the General,” he wrote, “. . . willing hands furnished two picket ropes. Quickly those two brutal savages were strung up on the limb of a mango tree.”\textsuperscript{20}

It is certain that African-American experience in the Philippines at the turn of the century was shaped, in many ways, by the experience at home in the United States. Segregation and mob violence were hallmarks of Jim Crow which constantly reminded black soldiers that the physical distance of the Philippines was no safeguard against the racist elements of American society. Linguistically, the degree to which white soldiers maintained a close relationship with American ideology was expressed by the inclusion of Filipinos into what Frederick Palmer, a white officer stationed in the Philippines, called a “general class called “nigger’.”\textsuperscript{21} He also mentioned that “. . . soldiers, and officers” used the term “. . . almost without exception” to insult both blacks and Filipinos.\textsuperscript{21} The War Department and members of the Senate Committee on the Philippine Islands considered implementing an official ban on using the racial slur when it was noted that “. . . the natives are beginning to understand what the word ‘nigger’ means.”\textsuperscript{22}

The frequent mistreatment of African-Americans and Filipinos did not stop at verbal harassment. With great ferocity, whites resisted social interaction with Filipinos, and they demanded separate facilities. An editorial in the \textit{Manila Times}, for example, complained about incarcerated white persons having to share jail cells with “natives and Mongolians of the lowest scum and strata of society,” and the author requested that the provisional authorities “. . . have a separate room for the white occupants and another one for the Colored.”\textsuperscript{23} One black soldier contended that the very reason for Filipino resistance to American occupation was that white soldiers “. . . began to apply
home treatment for colored peoples: cursed them as damned niggers, steal [from] and ravid them, . . . burning, robbing the graves.”24 This remark illustrates the unique position in which the war in the Philippines placed the African-American soldier: he endured open hostility from his white colleagues and officers, and he watched how they imposed “home treatment for colored peoples” on Filipinos.

Racism, Filipino Nationalism, and Soldier-Civilian Relations

Capitalizing on the black soldier’s dilemma, Filipino Nationalists’ propaganda specifically targeted African-American soldiers. As war with the U.S. progressed and black troops were deployed in Northern Luzon, Filipino Nationalists developed a particular method of propaganda aimed at African American soldiers. Michael Robinson Jr. of the 25th Infantry complained that he and other members of the regiment periodically found “placards, some being placed on trees, others left mysteriously in houses we have occupied,” which said that Filipino nationalists are “...contending on the field of battle” for the same cause that African-Americans are struggling in the U.S. and that blacks are “being lynched by the same people who are trying to compel us [Filipinos] to believe that their government will deal justly and fairly with us [Filipinos].”25 The following notice, allegedly written by Emilo Aguilaldo, is typical of this kind of placard.

‘To the Colored American Soldier.’ It is without honor that you are spilling your costly blood. Your masters have thrown you into the most iniquitous fight with double purpose—to make you the instrument of their ambition and also your hard work will soon make the extinction of your race. Your friends, the Filipinos, give you this good warning. You must consider your history, and take charge that the Blood of Sam Hose [an African-American brutally lynched and mutilated in Newnan, Georgia] proclaims vengeance.26

It is difficult to measure the extent to which placards of this sort affected the point of view of the African-American soldier—they may have reinforced conclusions that African-American soldiers had already accepted. Many were outraged by the way that white soldiers treated Filipinos. They were conscious of the racial aspect of American imperialism and often compared the Filipino’s oppression to their own plight as black soldiers in a white dominated Army. The behavior of white soldiers verified the appropriateness of this comparison—especially their tendency to call both African-American soldiers and Filipinos “niggers.” In a letter to the Cleveland Gazette, Sergeant Patrick Mason, a black noncommissioned officer of the 24th Infantry, angrily exclaimed that “...the first thing in the morning is the ‘Nigger’ and the last thing at night is the ‘Nigger.’ You have no idea the way these people [Filipinos] are treated here.” He went on to caution that “...I must not say much as I am a soldier.”27

African-American soldiers often developed social ties with Filipino communities located in the towns and villages that they occupied. Unlike most white soldiers who regarded Filipinos as part of a lower racial caste, African-American soldiers often had relationships with Filipino women. In many cases white soldiers colored their contact with Filipino women with an overt contempt. In a letter to the Wisconsin Weekly Advocate a black soldier of the 13th Minnesota bragged about having “cut off a native woman’s arm in order to get a fine, inlaid bracelet.”28
Even in the sphere of intimate relationships, observers noted that white soldiers were particularly abusive, and would often return to the United States without notifying the Filipino women with whom they were involved. T. Thomas Fortune, a prominent black journalist and advocate of African-American civil rights who traveled extensively throughout the Philippines during the early 1900's, noted that "a white American never marries a Filipino woman, but a great many of them live with Filipino women in Manila, and in the provinces. When they are ready to leave for the United States, they do so without regard to their obligations to Filipino women and children."29

African-American soldiers' relationships with Filipino women was also affected by the temporary schedule that characterized military life. For instance, General Hughes, during the Senate hearings on affairs of the Phillippines, said that when he withdrew African-American soldiers form the Santa Rita province he "was told that natives shed tears over their going away." He went on to declare, "I know, they begged me to leave them."30 Nevertheless, a large number of African-American soldiers married Filipino women, and a significant number of them remained in the Philippines after the war and stayed with their Filipino families.

The inhabitants of the Philippines were of diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds; nevertheless, African-American and white soldiers' experiences in the United States shaped the way they regarded the Filipinos. Most white soldiers saw them as "niggers," and many African Americans saw Filipinos as light-skinned blacks or as C.W. Cordin of the 25th Infantry called them "mulatto people."31 In a letter home, an African-American soldier frequently claimed that Filipinos are "just the same as the American Negro."32 For many, this notion was central to their ability to get along with Filipinos. Speaking of the racial similarity between African-Americans and Filipinos, an African-American soldier in the 25th Infantry wrote that when a white battalion arrived at his company's post, the white soldiers mistakenly "thought some of us were natives."33

The perceived similar racial make-up of African-Americans and Filipinos did not create a framework for close relationships between African-American soldiers and Filipino men. Most of the contact that African-American soldiers had with the Filipino community came about via relationships with women. African-American soldiers were less likely to form friendships with Filipino men, particularly younger ones, because they were regarded as potential enemies or spies. The Filipino Nationalists enhanced their "guerrilla" war tactics by employing an intricate system of infiltration and espionage. The U.S. Army responded by paying Filipinos to infiltrate the Filipino Nationalist Army; the end result was a hodge-podge of confusion which left most soldiers in the U.S. Army very suspicious of Filipino men in general.

Richard Johnson of the 48th volunteers recollected these sentiments in his autobiographical papers, *My life in the U.S. Army 1899-1922*. "We were so unfamiliar with the natives' habits and customs," he wrote,

... that it was not possible to have any measure of success at apprehending the marauding bands without the aid of native informers and guides... But I have wondered since, if these guides and informers might not have been playing a double game."34
He also described how African-American soldiers' suspicion of Filipino men played itself out when his company arrived at a town in Luzon. "As before," he stated, "we were soon on friendly terms with the surroundings, especially the women, though the men were still regarded as potential enemies."35

In their attempt to be on "friendly terms" with Filipino women African-American soldiers sometimes found language to be a barrier to communication. While many African-American soldiers' stay in the Philippines forced them to develop a previously untapped capacity to learn foreign languages, some had difficulty learning Spanish or any of the indigenous Filipino languages. Richard Johnson described his own struggle with the language question in the following passage:

In addition to the study of Spanish I had attempted to pick up some of the native dialect as I went along. But these frequent changes of location kept me pretty well mixed up. I picked up a few words of Tagalog which they spoke in Manila, but this became useless when we moved to La Union where they spoke Illocano. While I did better than some in learning the native language there were others who did far better in this. . . . A few showed a remarkable aptitude for these dialects, and strangely enough these were generally the less educated ones.36

Arthur Boettcher of the 24th Infantry recollected that "due to language . . . I never met socially any of the natives."37 Nonetheless, there are examples of black soldiers who interacted with Filipinos and found them intent on speaking English. One soldier from the 25th Infantry, for example, complained that he often tried to speak Spanish to the Filipinos, but he notice that ". . . they want to talk American. . . ."38

If language proved to be an obstacle to communication between black soldiers and Filipinos, that barrier could not withstand the power of the dollar. Although black soldier’s treatment of Filipino women was not tainted by the racism and brutality that characterized white soldiers’ behavior, black soldiers did not escape the tendency to use their economic power as a means to exact their desires on a resource-poor peoples. By 1900, low-ranking U.S. servicemen received a salary of fifteen dollars and sixty cents per month. Richard Johnson, whose rank was corporal, noted that this amount was "more than that of most [Filipino] officials of the town; things were so cheap and their needs so meager that half of this amount would keep the average family in good circumstances for a month." He also mentioned that "when some of the soldiers offered this as a monthly allowance to possess a woman, many of those of weaker will fell for the temptation."39

Oftentimes, soldiers would introduce their capital to a Filipino family through the children. Johnson described this process in the following manner:

Many of our men found a lead to contact with the women by becoming friendly with children. Youngsters hanging around our mess shed were occasionally given a portion of one's meager ration—corn beef, salmon and hardtack was a rare treat to these urchins, and often let to an invitation to the beneficiary's home, and an introduction to his mother—and perhaps an elder sister.40

A Filipino woman's comments verified the pervasiveness of the pattern that Johnson described. Antoina Penafor was an eighty-seven year old widow when she was interviewed by an Ebony magazine correspondent in 1972. She was still a teenager at the turn of the century, when she met her husband, Sergeant Eugene Grills, a West Virginian black soldier stationed in the Philippines. Similar to the pattern that Johnson noted
she said, "I first met my husband during the [Philippine-American War] when he began bringing food to our house during the war. He was good to us."  

Economics played a central role in the Filipinos' acceptance of African Americans into their family, and it also influenced the decision of many black soldiers to remain in the Philippines. By the end of 1901 almost all of the Filipino Nationalists on the island of Luzon had surrendered and taken the oath of allegiance to the United States. The U.S. presence in the Philippines changed from being one of military conquest to that of colonial occupation. By October, 1902, Sergeant-major T. Clay Smith of the 24th Infantry wrote to the Savannah Tribune that:

several of our young men are now in business in the Philippines and are doing nicely, indeed, along such lines as express men, hotels and restaurants, numerous clerks in the civil government as well as in the division quartermaster's office, and there are several school teachers, one lawyer and one doctor of medicine.

Richard Johnson was one of the many black soldiers who stayed in the Philippines and worked in the quartermaster's office. He noted that "all who desired to remain in the Philippines were permitted do so. . . . The government needed a large civilian force to set the new civilian order in motion. . . . There were also good opportunities in certain business ventures. . . ." In fact, in 1903 Carter G. Woodson became one of the many African-American educators to answer the government's need for teachers in the Philippines. He taught English and health in the province of Nueva Ecija and Pangasinan for nearly four years.

Some black soldiers believed that African-American mass migration to the Philippines was a solution to the oppression they faced in the U.S. For instance, Captain F.H. Crumley of the 48th Volunteers, one of the few black officers in the Philippine-American War, wrote a letter printed in the Savannah Tribune which called for black Americans to take advantage of the situation in the Philippines: "It will soon be the purpose of the churches and Christian agencies to send missionaries to this island [Luzon]. . . . There are every openings here for the Negro in business, and room for thousands of them." Nonetheless, few African-Americans, other than the black soldiers who remained, chose to settle in the Philippine Islands. Ironically, the call for mass relocation to the Philippines corresponded with the agenda of Southern racists such as South Carolina's Senator Tillman who saw in the Philippines an opportunity to "get rid of the incubus of the Negro domination hanging over us." He demanded that Congress "Let us colonize them."

There were a number of prominent Filipinos who welcomed the idea of black emigration. They considered the participation of African-Americans as a necessary component of the rebuilding process that would take place in the war's aftermath. Sergeant John Calloway of the 24th Infantry interviewed some Filipinos whom he knew personally and sent excerpts of the conversations to the Richmond Planet. He stated that the purpose of these interviews was to "probe the Filipino as to his knowledge of the American colored man. . . ." In one dialogue, Thomas Consunji, a "wealthy Filipino planter," proclaimed: "We want occidental ideas but we want them taught to us by colored people. . . . We ask your educated, practical men to come and teach us." In addition to the obvious economic aspect of this rationale, there is a racial emphasis which is repeated in statements from other Filipinos. For example, in Callo-
way's interview with Todorica Santos, a physician, Santos said: "You exercise your
duty so much more kindly and manly in dealing with us. We can't help but appreciate
the differences between you and the whites." 48

Expressions of Filipino-African-American racial similarity and solidarity was an em-
barrassment to the small number of white American servicemen who also had rela-
tions with Filipino women. James Blount, author of The American Occupation of the
Philippines, 1898-1912, was an officer in the U.S. volunteers from 1899 until 1901
and was U.S. District Judge in the Philippines from 1901 until 1905. In the aforemen-
tioned book published in 1912 he claimed that "We [white soldiers] resented any sug-
gestion of comparing the Filipinos to Negroes." Angry that many black and fellow
white soldiers categorized Filipinos as black—or very close to it—Blount went on a
dubious racial tirade to clear himself from the accusation of "chumming with
Negroes."

We had many warm friends among the Filipinos, had shared their generous hospitality often, and in
turn had extended ours. Any suggestion as that indicated or implied that we had been doing some-
thing equivalent to eating, drinking, dancing, and chumming with Negroes. And we resented such
suggestions with an anger quite as cordial and intense as the canons of good taste and loyal freind-
ship demanded. . . . The African is aeons of time behind the Asiatic in development: the latter is
aeons ahead of us [Europeans] in the duration of his civilization. 49

Other officials within the American military and political establishment took note of
the ease with which black soldiers and Filipinos interacted in the "pacified" regions
occupied by the U.S. Army. Some even regarded contact between the Filipinos and
African-American soldiers as a security threat. The U.S. appointed Governor of the
Philippines, William Taft, complained to the Secretary of War that black soldiers "get
along too well with native women." He went on to assert that this was the cause for
"a good deal of demoralization in towns where they are stationed." 50 The tension sur-
rounding the contact between the "little brown brothers" and the "little brown sis-
ters" generated a distrust of the black soldier's capacity to remain loyal. Indeed, Ste-
phen Bonsal, military policy analyst, concluded in a article he wrote in 1907 that
African-American soldiers were "in closer sympathy with aims of the native popula-
tion than they were with the white leaders and the policy of the U.S." 51

The special relationship that black soldiers had with Filipinos was as much an indi-
cation of the limited socio-economic possibilities for these black men in the U.S. as it
was an expression of "sympathy with aims of the native population." The social sta-
tus and in some cases the economic wealth that African-American soldiers acquired in
the Philippines was incomparable to the subservience and social immobility of share-
cropping in the U.S. This may be a partial explanation for what Era Bell Thompson
noted was a number of more than "1,000 blacks who remained" in the Philippines
". . . married indigenous women and made the Spanish speaking islands their perma-
nent address" after the U.S. Army defeated the Filipino Nationalists in 1902. 52 In
1972, when Thompson's article "Veterans who Never Came Home" was published
only two African-American veterans of the Philippine-American War were known to
be alive and still residing in the Philippines; ninety-five year old John Wilson of the
25th Infantry and an eighty-nine year old former sergeant, Littleton Chapman of the
10th Cavalry. According to the article during World War II hundreds of these black
veterans were "killed by the Japanese or died along with Filipinos from disease and ill treatment in internment camps."\textsuperscript{53}

Conclusions

The social relations previously discussed were largely shaped by the African-American soldiers' response to the general problem of being a foot soldier for, and simultaneously a victim of, racial imperialism. Richard Welch summarized relations between Filipinos and African-American soldiers in the following manner:

. . . national identification was stronger than racial sympathy. If the black soldier entertained no color phobia toward the Filipino, he could still entertain the prejudices of the warrior for the civilian. For him the Filipino might be less foreign, but he still was not to be confused with an American of any race or color.\textsuperscript{54}

Although this analysis correctly notes that the African-American soldier's world view and behavior in the Philippines was in part shaped by his position as military conqueror, Welch's remarks fall short of recognizing that the context of Filipino-African-American relations gave rise to a unique historical situation. Arguably, the Philippine islands had in its possession history's largest proportion of African-American soldiers who opted not to return home after completing military service abroad. The African-American soldier's decision to remain in the Philippines was the result of a complex and sometimes paradoxical relationship with Filipinos. On one hand, they bonded because both were victimized by the racism that white American colonialism exported. However, the high socio-economic status the black soldiers maintained among Filipinos was often based on the extent to which they remained linked to white American colonial institutions (salaries and pensions from the U.S. Army, salaries from American businesses and U.S. government offices, etc).

The African-American soldiers' close social relations with Filipino civilians and the resultant contact with Filipino Nationalist propaganda demonstrates how interactions between peoples of color—even within the prism of soldier-civilian tensions—challenged stereotypical conceptions of the "enemy" as defined by a white dominated military. African-American soldiers in the Philippines had extensive relations with Filipino civilians. Thus they were generally not as susceptible to the U.S. Army's propaganda—which defined Filipinos as "other"—as were their white counterparts.

If this variable, social contact is as influential in other settings as it was in the Philippine-American War, then it has tremendous explanatory value. Perhaps one reason why the Buffalo soldiers on the Western frontier did not as extensively criticize the U.S. Army's treatment of Native Americans is because these African-American soldiers were stationed at isolated forts and had little social contact with Native Americans. Conversely, African-American soldiers in the Philippine-American War interacted regularly with Filipinos and challenged the United States' mistreatment and racial stereotyping of them. Soldier/civilian relations is an understated variable that should be explored by other scholars in their attempts to understand how African-American soldiers have historically responded to the contradiction of fighting against other peoples of color abroad when the struggle against racism at home in the U.S. is far from complete.
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