

Critical Discourse Analysis of Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego's 1932 Monograph *"The Language Problem of the Filipinos"*: A Study of Postcolonial Linguistic Perspectives

Rene Boy E. Abiva¹

Manuel V. Gallego Foundation Colleges

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the life and works of Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego (1893–1976), a Filipino lawyer, scholar, educator, and statesman, by critically analyzing his 1932 monograph "The Language Problem of the Filipinos." The study aims to elucidate Gallego's linguistic and educational philosophies embedded in this work and to assess their impact on national discourse and policy. Guided by the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) method, the research utilized primary written sources – including his published books, archival photographs, and newspaper articles – as well as unwritten sources, notably an oral interview with his grandson, Dr. Joseph L. Gallego. The analysis revealed five key thematic findings: (1) the need to elevate scholarly discussions on Gallego's intellectual legacy; (2) the historical roots of current linguistic challenges in the Philippines; (3) the significance of Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) at the elementary level; (4) political institutionalization as essential for language intellectualization; and (5) the urgent need to establish a theoretical foundation for the Gallegan Philosophy course (SSC 111/SSC 112) to advance discourse in both vernacular and national languages. In conclusion, the paper underscores Dr. Gallego's active role in addressing educational and linguistic issues, particularly through the founding of the Central Luzon Education Center (CLEC), now Manuel V. Gallego Foundation Colleges (MVGFC). It recommends further in-depth studies on his writings and contributions to vernacular language development and the national language policy, areas that remain largely unexplored in Philippine scholarship.

Keywords: Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego, language, MTB-MLE, national language, post-colonialism, Tagalog

I. INTRODUCTION

Language shapes individuals, yet individuals also hold the power to shape language itself. In the Philippines, however, language remains a battleground of historical, cultural, and political forces. Despite its rich linguistic diversity of over one hundred native languages, educational policies have long privileged foreign languages over local tongues. This deep contradiction has resulted in persistent learning inequities, systemic marginalization, and the erosion of cultural identity among Filipinos (Abiva, 2024).

doi: 10.5281/zenodo.16980564

¹Corresponding Author: reneboy.abiva@mvgallego.edu.ph

The fundamental problem this paper seeks to address is the enduring marginalization of Filipino and other native languages in education, which continues to perpetuate colonial structures and hinder national development. While Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) was implemented in the 2012–2013 school year to address such issues, its abrupt discontinuation under Republic Act No. 12027 in 2024 reinstated Filipino and English as primary mediums of instruction. This reversal highlights the inconsistent and regressive approach to language planning in the country. Compounding this problem is the removal of Filipino language and literature from college curricula under CHED Memorandum Order No. 20, Series of 2013. Such policies, alongside the deep-seated influence of American colonial education systems, continue to obstruct the Filipinization and intellectualization of language in Philippine education (Abiva, 2024).

Considering these challenges, the life and works of Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego (1893–1976) offer critical insights. A lawyer, scholar, educator, and statesman, Dr. Gallego dedicated his career to examining the intersections of language, education, and national sovereignty. His writings, including *The Price of Independence* (1939), *The Philippine Trade Act in the Light of History* (1946), and *The Language Problem of the Filipinos* (1932), critiqued American imperialism and exposed how economic and educational policies perpetuated colonial dominance even after independence.

In *The Language Problem of the Filipinos*, Dr. Gallego argued that the imposition of English constituted cultural subjugation, depriving Filipinos of the freedom to define a national language based on their terms and aspirations. His critiques extended beyond language policy to the broader education system, which he saw as conditioning Filipinos to adopt an American worldview at the expense of their cultural identity.

Historically, Filipino revolutionary movements used native languages as tools of resistance and solidarity. The Katipunan chose Tagalog as the language of revolution, and this practice persisted under American rule through leaders like Asedillo and Encallado. Literature written in the vernacular likewise preserved indigenous philosophies and nurtured collective identity. Yet despite such legacies, contemporary education remains trapped in colonial frameworks. Imported pedagogical models, foreign policy alignment, and mechanical curriculum reforms continue to dominate, failing to center Filipino realities and aspirations.

This paper, therefore, aims to:

1. Provide a scholarly account of the intellectual biography of Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego;
2. Contribute to ongoing discourse on the country's language problems, particularly in support of reinstating MTB-MLE in elementary education; and
3. Lay a conceptual foundation for developing the Gallegan Philosophy course (SSC 111/SSC 112) to strengthen intellectual and cultural grounding in both vernacular and national languages.

To achieve these objectives, this paper is divided into two main sections. The first presents a concise account of Dr. Gallego's life and intellectual engagements. The second offers an initial analysis of his aphorisms in *The Language Problem of the Filipinos* (1932),

exploring their relevance to contemporary struggles for linguistic equity, educational reform, and national sovereignty.

Literature Review

Despite its official designation as the national language, Filipino remains marginalized within its 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 et al., 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, 2024a).

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, 2024b). 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, 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. This policy was solidified by the Tydings-McDuffie Act, embedding English into constitutional and educational frameworks (Gallego, 1936a). Gallego noted that this imposition deprived Filipinos of the right to determine their national language during the critical transition to independence. Onofre Corpuz (1970) 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* (1939), Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego critiqued these dynamics, arguing that American imperialism operated beyond political structures through organized violence, economic reconfiguration, and ideological 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 (Gallego, 1936) reflect what Ngūgĩ 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 (1946) 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.

II. METHODS

This study employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as its primary methodological approach. CDA investigates how language constructs, maintains, and challenges power relations within society. It treats texts not merely as neutral conveyors of information but as politically charged interventions shaped by specific historical and social contexts. In the Philippine setting, where educational and language policies continue to reflect colonial legacies, CDA offers a rigorous framework to examine how Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego's writings critique and resist structures of cultural domination.

The CDA approach in this study is informed by the postcolonial theories of Frantz Fanon and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. Fanon (1963) emphasized that colonial language imposition is a form of psychological and cultural violence, conditioning colonized identities to seek validation from the colonizer. He argued that "to speak is to exist

absolutely for the other,” revealing how language structures power and subjectivity. Similarly, Ngũgĩ (1986) asserted that language is both a means of communication and a carrier of culture, arguing that the domination of indigenous languages by colonial tongues enables control over the mental universe of the colonized. These theoretical insights guided the study’s analysis of Dr. Gallego’s 1932 monograph *The Language Problem of the Filipinos*. Gallego argued that colonial education constituted “a conquest not only of our country but also of our native dialect.” His assertion that “language is the expression of a nation’s thought” aligns with Fanon’s and Ngũgĩ’s claims that linguistic subjugation directly impacts cultural identity and national consciousness.

The study utilized qualitative textual analysis, focusing on three main data sources. First were primary written texts, including Dr. Gallego’s published books (*The Language Problem of the Filipinos*, *The Price of Independence*, *The Philippine Trade Act in the Light of History*), archival newspaper articles, and official legislative documents such as Bill No. 2182. Second were archival materials, such as photographs and institutional records retrieved from the MVGFC College of Nursing archives. Third was unwritten data, specifically a personal interview with Dr. Joseph L. Gallego, Dr. Gallego’s grandson, to validate biographical and historical contexts.

The analysis proceeded through three steps: contextualization, which situated Gallego’s writings within their historical and political contexts to identify embedded power dynamics; thematic coding, which identified key discursive themes related to language, education, and colonial power guided by CDA’s emphasis on language as social practice; and theoretical interpretation, which linked these themes to Fanon’s and Ngũgĩ’s postcolonial theories to elucidate the implications of Gallego’s critiques for contemporary Filipino language and education policies.

Although this study did not involve direct human subjects, it adhered to strict ethical standards. All primary and secondary sources were properly cited to uphold academic integrity. Institutional coordination and permission were obtained for the retrieval of archival materials. The researcher ensured faithful representation of the ideas of Dr. Gallego, Fanon, and Ngũgĩ, avoiding decontextualization or misinterpretation, and maintained sensitivity to cultural, historical, and political implications when interpreting colonial and postcolonial texts.

This study acknowledges several limitations, particularly regarding the application of CDA. First, CDA’s inherent interpretive nature risks researcher bias, as analyses are inevitably framed by the researcher’s positionality and theoretical orientation. While CDA illuminates power relations and ideological structures, it may underemphasize micro-level linguistic features or pedagogical impacts, which purely linguistic discourse analyses or education-focused evaluations could better capture. Second, CDA’s focus on texts as social practices limits its ability to measure actual policy impacts or shifts in public attitudes resulting from discourses. Thus, while CDA provides depth in uncovering embedded power dynamics, it does not directly account for empirical educational outcomes or language proficiency effects in classroom contexts. Third, the scarcity of prior scholarship on Dr. Gallego’s works constrained comparative analyses with other Filipino scholars’ contributions to language policy debates. Fourth,

the study's exclusive reliance on textual analysis, without integrating quantitative policy impact assessments or program evaluation methods, may have limited its interdisciplinary relevance and practical policy recommendations. Fifth, there was limited access to primary sources, with key materials only retrieved in October 2024 after decades of inaccessibility. Finally, the absence of triangulation with oral histories or testimonies from Gallego's contemporaries restricted opportunities for validating historical interpretations through lived narratives.

Despite these limitations, CDA remains an appropriate method to unpack the complexities of Dr. Gallego's critiques against colonial language policies and his vision for education as a means of reclaiming cultural sovereignty. This study's CDA application focuses on analyzing the (1) *The Erasure of Indigenous Intellectual Advocacy in Colonial and Postcolonial Language Narratives* and (2) *Importance of the National Language, U.S. Policy, and Weaknesses of English and American Education*.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. *The Erasure of Indigenous Intellectual Advocacy in Colonial and Postcolonial Language Narratives*

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of Dr. Manuel V. Gallego's biography and legislative initiatives reveals a dominant theme: the systematic erasure of indigenous intellectual advocacy within both colonial and postcolonial language policy narratives in the Philippines. Contextual analysis situates Gallego as a pivotal figure born in 1893 in San Miguel, Bulacan, into an educated Filipino family linked to nationalist circles through Dr. Maximo Viola, a close friend of Dr. Jose Rizal. His rapid completion of law studies at the University of the Philippines and attainment of a Juris Doctor from Chicago-Kent Northwestern University demonstrate his intellectual caliber. As a representative of Nueva Ecija elected in 1931, Gallego authored landmark legislation on land reforms, women's suffrage, school health, and, notably, national language development—including his crucial role in selecting Tagalog as the national language under National Ordinance No. 134 in 1937. Yet despite these contributions, his name is largely absent in contemporary works on Philippine language policy.

Thematic coding reveals a consistent discursive pattern in his legislative efforts that directly challenged American linguistic hegemony. His authorship of Bill No. 588, which advocated for the use of native dialects in schools, and Bill No. 2182, which proposed Tagalog as the medium of instruction for the first four years of elementary education, foregrounds his understanding of language as both a site and an instrument of colonial domination. His aphorism describing colonial education as "a conquest not only of our country but also of our native dialect" encapsulates the depth of his critique. Moreover, his legislative interventions engaged with five enduring debates in Philippine language policy: the primacy of Tagalog versus native dialects, the appropriate duration and level of implementation, and the nationwide enforcement of mother tongue education.

However, theoretical interpretation guided by Fanon and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o underscores how Gallego's critiques and contributions have been systematically marginalized within colonial and postcolonial discourses. Fanon (1963) argued that colonial education conditions the colonized to seek validation from their oppressors, stating that "to speak is to exist absolutely for the other." Gallego's legislative initiatives can thus be read as acts of resistance aimed at reclaiming Filipinos' existential agency by centering language rooted in indigenous culture rather than colonial imposition. Ngũgĩ (1986) emphasized that language is both a means of communication and a carrier of culture, and Gallego's push to institutionalize Tagalog as the national language aligns with this perspective, positioning language policy as a foundation for intellectual sovereignty and national consciousness.

Applying CDA yielded the following analytical insights for this major theme. First, contextualization situated Dr. Gallego's writings and legislative efforts within their historical and political contexts, revealing that his proposals emerged during a period when the Philippines was negotiating its semi-colonial independence while remaining under the shadow of American educational hegemony, established through policies like the 1901 Philippine Commission Act No. 74. Second, thematic coding identified five core discursive themes: (1) the tension between Tagalog and native dialects as mediums of instruction; (2) the strategic focus on early childhood education as the site for linguistic intervention; (3) the systematic Americanization of Filipino intellectuals and constitutional framers; (4) the erasure of Gallego's contributions within official historical narratives; and (5) the enduring colonial structuring of Filipino linguistic identities. Third, theoretical interpretation illuminated how these themes connect to Fanon's critique of colonial education as psychological violence and Ngũgĩ's framing of language domination as mental subjugation. The omission of Gallego's role in works like Virgilio Almario's *Ang Wikang Pambansa at Amerikanisasyon* (2023) illustrates Ngũgĩ's assertion of the deliberate silencing of indigenous intellectuals who challenge imperial discourses.

This major theme exposes how both colonial and postcolonial discourses structurally erase figures like Dr. Gallego, whose advocacy for linguistic sovereignty threatened the ideological stability of the colonial order. His absence in historiography is not merely an academic oversight but a politically charged silencing that sustains neocolonial dominance by obscuring indigenous intellectual agency in shaping national language and education policies. CDA thus reveals that Gallego's legislative interventions were not merely policy proposals but discursive acts of resistance, challenging hegemonic power structures and seeking to restore dignity, cultural self-definition, and intellectual independence to the Filipino people.

B. Importance of the National Language, U.S. Policy, and Weaknesses of English and American Education

Applying Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to Dr. Manuel V. Gallego's monograph and related writings reveals a major theme: the tension between the intrinsic value of the national language and the colonial imposition of English as an educational and ideological tool. Contextualization situates Gallego's discourse within the early 20th-

century Philippine sociopolitical context, where the American colonial government systematically enforced English as the medium of instruction to entrench its cultural and political hegemony (Gallego, 1937a). Gallego, drawing intellectual inspiration from both Filipino nationalist traditions, such as Dr. Jose Rizal and contemporaries like Eulogio B. Rodriguez, framed language as “the expression of a nation's thought” (Gallego, 1937b), emphasizing its foundational role in shaping consciousness and nationhood. His citations of Dr. Saleeby’s assertion that no language is sweeter than one’s native tongue and Rafael Herrmann’s call for linguistic unity underscore this deep recognition of language as an existential and cultural anchor for Filipinos (Gallego, 1937c).

Thematic coding of Gallego’s critique surfaces five interrelated discursive patterns. First, he exposes the ideological violence of American educational policy, highlighting how laws such as the Hawes-Cutting Bills and the Hare Bill institutionalized English and marginalized native languages as part of broader colonial pacification (Gallego, 1937d). Second, he contrasts Spanish colonial policy, which encouraged learning local languages (Santos, 1924), with American colonial policy that equated English fluency with modernization, revealing the weaknesses of American education rooted in its lack of cultural integration. Third, he critiques Filipino complicity, exemplified by the *clase ilustrada*’s embrace of English and the constitutional framers’ exclusion of indigenous languages, reflecting Fanon’s (1963) insight that colonized elites often internalize the linguistic superiority of the colonizer. Fourth, Gallego highlights the American government’s contradictory positions, wherein official reports proclaimed Filipinos’ eagerness to learn English while simultaneously acknowledging native languages’ pedagogical effectiveness (Gallego, 1937e). Finally, he identifies the structural failure of American linguistic imperialism, noting that the English spoken by Filipino *pensionados* remained a “caricature” of authentic usage, exposing the policy’s superficial and alienating impact (Gallego, 1937f).

Theoretical interpretation rooted in Fanon and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o deepens these insights. Fanon (1963) argued that colonial education renders the colonized subject dependent on the language of the oppressor for social mobility and psychological validation, encapsulated in his statement that “to speak is to exist absolutely for the other” (p. 17). Gallego’s critique aligns with this, as he exposed how American education equated fluency in English with individual and national independence, effectively delegitimizing indigenous languages as inferior or impractical (Gallego, 1937g). Ngũgĩ (1986) emphasized that language carries culture and identity, and its domination erases collective memory and indigenous epistemologies. Gallego’s insistence that language is the expression of national thought and consciousness echoes this perspective, as he viewed the use of the Filipino languages not merely as practical communication but as an assertion of cultural sovereignty.

Furthermore, Gallego problematized the Eurocentric assumptions embedded in American education, citing Schurman’s acknowledgment that imposing American institutions universally was not only futile but morally questionable (Gallego, 1937h). This critique unmasked the ideological arrogance underpinning American colonial education, which assumed English’s universality while dismissing the cultural and

cognitive integrity of local languages. Despite massive investments in English-language education, Gallego observed that its outcomes remained limited and alienating, creating a disjuncture between the government's language policies and the people's lived linguistic realities. Vice Governor Butte's admission that no force could permanently replace native languages reinforced Gallego's argument that language policy is inherently linked to national dignity and consciousness, and any attempt to erase it is ultimately unsustainable (Gallego, 1937i).

CDA reveals that Gallego's writings constitute a powerful discursive intervention against colonial linguistic hegemony. His framing of language policy was not merely legislative advocacy but a profound philosophical and cultural critique that sought to reorient Filipino education toward intellectual autonomy and cultural integrity. This major theme underscores that the continued marginalization of Filipino languages in education is rooted in a long colonial history of equating English proficiency with modernity, a fallacy that Gallego's work courageously challenged (Gallego, 1937j).

IV. CONCLUSION

This research has successfully achieved its intended objectives, as evidenced by the findings of the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The first objective—to elevate the quality of discourse on Dr. Manuel V. Gallego's intellectual biography in a scholarly manner—was realized through contextualization of his life and legislative efforts within their historical and political contexts. CDA revealed Major Theme 1: *The Erasure of Indigenous Intellectual Advocacy in Colonial and Postcolonial Language Narratives*, highlighting how Gallego's pivotal contributions to national language development, educational reforms, and legislative advocacy were systematically marginalized in official histories. By situating Gallego's initiatives—such as Bill No. 588 and Bill No. 2182—within postcolonial frameworks, the study exposed the discursive silencing of indigenous intellectuals resisting linguistic imperialism.

The second objective—to contribute to national discourse on language policy, particularly Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE)—was likewise fulfilled. Thematic coding and theoretical interpretation uncovered Major Theme 2: *The Importance of the National Language, U.S. Policy, and Weaknesses of English and American Education*. Gallego's framing of language as "the expression of a nation's thought" and his critique of American linguistic imperialism affirm the enduring importance of promoting linguistic sovereignty, cognitive development, and cultural dignity through mother tongue education. This insight remains highly relevant despite the repeal of MTB-MLE under R.A. No. 12027, as the structural issues Gallego identified—such as linguistic alienation, epistemic violence, and the erasure of indigenous languages—persist within the current educational system. Thus, his writings provide a critical historical lens to interrogate the implications of this policy reversal and to advocate for the continued intellectualization of Filipino and regional languages.

The third objective—to establish a concrete and intellectualized foundation for the Gallegan Philosophy course (SSC 111/SSC 112)—was partially achieved. While CDA provided initial theoretical and pedagogical grounding for Gallegan Philosophy, its

reliance on Fanon and Ngũgĩ's Western postcolonial theories indicates a limitation. These risks overshadow indigenous epistemologies and Philippine philosophies inherent in Gallego's vision. Furthermore, the absence of substantial studies on Gallegan Philosophy from 1979 to 2023 has hindered its evolution into a robust intellectual framework, resulting in continued biographical reiteration rather than philosophical expansion.

Moving forward, this study recommends three key actions directly grounded in CDA results. First, pursue dedicated philosophical and educational research that synthesizes Gallego's writings with indigenous Filipino philosophies, thereby overcoming Western theoretical dominance and enabling a truly decolonizing framework. Second, integrate his legislative discourses on language, education, and national identity into teacher education curricula, particularly in courses on language policy, Philippine education history, and MTB-MLE or its equivalent frameworks, to cultivate critical and historically grounded educators. Third, initiate institutional projects to systematically archive, translate, and disseminate Gallego's works to expand accessible resources for scholars, educators, and policy advocates.

Ultimately, this research reaffirms that Dr. Manuel V. Gallego's ideas remain highly relevant to current efforts to strengthen Filipino and regional languages within a decolonizing educational system. His advocacy continues to offer critical insights for revisiting, resisting, and transforming language policies that undermine Filipino linguistic empowerment. By revisiting his life and contributions through CDA, this study foregrounds the urgent need for unity, intellectual agency, and cultural determination in restoring dignity and self-definition to the Filipino people, especially in an era when the promise of mother tongue education is once again under threat.

V. REFERENCES

- Abiva, R. B. (2024, July). *Intelektuwal na talambuhay ni Dr. Manuel Viola Galego: Muhon sa institusyonalisasyon sa Tagalog bilang wikang pambansa* [Paper presentation]. International Conference on Teacher Education 2024. <https://www.scribd.com/document/753386964/ICTED2024-Dr-Gallego-Prof-Abiva>
- Abiva, R. B. (2024). *Muhon at pasyok: Ang diskurso sa wika at politika sa unang seksiyon ng The Language Problem of the Filipinos monograph (1932) ni Dr. Manuel Viola Gallego*. Instabright Gazette. <https://www.instabrightgazette.com/blog/muhon-at-pasyok-ang-diskurso-sa-wika-at-politika-sa-unang-seksiyon-ng-the>
- Adriatico, M. (2008). Paunawa. In L. K. Santos, *Banaag at sikat* (p. vi). Anvil Publishing.
- Almario, V. (2023). *Ang wikang pambansa at Amerikanisasyon*. Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Amarilla, A., Aliporo, L. J., Georfo, M., Rañon, K. G., Roylo, S., & Tonido, M. (2021). "It's hard to speak Filipino, why is that?" A case study among non-Filipino speakers. *South Florida Journal of Development*, 6(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.46932/sfjdv6n2-018f>
- Batnag, A. (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. B. (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>
- Corpuz, O. D. (1970). *The Philippines*. Prentice Hall.
- Gallego, M. V. (1932). *The language problem of the Filipinos*. Bureau of Printing.
- Gallego, M. V. (1939). *The price of independence*. Bureau of Printing.
- Gallego, M. V. (1946). *The Philippine Trade Act in the light of history*. Bureau of Printing.
- 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*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000246278>
- Ordoñez, E. (2004). The question of language in democratizing society. In A. Tujan, Jr. (Ed.), *Transformative education*. IBON Books.
- Paz, V. (2024). *Mga dahong unang nalagas: Kasaysayang taong-labas at rebolusyunaryo nina Asedillo at Encallado*. University of the Philippines Press.
- Ranque, K. M. I., Liwanan, R. B., Nieva, D. S., & Bernal, A. I. S. (2024). Students' proficiency in using Filipino language in academic communication. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Education*, 3(3).
<https://doi.org/10.58806/ijirme.2024.v3i3n08>
- Santos, L. K. (2013). Tinging pahapyaw sa kasaysayan ng panitikang Tagalog. In G. Zafra (Ed.), *Mga lektura sa kasaysayan ng panitikan*. Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2010). *2010 Education for all global monitoring report 2010: Reaching the marginalized*. UNESCO Digital Library. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000187279>
- Usero, J. C. (2021, September 15). Counter-Babel: Reframing linguistic practices in multilingual Philippines. *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>