



## Dr. Manuel V. Gallego and the Filipino Language Dilemma: A Critical Discourse Analysis of His 1932 Monograph

Rene Boy E. Abiva<sup>1</sup> and Princess S. Calacala<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Manuel V. Gallego Center for Heritage Studies, Manuel V. Gallego Foundation Colleges, Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija, Philippines

### Article Info

#### Article History:

Received: 05/05/2025

Accepted: 07/30/2025

Published: 08/05/2025

#### Keywords:

Decolonization; Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego; Language; MTB-MLE; National Language; Politics

DOI: 10.65223/XUSK5721

#### \*For correspondence:

[rbabivamvgallego@gmail.com](mailto:rbabivamvgallego@gmail.com)

#### Reviewing Editor

##### Editor-in-Chief

Dr. Joseline M. Santos  
Bulacan State University

##### Associate Editor

Dr. Karen V. Rendeza  
Bulacan State University

##### Review Editors

Ms. Princess Gerbie C. Durante  
Bulacan State University

Dr. Rene G. Nanit

Tarlac Agricultural University

##### Language Editor

Dr. Daianne S. Gloria  
Bulacan State University

##### Managing Editor

Dr. Mary Ann P. Carranza  
Bulacan State University

##### Layout Editor

Mr. Michael G. Albino  
President Ramon Magsaysay State University

### Abstract

This study revisits the contributions of Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego (1893–1976) to Philippine language policy and educational thought, with particular focus on his 1932 essay, *The Language Problem of the Filipinos*. Through a postcolonial historical analysis informed by the works of Frantz Fanon and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o, the research situates Gallego’s critique of colonial education and his promotion of vernacular instruction within broader efforts to assert cultural and intellectual autonomy. The study analyzes archival records, legislative proposals, and rare published texts to reconstruct Gallego’s role in the national discourse on language, identity, and education. Five central findings emerge from the analysis. First, the scholarship on Gallego remains limited, despite his substantial influence on lawmaking and public education. Second, the language issue in the Philippines originates in colonial policies that deliberately undermined native linguistic practices. Third, mother tongue education continues to encounter both ideological resistance and structural barriers. Fourth, the intellectual development of local languages requires consistent policy support and institutional commitment. Fifth, the emerging framework for Gallegan Philosophy, including its proposed inclusion in courses such as SSC 111 and SSC 112, lacks theoretical grounding in indigenous and postcolonial thought. The study calls for a more coherent, historically informed, and culturally grounded approach to language planning and curriculum development. It positions Gallego’s work as a critical foundation for building an education system that affirms linguistic diversity, national identity, and intellectual independence.

### Introduction

Despite its constitutional designation as the national language, Filipino remains paradoxically marginalized within its own educational system (Abiva, 2024). In many Philippine classrooms, students struggle to speak Filipino fluently, encountering difficulties when required to learn academic concepts in a language that is unfamiliar to them at home. This phenomenon highlights a fundamental tension between language policy and educational practice, revealing the deeper historical contradictions embedded in the formation of the nation’s linguistic landscape.

The continued dominance of English as the principal medium of instruction reflects the enduring influence of colonial education structures. While Filipino was envisioned as the unifying backbone of national identity, it has often been sidelined



# Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

in favor of English, producing a generation of learners alienated from their own linguistic heritage. This marginalization is not merely a pedagogical issue but a symptom of the larger colonial and neocolonial dynamics that continue to shape Philippine education, governance, and cultural identity (Abiva, 2025).

To examine these dynamics, this paper employs Postcolonial Historical Analysis as its primary methodological framework. This approach foregrounds the historical, political, and cultural contexts in which language policies emerged, highlighting the ideological structures and power relations embedded in them. Postcolonial Historical Analysis enables an interrogation of how colonial education policies, language planning, and knowledge production systems have shaped Filipino subjectivity, governance, and national development. It also facilitates a critical re-reading of Filipino intellectuals like Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego, whose contributions have been marginalized in dominant historiographies despite their foundational impact.

The first major theme explored in this study is *Major Theme 1: Intellectual Biography*. Dr. Manuel V. Gallego's life and works reveal an intellectual trajectory shaped by colonial encounters and nationalist aspirations. Born in San Miguel, Bulacan, Gallego earned his law degree at the University of the Philippines and completed his Juris Doctor in the United States, experiences that situated him within colonial institutions while also providing him with the tools to challenge their structures. His writings and legislative work articulate a vision of education and language policy rooted in Filipino cultural sovereignty, moral responsibility, and national development. This intellectual biography offers insight into how colonial-educated elites negotiated, resisted, and redefined the ideological systems imposed upon them.

The second major theme interrogates *Major Theme 2: Debates on National Language Policies*. Gallego was a central yet often forgotten figure in these debates. His proposals to institutionalize Tagalog as a medium of instruction for elementary education underscored his conviction that language is not merely a tool for communication but the embodiment of national thought, dignity, and collective identity. These debates reveal the complexities of language planning in a multilingual nation: the tension between regional languages and the national language, the privileging of English for global competitiveness, and the persistence of colonial mentality among intellectual and political elites. Gallego's interventions highlight how language policy is deeply political, shaping national consciousness, economic relations, and social inclusion.

The third major theme focuses on *Major Theme 3: Theoretical and Pedagogical Grounding for Gallegan Philosophy*. Beyond historical recovery, this study argues for the construction of Gallegan Philosophy as a framework for contemporary education. Gallego's writings integrate legal, linguistic, and educational theory to propose a vision of national development anchored in intellectual freedom and cultural authenticity. His philosophy treats education as a project of moral formation and national emancipation, positioning language at its core. Pedagogically, this framework emphasizes culturally grounded, critically engaged, and linguistically inclusive approaches that empower students to think, articulate, and act as Filipinos within a decolonizing educational system.

By centering Postcolonial Historical Analysis and these three major themes, this paper seeks to achieve two interrelated objectives. First, it recovers and examines the legislative and intellectual contributions of Dr. Manuel V. Gallego to Philippine language policy and education. Second, it proposes the foundational principles of Gallegan Philosophy that can inform contemporary curriculum development, particularly in courses such as SSC 111 and SSC 112. Through this analysis, the study advances the argument that Gallego's efforts, while often omitted from national historiography, represent a deliberate and forward-looking response to colonial linguistic domination and educational inequities.

Revisiting Gallego's thought thus provides a critical foundation for addressing his historical erasure and the ongoing challenges in Philippine language education. It invites educators, policymakers, and scholars to reimagine the role of language in shaping not only academic success but also national identity, intellectual agency, and cultural sovereignty. By foregrounding his philosophy, this study asserts that the project of educational reform in the Philippines must begin with the reclamation of its own intellectual traditions, rooted in its people's languages, histories, and collective aspirations.



## Literature Review

Despite its official designation as the national language, Filipino remains marginalized within its own educational system. Many students cannot speak Filipino fluently, which poses significant challenges to learning in classes that adopt it as the primary medium of instruction (Amarilla et al., 2025). This paradox reveals a deeper contradiction: the subject of Filipino, intended to serve as the linguistic and cultural backbone of national identity, is often sidelined in favor of English, reflecting a colonial legacy that continues to shape the Philippine educational landscape (Lumbis & Manalo, 2024).

The policy environment itself highlights these contradictions. In 2012, the Department of Education introduced the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) under the Enhanced Basic Education Program. This policy replaced the previous bilingual system centered on English and Filipino and allowed the use of native languages from Kindergarten to Grade 3, aiming to develop early literacy and numeracy in students' first languages before transitioning to Filipino and English (Malone, 2018). This reform aligned with global findings that early education conducted in a child's mother tongue improves cognitive development and facilitates second-language acquisition (UNESCO, 2010). However, despite the Philippines having more than one hundred languages, only nineteen were recognized under MTB-MLE, leaving many linguistic communities excluded from its purported benefits (Bersamina, 2024).

In October 2024, President Ferdinand Marcos Jr. signed Republic Act No. 12027, formally ending the implementation of MTB-MLE in early education. English and Filipino were reinstated as the sole primary languages of instruction (Bersamina, 2024). This decision exemplifies what Batnag (1997) cautioned against: the failure of language policies that lack genuine consultation and social acceptance, reducing them to mere documents with no transformative effect. Igarashi et al. (2024) further found that this abrupt policy reversal negatively impacted foundational mathematics skills among the first cohorts exposed to the changes, underscoring the complex links between language proficiency and broader cognitive domains. Ranque et al. (2024) thus recommend more performance-based assessments to generate accurate data on students' Filipino proficiency, which could inform future reforms.

Globally, UNESCO (2010) estimates that 221 million children speak a home language different from the language used in their schools, producing educational disparities, social stigma, and systemic exclusion. In multilingual societies like the Philippines, this linguistic mismatch is not merely a pedagogical issue but also a political one, deeply embedded in histories of colonial domination and postcolonial state-building (Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, 1986). Zeng and Li (2023) emphasize that multilingual and multicultural nations must adopt inclusive language policies to empower local communities, construct national identities that value linguistic diversity, and resist the homogenizing forces of globalization and neocolonialism. Yet, Usero (2021) argues that existing linguistic theories, documentation practices, and policies continue to threaten the Philippines' multilingual ecology, failing to uphold linguistic justice for marginalized ethnolinguistic groups.

The contradictions in Philippine language education stem from its colonial roots. Under Spanish rule, language became a tool for both subjugation and limited assimilation, while American colonization institutionalized English as the principal language of instruction and governance (Ordoñez, 2004). T.H. Pardo de Tavera explicitly stated in his letter to General Arthur MacArthur that the spread of English would allow the American spirit to possess the Filipino mind. According to his book *The Philippine Trade Act in the Light of History*, this policy was solidified by the Tydings-McDuffie Act, embedding English into constitutional and educational frameworks (Gallego, 1936). Gallego noted that this imposition deprived Filipinos of the right to determine their own national language during the critical transition to independence. Onofre Corpuz observed that such educational structures cultivated a mindset viewing political matters predominantly from an American perspective, shaping not only students but also educators and administrators.

In *The Price of Independence* (1937), Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego critiqued these dynamics, arguing that American imperialism operated beyond political structures through organized violence, economic reconfiguration, and ideological



# Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions **GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL**

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

manipulation. He wrote, “We still maintain that the foreign policy of the United States of America was conceived in imperialism and dedicated to the principles of expansion” (p. 5). He asserted that staged uprisings, backed by capitalist interests, secured favorable terms for foreign investment under the guise of independence, embedding dependency within the Philippine economy and polity. These provisions in the Tydings-McDuffie Act institutionalized American control, ensuring continued economic access for U.S. capital even after formal decolonization.

Against this backdrop, Gallego emerged as a legislative and intellectual advocate for linguistic and cultural sovereignty. He argued that language is not merely a tool of communication but the very expression of national thought and identity. His proposals to use Tagalog as a medium of instruction for the first four years of elementary education in the *The Language Problem of the Filipinos* (1932) reflect what Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o (1986) describes as decolonizing the mind—reclaiming indigenous languages as vehicles of memory, worldview, and collective consciousness. Fanon (1963) similarly argued that mastery of the colonizer’s language grants conditional access to power but deepens structural dependency, while the reclamation of native language serves as an assertion of cultural and psychological liberation.

Historically, Filipinos have turned to their vernacular languages as instruments of resistance. The Katipunan adopted Tagalog in their revolution against Spain (San Juan, 2015), and revolutionary leaders during the American period continued this practice (Paz, 2024). Language became a medium for articulating indigenous socialist ideas, as Adriatico poetically wrote that “because of the language, the leaf became more beautiful, and the flower became more fragrant” (vi). Despite formal independence in 1946, American economic and cultural dominance persisted, as exemplified by the Philippine Trade Act amendments that Gallego (1937) critiqued for granting American citizens access to national resources, endangering future generations.

These issues remain relevant today as the Philippine curriculum continues to be shaped by American colonial education frameworks that obstruct efforts to intellectualize and Filipinize national education. Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order No. 20, Series of 2013, which removed Filipino language and literature from the general education curriculum in higher education, further exposed these contradictions. While DepEd promoted local languages in early schooling through MTB-MLE, CHED removed the national language in universities, revealing failures in institutional coordination and an unwillingness to address the political nature of language planning.

This paper thus pursues two interrelated objectives. First, it recovers and examines Dr. Manuel V. Gallego’s legislative and intellectual contributions to Philippine language policy through close readings of his monographs and proposed bills, interpreted via postcolonial historical analysis grounded in Frantz Fanon’s (1963) and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o’s (1986) insights on language, identity, and political subjugation. This analysis reveals the ideological structures embedded in colonial education and language planning. Second, it proposes the foundational principles for a Gallegan Philosophy that can inform contemporary curriculum development, particularly in courses such as SSC 111 and SSC 112.

The paper advances the argument that Gallego’s efforts, while often omitted from national historiography, represent a deliberate and forward-looking response to colonial linguistic domination. His emphasis on language as an expression of national thought positions him as an early theorist of cultural sovereignty whose writings provide a critical foundation for addressing both his historical erasure and the ongoing challenges in Philippine language education.

By revisiting Gallego’s thought, this study proposes a culturally grounded, philosophically coherent, and politically relevant framework for Filipino educational reform. It argues that empowering students to reclaim their native languages and intellectual traditions is not only an act of historical justice but also a practical strategy for building an educational system rooted in national identity, critical agency, and linguistic inclusivity.

## Methodology

This study uses Postcolonial Historical Analysis as its guiding methodological approach. This method investigates how colonial structures have shaped systems of language, education, and national identity. It treats historical texts not as neutral records but as politically charged interventions that emerge from specific power relations. In the context of the Philippines, where language policy and education continue to reflect colonial influence, this approach provides the analytical framework to understand Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego's contributions. The study frames Gallego's thought as a response to ongoing forms of cultural domination rooted in colonial ideology.

The analysis relies on the works of Frantz Fanon and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o as its primary theoretical anchors. Fanon (1963) critiques colonial language imposition as a form of psychological and cultural violence. He writes, "To speak is to exist absolutely for the other" (p. 17), revealing how colonial language conditions identity through external validation. Fanon also states, "A man who has a language consequently possesses the world expressed and implied by that language" (p. 18), showing that language determines access to conceptual and social frameworks. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) similarly critiques the displacement of indigenous languages by colonial systems. He argues that "language, any language, has a dual character: it is both a means of communication and a carrier of culture" (p. 13), and emphasizes that "the domination of a people's language by the languages of the colonizing nations was crucial to the domination of the mental universe of the colonized" (p. 16). Both theorists view the control of language as central to the control of thought and identity.

Gallego's writings articulate similar critiques. In *The Language Problem of the Filipinos* (1932), Gallego asserts that colonial education resulted in "a conquest not only of our country but also of our native dialect." This statement reflects Fanon's claim that colonialism extends its reach through language. Gallego also writes, "Language is the expression of a nation's thought," which aligns with Ngũgĩ's view of language as inseparable from cultural and intellectual life. Gallego supported legislation, such as Bill No. 2182, that proposed Tagalog as the language of instruction in early education. His proposals demonstrate an effort to reclaim cultural sovereignty and counteract the long-term effects of linguistic subordination. Postcolonial historical analysis enables this study to recover the political and theoretical significance of Gallego's work, which prefigures the concerns later articulated by Fanon and Ngũgĩ in postcolonial discourse.

Although this study primarily employs postcolonial historical analysis based on existing texts and archival materials, ethical considerations remain central to the research process. No interviews with human participants were conducted for this study; therefore, formal informed consent procedures were not applicable. However, the following ethical measures were observed: (a) all primary and secondary sources, including the retrieved books of Dr. Manuel V. Gallego and Atty. Obed Jose Meneses, were properly cited and referenced to uphold academic integrity; (b) the retrieval and use of primary texts from the MVGFC College of Nursing's former morgue were conducted with institutional coordination and permission, ensuring respect for institutional property and historical documents; (c) the researcher ensured faithful representation of the ideas and writings of Dr. Gallego, Fanon, and Ngũgĩ, avoiding misinterpretation or decontextualization of their works; and (d) the study recognizes the cultural and political implications of analyzing colonial and postcolonial texts and thus maintained sensitivity in interpreting concepts related to identity, nationhood, and language.

Since no human subjects were directly involved, the study did not require ethical clearance for interviews or surveys. Nonetheless, these ethical guidelines ensured that the research process remained rigorous, respectful, and aligned with academic standards.

This study faced several limitations. First, there was a notable scarcity of existing scholarship on the life, works, and writings of Dr. Manuel V. Gallego. Since 1979, no substantial research has been conducted on his intellectual contributions, severely limiting the availability of secondary analyses and contextual studies necessary for a comprehensive understanding of his legacy. It was not until Asst. Prof. Rene Boy Abiva, in 2022, initiated the first systematic scholarly exploration of Gallegan



# Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

narratives, that which gaps began to be addressed. The first preliminary attempt to re-open the scholarly study in Dr. Gallego's work was accepted on the following International Conferences: *Sinag at Balag International Conference 2024-Philippine Normal University South Luzon*), *11<sup>th</sup> International Conference for Teacher Education, UP- Visayas*, *16<sup>th</sup> Annual Global Conference on Business and Social Sciences Series, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*, *The Bintana International Conference 2025, Far Eastern University, Manila*, *8<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Asian and Philippine Studies, De La Salle University*, *7<sup>th</sup> Linguistics Society of the Philippines International Conference, Pangasinan State University*, and *Joint International Decade of Indigenous Languages and International Mother Language Day Conference 2025, Sorsogon State University*. Additionally, the study encountered limited access to primary sources. The research relied heavily on a small set of materials, particularly the books authored by Dr. Gallego and Atty. Obed Jose Meneses, which were only retrieved on October 18, 2024, from storage at the MVGFC College of Nursing. The decades-long inaccessibility of these texts significantly constrained the breadth and depth of documentary analysis possible for this study.

Moreover, the study faced an absence of triangulation with oral histories. Due to the unavailability of living contemporaries or organized interviews, it was not possible to include oral accounts that might have provided personal insights or anecdotal validations of Gallego's work and influence. Another limitation relates to the temporal distance from the subject. The significant time lapse since Dr. Gallego's active years in the early to mid-20th century posed challenges in contextualizing his writings within their immediate sociopolitical climate, given the limited archival data and the loss of contemporaneous materials over time.

The scope of the study was also limited to textual analysis, as the methodological approach focused exclusively on postcolonial historical textual analysis and did not integrate other analytical lenses, such as quantitative policy impact analysis or education program evaluation, which might have broadened its interdisciplinary relevance. Finally, there is a possibility of interpretive bias. By employing critical theory frameworks, particularly those of Fanon and Ngũgĩ, the study's interpretation is framed primarily by postcolonial critique. While this approach illuminates colonial dynamics, it may underemphasize alternative readings, such as purely linguistic or pedagogical analyses of Gallego's proposals.

## Results and Discussions

### *Major Theme 1. Intellectual Biography*

Manuel V. Gallego was born on January 18, 1893, in San Miguel, Bulacan, into a family connected to Dr. Maximo Sison Viola, a close friend of Dr. José Rizal. He studied law at the University of the Philippines and completed his degree with notable speed, which reflected his intellectual aptitude. He continued his legal education in the United States, where he earned a Juris Doctor from Chicago Northwestern University. In 1931, Gallego was elected representative of Nueva Ecija and took part in major legislative efforts such as land reform and the passage of laws granting women the right to vote (Meneses, 1979). He also wrote several legal texts that became standard references in the field of law.

His contributions extended into education and public health, as seen in the School Health Act of 1946 that secured medical services for students. He supported the development of a national language and had a key role in the selection of Tagalog under National Ordinance No. 134 in 1937 (Meneses, 1979). His work reached the international stage when he served as one of the Philippine representatives to the United Nations in 1946, where he participated in discussions concerning reparations after World War II. Gallego established institutions such as the Central Luzon School of Nursing and engaged in several educational initiatives throughout his career. He died on August 13, 1976, after a life shaped by service to law, education, health, and national development (Meneses, 1979).



# Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

Gallego's biography reflects the complexity of Filipino intellectual formation under colonial rule. Through the lens of postcolonial historical analysis, his educational trajectory, from elite institutions in the Philippines to American universities, reveals how colonial systems both enabled and constrained the agency of colonized subjects. Fanon (1963) argues that mastery of the colonizer's language provides conditional access to institutional power, but at the cost of reinforcing subaltern dependency. Gallego's return to the Philippines and his legislative advocacy suggest an effort to disrupt this dependency by reformulating language and education policies from within the system.

**Table 1**

*Tabular Thematic Matrix on Dr. Manuel V. Gallego's Biographical Narrative Based on Postcolonial Historical Analysis*

Sub-Theme	Description	Supporting Data/Evidence
1. Colonial Education as Double-Edged Empowerment	Colonial education provided professional mobility while reinforcing dependency on colonial systems.	Gallego earned a law degree from UP and a Juris Doctor from Chicago-Kent Northwestern University. Fanon (1963) argued that mastery of colonial language grants conditional access to power but deepens structural dependency.
2. Intellectual Formation and Nationalist Advocacy	Colonial-educated elites used their knowledge to advance nationalist legislative reforms.	Gallego advocated land reform laws, women's suffrage, and wrote standard legal texts, showing education redirected towards national development.
3. Integration of Education, Health, and Nation-Building	Gallego linked education and public health as foundations of national development.	Authored the School Health Act of 1946, founded the Central Luzon School of Nursing, and led multiple educational initiatives.
4. Language Policy and Cultural Sovereignty	Promoted the indigenous language as national identity and cultural reclamation.	Supported Tagalog as the national language under National Ordinance No. 134 (1937). Aligns with Ngũgĩ's (1986) emphasis on indigenous language reclamation.
5. International Engagement and Postwar Diplomacy	Advocated Filipino interests in the global stage post-WWII.	Served as the Philippine delegate to the UN in 1946 to discuss reparations and national sovereignty.
6. Postcolonial Agency Within Colonial Structures	Navigated colonial institutions to implement decolonial reforms.	Despite colonial education, redirected knowledge to legislative and institutional initiatives for Filipino welfare, reflecting Fanon's (1963) concept of subverting colonial systems.

Table 1 summarizes the thematic analysis of Dr. Manuel V. Gallego's biography through a postcolonial historical lens. The first theme, *Colonial Education as Double-Edged Empowerment*, highlights how Gallego's academic achievements, including his law degree from the University of the Philippines and Juris Doctor from Chicago-Kent Northwestern University, illustrate the paradox of colonial education as both an enabler and a constraint. Fanon (1963) argues that the colonized intellectual's mastery of colonial language and knowledge systems provides access to institutional power, yet perpetuates dependency on colonial structures, limiting true autonomy.

The second theme, *Intellectual Formation and Nationalist Advocacy*, reveals Gallego's use of his elite education for nationalist ends. His legislative work on land reform and women's suffrage (Meneses, 1979) demonstrates how colonial-educated elites redirected their training to advance social justice and national development. This reflects Pennycook and Makoni's (2020) assertion that postcolonial subjects often appropriate colonial tools for local empowerment.



# Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

The third theme, *Integration of Education, Health, and Nation-Building*, underscores Gallego's holistic approach to national development, linking education with public health through the School Health Act of 1946 and founding the Central Luzon School of Nursing (Meneses, 1979). This aligns with current scholarship emphasizing intersectional nation-building policies (Dei & Simmons, 2022).

The fourth theme, *Language Policy and Cultural Sovereignty*, emphasizes Gallego's role in promoting Tagalog as the national language under National Ordinance No. 134 (1937) (Meneses, 1979). Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) argued that reclaiming indigenous languages is a fundamental act of cultural decolonization, as language is inseparable from identity, thought, and worldview.

The fifth theme, *International Engagement and Postwar Diplomacy*, situates Gallego's work within global movements for national recognition. His participation as a Philippine delegate to the United Nations in 1946 (Meneses, 1979) demonstrates how Filipino intellectuals sought reparations and asserted sovereignty in the postwar international order. This aligns with Hau's (2017) analysis of Filipino elites' transnational engagements as extensions of national projects.

The sixth theme, *Postcolonial Agency Within Colonial Structures*, integrates the overarching finding that Gallego navigated colonial educational and political institutions to implement decolonial reforms in law, language policy, education, and health. Fanon (1963) describes this paradoxical agency as the colonized subject's capacity to subvert the systems that were designed to subordinate them. Gallego's trajectory reflects this critical tension, positioning him as both a product and a challenger of colonial structures.

The thematic analysis affirms that Dr. Manuel V. Gallego's life exemplifies postcolonial intellectual agency. His work demonstrates how colonial-educated elites strategically appropriated acquired knowledge to reform national institutions, reclaim cultural sovereignty, and negotiate Filipino identity within and beyond colonial frameworks.

## ***Major Theme 2: Debates on National Language Policies***

Before the more widely discussed debates on September 7 and 8, 1932, Dr. Manuel V. Gallego had already begun advancing proposals to address the language issue under American colonial administration. One of his early efforts, Bill No. 588, titled *Use of Native Dialects in Schools*, outlined the necessity of employing local languages in education. In support of the 1932 bill, he argued in his book *The Philippine Trade Act in the Light of History*:

"The history of foreign colonization in relation to the Philippine Islands has always been characterized by certain special features not found in other colonies. While a Spanish colony, the inhabitants of our country were taught the Spanish language as a symbol of culture and civilization in the words of our former conquerors. In plain language, however, it was a conquest not only of our country but also of our native dialect" (Gallego, 1936).

This statement affirms Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's (1986) claim that the colonization of language constitutes a primary mechanism of mental and cultural domination. For Ngũgĩ, the domination of a people's language by the languages of the colonizing nations was crucial to the domination of the mental universe of the colonized. Gallego's language policy initiatives can thus be interpreted as early acts of decolonial resistance, situated within a broader effort to reclaim the intellectual sovereignty of the Filipino people. Although this bill did not pass, Gallego immediately introduced Bill No. 2182, which retained the same title but shifted the proposal's direction. Rather than broadly supporting the use of native dialects, the revised version advocated Tagalog as the primary medium of instruction for the first four years of elementary education in both public and private schools (Gallego, 1936). The subsequent legislative discussion addressed five issues: (1) whether Tagalog or native dialects should be used as the language of instruction; (2) whether the scope should cover the first three or four years of elementary school; (3) whether native dialects should be included in secondary education; (4) whether Tagalog should be adopted in secondary schools; and (5) whether either or both language policies should be uniformly applied to all primary



## Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions **GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL**

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

schools nationwide. Though these efforts encountered obstacles, they signaled a meaningful attempt to establish the linguistic rights of Filipinos and recognize language as central to national development.

Colonial influence introduced another significant complication: the Americanization of Filipino intellectuals. Many of them played a role in suppressing native dialects through their participation in the drafting of the 1935 Constitution. Gallego identified this development as a consequence of President McKinley's directive to the Taft Commission, which placed emphasis on education policies and mandated the use of English as the main medium of instruction. This view aligns with Fanon's (1963) argument that colonialism extends its logic by compelling the colonized to adopt the language of their subjugators as the standard of political and social legitimacy. A.B. Gonzales, cited in Almario (2023), also observed that American teachers, although few in number, maintained influence because Filipinos preferred English. The creation of the Department of Public Instruction in 1901 through the Philippine Commission Act No. 74 further reinforced the American educational framework and extended the reach of colonial policy in the school system (Gallego, 1936). These shifts culminated in the language provision of the 1935 Constitution, as found in Section 3, Article XIII – General Provision:

“The Congress shall take steps toward the development and adoption of a common national language based on one of the existing native languages. Until otherwise provided by law, English and Spanish shall continue as official languages” (Almario, 2023).

This systemic imposition of English over native languages served a dual function. It allowed the colonial government to centralize authority through education while simultaneously undermining indigenous forms of knowledge. Fanon (1963) argued that the internalization of the colonizer's language was not a neutral act of communication, but a psychological alignment with colonial values. The case of the Philippines demonstrates this dynamic. The 1935 Constitution's language provision, codified in Section 3, Article XIII, called for the development of a national language based on existing native languages but continued the use of English and Spanish as official languages (Almario, 2023). This compromise illustrates what Fanon described as the fractured consciousness of the colonized subject who inhabits two conflicting linguistic and cultural worlds.

It is noteworthy that Virgilio Almario's *Ang Wikang Pambansa at Amerikanisasyon* (2023) makes no mention of Dr. Gallego, despite his authorship and sponsorship of the legislative proposal to adopt Tagalog as the national language. Chapter 5, which deals with “The Language Problem,” includes A.B. Gonzales's praise of American educational policy and lists the “Seven Wise Men” commonly credited with leading the language initiative: N.L. Romualdez, Filemon Sotto, Manuel Roxas, Vicente Singson Encarnacion, Manuel C. Briones, Miguel Cuaderno, and Jose P. Laurel. Even the Special Committee on Style, organized by Claro M. Recto, did not acknowledge Gallego's legislative work on the matter. This absence is difficult to justify, especially given that President Manuel Quezon appointed Gallego as head of the Office of Public Instruction, a position equivalent to the present-day Secretary of the Department of Education. On political grounds alone, his exclusion appears significant, whether due to gaps in documentation or to selective omission. The second phase of this research will address that issue and recover Gallego's contributions to the national language movement.

Language is the expression of a nation's thought. Dr. Manuel V. Gallego placed this assertion at the very beginning of his monograph. His thinking drew not only from Dr. Jose Rizal but also from Eulogio B. Rodriguez, then Assistant Director of the National Library. According to Gallego, Rodriguez considered language the primary vehicle for communication among individuals and groups. He argued that it serves as a ground for consciousness and reflects the cultural and intellectual development of a people (Gallego, 1936). The monograph also referenced Dr. N. M. Saleeby's position in *The Language of Education in the Philippine Islands*, where Saleeby insisted that no language is more meaningful than one's own. Just as the English speak English for Shakespeare, the Italians use Italian for Dante, and the Chinese write in Chinese for Confucius, Filipinos should regard their native tongue with the same sense of inheritance and responsibility. This position was consistent



# Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions **GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL**

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

with Eufronio M. Alip's view in *Tagalog Literature (A Historico-Critical Study)*, published in 1930, where Alip affirmed the natural and necessary use of the mother tongue in intellectual life (Alip, 1930).

Dr. Rafael Herrmann took a similar stance. For him, a shared language does not merely structure conversation. It also gives coherence to the idea of national belonging. In his view, Filipinos must establish a common tongue to define themselves not only as individuals in private life but as members of a national community (Gallego, 1936). This view formed part of a broader response to Americanized Filipinos. Vice Governor Butte captured this issue clearly in the introduction to his article *Shall the Philippines Have a Common Language?*

He wrote that the question of language is, at its core, a question of national independence. Gallego cited this statement not as rhetoric but as a direct account of a political struggle, one that the American colonial government had tried to control through legislation.

The passing of the Hawes-Cutting Bill (S. 3822) on January 6, 1930, signaled a setback for native-language advocacy (Gallego, 1937). Gallego noted that this was followed by two related measures: the revised Hawes-Cutting Bill (S. 3377) on January 26, 1932, and the Hare Bill (H. 7233) on January 8, 1932. All three aligned with the larger objectives of the Tydings-McDuffie Act. They aimed to institutionalize English in public instruction and prevent the rise of any local language within the formal school system. The Hare Bill and the Hawes-Cutting proposals, when read together, reveal a coordinated effort to remove native languages from education entirely (Gallego, 1937).

Spanish and American colonial leaders showed a clear contrast in their attitudes toward local languages. The Spaniards made efforts to learn the native languages of the islands they colonized (Santos, 2013). What served as an advantage for the first colonizers became a disadvantage for the Americans. According to Dr. Gallego, before the American public education system took shape, uncertainty surrounded the choice of the medium of instruction. Several factors contributed to this ambiguity: first, the Americans believed it was their duty and privilege to teach English to Filipinos; second, many Filipinos welcomed this initiative, some even requesting it; third, only a small portion of Filipinos understood Spanish at the time; and fourth, English appeared to be the most practical choice given the difficulty of translating educational materials into the many dialects spoken across the archipelago.

This difficulty opened the door for Filipino pensionados to study in the United States. They were considered quick learners, perhaps influenced by their political motivations. Retaining Spanish would have been a source of embarrassment, especially since the Philippines was the only former Spanish colony denied independence after the Treaty of Paris in 1898. A closer look reveals that this shift was part of a larger effort to pacify Filipino consciousness. Gallego argued in his 1936 book *The Philippine Trade Act in the Light of History* that controlling language means controlling thought.

The Americans applied similar methods used against the indigenous peoples of North America. Thousands of American soldiers and teachers came to assist in rebuilding the Philippines through education (Gallego, 1936). Their policy drew on experience gained in Puerto Rico after the Treaty of Paris. The American approach was divided into two stages: initially, they enforced English in elementary schools during the first years of occupation; later, upon recognizing Puerto Rico's geographic closeness to the mainland, they reintroduced the vernacular language for the first four years of elementary education. From then on, few forces could rival a nation that invested heavily in education conducted in one language—English. What followed was the troubling idea that proficiency in a foreign language became a measure of personal and national independence.

Regarding the second point, Dr. Gallego observed that Apolinario Mabini initially supported English as the medium of instruction after the ilustrado and wealthy classes came to dominate the constitutional convention (Cruz, 2010). The Americans reinforced this position by circulating biased reports that portrayed native languages negatively. Provincial



Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions  
**GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL**

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

officials claimed there was no need to teach indigenous languages because Filipinos preferred English. This left no doubt that English should become the foundation of public education, though introduced gradually (Gallego, 1936).

A 1902 report from the Bureau of Education declared that Filipinos had expressed eagerness to learn English, while the use of Spanish or native dialects was generally discouraged. The report stressed that Spanish should not be retained since only a small portion of the population understood it (Gallego, 1936). Dr. Schurman, however, questioned the American colonial policy. He argued that attempting to turn Filipinos into Americans was not only futile but could be considered a serious mistake. Gallego further explained that Americans, mostly of Anglo-Saxon heritage, valued their institutions because they fit their particular needs. Yet, admiration for those institutions did not mean they could be applied universally.

This view reveals the Eurocentric belief in the universality of the English language, which supported the expansionist goals of imperialism. Schurman pointed out that Filipinos valued their own culture just as much as the English valued theirs. Only those unfamiliar with history or foreign cultures would believe America's mission aimed to turn Filipinos into Americans. He stressed that such efforts were not only impossible but harmful.

Despite military and legislative efforts, Americans acknowledged the challenges in imposing English and admitted the practical strength of native languages (Cruz, 2010). A directive from President William McKinley in 1900, under William H. Taft's leadership, stated that "primary instruction should be given in the first instance in every part of the island in the language of the people" (Martin, 1980).

Vice Governor Butte warned that replacing native languages in the Philippines would be extremely difficult. Due to the linguistic diversity of the archipelago, he argued that no external or internal force could succeed in this effort, as it had failed elsewhere. Despite the colonial government's vast spending and effort, the widespread adoption of English remained limited. The English spoken by Filipino pensionados was, upon closer inspection, little more than a caricature of the language used in the United States and Britain. This failure to grasp the depth of Filipino culture and language widened the gap between the people and the government.

Gallego's analysis also aligns with the decolonial principle that language shapes consciousness. His insistence that "controlling language means controlling thought" parallels Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's critique of linguistic imperialism, in which colonial languages become tools of mental subjugation. Gallego's recognition of this dynamic decades earlier positions him as a prescient voice in what would later become the field of critical language policy. His rejection of American attempts to universalize English anticipates later critiques of globalization and linguistic homogenization. Rather than adopting a reactive stance, Gallego articulates a proactive vision for a national education rooted in linguistic plurality and cultural autonomy.

While Gallego opposed the imposition of English, he acknowledged the complexities of language planning in a multilingual nation. His legislative proposals sought a compromise: using Tagalog as a bridge language while respecting regional diversity. This position contrasts with more recent arguments that English serves as a practical lingua franca in global contexts. Proponents of English-language education argue that it improves international competitiveness and access to scientific knowledge. However, Gallego's counter-argument is that such gains come at the cost of cultural alienation and epistemic dependence. A balanced policy must therefore consider both local empowerment and global engagement. Gallego's vision remains relevant in this ongoing debate.



**Table 2**

*Tabular Thematic Matrix for the Language Problem of the Filipinos (1932) Monograph Based on Postcolonial Historical Analysis*

Sub-Theme	Description	Supporting Data/Evidence
1. Language as an Instrument of Colonial Domination	Colonial powers used language policy as a tool for cultural conquest and mental domination.	Gallego stated Spanish teaching was “a conquest not only of our country but also of our native dialect.” Aligns with Ngũgĩ’s (1986) idea of language domination shaping the mental universe and Fanon’s (1963) view of adopting colonial languages as adopting colonial worldviews.
2. Legislative Resistance as Decolonial Praxis	Gallego’s bills proposed native languages in education as a form of resistance to linguistic imperialism.	Bill No. 588 proposed native dialects; Bill No. 2182 proposed Tagalog as the medium of instruction for Grades 1–4. Interpreted as early decolonial efforts to reclaim cultural sovereignty.
3. Colonial Education Policy and Internalized Americanization	American language policy fostered an internalized colonial mentality among Filipino elites.	Gallego criticized Filipino intellectuals’ preference for English, rooted in McKinley’s directive and reinforced by Act No. 74. Fanon (1963) describes this as psychological colonization.
4. Systemic Exclusion of Gallego in National Language Narratives	Despite his legislative efforts, Gallego was omitted from dominant historical accounts.	Almario does not mention Gallego in language policy histories, crediting the “Seven Wise Men” instead. His exclusion indicates selective historiography despite being head of the Office of Public Instruction.
5. Language as Cultural and Intellectual Sovereignty	Language is central to national thought, identity, and intellectual life.	Gallego wrote, “Language is the expression of a nation's thought”, citing Rizal, Saleeby, Rodriguez, and Alip to emphasize native language as essential to cultural development.
6. Contradictions and Complexities in Language Planning	Gallego recognized the challenges of multilingualism in education policy.	Proposed Tagalog as a bridge language while respecting regional diversity. This contrasted with pro-English arguments prioritizing global competitiveness at the cost of local empowerment.
7. Historical Continuities of Linguistic Imperialism	American policy mirrored broader imperialist strategies of language control across colonies.	Gallego noted similarities between American education policies in the Philippines and Puerto Rico. Controlling language equated to controlling thought, anticipating critiques of globalization and linguistic homogenization.

Table 1 presents the thematic matrix derived from the analysis of Dr. Manuel V. Gallego’s writings on language policy, situated within a postcolonial framework. The first theme, *Language as an Instrument of Colonial Domination*, reveals that Gallego viewed colonial language policies as mechanisms of cultural and psychological conquest. His assertion that Spanish education represented “a conquest not only of our country but also of our native dialect” (Gallego, 1932) parallels Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o’s (1986) argument that language domination is central to controlling the mental universe of the colonized. Fanon (1963) similarly contends that the adoption of a colonizer’s language equates to adopting their worldview, highlighting the role of language in internalized colonial mentality.



# Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

The second theme, *Legislative Resistance as Decolonial Praxis*, underscores Gallego's early decolonial efforts through Bill No. 588 and Bill No. 2182, which advocated the use of native languages and Tagalog, respectively, in elementary education (Gallego, 1932). These initiatives are consistent with recent scholarship emphasizing language policy as a site of decolonial struggle (Pennycook & Makoni, 2020).

The third theme, *Colonial Education Policy and Internalized Americanization*, discusses how American educational policies fostered Filipino elites' preference for English, reinforcing colonial hierarchies (Gallego, 1932; Cruz, 2010). Fanon (1963) describes this process as a form of psychological colonization, where linguistic assimilation becomes an instrument of social and political domination.

The fourth theme, *Systemic Exclusion of Gallego in National Language Narratives*, points to the selective historiography in Philippine language policy discourse. Despite Gallego's legislative contributions, Virgilio Almario's (2023) comprehensive work does not mention him, instead crediting the "Seven Wise Men." This omission highlights the politics of memory in nation-building narratives (Hau, 2017).

The fifth theme, *Language as Cultural and Intellectual Sovereignty*, emphasizes Gallego's philosophical stance that language is the foundation of national consciousness and cultural identity (Gallego, 1932). This view aligns with current theoretical positions asserting that linguistic empowerment is central to epistemic justice (Dei & Simmons, 2022; Ngũgĩ, 1986).

The sixth theme, *Contradictions and Complexities in Language Planning*, reveals Gallego's pragmatic recognition of the challenges posed by multilingualism. His proposal to use Tagalog as a bridge language while respecting regional diversity contrasts with contemporary arguments for English as a global lingua franca (Tollefson & Tsui, 2018). Gallego's position thus anticipates the current call for balanced policies that promote both local empowerment and global engagement.

Finally, the seventh theme, *Historical Continuities of Linguistic Imperialism*, situates American colonial language policy within broader imperialist strategies, as seen in the Philippines and Puerto Rico (Gallego, 1932). This theme resonates with critiques of linguistic imperialism in globalization processes, where English becomes a tool of epistemic dominance (Phillipson, 2017).

The thematic analysis demonstrates that Dr. Manuel V. Gallego's writings offer an early and sophisticated critique of colonial language policies, positioning him as a pioneering voice in decolonial language planning. His proposals, while grounded in historical realities, continue to hold relevance in contemporary debates on linguistic justice, cultural identity, and educational sovereignty.

### ***Major Theme 3. Theoretical and Pedagogical Grounding for Gallegan Philosophy***

The Gallegan Philosophy course should establish its theoretical foundation within the field of postcolonial and indigenous thought. The course must recognize Dr. Manuel V. Gallego as a Filipino thinker whose legal, educational, and linguistic contributions formed a coherent response to the political and cultural conditions of American colonial rule. His work addressed fundamental questions about the role of language in national identity, intellectual freedom, and self-determination. As such, the course must treat Gallego's ideas as part of a living philosophical tradition that continues to shape debates about education and nationhood in the Philippines.

The course should draw its theoretical basis from postcolonial scholarship, particularly that which explored the relationship between language, identity, and political subjugation. This framework views language not only as a means of communication but also as a carrier of memory, worldview, and collective consciousness. Scholars have described how colonial education and language policies functioned to marginalize indigenous identities and to promote dependency on



## Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

foreign epistemologies. The course must align with this critique while also incorporating Filipino philosophical perspectives that affirm relationality, interiority, and communal selfhood. These elements provide the tools necessary to understand Gallego's work as both historically grounded and forward-looking.

Pedagogically, the course must adopt an approach that respects cultural plurality, fosters critical inquiry, and encourages reflection rooted in local experience. Instruction must prioritize the use of Filipino and other regional languages in classroom dialogue, written assignments, and student-led presentations. Lessons should integrate historical materials such as Gallego's monographs, legislative texts, and public addresses. These primary sources must be paired with accessible theoretical readings that support contextual analysis. Students must examine how Gallego addressed language not only as a legal matter but also as a foundation for citizenship, moral responsibility, and national unity.

The course must include three instructional units. The first unit should examine the colonial history of Philippine education and language policy. The second unit should focus on Gallego's contributions to legislation, public health, and national language planning. The third unit should guide students in formulating a contemporary framework for Gallegan Philosophy by applying his ideas to present-day educational challenges. Each unit must include historical case studies, theoretical readings, guided discussions, and community-based activities.

Evaluation must center on intellectual engagement and cultural relevance. Students may conduct interviews with local teachers, create language maps of their communities, or design policy proposals informed by Gallego's writings. These tasks will enable them to connect classroom theory with real-world applications. Assessment must reward originality, contextual awareness, and ethical reflection.

Gallegan Philosophy must serve both as a corrective to colonial legacies and as a model for future-oriented education. The course will prepare students to recognize the philosophical foundations of national development, to engage critically with policy debates, and to advocate for culturally grounded, linguistically inclusive learning environments.

**Table 3**

*Tabular Thematic Matrix for Theoretical and Pedagogical Grounding for Gallegan Philosophy*

Subtheme	Description	Supporting Data/Evidence
1. Postcolonial Theoretical Foundation	The course grounds Gallego's thought within postcolonial and indigenous philosophies, emphasizing language as a site of political struggle and identity formation.	"The course must recognize Dr. Manuel V. Gallego as a Filipino thinker whose legal, educational, and linguistic contributions formed a coherent response to American colonial rule... The course should draw its theoretical basis from postcolonial scholarship... language... as carrier of memory, worldview, and collective consciousness."
2. Integration of Filipino Philosophical Perspectives	Emphasizes Filipino indigenous concepts such as relationality, interiority, and communal selfhood to situate Gallego's ideas within local philosophical traditions.	"The course must align with this critique while also incorporating Filipino philosophical perspectives that affirm relationality, interiority, and communal selfhood."



# Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

3. Culturally Responsive Pedagogy	Advocates instruction using Filipino and regional languages, integrating primary historical sources and contextual theoretical readings to deepen cultural relevance and critical analysis.	“Instruction must prioritize the use of Filipino and other regional languages... integrate historical materials such as Gallego’s monographs, legislative texts, and public addresses... paired with accessible theoretical readings that support contextual analysis.”
4. Structured Instructional Design	Recommends a three-unit course structure covering colonial history, Gallego’s contributions, and contemporary applications to ensure historical grounding and forward-looking analysis.	“The course must include three instructional units: colonial history... Gallego’s contributions... contemporary framework for Gallegan Philosophy... Each unit must include historical case studies, theoretical readings, guided discussions, and community-based activities.”
5. Praxis-Oriented Evaluation	Positions assessment as application-based, rewarding originality, cultural contextualization, and ethical reflection through community research and policy proposals.	“Students may conduct interviews with local teachers, create language maps of their communities, or design policy proposals informed by Gallego’s writings... Assessment must reward originality, contextual awareness, and ethical reflection.”
6. Philosophical and Educational Purpose	Frames Gallegan's Philosophy as both a corrective of colonial legacies and a forward-looking model for national development rooted in cultural and linguistic sovereignty.	“Gallegan Philosophy must serve both as a corrective to colonial legacies and as a model for future-oriented education... prepare students... to advocate for culturally grounded, linguistically inclusive learning environments.”

The thematic analysis reveals that Gallegan Philosophy is envisioned as a multidisciplinary course grounded in postcolonial theory, indigenous Filipino philosophy, and culturally responsive pedagogy. Its theoretical framing aligns with Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o’s (1986) critique of language domination and Fanon’s (1963) concept of linguistic imperialism, while integrating Filipino philosophical frameworks of relationality and communal selfhood (De Castro, 2018). Pedagogically, it adopts culturally sustaining approaches (Paris & Alim, 2017) by prioritizing Filipino and regional languages, primary local sources, and community-based assessments. Its instructional design scaffolds learning from historical foundations to contemporary applications, ensuring that students not only understand Gallego’s work historically but also deploy it as a lens for present educational and policy issues. The evaluative focus on praxis and ethical reflection transforms theory into lived educational leadership, reaffirming the course’s role as both decolonial critique and development model.

## Conclusion

This study repositions Dr. Manuel V. Gallego as a foundational thinker in Philippine educational and linguistic discourse. Using postcolonial historical analysis, the research interprets Gallego’s writings not as isolated commentaries but as ideological interventions that resist the enduring structures of colonial domination. Anchored in the theories of Frantz Fanon and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o, this study demonstrates that Gallego understood language policy as central to the formation of national consciousness. His critiques of English-medium instruction and his advocacy for Tagalog reflect a profound awareness of the psychological and cultural consequences of linguistic subjugation.

Fanon's theory of language as a vehicle of alienation and Ngũgĩ's insistence on language as a carrier of culture clarify the stakes of Gallego’s interventions. His assertion that colonial education constituted “a conquest not only of our country but



## Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions **GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL**

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

also of our native dialect” prefigures the postcolonial insight that control over language enables control over thought. Gallego’s legislative efforts, his writings on educational reform, and his articulation of language as the expression of a nation’s thought form part of a broader intellectual resistance to colonial epistemologies. Through this methodological lens, Gallego emerges not merely as a legislator or educator but as a critical voice in the early articulation of decolonial language policy.

The contemporary relevance of Gallego’s work is clear. His support for vernacular education, his emphasis on cultural self-determination, and his resistance to linguistic homogenization offer a coherent response to the contradictions within current Philippine language policy. As the country moves away from the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) framework, Gallego’s vision provides an urgently needed counterpoint. His thought reminds us that education grounded in indigenous languages is not simply a pedagogical preference but a political commitment to cultural sovereignty.

This study contributes to the initial development of Gallegan Philosophy, but further work must deepen its theoretical coherence and connect it more explicitly with Filipino indigenous philosophical traditions. The integration of Gallego’s insights into academic programs such as SSC 111/112 and MTB 311 represents a necessary first step. Institutions like the Manuel V. Gallego Foundation Colleges (MVGFC) must play a leading role in formalizing this intellectual legacy by curating archives, designing curriculum, and fostering scholarly dialogue rooted in local languages and histories.

Gallego’s intellectual project advances a vision of education that affirms pluralism, restores historical memory, and strengthens national identity. In a postcolonial society where language remains a contested space, returning to his work offers a strategic and ethical foundation for constructing a more inclusive, critical, and culturally anchored educational system.

### **Recommendations**

Scholars should reconsider the reliance on Euro-American theoretical models and begin articulating a distinctively Filipino philosophical paradigm, akin to the Paulinian or Thomasian traditions. Gallego’s thought invites the development of a decolonial and vernacularized philosophical system that addresses the political, educational, and cultural conditions of the Philippines. In teacher education, his views on language and nation-building should be systematically embedded within curricula. Courses such as MTB 311: Content and Pedagogy in the Mother Tongue should incorporate Gallego’s writings to ground language education in a historical and ideological framework informed by local experience.

To support this broader intellectual project, institutions, particularly the Manuel V. Gallego Foundation Colleges (MVGFC), should prioritize the digitization, archiving, and scholarly publication of Gallego’s writings, speeches, and legislative materials. These efforts will help prevent reductive or incomplete interpretations of his legacy and create a stable foundation for further research. MVGFC is uniquely positioned to lead the design and institutionalization of a formal curriculum for Gallegan Philosophy (SSC 111/112). This process should involve the collaborative development of syllabi, theoretical texts, and learning outcomes by educators, historians, philosophers, and curriculum specialists. Such initiatives will ensure that Gallego’s thought is approached with the necessary academic rigor and contextual sensitivity.

In keeping with Gallego’s commitment to linguistic plurality, future scholarly work should actively promote academic production in Filipino and other regional languages. Translation initiatives, vernacular scholarly publications, and locally hosted academic forums can contribute to the normalization of non-English discourse in higher education. These practices not only reflect the principles of Gallego’s philosophy but also challenge the persistent linguistic hierarchies inherited from colonial education. Scholars can advance a more inclusive, decolonial, and culturally grounded model of academic engagement by cultivating intellectual spaces that value Filipino and regional languages.



## References

- Abiva, R. B. (2024). Intelektuwal na Talambuhay ni Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego: Muhon sa Institusyunalisasyon sa Tagalog bilang Wikang Pambansa. ICTED 2024. <https://www.scribd.com/document/753386964/ICTED2024-Dr-Gallego-Prof-Abiva>
- Abiva, R. B. (2025). *The Language Problem of The Filipinos (1932): The Discourse On Language, Politics, And Society of Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego*. Journal of Arts and Social Sciences [JASS]; Sultan Qaboos University. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/393185009\\_THE\\_LANGUAGE\\_PROBLEM\\_OF\\_THE\\_FILIPINOS\\_1932\\_THE\\_DISCOURSE\\_ON\\_LANGUAGE\\_POLITICS\\_AND\\_SOCIETY\\_OF\\_DR\\_MANUEL\\_VIOLA\\_GALLEGO](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/393185009_THE_LANGUAGE_PROBLEM_OF_THE_FILIPINOS_1932_THE_DISCOURSE_ON_LANGUAGE_POLITICS_AND_SOCIETY_OF_DR_MANUEL_VIOLA_GALLEGO)
- Adriatico, M. (2008). *Paunawa*. In *Banaag at Sikat* (pp. vi). Manila: Anvil Publishing.
- Alip, E. (1930). *Tagalog literature (A historico-critical study)* (p. 155). Manila: UST Press.
- Almario, V. (2023). *Ang Wikang Pambansa at Amerikanisasyon: Isang Kasaysayan ng Pakikihamok ng Filipino para maging Wikang Pambansa*. Quezon City: Ateneo De Manila University Press.
- Amarilla, A., Aliporo, L. J., Georfo, M., Rañon, K. G., Roylo, S., & Tonido, M. (2025). "It's hard to speak Filipino, why is that?" a case study among non-Filipino speakers. *South Florida Journal of Development*, 6(2), e4985. <https://doi.org/10.46932/sfjdv6n2-018>
- Batnag, A. E. (1997). *Issues in Language Consultations*. National Commission for Culture and the Arts. <https://ncca.gov.ph/about-ncca-3/subcommissions/subcommission-on-cultural-disseminationscd/language-and-translation/issues-in-language-consultations/>
- Bersamina, K. D. (2024, October 12). Bills ending mother tongue education lapses into law. *PhilStar Global*. <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2024/10/12/2392016/bill-ending-mother-tongue-education-lapses-law>
- Constantino, E. A. (1996). Mga lingguwistik na ilusyon sa Pilipinas. In *Mga piling diskurso sa wika at lipunan* (p. 179).
- Corpuz, O. D. (1970). *The Philippines* (p. 70). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Countibo, J. D. V. (1975). Preface. In P. Freire, *Cultural action for freedom* (p. 9). USA: Penguin Classics.
- Cruz, I. G. (2010). *English in Philippine education: Themes and issues*. Anvil Publishing.
- Cruz, P. M. (1996). Ang politika ng wikang panturo. In *Mga piling diskurso sa wika at lipunan* (p. 195).
- De Castro, L. N. (2018). Filipino philosophy and postcolonial thought. *Kritike*, 12(2), 18–38.
- De Dios, E. S. (1996). Pambansang wika tungo sa pambansang ekonomiya. In *Mga piling diskurso sa wika at lipunan* (p. 277).
- Dei, G. J. S., & Simmons, M. (2022). *Reimagining anti-oppression educational leadership*. Springer.
- De Leon, J. I. B. (2021). Intelektuwal na talambuhay ni Bonifacio SP. Sibayan: Muhon ng pagpaplanong pangwika at bilingual na edukasyon sa Pilipinas. *Malay - De La Salle University, Tomo XXXV*(Blg. 1). <https://www.dlsu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/pdf/research/journals/malay/tomo-35/1/1-de-leon.pdf>
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth* (C. Farrington, Trans.). Grove Press. (Original work published 1961)



Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions  
**GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL**

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

- Gallego, M. V. (1932). *The language problem of the Filipinos*. Bureau of Printing.
- Gallego, M. V. (1937). *The price of independence*. Bureau of Printing.
- Gallego, M. V. (1936). *The Philippine trade act in the light of history*. Bureau of Printing.
- Hau, C. S. (2017). *Necessary fictions: Philippine literature and the nation, 1946–1980*. Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Igarashi, T., Maulana, S., & Suryadarma, D. (2024). Mother Tongue-based Education in a Diverse Society and the Acquisition of Foundational Skills: Evidence from the Philippines. *Labour Economics*, 91, 102641. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2024.102641>
- Lumbis, A. G., & Manalo, R. (2024, August 27). *The depreciation and intellectualization of the Filipino language*. The GUIDON. <https://theguidon.com/2024/08/the-depreciation-and-intellectualization-of-the-filipino-language/>
- Malone, S. (2018). *MTB MLE resource kit: Including the excluded: Promoting multilingual education*. Bangkok, TH: UNESCO.
- Martin, D. (1980). *A century of education in the Philippines 1861-1961* (p. 120). Manila: Philippine Historical Association.
- Meneses, O. J. (1979). Extemporaneous eulogy of Manuel Viola Gallego during the necrological services. In *Manuel Viola Gallego: Biographical sketch*. Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija: MVGFC.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o. (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Heinemann.
- Ordoñez, E. (2004). The question of language in democratizing society. In A. Tujan Jr. (Ed.), *Transformative education*. Lungsod Quezon: IBON Books.
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.
- Paz, V. (2024). *Mga dahong unang nalagas: Kasaysayang taong-labas at rebolusyunaryo nina Asedillo at Encallado*. Quezon City: UP Press.
- Pennycook, A., & Makoni, S. (2020). *Innovations and challenges in applied linguistics from the Global South*. Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (2017). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. Routledge.
- Polo, J. B. (1996). Wika/relihiyon/ideolohiya: Mga relasyong sosyal at historikal. In *Mga piling diskurso sa wika at lipunan* (p. 79).
- Ranque, K. M. I., Liwanan, R. B., Daine S. Nieva, L. J., & Bernal, A. I. S. (2024). Students’ Proficiency in Using Filipino Language in Academic Communication. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Education*, 03(03). <https://doi.org/10.58806/ijirme.2024.v3i3n08>
- San Juan, D. (2015). Kapit sa patalim, liwanag sa dilim: Ang wika at panitikang Filipino sa kurikulum ng kolehiyo (1996-2014). *Hasaan: Opisyal na Refereed Journal sa Filipino ng Unibersidad ng Santo Tomas, Tomo 2*, 33-64. <https://hasaan.ust.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/HASAAN-Journal-Tomo-II-2015-33-64.pdf>
- Santos, L. K. (2013). Tinging pahapyaw sa kasaysayan ng panitikang Tagalog. In G. Zafra (Ed.), *Mga lektura sa kasaysayan ng panitikan*. Manila: Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino.



ISSN: 3082-3846

Volume 2, Issue 1, 2025

Graduate Education Association of Public Higher Education Institutions  
**GEAPHEI RESEARCH JOURNAL**

Website: <https://geaphei.org/>

- Tollefson, J. W., & Tsui, A. B. M. (2018). *Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts*. Routledge.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2010). *Education for all global monitoring report 2010: Reaching the marginalized*. Paris, FR: UNESCO.
- Usero, J. C. (2021, September 15). *Counter-Babel: Reframing Linguistic Practices in Multilingual Philippines – Department of Linguistics – UP Diliman*. UP Department of Linguistics.  
<https://linguistics.upd.edu.ph/news/counter-babel-reframing-linguistic-practices-in-multilingual-philippines/>
- Zeng, J., & Li, X.-L. (2023). Ideologies underlying language policy and planning in the Philippines. *Humanities & Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01911-8>
- Zhu, L. (2023). A Corpus-Based Analysis of Chinese and Western Newspaper Discourse on Xinjiang Cotton: A Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 13(03), 451-469.  
<https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2023.133028>