

**Philippine Historiography and Colonial Discourse:  
Eight Selected Essays on Postcolonial Studies in the Philippines  
(An Introduction to the Japanese Translation)**

**Yoshiko Nagano**  
(translated by Michiyo Yoneno-Reyes)

from

Reynaldo C. Ileto, Vicente L. Rafael and Floro C. Quibuyen,  
Translation texts compiled and edited by Yoshiko Nagano,  
*Firipin Rekishikenkyu to Shokuminchi Gensetsu*  
[*Philippine Historiography and Colonial Discourse*],  
Published by Mekong Publishing Co., Tokyo, 2004, 389pp.  
(p.357-p.385)

**[Introduction by Translator]**

*This essay was originally written by Yoshiko Nagano in 2004 in Japanese as a commentary to a book where Japanese translation of eight essays by three Filipino historians, Reynaldo C. Ileto, Vicente L. Rafael and Floro C. Quibuyen - originally written in English – are compiled. I consider it significant to publish the English translation of the commentary for wider readership for the following two reasons.*

*First, this essay serves as a handy yet reliable introduction to the current discourse and debates in Philippine historiography, particularly those of the American colonial period in the framework of a postcolonial critique. The insightful observations of the author, who has been vigorously engaged in Philippine studies for the past quarter-century, sheds light on the question of the “United States’ politico-cultural power,” both explicit and implicit, throughout the colonial and postcolonial Philippines. I believe that the three distinguished Filipino historians, as shown in this essay, suggest a provocative approach towards postcolonial discourse, as well as towards globalization. This is very*

*useful. Furthermore, I consider that reconstruction of the history of the American period in the Philippines, as summarized in this essay, also contributes to another trend in Philippine studies, by providing critical reflections on the Marcos regime outside the narrow field of political science.<sup>i</sup> Particularly the discussion of idiosyncratic nationalism by the dictator vis-à-vis the legacy of American colonial experiences has in recent years led to self-reflective narratives by Filipino scholars/ intellectuals/ artists on their own or their colleagues' engagement with the dictatorship.<sup>ii</sup>*

*Secondly, I believe in the academic benefit of crossing borders between two different systems of discourse defined by language – in this case Japanese and English – as it allows a “double perspective”, in Said’s expression, that enables us “to see a much wider picture”.<sup>iii</sup> I would hope this would lead, if successful, to a genuinely hybrid discourse, though within the limitations of translation. The essay summarizes how a Japanese Filipinologist views recent significant discourse in Philippine historiography; how she constructs it in the context of Japanese political and philosophical thought; largely inspired by the development of English-language discourse on the topic by Filipino scholars. It is especially important, in my personal view, that this essay be made available to Filipino readers, as well as to a wider global readership, not only for the information it contains, but also for its contributions to the formation of the English discourse on the topic at large, including both praise and criticism, if any.*

*A few words were supplemented in this translation text, as is usual in any translation. This was done particularly because of the shifts in target readership in the process of producing this text. Originally it was written for Japanese readers, then first translated for my students at University of the Philippines, and finally for the wider English-reading audience. Changes are not necessarily noted unless considered important.*

*Lastly, I would like to express my deep gratitude to Yoshiko Nagano for her moral support and considerable helpful suggestions on the earlier versions of this translation text. I also thank my colleague Floro C. Quibuyen for his strong encouragement for this translation work. Similarly, I thank Vicente L. Rafael and Reynaldo C. Iletto for their encouragement and comments on the earlier versions. However, I alone am responsible for the errors and inconsistencies.*

## **Introduction**

With the publication of his *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines 1840-1910* (Ileto 1979), Reynaldo C. Ileto explored a new horizon in the historiography of the Philippine Revolution and established his international scholarship. Meanwhile, Vicente L. Rafael, in his *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule* (Rafael, 1988), succeeded in his ambitious attempt of introducing poststructuralist theories in the analysis of the colonial society. These two Filipino historians have been very influential since the 1980s not only in Philippine studies both at home and abroad, but also in Southeast Asian studies generally. In recent years, in his *A Nation Aborted: Rizal, American Hegemony, and Philippine Nationalism* (Quibuyen 1999), Floro C. Quibuyen, as provocative political scientist, vigorously challenged the deconstruction of the national hero Jose Rizal that became prototypical during American colonial period. This volume is a compilation of eight stimulating essays written by the above three excellent Filipino scholars and selected by myself. All of them have continuously been engaged in enthusiastic and penetrating research on Philippine historiography, politics and culture, thereby bringing to life various debates and controversies both within and without. The following are the original English titles and sources of the eight essays translated and included in this volume.

## **Part I: From Historiography on the Philippine Revolution to the Critique of Orientalism**

Chapter 1: Reynaldo C. Ileto, "The Revolution of 1896 and the Mythology of the Nation State", *The Philippine Revolution and Beyond vol. 1 (Papers from the International Conference on the Centennial of the 1896 Philippine Revolution)*, edited by Elmer A. Ordoñez, Manila: Philippine Centennial Commission, National Commission for Culture and Sports, 1998, pp. 61-67.

Chapter 2: Reynaldo C. Ileto, "Lecture 2: Knowledge and Pacification: The Philippine-American War," *Knowing America's Colony: A Hundred Years from the Philippine War*, Philippine Studies Occasional Paper Series no. 13, Center for Philippine Studies, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, 1999, pp. 19-40.

Chapter 3: Reynaldo C. Ileto, "Lecture 3: Orientalism and the Study of Philippine Politics," *Knowing America's Colony: A Hundred Years from the Philippine War*, Philippine Studies Occasional Paper Series no. 13, Center for Philippine Studies,

University of Hawai'i at Manoa, 1999, pp. 41-65. The translation for this volume is based on its revised version in the *Philippine Political Science Journal*, vol. 22, no. 45 (2001), pp. 1-32. (Japanese translation with the permission of the author).

## **Part II: American Colonialism and Cross-Cultural Experiences**

Chapter 4: Vicente L. Rafael, "Chap. 1: White Love: Census and Melodrama in the US Colonization in the Philippines," *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History*, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press 2000. Only the part of the discussion on the 1903 Census (pp.19-39) is translated.

Chapter 5: Vicente L. Rafael, "Chap. 2: Colonial Domesticity: Engendering Race at the Edge of Empire, 1899-1912," *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History*, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press 2000, pp. 52-75. Chapter 6: Vicente L. Rafael, "Chap. 4: Anticipating Nationhood: Identification, Collaboration, and Rumor in Filipino Responses to Japan," *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History*, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press 2000, pp.103-121 (Copyright @ 2000 by Duke University Press).

## **Part III: Changing Images of Jose Rizal**

Chapter 7: Floro C. Quibuyen, "Chapter 2: "Rizal and the Revolution," *A Nation Aborted: Rizal, American Hegemony, and the Philippine Nationalism*, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1999, pp. 41-72.

Chapter 8: Floro C. Quibuyen, "Chapter 10: Remarking Filipino History," *A Nation Aborted: Rizal, American Hegemony, and the Philippine Nationalism*, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1999, pp. 275-302 (Copyright @ 1999 by Ateneo de Manila University Press).

The translation of these two chapters is based on the manuscript for the second edition, which the author is currently preparing. Decisions for necessary additions and corrections were made by the translator in consultation with the author.

While the three authors develop unique arguments independently of each other in the eight essays compiled in this volume, there seems to be one common feature worth noting among them. That is to say, these authors - all of whom belong to the "post-independence generation" who were born and grew up in the Philippines after World War II - look into the historical situation in the Philippines from new and critical perspectives. They view colonial modernity (the deep root of contemporary Philippine society) as the result of several centuries' experience of colonial rule by Spain, the United States and Japan. This also means that their approaches to colonial modernity in the Philippines have multiple aspects such as politics, society and culture, in relation to the problems of

imperialism and nationalism. This enables them to construct novel analytical insights and perspectives. All of the eight essays included in this volume are excellent pieces by the three authors who convey strong and passionate opinions of Philippine society in questioning Philippine history from the horizon of the present in order to explore future possibilities. In compiling this translation volume, I tried to be careful in arranging the sequence of each essay from Part I to Part III, so as to be able to convey most directly the attitudes of the three authors towards their writing activities. I also paid attention to the manner of putting translator's notes so that each Japanese reader may start from any chapter of the book in accordance with his/her interest. As will be obvious, this introduction to our translation volume does not represent the opinions of the five translators jointly engaged in the Japanese translation of this volume, rather it expresses my personal views.

### **Locating the New Trend of Philippine Historiography in the Japanese Cultural Milieu**

This translation volume is about the historiography of the Philippines. However, the essays compiled in this volume are not based on historiography in the narrow sense of the word, but rather they are deeply integrated into the realm of philosophy and intellectual history which I call "postcolonial critique as the counter-consciousness of globalization" (Nagano 2002a). Indeed, the eight selected essays in this volume were written in the 1990s and they can be understood as the outcome of the intellectual struggles reflecting the new surroundings of thoughts or ideas in the Philippines during the post-Cold War period when various stimulating and provocative writings in Philippine historiography have appeared one after another, particularly after the late 1990's. In these intellectual endeavors, the 20<sup>th</sup> century's historical perspectives or its interpretations that used to be accepted as social norms in Philippine society came to be understood as American colonial discourses. Attempts have been made to free Philippine history and society from its colonial bondage by re-examining primary historical sources. There are two significant events to note as the background of these attempts in recent years.

First, the separation of Philippine society from the United States was escalated during the post-Cold War period due to the withdrawal of US bases from the Philippines in

1992. The Philippines had kept its intimate relationship with United States as the former suzerain even after its independence at the end of World War II, making the United States a special country for Filipinos for quite a long time. However, since the 1990s the Philippines has developed closer ties with neighboring Asian countries, while at the same time internally there have been attempts to re-question the Americanized pattern of thinking that used to lie silently at the bottom of the structure of Filipino consciousness.

Secondly, the Philippines celebrated the centennial anniversary of the Philippine Revolution in 1996-1998. The Philippine Revolution of 1896 - 1898 (or at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century) was the first independent struggle in colonial Southeast Asia. The Philippines gained its independence from Spain in 1898, but, the United States soon intervened in the Spanish-American War and bought the territory of the Philippine archipelago from Spain under the Treaty of Paris. As a result, the Philippine-American War broke out in 1899. The United States declared pacification complete in 1902, thus aborting the Revolution. In spite of the historical complexity, we might see that in the collective memory of Filipinos today, the Philippine Revolution has been remembered as the root of Philippine modern history. Taking the opportunity provided by the centennial anniversary of the Philippine Revolution, some Filipino scholars have begun to re-write Philippine history from new perspectives, reflecting the “globalized” surroundings of Philippine society in the post-Cold War period.<sup>iv</sup>

With such background, there have arisen various attempts by Filipinos to free themselves from the American cultural influence that has restricted their patterns of thought for a long time. Generally speaking, Filipino scholars who engage in such attempts have acute historical consciousness and they have some common experiences of earning higher degrees in graduate schools of distinguished universities in the United States. They did so while carrying with them the knowledge of historiography, political science, and philosophy or intellectual history that they had previously learned from their undergraduate studies in the Philippines. To seek their own identities they have struggled with American scholarship and continuously been exploring their own ways of integrating their historical experiences as Filipinos into their scholarship and writings. By looking penetratingly at the United States as the former suzerain through their own eyes, they were able to use American society as its own mirror, revealing the Americanized

patterns of ideas and values that had been lying at the depth of their consciousness. This exercise has enabled them to free themselves from the dominating influence of the American colonial discourse.

However, it seems that American mainstream scholars who engage in Philippine studies often are cool towards such intellectual struggles by Filipino scholars. This is especially so in the interpretation of the Philippine Revolution. The large gap between American historians and their Filipino counterparts became apparent in 1997-1998 in a heated debate on the historiography of the Philippine Revolution. Since I have already written about this debate in detail elsewhere (Nagano 2000), here I limit myself only to state its summary.

The debate began with Glenn May's *Inventing a Hero: The Posthumous Re-Creation of Andres Bonifacio* (May 1997) that came out during the centennial anniversary of the Philippine Revolution. Glenn May's main argument in his book is as follows. Since the publication of Teodoro Agoncillo's *The Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan* (Agoncillo 1956), Andres Bonifacio has been regarded as a national hero, the leader of the masses who initiated the Philippine Revolution. However, May claims that such interpretation of Bonifacio's role in the Revolution was drawn not by scrutinizing historical documents, but merely using unreliable documents and interviews. May also criticized Reynaldo Ileto's *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910* (Ileto 1979). Ileto had traced the revolutionary ideas of the Katipunan, a secret society led by Bonifacio, to those of indigenous religious movements such as spontaneous peasant uprisings called "colorum". May felt that the authenticity of the historical documents used by Ileto to prove the connection between the two movements was highly doubtful.

Glenn May's attack on the Filipino historians had an enormous impact and a number of critiques as well as contesting arguments against May appeared in the Philippines. In this situation it was Reynaldo Ileto, taking a sharp stand against Glenn May, who declared that the real intention of May was not a minor quibbling about historical documents but an overwhelming attack on the entire historiography of the Philippine Revolution that had been written in the Philippines since Agoncillo's *The Revolt of the Masses* (Ileto 1998, Chap.9).

In this context, the May-Ileto debate on the interpretation of Bonifacio's role in the Philippine Revolution might be understood as one of the "hegemonic struggles at the level of the discourses on postcolonialism" between an American historian and his Filipino counterpart (Nagano 2002). If we observe it only from a superficial viewpoint, the May-Ileto debate might seem to be merely the difference of views on the historiography of the Philippine Revolution between American and Filipino historians. However, it is important to note here that the argument with which May challenged Filipino historians contains more profound meanings or problematique. That is to say, I observe in May's argument the existence of cultural ascendancy that lies behind the ideas of other American historians. In this sense, I assume that the May-Ileto debate on the historiography of the Philippine Revolution is the epitome of an asymmetrical relationship that arose within the hegemonic structure that lies in the cultural relationship between the United States and the Philippines, or between the former suzerain and its former colony (Nagano 2004; San Juan 2000: 82-84, 205-206).

Approaching the new trend of Philippine historiography in recent years from the above perspective, I propose the following two points as being characteristic. First, generally speaking, we might say that such a new trend is an attempt to reconstruct the history that has been fragmented under colonialism and postcolonialism while keeping a critical eye on the images of the world that have been constructed during the U.S. hegemony of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, particularly after World War II. Secondly, in the 1990s, after the end of the Cold War, US-led "globalization" increased in acceleration, and in such a situation arguments that deconstruct nationalism or the collective memory of a nation-state as a political unit seem to have been emerged as "dominion discourse." In this context, it can be said that the concept of "post colonial" is currently establishing its significance as a new way of thinking to confront critical discussions on nationalism or the nation-state. Such a new wave in Philippine studies has something in common not only with historiography in neighboring Southeast Asian countries but also with Subaltern studies in India that has flourished since the 1980s and been noted internationally (Guha et al. 1998; Loomba 1998).

I understand the eight essays compiled in this volume as the "new trend in Philippine historiography as postcolonial critique." However, this does not mean that the



scholars who are engaged in Philippine postcolonial studies work together as a group. Rather it seems to me, as I will discuss later, that political science and historiography seem to form a new research field of Philippine studies that might be called postcolonial studies (see also Mendoza 2002). Because of this, I consider it necessary to clarify how I understand postcolonial studies before I discuss the trend of post-colonial studies in the Philippines.

First, post-colonial studies pays attention to the situation where even after political independence the influence of the colonial period remains within the political, economic, social and cultural structure in countries with colonial experience, such as the ones in Asia and Africa that gained independence after World War II as well as the ones in Latin America that had become independent in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Indeed, previous studies on Asia, Africa and Latin America have been concerned with issues of the colonial legacy in the social structure after independence. Post-colonial studies, however, can be seen as a new and more dynamic approach in trying to stress the continuing presence of colonial patterns of thinking and values in the people's minds in the present society that have been an obstacle to the de-colonization of the society. They also revealed ways in which the people in former colonies had become enslaved to the patterns of thinking and values infused by the suzerain states during the colonial period (Ueno-Mori 2000).

In addition, I want to emphasize here that the meaning of postcolonial studies in Japan is fundamentally different from that in the United States, Europe or Australia. Relating ourselves as Japanese to the "post-colonial" means that we must grasp more consciously than ever that we Japanese have historically formed in the depth of our psyche the dual structure of the "postcolonial" in the formation of a modern society. While Japanese were forced to exist as the *other* against the people of Western societies, Japanese demanded the people of the neighboring Asian countries to be the *other* (Komori 2001).

At the same time, there is another important perspective that should not be ignored when Japanese scholars involve themselves in the "postcolonial". The people of the neighboring Asian countries whom Japanese demanded to be the *other* historically have also been viewed as the *other* by the West, when exposed to the waves of

modernization emanating from Western countries. This is very similar to what we Japanese experienced. Therefore, being involved in the “postcolonial” as Japanese becomes meaningful when we compare and examine whether there is a commonality between neighboring Asian countries and Japan in terms of the contradictory and complicated structure of consciousness in the early stage of modern society, and at which point the difference occurs, should it exist (Nagano 2001b).

I consider that such attempt helps us cultivate a way to comprehend critically today’s Japanese society and its intellectually “colonial” situation, by not limiting the concept of the “postcolonial” as an “imported” concept as it was imported to Japan via Australia, the United States and Europe, but by locating it in the reality of Japanese society and its historical context, and by looking at the modernity we are to overcome. The reason why I am concerned with the concept of the “postcolonial” so particularly is because I believe we should not involve ourselves with the “postcolonial” as stranger. Rather, I think we should investigate the commonalities and differences between the “postcolonial” in Japanese society and that in the neighboring Asian societies so as to overcome the deadlock that Japanese society has faced since the end of the Cold War, through the “lost decade” of the 1990s.

Despite the collapse of the so-called 1955 system that has been the foundation of the strength of Japanese society during the Cold War, Japan still remains unable to identify a positive perspective toward the future. It seems to me the way to search for such a perspective begins with re-examination of the meaning of the “presence of America-ness” that has been increasingly influential in our intellectual life as Japanese after the end of World War II and more particularly since the 1980s. In this context, the attempts of Filipino scholars to deconstruct American colonial discourse could be an important clue for us Japanese in re-examining the historical path we have experienced since the end of World War II and in the search for a desirable future for Japanese society. I sincerely wish that this book be read not separately from our Japanese experiences but as a venue to find out the historical commonality of the postcolonial situation between the Japanese and Filipino people.

## **Profile of Three Authors and the Features of Their Writings**

Let us introduce here the profile of these original authors and their writings. I had opportunities to meet the three of them personally through the translation work for this volume as well as during my career as a scholar of Philippine studies. I met Reynaldo C. Ileto in Tokyo and Singapore, Vicente L. Rafael in New York and Leiden, and Floro C. Quibuyen in Iloilo City, Philippines. I had very stimulating discussions with all of them. I also exchanged e-mails quite frequently with them and had the opportunity to exchange views on various issues such as Philippine studies, postcolonial studies, the significance of translation, the wars after the 9/11 attacks as well as current problems of Japanese society. Here I would like to sketch the profiles of the three authors based on my interaction with them over the past few years.

### **Reynaldo C. Ileto.**

Few would deny that Reynaldo C. Ileto is one of the most noteworthy figures in Philippine historiography today. He has developed very unique arguments in his publications, paper presentations and lectures. Because of his provocative and often imaginative style, he has received keen attention by various scholars and intellectuals while receiving severe criticisms from within and without the Philippines. As demonstrated by the fact that he was awarded the Academic Prize among the 14<sup>th</sup> annual Fukuoka Asian Cultural Prizes in 2003, (the most prestigious prize in the field of Asian studies in Japan), he is highly appreciated as a historian among Japanese Southeast Asian specialists. In Japan, his works have been introduced since the 1980s through the writings of Setsuho Ikehata, the notable Japanese historian on Southeast Asia specializing in the history of the Philippine Revolution (Ikehata 1987; Ikehata 2001). One of his articles on the colonial war (Ileto 2001) is translated into Japanese (Ileto, Uchiyama trans. 2002) and the Japanese translation of his *Pasyon and Revolution* will also come out soon (Ileto, Shimizu and Nagano co-edit. 2005).<sup>v</sup>

First, sketching briefly his career, Reynaldo Ileto was born in Manila in October, 1946. After graduating from Ateneo de Manila University in 1967, he studied at Cornell University in the United States, and earned an MA (majoring in Southeast Asian history with modern and contemporary Chinese history as a minor) in 1970, and a PhD (majoring

in Southeast Asian History with anthropology as a minor) in 1975. In 1979, *Pasyon and Revolution* was published based on his dissertation but with extensive expansion and substantial revisions.

When this monumental work came out, Iletto was assistant professor at the Department of History, University of the Philippines (UP), Diliman, formerly headed by Teodoro Agoncillo, the leading authority on the Philippine Revolution. After the publication of *Pasyon and Revolution*, the relationship between Iletto and Agoncillo became hostile because the former had pointed out the limitations of the latter's *Revolt of the Masses*. It was Milagros Guerrero (who was considered then as the most favorite student of Agoncillo) who challenged Iletto's arguments in *Pasyon and Revolution*. The response of Iletto to the Guerrero's criticism is compiled in Chapter 9 of *Filipinos and Their Revolution: Event, Discourse and Historiography*, Iletto's second book on the historiography of the Philippine Revolution (Iletto 1998). During the 1980s *Pasyon and Revolution* was not accepted easily by the academic circles in the Philippines. Iletto had returned to U.P. after years of study at Cornell where he had honed his acute analysis on various historical questions as well as his excellent manner of developing arguments by amalgamating various disciplines like history, critical literature, anthropology, philosophy and intellectual history.<sup>vi</sup>

Outside the Philippines, the situation was different. Iletto's *Pasyon* acquired a high reputation in the field of Southeast Asian studies in the United States and he was awarded the Harry Benda Prize from the Association of Asian Studies (AAS) in 1985, the prize given for excellent first books written by scholars in the area of Southeast Asian studies. Iletto moved to Australia to teach at James Cook University in 1986 and then moved to Australian National University in 1996. Iletto told me personally that he became conscious about the underlying radical discrimination against Asians in Australia and that this might have caused a change in his viewpoint. In Australia, unlike in the United States where he stayed as graduate student, by working as a faculty member in the university, he was compelled by circumstances to be more conscious about the differences between the "White" and "Asian". He came to have a more critical consciousness than before about the framework of Southeast Asian studies in the United States, which had served as the academic soil in producing *Pasyon and Revolution*. It was in 1999 that "Orientalism and

the Study of Philippine Politics” was published for the first time (Ileto 1999) though he says it was first written in 1995. This brought about the heated clash between Ileto and American mainstream Philippine studies scholars mentioned earlier as illustrated by the dispute between Glenn May and Ileto in 1997-1998.

Ileto is currently preparing his third book entitled: *Knowledge and Pacification: Essays on the U.S. Conquest and the Writing of Philippine History* (Ileto, forthcoming). The above book includes three essays compiled in this translation volume in Part I of “From Historiography on the Philippine Revolution to the Critique of Orientalism”, while the essays in the first and second chapters are largely revised in the forthcoming book. I was lucky to have his permission to read through the entire manuscript of *Knowledge and Participation* that should be composed of eleven chapters. By reading it, I was able to locate properly the three articles incorporated in Part I of this translation volume within Ileto’s long research on the historiography of the Philippine Revolution.

The purpose both of *Pasyon and Revolution* and *Filipinos and Their Revolution* was to uncover the reasons why Filipinos fought the Philippine Revolution in 1896-1898 and how the past of the Revolution still exists in the present as an unfinished revolution. In *Knowledge and Pacification* (manuscript) the center of the argument moves to the Philippine-American War in 1899-1902. Its main theme is to examine critically the meaning of this war and to analyze the nature of the American “phantom”, with which Philippine politics and society is still haunted today. Furthermore, in Chapters 9 and 10, Ileto talks about himself becoming “a historian Ileto”, through his graduate student life at Cornell University as well as the later transformation of his ideas about Philippine historiography. This makes *Knowledge and Pacification* (manuscript) unique. Its final chapter (Chapter 11) includes a provocative essay entitled: “Orientalism and the Studies of Philippine Politics”, implying that this is Ileto’s philosophical or intellectual stance today.

After its publication in 1999 this essay caused a great sensation. In 2002 heated debates were conducted between Ileto and three scholars from the United States as well as the Philippines in the *Philippine Political Science Journal* (Azurin, 2002; Ileto, 2002; Lande, 2002; Sidel, 2002). In the essay “Orientalism and the Studies of Philippine Politics,” Ileto challenges the major analytical framework of Philippine studies that was

established in the United States by the mid-1960s. What Iletto criticizes as “Orientalism” here is the “patron-client relationship” which Carl Lande successfully introduced into Philippine studies, using functionalism as a theory of social science. The concept of *utang na loob* and *hiya* is the Philippine version of this reciprocal social relationship that Iletto himself had already argued in *Pasyon and Revolution* (Iletto 1979:11-15). This initial and infant critical examination of the concept of reciprocal social relationships was later developed further by Vicente L. Rafael (Rafael 1988: Chap. 4). And recently Fenella Cannell discusses this issue in more detail in her excellent anthropological study on the Bicol Region in Southern Luzon that won the Harry Benda Prize in 2001 (Cannell 1999).. It received the second prize given in Philippine studies sixteen years after Iletto.

By viewing Iletto’s career this way, we can see that Iletto’s criticism of the framework of Southeast Asian studies in the United States did not only begin in the 1990s. Iletto already was skeptical of American academia when he was studying at Cornell. As Iletto himself wrote in the preface of *Pasyon* (Iletto 1989[3<sup>rd</sup> print], preface), *Pasyon and Revolution* was the outcome of his deep internal agony as well as his struggle in thinking about how to reconcile the gaps between Western philosophy or intellectual history that he had learned at Ateneo and the American social science that he had studied at Cornell. Since 2001 Iletto has taught as a professor at the National University of Singapore. He currently serves as coordinator of its Southeast Asian Studies Program.<sup>vii</sup>

### **Vicente L. Rafael**

Vicente Rafael was born in Manila in February 1956. After graduating from Ateneo de Manila University in 1977, he taught at the Ateneo Department of History for two years. He then studied at Cornell University and earned a PhD in 1984 majoring in Southeast Asian history, with anthropology and history of Western philosophy as his minors. He published an ambitious work entitled: *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule* (Rafael 1988), based on his dissertation.

Rafael and Iletto have kept intimate scholarly linkages. As Rafael states in the acknowledgement of his *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History* (Rafael 2000), Iletto’s “imaginative depth and intellectual rigor” greatly influenced his early works.<sup>viii</sup>

Rafael is younger than Iletto by ten years. As Iletto finished his studies at Cornell and began to teach at UP in 1977, Rafael sat in Iletto's classes and was enlightened intellectually. Later Rafael left for Cornell, I have heard, with strong encouragement by John N. Schumacher of the Department of History at Ateneo.

Perhaps because of this process, Rafael's *Contracting Colonialism* utilizes a number of methods from Iletto's *Pasyon and Revolution*, for example, its technique of analyzing the ideas of people's resistance using the *Pasyon* as text and its critical examination of the concept of reciprocal social relationships in Philippine society. Rafael's *Contracting Colonialism* analyzes the role that language played in the conversion process to Catholicism and later colonization of the people in the Tagalog region near Manila in the early period of Spanish colonial rule from the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century to the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. Rafael develops a sharp analysis of the historical aspects of the forms of communication between the Spaniards and the Tagalogs, making full use of poststructuralist theories of Derrida and Foucault. By so doing, Rafael successfully describes both the process of formation of the Spanish colonial ruling system and the infant forms of resistance by residents. Rafael's outstanding theoretical way of thinking particularly shines in his statements about the process wherein the Spanish missionaries' concept of power and exchange is coded in the texts of the Tagalog grammar books and dictionaries they edited, and their translations of Catholic doctrine into Tagalog. These, he says, eventually influenced the culture of Tagalog society.

As Rafael himself aptly says, *Contracting Colonialism* has reached almost the same conclusion as James Siegel, the famous anthropologist at Cornell, who used Solo, an ancient city of central Java, to show the relationship between translation and the formation, collapse, and later re-formation of the social order in contemporary Indonesia (Rafael 1988: 210). Thus it can be said that *Contracting Colonialism* marks the academic achievement of an excellent hybrid of the following three things; poststructuralist theories, Iletto's *Pasyon and Revolution*, and Siegel's anthropological studies on Indonesia. However, Rafael has been more inclined to do textual analysis using poststructuralist theories than Iletto. Rafael exceeds Iletto in his understanding of poststructuralist theories and their applications to textual analysis. This is manifested by the fact that Iletto in his essay that is translated in Chapter 2 of Part I in this volume

frequently quotes Rafael's essay on the 1903 Census that is also translated in Chapter 4 of Part II. In other words, if Iletto is a historian who reads historical documents through the intensive dialogue between the present and the past and appropriates philosophical theories by deciphering them from his inmate creativity, Rafael is a theoretically sharp and ambitious scholar who introduces poststructuralist theories in historiography to the maximum degree.

Rafael's second book entitled *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History* is also a work where his same scholarly talents are demonstrated. The three essays translated in Part II of this translation volume are remarkable works that manifest Rafael's rare talent for theoretical sharpness, making their translation extremely difficult. Because of Rafael's sharp theoretical logic and well-calculated manner of argument it might be incomprehensible if there were an error in translating even a single term. I paid most delicate attention to editing the translation manuscript; however, there might be careless mistakes that could not be avoided and I humbly request frank criticisms from the readers of our translation volume if any are noticed.

In relation to Rafael's works, we should also mention here that Benito Vergara Jr.'s book entitled: *Displaying Filipinos: Photography and Colonialism in Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century Philippines* (Vergara 1995) is an important study on the 1903 Census, the topic of Chapter 4 of this translation volume. This work is another attempt to read the census as a mirror of American colonialism. I myself also wrote a short article on this topic inspired by Rafael's and others (Nagano 2001a). In this connection, what I might suggest here as further study on the census is the necessity to reexamine the significance of the Spanish census that was introduced in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and to ask why the United States has so particularly insisted that the 1903 Census is the first modern census in the Philippines. This might be another way to deconstruct the censuses during American colonial period from a wider historical perspective to reveal the nature of American colonialism.<sup>ix</sup> In addition, it is also noted that Elizabeth Mary Holt in her recent book entitled: *Colonizing Filipinas: Nineteenth-Century Representations of the Philippines in Western Historiography* deals with gender issues as the same theme that Rafael's essay in Chapter 5 of this translation volume argues; Chapter 4 of Holt's book particularly has common points with the Rafael's essay (Holt 2002).



Lastly, I sum up here Rafael's profile. After receiving his PhD from Cornell, Rafael taught at the Department of History, University of Hawai'i, as assistant professor from 1984-1988. He then moved to the Department of Communication, University of California, San Diego as associate professor, gaining a professorship at the same university from 1999-2003. He now teaches at the Department of History, University of Washington. Rafael has edited two books (Rafael 1995; Rafael 1999) and soon his new book will come out.<sup>x</sup> The main theme of Rafael's forthcoming book *The Promise of the Foreign Narration and the Technic of Translation in the Spanish Philippines* is to analyze Philippine nationalism in the Spanish colonial era in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century in relation to translation, communication technique and anti-colonial resistance (Rafael, 2005). I am looking forward to comparing this new book with his first work *Contracting Colonialism*.

### **Floro C. Quibuyen**

Floro C. Quibuyen has pursued a different type of career from Reynaldo C. Ileto and Vicente L. Rafael. While both Ileto and Rafael are scholars who have straightforwardly pursued their careers in academia, Quibuyen made a considerable detour until he published *A Nation Aborted: Rizal, American Hegemony, and Philippine Nationalism* in 1999 (Quibuyen 1999).

Quibuyen was born in Manila in November 1947. He took Philosophy as his major at UP Diliman and was graduated from UP in 1968. He taught at UP Tarlac until 1971, and then UP Manila from 1971-86. During these years, he taught such various courses as psychology, anthropology, and Philippine history. In 1979, he began to engage in filmmaking. He produced three films until 1986, and all of them were finalists (among the 10 best) in the Experimental Cinema of the Philippines Festival, an annual Short Film Festival. One of them is about the Rizalista cults on Mt. Banahaw in Quezon Province, Luzon Island. Quibuyen also actively involved himself in the radical movement against the regime of Ferdinand Marcos. He witnessed the downfall of the Marcos regime by the EDSA Revolution in 1986. This was in the same year that Quibuyen began to pursue his graduate studies at the University of Hawai'i, earning an MA in anthropology (1998) and then a PhD in Political Science (1996). His first work *A Nation Aborted* was based on his

dissertation. After 1994 Quibuyen lived in Sydney, Australia and engaged in research and writing activities as free lancer. He then taught at UP Visayas in 2001-2002 and was appointed an associate professor at the Asian Center, UP Diliman, in 2004.

The central theme of *A Nation Aborted*, two chapters of which are translated in this volume, is to re-examine the images of national hero Jose Rizal in Philippine historiography. The consistent emphasis by Quibuyen in this book is that the image of Rizal that has been firmly and widely established among Filipinos until today is actually one that was created under the influence of American colonialism. The American image of Rizal, he says, is that Rizal was an *illustro* who opposed the revolution, supporting instead the idea of the annexation of the Philippines to Spain. In contrast, Quibuyen came to hold the view that Rizal was not reformist at all, but rather embodied the idea of resistance and even showed his understanding of the armed uprising of the secret society *Katipunan*.

*A Nation Aborted* consists of ten chapters, each of which makes interesting points. Translated in this volume are two chapters (Chapters 2 and 10) where the flow of discussion would, I hope, be understood well by our Japanese readers. In these two chapters Quibuyen critically examines what kind of historical documents were used by Filipino intellectuals and historians as well as American colonial administrators in constructing the image of the “reformist” Jose Rizal since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. He also critically reflects on the fact that that these images have continuously caught the imaginations of Filipinos even until today, such a long time after independence. In Chapter 2: “Rizal and the Revolution”, Quibuyen sharply points out that even Renato Constantino, the most prominent radical critic in the Philippines, presented his negative evaluation of Rizal based on the American colonial image of Rizal. He refers to the famous lecture in 1969 in which Constantino vigorously asserted that the Filipino national hero is not Jose Rizal but Andres Bonifacio, the leader of *Katipunan* (Constantino 1969; Nagano 2002; Nagano 2003).

In Chapter 10, “Remarking Philippine History”, Quibuyen argues as follows: while Constantino could see that the contemporary image of Rizal is a fiction created by American colonial discourse, he himself had been trapped by the limitations of this view of Rizal based on such fictitious images. According to Quibuyen, it is only John N.

Schumacher, a notable historian of 19<sup>th</sup> century Philippine nationalism, and Reynaldo C. Ileto who have gone beyond Constantino's view of Rizal to date. Still, Quibuyen states that although Schumacher has most closely been able to identify a detailed illustration of the American image of Rizal by using Constantino's concept of appropriation, he, as well as Ileto, did not see the importance of these images being incorporated into the political system at the time of state formation in the Philippines.

Quibuyen asserts that the appropriation of Rizal by the Americans does not cut off the Spanish colonial past from the Filipinos' consciousness as Schumacher claims, but rather by this action the Americans changed the telling of the Spanish colonial past to make use of such "history" for their colonial policy. Schumacher, in replying to Quibuyen's criticism, published a book review in the journal *Philippine Studies* (Schumacher 2000), pointing out the problems regarding historical documents and books that Quibuyen used in his construction of the images of Rizal to show that Rizal was not a reformist but that he embodied the radical ideas of resistance. Intensive debates broke out between Quibuyen and Schumacher where neither of them would budge an inch -- neither on the interpretation of Rizal nor on historical interpretation of other issues nor on the usages of historical documents (Quibuyen 2002, Schumacher 2002). Here has occurred another debate on the American colonial discourse, this time centering on the images of Rizal.

In Chapter 10: "Remarking Philippine History", Quibuyen also criticizes Ileto's view of Rizal. It is not an outright criticism, but he says that Ileto's view on the mass movement is a bit unrealistic. Quibuyen specifically points out that "[t]here is a real danger in the tendency among the younger crop of poststructuralist, Cornell-trained Filipino historians, from Reynaldo Ileto, Vicente Rafael, to Benito Vergara Jr., to construe the struggle for meaning as if it were a fair and square fight among social forces over the development of signs" (Quibuyen 1999: 301). My views on this critique are as follows:

First, regarding Reynaldo Ileto and Rizal, I would like to point out that Ileto published an excellent article entitled "Rizal and the Underside of Philippine History" in 1982. This article marvelously depicts the nodding points between the Philippine Revolution and Rizal in the context of indigenous culture in the Philippines, an approach

none of the previous studies on Rizal had ever taken. Quibuyen himself quotes Iletto's arguments on Rizal extensively. I read this article 16 years after its first publication when it was included as Chapter 2 in *Filipinos and Their Revolution* (Iletto 1998, Chap. 2). I still remember distinctly how much I was moved and how my own images of Rizal dramatically changed while reading it. Because of this experience, I can juxtapose the portrayal of Rizal offered by Quibuyen and that by Iletto, and my impression is that there is not as much difference between Quibuyen's and Iletto's views about the images of Rizal as Quibuyen claims.

Secondly, Quibuyen calls the three historians -- Iletto, Rafael, and Vergara -- all of whom earned PhDs from Cornell, "poststructuralist", thus lumping them together. Although there is not enough space here to discuss the works of Vergara (see Vergara 1995), there is a considerable difference in research technique and even historical perspective between Iletto and Rafael, comparing the two historians alone, as I have argued earlier. I wonder if I could be the only one who feels apprehensive about labeling the three as "poststructuralists" as it might lead to the loss of future opportunities to understand the significance of the unique research by each scholar. Furthermore it might limit the wider scope of historiography created by consistently repeating dialogues between theory and reality or with various historical documents.

Let me quote a sentence from a classical masterpiece *What is History* by E. H. Carr, "History properly so-called can be written only by those who find and accept a sense of direction in history itself. The belief that we have come from somewhere is closely linked with the belief that we are going somewhere. A society which has lost belief in its capacity to progress in the future will quickly cease to concern itself with its progress in the past" (Carr, E. H., 1961[2001], pp. 126-127). The eight selected essays compiled in this translation volume are all written with the above sentiment in mind. This is the reason why I have identified them all as postcolonial studies, a new trend of intellectual activity among the post-independence generation in the Philippines.

### **III. Procedures Used for the Japanese Translation**

Lastly, I would like to explain our procedures used for the translation work of this volume. I remember that it was around June of 2001 when I conceived the idea of

compiling this translation volume as it is today. In September of the same year, while being shocked by the 9/11 attacks, I began contacting the three authors and selected essays to be translated. I then consulted with co-translators for their preference of translation among the eight essays. From the end of 2001 to the beginning of the following year, I negotiated for translation rights from several publishers and authors. It was after April 2002 that translation work actually began. The co-translators include Takefumi Terada, Satoshi Miyawaki, Fumiko Uchiyama and Yoriko Tatsumi. While revising their translation manuscripts, I myself engaged in translating two of the essays. Exchanging translation manuscripts with co-translators occurred frequently, even five or six times in some cases. The two chapters I translated were carefully read by Satoshi Miyawaki who gave me a number of invaluable comments and suggestions for improvement.

The key concepts or terms in the essays have been made uniform as much as possible by the translation team. However, in some cases, we have chosen different Japanese terms, based on the different interpretations of these terms by the original authors or the different understandings of those terms among the co-translators. The term “nationalist” is translated “*minzoku shugisha*” (民族主義者). However, I would like to remind the readers that in many cases this term also contains the meaning “*kokumin shugisha*” (国民主義者). The reason why we deliberately chose not to use “*nasyonaristu* (ナショナルリスト) is because we tried to avoid loanwords as much as possible.<sup>xi</sup> As for the translator’s notes, I requested Fumiko Uchiyama to write about Chapter 1 of Part I, while I myself wrote the notes on the rest of the chapters (Chapter 2 of part I through Chapter 8 of Part III) to retain uniformity throughout this volume. In writing the translator’s notes, the following references were mainly used: (*Filipinos in History, 1989, 1990, 1992, 1994*; Ishii et al. 1986; Ishii et. al. 1992; Ikehata 1987).

I received assistance from Leslie E. Bauzon of Tsukuba University to understand the meaning of some technical terms in the original scripts, from Masanao Ooue of Osaka University of Foreign Studies for the translation of Tagalog words, and from Masako Goto of Kanagawa University for the translation of Spanish words. The three authors, Reynaldo C. Ileta, Vicente L. Rafael, and Floro C. Quibuyen extended their understanding and patience to our translation project for nearly three years. In addition,

though I refrain from mentioning their names here, I received aid from several individuals to whom I would like to express my gratitude. To make the publication of this volume possible, we received a grant from the Toyota Foundation's "Know Our Neighbors Program" Translation-Publication Division. Shin Kuwabara of Mekong Publishing Co. helped us in the editorial work for which I express my heartfelt gratitude.

Since the United States' attack on Iraq in March 2003, the sickness of "the time of terrorism" has been spread across the entire globe. The rapid turn from "the time of globalization" to "the time of terrorism" after the 9/11 terror attack seems to indicate that "globalization" itself was a kind of ideology created by the United States in the early 1990s. In Japan more and more official policies or public ideas have followed those of the United States; hypocrisy and deception are rampant, and many facts seem to be hidden as if old and new "phantoms" become increasingly powerful in our Japanese society. It is not easy for us to pursue intellectually stimulating academic research in such a time of crisis, while keeping a critical eye on our societies. As Edward Said writes, "the intellectual always stands between loneliness and alignment" (Said 1994: 22). However, the essays compiled in this volume would lead us, who might be easily lulled into intellectual inertia, to the wonderful intellectual world led by the high quality and standard of Filipino scholarship in Philippine historiography. While I think of the "ethical and political meaning of translation" (Sakai 1997: 7), I strongly hope that this volume will acquire a large number of readers in Japan.

### **Reference Cited:**

#### **[English sources]**

- Agoncillo, Teodoro, A. 1956 (1<sup>st</sup> ed) / 1996 (reprint). *The Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan*, Quezon City: University of the Philippines.
- Azurin, Arnold M., 2002. "Orientalism? Privilege Vistas Most Probably," *Philippine Political Science Journal*, vol. 23, no. 46.
- Cannell, Fenella, 1999. *Power and Intimacy in the Christian Philippines*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Carr, E. H., 1961[2001]. *What is History?*, Houndmills, UK: Palgrave.
- Constantino, Renato, 1969. "Veneration without Understanding," Third National Rizal Lecture, 30 December 1969; In *Dissent and Counter Consciousness*, Manila: Erewhon, 1970
- Filipinos in History*, 1989, 1990, 1992, 1994. 4 vols., Manila: National Historical Institute.

- Holt, Elizabeth Mary, 2002. *Colonizing Filipinas: Nineteenth-Century Representations of the Philippines in Western Historiography*, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Ileto, Reynaldo C., 1979 [1<sup>st</sup> print.] / 1989 [3<sup>rd</sup> print]. *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910*, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1998. *Filipinos and Their Revolution: Event, Discourse, and Historiography*, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1999. *Knowing America's Colony: A Hundred Years from the Philippine War*, Philippine Studies Occasional Paper Series no. 13, Center for Philippine Studies, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2001. "Colonial Wars in Southern Luzon: Remembering and Forgetting," *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies* no. 33.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2002. "On Sidel's Response and Bossism in the Philippines," *Philippine Political Science Journal*, vol. 23, no. 46.
- \_\_\_\_\_, forthcoming. *Knowledge and Pacification: Essays in the U.S. Conquest and the Writing of Philippine History*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Lande, Carl H., 2002. "Political Clientalism, Developmentalism and Postcolonial Theory: A Reply to Ileto," *Philippine Political Science Journal*, vol. 23, no. 46.
- Loomba, Ania, 1998. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, London and New York: Routledge
- May, Glenn Anthony, 1997. *Inventing a Hero: The Posthumous Re-Creation of Andres Bonifacio*, Quezon City: New Days Publishers.
- Mendoza, S. Lily, 2002. *Between the Homeland and the Diaspora: The Politics of Theorizing Filipino and Filipino American Identities: A Second Look at the Poststructuralism-Indigenization Debates*, New York and London: Routledge.
- Nagano, Yoshiko, 2004. "Collective Memory in a Globalized Society': The Debate on the Philippine Revolution Reconsidered," *What is to be Written?: Setting the Agendas for Study of History: Workshop Proceedings*, Institute for International Studies, Meiji Gakuin University.
- Quibuyen, Floro C., 1999. *A Nation Aborted: Rizal, American Hegemony, and the Philippine Nationalism*, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2002 "Rizal and Filipino Nationalism: Critical Issue," *Philippine Studies*, vol. 50, no. 2.
- Rafael, Vicente L., 1988. *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., 1995. *Discrepant Histories: Translocal Essays in Filipino Cultures*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., 1999. *Figures of Criminality in Indonesia, the Philippines and Colonial Vietnam*, Ithaca: Southeast Asian Program Publications, Cornell University.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2002. *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History*, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2005. *The Promise of the Foreign: Nationalism and the Technics of Translation in the Spanish Philippines*, Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press.
- Said, Edward W., 1994. *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*, New York: Vintage Books.

- San Juan, E., 2000. *After Postcolonialism: Remapping Philippines-United States Confrontations*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Schumacher, John N., S. J., 2000. "Rizal and Filipino Nationalism: A New Approach," *Philippine Studies*, vol. 48, no. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2002. "Reply of John N. Schumacher to Floro Quibuyen's Response to the Review of His *A Nation Aborted*," *Philippine Studies*, vol. 50 no. 3.
- Sidel, John T., 2002. "Response to Iletto: Or Why I Am Not an Orientalist," *Philippine Political Science Journal*, vol. 23, no. 46.
- Vergara, Benito M. Jr., 1995. *Displaying Filipinos: Photography and Colonialism in Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century Philippines*, Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

[Japanese sources]

- Guha, R, G. Pandey, P. Chatterjee, G. Spivak, Chiharu Takenaka trans., 1998. *Sabarutan no Rekishi: Indoshi no Datsukochiku [History of Subaltern: The Deconstruction of Indian History]*, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Ikehata, Setsuho. 1987. *Firipin Kakumei to Katorisizumu [Philippine Revolution and Catholicism]*, Tokyo: Keiso Shobo.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2001. "Iletto, Reynaldo C.," Isamu Ogata, Koichi Kabayama and Yoichi Kibata eds., *20-seiki no Rekishikatachi (4) Sekai-hen 2 [The Historians in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Vol. 4: Part II of the World]*, Tokyo: Tosui Shobo.
- Iletto, Reynaldo C., Fumiko Uchiyama trans., 2002. "Minami Luzon niokeru Shokuminchi Senso: Hibei Senso no Kioku to Bokyaku [Colonial War in Southern Luzon: Remembering and Forgetting of the Philippine-American War]," In *Hitsotsubashi Daigaku Shinpojiumu: 20-Seiki no Yume to Genjitsu; Senso, Bunmei, Fukusi [Hitotsubashi University International Symposium: Dream and Reality of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century; War, Civilization and Social Welfare]*, eds. By Tetsuro Kato and Masao Watanabe, Tokyo: Sairyusha.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Hiromu Shimizu, Yoshiko Nagano co-edit., Makito Kuwada, Satoshi Miyawaki and Kunio Takano co-trans. 2005. *Kirisuto Junanshi to Kakumei: 1840-1919-nen no Firipin Minshu Undo [Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-19190]*, Tokyo: Hosei University Press.
- Ishii, Yoneno, Koichi Takaya, Narifumi Maeda, Kenji Tshuchiya, and Setsuho Ikehata eds., 1986. *Tonan-Ajia o Shiru Jiten [Cyclopedia of South-East Asia]*, Tokyo: Heibon-sha.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., Shizuo Suzuki and Shinzo Hayase comp. 1992. *Firipin no Jiten [Cyclopedia of the Philippines]*, Kyoto: Dohosha.
- Nagano, Yoshiko, 2000. *Rekishi to Eiyu: Firipin Kakumei Hyakunen to Posutokoroniaru [History and Heroes: The Centennial of the Philippine Revolution and Postcolonial]*, Kanagawa Daigaku Hyoron Bukkuretto Shirizu [Kanagawa University Review Booklet Series] no. 11. Tokyo: Ochanomizu Shobo.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2001a. "Amerika Shokuminchi Kokka to Firipin Kokumin no Sozo: 1903-nen Sensasu ni Miru [American Colonial State and the Formation of Filipinos: A View from the 1903 Census]," *Shokei Ronso [Review of Commerce and Economics]* (Kanagawa University), vol. 36, no. 3.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2001b. "Kioku kara Posutokoroniaru e: Chi no Shokuminshi Jokyo o Koerutameni [From Memories to Postcolonial: To Go beyond the Colonial State in



Our Knowledge],” Kanagawa Daigaku Hyoron [Kanagawa University Review], vol. 39.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2002a. “<Zentaikai> Gurobaru Shihonshugi to Rekishi-ninshiki: Han-Gurobarizumu Shicho toshitenō Posutokoroniaru Hihyo; Firipin no Jirei [Plenary Session. Global Capitalism and Historical Consciousness: Postcolonial Critique as the Way of Thinking on the Counter-Globalism: A Case of the Philippines], *Rekishigaku Kenkyu [Journal of Historical Studies]*, vol. 768.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2002b. “Firipin no Chishikijin to Posutokoroniaru Kenkyu [Filipino Intellectuals and Postcolonial Studies],” In *Posutokoroniaru to Hi-Seio Sekai [Postcolonial and the non-Western World]*, ed. by Kanagawa Daigaku Hyoron Henshu Senmon Iinkai [Editorial Board of the Kanagawa University Review Book Series], no. 10, Tokyo: Ochanomizu Shobo.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2003. “Firipin Kakumeishi Ronso [The Debate on the Philippine Revolution],” In *Iwanami Koza: Tonan Ajiashi: Bekkan; Tonan Ajiashi Kenkyu Annai [Iwanami Lectures: Southeast Asian History Supplementary Volume: A Guide to the Study of Southeast Asian History]*, eds. By Shinzo Hayase and Shiro Momoki, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Sakai, Naoaki. 1997. *Nihon Shiso toiu Mondai: Honyaku to Shutai [Question on Japanese Thoughts: Translation and the Subject]*. Tokyo: Iwanamia Shoten.

Ueno, Toshiya and Yoshitaka Mouri, 2000. *Karuchuraru Sutadizu Nyumon [An Introduction to Cultural Studies]*, Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo.

(Written in June, 2004)

---

[Translator’s notes]

<sup>i</sup> For instance, Gerard A. Finin’s *The Making of the Igorot: Contours of Cordillera Consciousness* (Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2005) illustrates the continuity of the mental framework of the Filipinos at large on the concept of the “Cordillera” since the American period that was reinforced during the Marcos period by both administration and anti-Marcos advocates.

<sup>ii</sup> For instance, in his lecture “*Pantayong Pananaw* Revisited”, Arnold Azurin severely criticized the *pantayong pananaw* discourse from a postcolonial perspective (August 2004, University of the Philippines). The lecture evoked discussion from the floor on its academic engagement with the dictatorship. In his lecture “*Ugnayan: Music and Social Move in Composition*”, Ramon P. Santos revealed the details of the political background that facilitated the composition and performance of *Ugnayan* by late national artist José Maceda, who remained apolitical himself, in January 1974 (January 31, 2007, University of the Philippines). *Ugnayan* is an avant-garde work that could not have been produced without the extraordinary social condition of martial-law, as the piece requires the extensive cooperation/ participation of radio stations and a mass audience.

<sup>iii</sup> Edward W. Said, *Representation of the Intellectual* (Vintage Books, 1994[1996]); p.60.

<sup>iv</sup> The phrase after “reflecting” is an addition by the author for this English translation version.

<sup>v</sup> This sentence is an addition by the author to this English translation version.

<sup>vi</sup> The phrase after “by” is an addition by the author for this English translation version.

<sup>vii</sup> He served for the position until 2006.

<sup>viii</sup> The word “early” in this sentence is an insertion for this English translation version.

<sup>ix</sup> The phrase after “to reveal” is an insertion by the author for this translation version.

<sup>x</sup> Published in 2005.

<sup>xi</sup> “Minzoku shugisha” is literally “ethnicity-ist”, or an advocate of a certain ethnicity, while “kokumin shugisha” is “people of the nation-ist”, or an advocate of a particular nation-state and its people. “Nasyonarisuto” in Japanese often carries the nuance of right-wing nationalist, in association with the era of Fascism in their collective memory.