

THEORETICAL ADVANCES IN THE DISCOURSE OF INDIGENIZATION*

S. Lily L. Mendoza

Out of the initially uncoordinated and scattered moves to revamp theorizing within the Western-introduced academic disciplines in the Philippine academy, three programmatic narratives emerged from the disciplines of psychology, anthropology, and history, notably, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, *Pilipinolohiya*, and *Pantayong Pananaw*, respectively. I take them here as part of a single discursive formation, each working from the same principles of valuing *pagsasarili* (self-determination) and *pagtahak ng sariling landas tungo sa kabansaan* (“charting an autonomous path toward nation- or people-hood”). Together, they offer what appears to be the first organized, comprehensive, and programmatic challenge to the long-standing hegemony of colonial theorizing in the disciplines beginning in the period of the late 1970s and reaching a fuller maturation toward the latter half of the 1980s to the present. To date, all three discourses seem to have succeeded in attaining a certain measure of hegemony, not without their share of momentary setbacks and capitulations, but overall, managing to give force and direction to what heretofore had been mostly scattered, diffused critiques of colonization within Philippine higher education.

Sikolohiyang Pilipino

Beginnings, Institutionalization, and Pioneering Gains

The concept of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* (Filipino Psychology) was the brainchild of the late Virgilio G. Enriquez. Enriquez began teaching psychology at the University of the Philippines (UP) in 1963. As early as 1965, he began using Filipino, instead of the mandated English as medium of instruction in the classroom.¹ This shift in linguistic practice constituted more than a gesture of formalism signifying a nationalist orientation. Significantly, it served as a key radicalizing element in the way theorizing within the indigenization movement proceeded. By 1966, Enriquez left for the United States to take his master’s, and thereafter, his doctoral degrees at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. Upon returning in the early 1970s with a doctorate in Social Psychology, Enriquez became convinced that there ought to be a different way of doing psychology than merely taking Western psychological concepts and finding equivalents for them within the structure of Filipino personality--what he termed merely as “indigenization from without.” Teaming up with then Department of Psychology Chair, Alfredo V. Lagmay, at UP Diliman, Enriquez sought to reorient the teaching of psychology in the university from an allegedly “neutral” and “value-free” social science to one cognizant of the politics behind Western, and for that matter, all theorizing practices. In so doing, he aimed to debunk Western psychology’s claim to universal applicability, working alternatively for its recognition as merely another ethnic (*i.e.*, American) psychology, no better than any other. Corollarily, he proposed that a culturally-appropriate science of psychology attuned to the nuances and differing cultural characteristics of Filipinos be made the focus of theory development in psychology. This, instead of a presumed universal psychology common to all human beings regardless of cultural and historical specificities.

Thus persuaded, Enriquez began searching for indigenous psychological concepts that could serve as bases for differently construing psychology from a distinctively Filipino perspective. He looked at such concepts of Filipino personality as creativity and inventiveness, uniquely shared social

*Excerpted from S.L. Mendoza, *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 at London: Routledge, 2002, Revised Edition, Manila: University of Santo Tomas Publishing House, 2006, 61-109.

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

attributes arising out of Filipinos' shared collective experiences as a people, and *diwa* (roughly, psyche, the equivalent in English of "essence" but also carrying "an entire range of psychological concepts from awareness to motives to behavior" [Enriquez in Pe-Pua and Protacio-Marcelino,² 1998, 2]). Out of these studies were compiled two volumes of bibliographic sources on Filipino psychology and a locally-developed personality test called *Panukat ng Ugali at Pagkatao* (Measure of Character and Personality).³

Over time, Enriquez's work became known to others, attracting other scholars who by then had been similarly striving to develop a distinctively Filipino orientation in their own work, notably, anthropologist-sociologist Prospero R. Covar and historian-anthropologist-ethnologist Zeus A. Salazar.⁴ A fourth colleague, ethnomusicologist and humanities professor Felipe M. De Leon Jr. became a strong ally coming from the humanities side. For the succeeding years, Enriquez would devote his efforts to conducting first-hand research (and encouraging his students to do likewise) on what he considered ought to be the differing concerns of a "Filipino" psychology. Some of these concerns would fall under the areas of: *sikolohiya ng bata* (psychology of children), *laro* (play), *pagkain* (food), *pakikibaka* (emancipatory struggles), *antas ng pakikipagkapwa* (levels of relating with one's fellow beings), *panggagamot* (healing practices), *anting-anting* (charms or amulets), *literatura* (literature), *sining* (arts), and other aspects of popular and folk practices expressive of a different consciousness or, simply, of a different way of being. He wrote, read papers, and published articles and essays on indigenous psychology, the psychology and politics of language, philosophy and values, and the practice of cross-cultural psychology (Enriquez, 1976; 1978; 1985; 1997; among others). Among his most important works are: *Indigenous Psychology and National Consciousness* (1989), *Ang Sikolohiyang Malaya sa Panahon ng Krisis* [Liberation Psychology in a Time of Crisis] (1991), *From Colonial to Liberation Psychology* (1992), a volume he edited titled, *Indigenous Psychology: A Book of Readings* (1990), and his last publication shortly before he died in 1994, *Pagbabangong-Dangal* [Restoring Honor]: *Indigenous Psychology and Cultural Empowerment* (1994).

Under Enriquez's leadership, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* succeeded in becoming institutionalized as a professional organization under the name *Pambansang Samahan sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino* (National Association for Filipino Psychology) or PSSP. In 1975, Enriquez organized the First National Conference on Filipino Psychology (*Unang Pambansang Kumperensya sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino*). This first meeting provided a venue for the first-time articulation of basic ideas, concepts, and formulations of a discourse on *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* (Pe-Pua and Protacio-Marcelino, 1998). From then on, PSSP national conferences would be held annually, each time in different regions of the country so as to ensure the widest possible participation from outside Metropolitan Manila.

Among Enriquez's legacies is a center he established, first named the Philippine Psychology Research House (PPRH), later to become the Philippine Psychology Research and Training House (PPRTH), then later renamed still as *Akademya ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino* (Academy of Filipino Psychology). The center was designed to serve as a support-base for the growing research activities of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*. From its modest beginnings in 1971, it would grow into a research library of more than 10,000 references with its own small bookstore, the beginnings of a museum collection, and for some time (no longer), would provide short-term residence quarters for visiting researchers and foreign scholars (Enriquez, 1992; Pe-Pua and Protacio-Marcelino, 1998). The project, as Enriquez envisioned, was intended to offer support and nurturance for home-grown scholars to gain confidence to theorize on their own, produce new knowledge, and carry out innovative research as students of Filipino Psychology. A practice he instituted toward this goal was to place students' term papers, theses, and other research reports at the PPRTH library and make them publicly accessible, that is, short of outright publication for which there wasn't always sufficient funds available.

In the classroom, he sought to undermine students' excessive awe and unquestioning acceptance of Western norms of scholarship by critiquing the whole citational tradition in Western social science where a self-perpetuating logical system tends to be built around the practice of name-

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

dropping of published authorities as warrant for knowledge claims. Instead, he encouraged students to trust their own instincts and believe in their own ability to create new knowledge. In lieu of outside (mostly Western) authorities, he motivated them to use their own voices, think their own thoughts, and look to each other as well as to other local authors and scholars for intellectual challenge and stimulation. As an auxiliary activity, the center would hold regular *kaphans* (coffee hours) and *balitaktakans* (informal exchanges) where students, institute affiliates, and friends interested in the study of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* would congregate around native drink and delicacies and exchange reports on their latest research findings, brainstorm on possible research projects, or simply, engage in new ways of conceptualizing (*pagdadalumat*) different aspects of the study of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*. Over time, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* and the PPRTH succeeded in developing a cadre of converts, believers, committed scholars, and practitioners. The Psychology Department at the University of the Philippines Diliman, however, was to remain split between adherents of Western experimental psychology, on the one hand, and proponents of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, on the other, thus for a time stirring up considerable intra-departmental politics.

In what proved to be *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*'s difficult but eventual success in fighting for equal space within the academy, it helped initially that its primary exponent, Enriquez, possessed a high profile as a respected scholar and intellectual. Beyond his influence at U.P., his work became widely known in such other institutions in the Philippines as De La Salle University (DLSU), Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Maynila, University of Santo Tomas, and Centro Escolar University where he was invited to teach and/or lecture periodically. Eventually, he would also gain international recognition in his stints as Visiting Professor at the University of Hawaii, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, University of Malaya, University of Hongkong, and University of California Berkeley.⁵ Enriquez was recognized not only for his contributions to the study of Filipino psychology but more generally, to Asian and cross-cultural psychology. Among the awards he received are: the Outstanding Young Scientist of the Philippines Award granted by the National Academy of Science and Technology in 1982 and posthumously, the National Achievement in the Social Sciences Award granted in 1997 by the National Research Council of the Philippines "for outstanding contribution in the social sciences on a national level" (Pe-Pua and Protacio-Marcelino, 1998, 4).

Such high-profile leadership, however, was not without its costs. Potential critics (particularly those coming from within the movement itself) would later on admit feeling constrained, in their deference to Enriquez's authority, from voicing questions and concerns they had regarding some of the directions that *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* was (or was not) taking and which are now seen, in retrospect, to have had the effect of stunting its growth both as a movement and as a theoretical project. More will be said on this later.

Meanwhile, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* became more than just another "school of thought" in the academy. In the sense that it demanded a fundamental transformation in worldview and personal valuing -- a change that inevitably creates a rippling effect to every other aspect of life for the "true believer," in Eric Hoffer's sense -- *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* may be said to have attained the momentum and dynamics of a movement (cf. Gerlach and Hine, 1970). Such paradigmatic "conversion" initiates adherents into a whole community of like-minded colleagues motivated to live according to the new(ly reclaimed) cultural ideology. Personal commitment in this regard entailed bringing one's life into alignment with a new set of values, priorities, goals, and behavior. Among academics, these included, among others, a commitment to a nationalist⁶ (versus a merely liberal, universalist, or colonial/Western) orientation; the use of Filipino (rather than English) as the medium of communication, instruction, and scholarship; the adoption of indigenous research methods and, more generally, the centering of (reconstructed) Filipino worldview(s) in their studies. The sharpness of the contrast between the received paradigm of Western psychology and what was constructed to be a "nationalist" orientation in *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* fomented rancorous division among students, faculty, and professionals alike: on the one hand, those who would insist on a strictly universalist, scientific, experimental, and behaviorist orientation, and on the other, those in the camp of *Sikolohiyang*

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

Pilipino, insisting on a more indigenously-grounded orientation. Inevitably, one had to identify with either one or the other tradition.

With its influence spreading beyond disciplinary boundaries and filtering into the media and spilling over into popular discourse, it wasn't long before *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* likewise gained a following outside the academy. Before long, commercial and government television caught onto the profitability of tapping into *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* concepts for advertising and social marketing purposes. By the 1970s, pop music artists through such organizations as the *Organisasyon ng mga Pilipinong Mang-aawit* (Organization of Filipino Music Artists) or OPM succeeded in reversing the discourse in pop music from the usual connotation of "local" and "Filipino" being mainly the consumption domain of the so-called "masses" and therefore "low class" or *bakya*,⁷ to the same now taking a cut in the middle and upper middle classes and signifying "hip," "cool," and "in." As Elizabeth Protacio-Marcelino (1999) reported in one conversation, despite what seemed to be the lag in academic theorizing after Enriquez's death in 1994,

... We're sort of alive and kicking... *talagang* [really] there's no better time to do business in this country. *SP* is just so accepted... in the schools... industry... *kamadrean* [among nuns], *kaparian* [among priests], media, communications, *lahat puwedeng pasukan* [you can go into almost anything]. And you can package yourself as an *SP* practitioner and you'll get anywhere if you really want to. *Ang benta n'yo, ang bili-bili n'yo* [you'll be hot, you'll sell easily] (personal communication, June 1999).

Protacio-Marcelino, a professor at the Psychology Department at U.P. and among Enriquez's early cohorts in pioneering *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* herself holds consultancy with PIDRO⁸ Communications, Inc., an outfit run by one of the members of a famous Filipino pop music group called the APO Hiking Society. This group, composed of three talented composers/singers -- all educated at a leading private university, the Ateneo de Manila University -- was one of the earliest and best-known popularizers of an affirming discourse on Filipino subjectivity in the music and television industry. The group, at the time of writing, is now going on its 32nd year in showbusiness and still going strong.

As a movement, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*'s rhetoric in many places is a fighting (*palaban*) rhetoric -- its language terse, politically charged, at times laced with biting sarcasm, at other times, passionate and emotive, in contrast to the neutral, objectivist, and scientific language of Western psychology.⁹ Alternatively taking on the label *sikolohiyang mapagpalaya* (liberation psychology), it appears that where the project has made the most gains is in contributing toward efforts to decolonize Philippine society through transformation of Filipino consciousness. One way that it has sought to do this is by contesting the sedimented negative meaning of the signifier "Filipino" as read from the colonial master narratives and by working for a complete change in its valence and signification.

To show how this process played out discursively, in the following section, I trace the shifts and turns in the discourse of Filipino subjectivity as *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* struggled to intervene and displace the colonial framework and work for the establishment of its own counter-discourse.

Re-signifying the Sign "Filipino": A Discursive Reversal

Off-hand, I want it noted that the chronology I construct here on the developments in the Philippine discourse on identity and subjectivity is not meant to imply a unilineal process of discursive formation, for to this day, one can find in the current literature simultaneous articulations of the differing modes of identity definitions that predominated at various stages in the contest over cultural representation. Rather, the sequential narrative is simply meant to trace the logic of transformation

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

that the discourse on Filipino subjectivity underwent in the hegemonic struggle to re-capture the “sign” Filipino and wrest it from its bastardization in the colonial narratives.

From the initial works of foreign scholars training their Western colonial disciplinary lenses on what they presumed to be “the” indigenous culture of Filipinos, Filipino “identity” (in the singular) was constructed in terms of a constellation of traits. These traits revolved around certain surface values that had mostly to do with preserving “face” or what has been labeled the “SIR syndrome” (*i.e.*, penchant for “smooth interpersonal relationships”). Identified as its concomitant trilogy of values are *utang na loob* (roughly, debt of gratitude), *pakikisama* (getting along), and *hiya* (shame). Accompanying this trilogy of values is a set of loose negative trait attributions: the habit of *mañana* (chronic procrastination), *ningas cogon* (good starters, poor finishers like the short blaze of cogon grass), *bahala na* (fatalism), and *talangka* mentality (“crab mentality,” *i.e.*, the tendency to pull down those who strive to be better). For decades, such identity constructs were generally accepted and used in textbooks to teach Filipinos about themselves.

One way that early *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* scholars sought to counter such negative trait ascriptions was to seek to reinterpret the same constellation of values from a more affirming trajectory. Thus, *bahala na* (fatalism) was reinterpreted as “determination and risk-taking,” “a way of pumping courage into one’s system so that [one does] not buckle down in the face of formidable obstacles” (Pe-Pua, 1991, 157-158). *Talangka* or crab mentality became a call for community members to acknowledge their indebtedness to others and to work for the good of the entire community and not just for themselves.¹⁰ But while such reinterpretations may have worked to “improve” Filipino self-image somehow, the laundry list of traits remained largely untouched, with the positive reinterpretations being mainly reactive (*i.e.*, a kind of reverse stereotyping), leaving the old defining colonial framework intact.

From this phase of strategic reversal of negative stereotypes, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, employing the principle of “indigenization from within,” saw the need to reject the colonial framework totally, and to replace it instead with an entirely new paradigm. Instead of seeking positive ways to reinterpret the old colonial framework, this phase argued that it was necessary to critique the very premises and assumptions of a universalist, transcultural psychology that had sought to define and measure “the” Filipino against its norms and tenets. Though framed within psychology, inputs into this new framework came from all quarters in the academy, as scholars from the various disciplines, first independently, then collaboratively, discovered surprising parallels in their findings. Here, the impetus has been to challenge the dominant paradigm with alternative evidence from various sources (historical, ethnographic, ethnolinguistic, folkloristic, and so on). Such first-hand research on the diverse Filipino indigenous communities, conducted in a range of academic disciplines (particularly anthropology, linguistics, humanities, psychology, and history) contributed to the emergence of a different concept, *kapwa* (roughly, “shared being”¹¹) as constituting the core of the Philippine value system (Enriquez, 1992). In contrast to previous models that stressed maintenance of surface harmony, this core value of *kapwa*, once adopted, generated a set of associated social values totally different from those culled from a putatively mistaken locating of the pivotal value on the surface instead of in the “deep structure” of the culture. These associated values were identified as *karangalan* (dignity), *katarungan* (justice), and *kalayaan* (freedom). Together, they formed the constitutive elements of “the” Filipino identity in *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*.

At this phase of indigenous theorizing, a growing consciousness of the political and historical dynamics involved in the very process of identity construction also began to emerge. This amounted to an awareness that identity is not a fixed datum that undergoes shifts and changes in response to external demands in the environment, although still retaining a “core.” Melba P. Maggay’s (1993) contribution in this regard is in highlighting the need for historical mediation in the practice of “reading” culture. Her suggested framework distinguishes between “core values” (the *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* framework of *kapwa*), on the one hand, and what she considered mainly as “survival values”

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

developed as coping strategies in the face of colonial oppression and marginalization, on the other. Though still premised on the presumed existence of “inherent” cultural characteristics¹² (for example, in terms of world view, time orientation, and other cultural dimensions suggested by traditional cultural anthropology), Maggay’s framework provided a way of looking at the seeming contradictions, fissures, and fractures in Filipino culture and personality (found to be most evident in the urban communities more heavily exposed to the Western influences of modern industrial culture) *without naturalizing them*. This framework was seen to be more imaginative than the mere drawing up of a laundry list of negative and positive traits. Consequently, the latter was rejected in that it tended to fix what it took to be “the” inherent Filipino character and personality into nothing more than a distorted image. Unfortunately, despite the latter’s debunking as a positivist, reductive model, such a framework remains influential in the minds of many to this day, with unwitting adherents even among well-meaning reformists in the Philippine bureaucracy. One such is former Senator Leticia Ramos-Shahani. In response to a certain U.S. journalist’s (Fallows, 1987) labeling of Filipino culture as a “damaged culture” shortly after the 1986 People Power Revolution ousting the Marcos dictatorship, Shahani (cf. Licuanan, 1988) orchestrated a “Moral Recovery Program” under the Senate Committee on Education, Arts, and Culture and the Committee on Social Justice, Welfare, and Development to inquire into the supposed “strengths and weaknesses of Filipino character.” Regarding such as mainly a pathologizing, moralizing, and individualizing approach to what in fact is a historic, structural social problem, Rimonte (1997) warns that such a historically unmediated approach to understanding “the” Filipino “character”

... endorses the essentialist myths that their problems are entirely due to who they are: that history has little to do with them and the problems they confront; that the only way for them to solve their problems is to change themselves; that if they have not changed themselves yet, it is because they are too lazy or too cheerful or too ignorant or too feckless or too sinful, having strayed from the prescribed... path of righteousness (page 59).

Thus, the alternative historicized framework proposed by Maggay (1993) is a significant move away from the more received (and essentialist) view of the earlier models. For one, it stresses the role played by the abnormality of the colonial condition in producing such cultural “distortions.” In the past, such distortions tended to be blamed entirely on an inherent “flaw” in “the” Filipino “character” (as in Fallows’ article charging “damaged culture” without inquiring as to who or what may be responsible for such damage). By contrast, where they occur at all are not simply projections of a view rationalizing domination, these “distortions” can now be interpreted more adequately as symptomatic of a pathology borne of marginalization, denigration, and the prevention of a people from assuming their own processes of self-direction and self-formation.¹³

Sikolohiyang Pilipino’s Role in Decolonization

The work of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* now spans three decades and goes beyond just the work of Enriquez to encompass a multiplicity of other voices from other Filipino psychologists as well as scholars in related disciplines.¹⁴ As it appears, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino’s* main project in its originary moment has to do with the liberation of the Filipino psyche from a colonized mentality, that is, the undoing of those psychological mechanisms whereby Filipinos become unwitting accomplices in their continuing colonial subjugation, mainly through internalization of their own victimization. With the “processes of subjectification” being secured mainly through discursive practices (Bhabha, 1994, 67), it made sense for proponents of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* to work for the dismantling of colonial discourse -- an “apparatus of power,” according to Bhabha (1994), whose “predominant strategic function is the creation of space for ‘subject peoples’ through the production of knowledges in terms of which surveillance is exercised...” (page 70). If colonial discourse, inscribed for centuries in official textbooks, was meant to contain and define Filipino subjectivity for purposes of colonial surveillance,

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

then undoing such ideological inscription via the very instruments of knowing (that is, via theorizing practices in the academy) was deemed a necessary first step in the long process toward reclamation of agency and self re-creation and production of a new Filipino subject.

Part of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino's* methodology in this regard is to uncover and make conscious the processes by which the national psyche became -- and to a degree, has remained -- captive to a colonial imaginary. Ultimately, if such processes of subjectification are to be unraveled, there has to be an understanding of how it is that Filipinos were (and continue to be) enticed to participate in their own self-subjection via the mechanisms of ideological interpellation. Enriquez's (1994) last volume written shortly before he died is meant to analyze comprehensively the dynamics involved in both the processes of "colonial domination," on the one hand, and "decolonization, counterdomination, and empowerment," on the other. He outlines the components of these two processes thus:

Phases of Cultural Domination:

Denial and Withdrawal [*i.e.*, repression of indigenous life and expression]
 Destruction and Desecration [of cultural artifacts and sacred ritual grounds];
 Denigration and Marginalization [of the Filipino soul, identity, values, artistic expressions, appearance, etc.];
 Redefinition and Token Utilization [of indigenous cultural elements as means of colonial co-optation];
 Transformation and Mainstreaming [nativization of aspects of dominating culture to facilitate acceptance]; and
 Commercialization and Commodification [of indigenous knowledge and resources for capitalist greed and profit].

Decolonization, Counterdomination, and Empowerment:

Indigenous Theorizing and Empowerment;
 Counterdomination through Indigenous Research Methods;
 Indigenous Resistance to Oppression;
 Resisting Class Oppression;
 Resisting Gender Oppression; and
 Resisting Academic Dependency (pages vi-viii).

Unfortunately, the book, which could have been Enriquez's most important synthesis of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* thought, appears to have been unfinished and more of a rough draft, owing perhaps to his long bout with illness at the time of writing. In many places, it is weakly-argued and appears more polemical and anecdotal than carefully theorized with well-substantiated evidence (a number of bibliographic citations in the text are also missing in reference list). It also proved too thin a volume for the sort of agenda it set out to accomplish. The book definitely bears rewriting but the framework may yet be made useful if reworked and thought through with much more care and analytical rigor.

Current State of Sikolohiyang Pilipino

At the time of this essay's original writing in 1999, there was the prevailing sense that Enriquez's early demise prevented the training of a second generation of scholars who could continue the work of theorizing within an indigenous framework. The view was that despite the movement's success in lending a more affirming trajectory to the conception of Filipino identity and subjectivity, theoretical output in the academy has failed to keep up with strides made outside. According to Protacio-Marcelino (personal communication, July 1999), this is due to the fact that Enriquez "used to take care of that aspect of the work; all his money also went to that." With the reality of Third World conditions and economic demands, most of the second generation *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* scholars, who were mostly in their 40s at that time and already tenured, appear to have had other priorities to think

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

about. Most of them either had clinical practice on the side or related consultancy jobs that more than augments their meager university salaries. While most of these other jobs (e.g., counseling, research projects on psychology-related topics such as child abuse, human rights, and child welfare) could have served as rich sources of insight for the productive theorizing of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, the time for sustained writing for publication seemed to be the first to go when pressures of teaching, consulting, and raising family mounted.¹⁵ Such a situation has proven a disadvantage to *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* faculty *vis-à-vis* the faculty of traditional Western psychology in terms of departmental clout and leadership. With the latter camp receiving reinforcement from younger, unmarried, mostly returning foreign-trained scholars used to the rigors of a “publish-or-perish” culture, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* could not but suffer by comparison as its proponents had not been as quick to translate researches into solid publications.¹⁶

Some critics of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, however, located the problem at a much deeper level than just economics. One of the problems pinpointed is theoretical: the pitfall of “crass empiricism” or the failure to clearly articulate Filipino psychology’s methodological bases for arriving at its theoretic formulations beyond the mere citing of arbitrarily chosen empirical examples as warrant (Avila-Sta. Maria, personal communication, July 1999). Salazar (1998b) and Madelene Avila-Sta. Maria suggest in this regard that well-meaning nationalist sentiments can, and should, never substitute for careful, clear-eyed analysis if *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* is to advance as a discipline and not just as a movement; otherwise, it would be nothing more than a case of “cultural romanticism or chauvinism.” Not unrelated is the criticism that *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* has gotten itself stuck in, and seems unable to get itself unstuck from, its preoccupation with a merely reactive stance *vis-à-vis* Western discourse. As such, it has failed to direct its attention to more constructive theorizing in allowing itself to get drawn into constantly repudiating Western psychology’s claim in so far as they fail to apply to the Filipino case.

As a theoretical project, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* then is accused of falling short in its stated goal of “inaugurating a new discursive order” or in Foucault’s term, a new “regime of truth.” Likewise, in terms of establishing its own theoretical agenda and grounding it in a truly new initiative *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* is deemed to have failed to move forward. Avila-Sta. Maria (1996), herself a product of the Master’s Program in Filipino Psychology at UP and now a holder of a doctorate degree in Psychology at the University of Cologne, Germany, noted in this regard:

This reactive stance, although perhaps a necessary condition for the formulation and delineation of an indigenous identity for a discipline, may in the long run stunt the growth of the discipline within the Filipino culture (page 115).

Contributing to this impasse, in Avila-Sta. Maria’s estimation, is the shift in the locus of articulation of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* from the Philippine context where it has had its founding movement, to other places outside the country where it happened to have found receptive audiences in various Filipino diasporic communities, most notably, the United States, Australia, and Japan, among others (personal communication, July 1999). Those critical of such a move believe that far from advancing the cause of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* by casting a wider net in terms of its target audience, this “marketing” of the discourse under the rubric of “cross-cultural psychology” to outside consumers (who are likely to have their own agendas and are working within other sets of contextual problematics) is considered a “fatal mistake” in terms of methodological strategy (Covar, Salazar, and Avila-Sta. Maria, from various personal communications, July 1999). This is because to do so, according to this view necessarily means reverting back to writing, speaking, and publishing once more in English and addressing other kinds of concerns more pertinent to such audiences’ differing contexts, needs, and problems, when the more urgent task would have been the deepening of theoretical work and research within the still-emergent discipline as grounded in the national discourse. Inevitably, in choosing to speak or report once more to an outside audience, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* has had to make itself relevant (*i.e.*, attain *saysay* [sense or meaning]) to such constituencies instead of continuing to engage the national context

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

as a matter of priority. Eventually, it was seen as divorcing *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* from its indigenous moorings which it would have needed as its lifeline and source of nourishment, that is, if it is to keep growing and succeed in reclaiming initiative in setting its own theoretical agenda.

Of course what is not obscured in any of this outward territorial expansion is the politics involved in the choice of speaking contexts, that is, the politics of funding sources, of foreign research, and travel money to be had from addressing external audiences, especially from the “First World.” And yet, what critics call for is a consideration of the ultimate trade-offs given the severely limited (human) resources that *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* had available to carry on the indigenization initiative and consolidate the discipline’s theoretical gains beyond its founding moment. In the end, Enriquez insisted on lending his expertise and spending more and more time in the United States nurturing a parallel movement in the Bay Area. Along with his reverting once more to writing in English, such a move triggered a huge controversy between him and one other leading figure in the indigenization movement, Zeus Salazar. In effect, Salazar claims that his charge against Enriquez having “betrayed the cause” is based on Enriquez’s (1991) own earlier stated commitment:

... [K]inakailangang bumuo ng isang tradisyon ng sikolohiyang Pilipino na ang patutungkulan ng ating pang-unawa ay tayo mismong mga Pilipino at hindi ang mga banyaga. Kaakibat nito ang paggamit ng sariling wika upang matiyak na ang proseso ng pagsasalaysay sa mamamayang Pilipino ay higit na malinaw at higit na maraming maabot. Ang sikolohiyang Pilipino, bilang disiplina ay dapat lumago mula sa tunay at tapat na pag-unawa sa sariling kultura. Hindi makakabuo ng isang namumukod na pambansang sikolohiya sa pamamagitan lamang ng pagbabatikos sa Amerikanong sikolohiya... (page 131).

(... We need to establish a tradition of Filipino psychology whose goal of understanding is we ourselves as Filipino people and not foreigners. Necessarily, this entails using our own language to ensure that the process of narration to the Filipino people will be more clearly understood by the majority. If Filipino psychology were to prosper as a discipline, it should be borne of a true and adequate understanding of our own culture. *There’s no way we can constitute a distinctive national psychology by merely deconstructing American psychology...*) (emphasis added).

With Enriquez and a number of his students going abroad on various stints as scholars at the very height of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*’s success in the homeland, indigenous theorizing in the discipline was seen by its internal critics to have taken a back seat even as old material was merely rehashed and recycled for foreign audiences without new theoretical production.¹⁷

In order to correct this perceived retrogressive trajectory, what Avila-Sta. Maria (1996) suggests is for *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* to now move beyond the framework (and polemics) of decolonization and begin the real hard work of actually systematizing knowledge and carrying out the methodological requirements for indigenous knowledge production. For this, she believes that what is needed is no longer goal enunciations and more motherhood statements about nationhood and nationalist education, but actual conduct of research studies carried on in the indigenous tradition -- with the constitutive elements of such “indigenous research tradition” clearly spelled out (Avila-Sta. Maria, 1996). Today, however, despite the failure to overturn completely Western psychology’s hegemony in the state university’s Psychology Department and to institute *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* as the controlling framework with mere sub-sections in American psychology, European psychology, and other ethnic psychologies, one sees the auspicious emergence of second and even third generation *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* scholars doing critical work and publishing prodigiously in the new tradition. To date, several works have been published in the following subject areas: peace and human rights, in particular, the rights of children under the leadership of Protacio-De Castro;¹⁸ sexuality and human personality under the leadership of Grace Aguiling-Dalisay;¹⁹ *pakikipagkapwa* (ways of being with

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

others) and voluntarism (cf. Aguilin-Dalisay, Yacat, and Navarro, 2004); language, literature, and communication;²⁰ and concepts, theory, methodology, use, and application.²¹ These empirically-based studies are examples of attempts to use *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* concepts to understand Philippine social realities and the sedimented culture(s) of Filipinos. Whether or not they respond to the methodological issues raised by critics earlier should be made the subject of another study.

As a movement, the PSSP continues to forge ahead with its advocacy work, holding regular meetings, conferences, symposia, and other activities centered on promoting *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* research and scholarship. PPRTH, although now a separate entity, remains an ally and a partner. Currently, the latter is mainly in charge of administering (culturally-appropriate) psychological measurements as requested by different institutions including industry. The other partners of PSSP are *Bagong Kasaysayan-Bahay Saliksikan sa Kasaysayan* (New Historiography-Research House for Historical Studies) or BAKAS, Philippine Educational Theater Association (PETA), and Volunteer Organizations, Information, Coordination, and Exchange (VOICE) Network. Although located mostly outside the academy, such institutions appear to indicate that *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* as a movement has gotten back on track and remains alive and well today after the setbacks it suffered earlier in its career. In 2005, PSSP celebrated the 30th year anniversary of its founding.

In the academy, Avila-Sta. Maria appears to have seized the initiative of advancing the work of theorizing in *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* even as its dynamic seems to have shifted from U.P. to another institutional site, the De La Salle University in Manila, a private Catholic school where Avila-Sta. Maria currently teaches psychology.

Pilipinolohiya

From Area Studies Discourse to a Defining Framework

Pilipinolohiya is another discourse that has emerged within the Philippine indigenization narrative, one that aims to constitute itself into an indigenously-conceived discipline. Its purported goal is to develop a new intellectual tradition that will undertake the production of knowledge on the Philippines and Filipinos “*mula sa loob*” (from within) in contrast to “*mula sa labas*” (from without) (Salazar, 1998d, 325). As such, it differentiates itself from the more popularly-known field of study called “Philippine Studies.” This latter, according to Salazar, derives from the larger discourse of “Area Studies” which comes out of the post-war academic division of labor in the West meant mainly to service the superpowers’ ideological requirements during the Cold War era (cf. Pletsch, 1981). Depending on whether a culture was considered capable of scientific and scholarly knowledge production or not, it either became the “locus of disciplinary and scholarly enterprise,” or else, the “object of study” (Mignolo, 1999, 47). Expectedly, the Philippines was one of those consigned to the latter because of its strategic significance to U.S. geopolitics and its status as a neocolony of the former Empire. Proponents of *Pilipinolohiya* consider the knowledge produced under the rubric of “Philippine Studies” (as a subset of Area Studies) as being “*mula sa labas*” (a view from without) (Salazar, 1998b, 325). That is, it is knowledge production initiated *by*, and *for*, First World nations’ consumption needs and, as such, deemed inimical to Filipino interest, couched as it is mostly in Western-styled racialized analysis of Philippine realities. In contrast, and consistent with *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*’s notion of “indigenization from within,” *Pilipinolohiya* proposes the development of a view that is “*mula sa loob*” (from within) as an alternative way of structuring knowledge on the Philippines.

Historical Formation and Conceptual Determinations

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

The notion of *Pilipinolohiya* was conceptualized jointly by UP Diliman professors Prospero R. Covar from the Anthropology Department, and Zeus A. Salazar, from the History Department. Covar finished his undergraduate and master's degrees both in Sociology at UP Diliman, and his doctorate degree in Anthropology at the University of Arizona in Tucson, Arizona. Salazar, for his part, obtained his Bachelor of Arts degree (*summa cum laude*) in History at UP Diliman and his doctorate in Ethnology at Sorbonne, University of Paris finishing with the highest honors. He also trained at the Ecole Nationale des Langues Orientales Vivantes in Paris, Freie Universitat Berlin in Germany, and Universiteit te Leiden in Olanda. He speaks and writes fluently in French and German and has published multilingually in Filipino, English, French, and German.²² He offers a straightforward definition of *Pilipinolohiya* as "*ang pag-aaral ng Kapilipinuhan, pagkaPilipino, at mga anyo't paraan ng pagpapakaPilipino*" (Salazar, 1998b, 327) ("the study of the world of Filipinos, of being Filipino, and the different ways of being Filipino") from the perspective of Filipinos. For Covar (1991), it means the "systematic study of (1) Filipino psyche, (2) Filipino culture, and (3) Philippine society using the terms and categories of thought of the culture" (page 37, as translated from the Filipino original). Both Covar and Salazar are for eschewing cultural representations, views, and theoretical agendas set by others that don't address the needs and concerns of Filipinos, first and foremost. They also reject constituting the Philippines and its people as mere "objects of knowledge," as one more specimen in a range of experiments to test the validity of the Western-styled disciplines. Salazar (1998c) emphasizes:

The gist of all of this is that *Pilipinolohiya* aims at understanding *Pilipinas* from within - that is, it has a singular focus and a single vantage point, that of the Filipino nationality. Therefore, the disciplines (including disciplinal tools, approaches, methods, and ways of posing problems) are only of auxiliary importance, however professionally they might (*as they must*) be applied (page 313, emphasis in original).

The term "nationality" here, as mentioned earlier, is not taken unproblematically. Rather, the view "from within" takes on singularity only within the context of a struggle for control of the symbolic means of representation. Where before, the terms of definition had been monopolized by an external *ouvre* or alien interpretation, *Pilipinolohiya* seeks to seize control of the production of meanings in the academy and ground the discourse within the codes of the culturally-diverse nation. Production of consensus then is premised on communication across, and recognition of, internal difference or plurality, and not denial of such.²³

Prior to *Pilipinolohiya's* formulation as a new approach to the study of the Philippines, "Philippine Studies" as a degree program was housed in three separate units of UP Diliman: at the *Sentrong Asyano* (Asian Center), at the *Kolehiyo ng Arte at Literatura* (KAL) or College of Arts and Literature, and at the *Dalubhasaan ng Agham Panlipunan at Pilosopiyang Pilipino* (DAPP) or College of Social Sciences and Philosophy. All three programs encouraged multidisciplinary in orientation and more or less espoused a nationalist bias of one sort or another. Although established in the mid-1970s, it was not until 1989 -- when Salazar was appointed Dean of DAPP and Covar, as Program Director -- that "Philippine Studies" was changed to *Programang Pilipinolohiya*, signaling what was intended to be a radical reorientation of the program toward a more indigenous point of view. Whereas the discourse of "Philippine Studies" was one that circulated among a community of international scholars invested in the Philippines as a subject area and therefore conducted mostly in the dominant language, framework, and categories of that community (*i.e.*, English/American), Covar and Salazar sought to ground the study of the Philippines within the national context, that is, in the desire to have Filipinos know and understand themselves, their society, and their culture *from within* or from an insider's point of view.²⁴

Once again, as in the case of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, the linguistic revision in this regard was more than simply a surface formalistic move. Proponents of *Pilipinolohiya* believe that without a working knowledge and actual use of the language(s) in which a culture is encoded, no deep

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

understanding of the same is possible. Salazar (personal communication, July 1999) laments for instance the way so-called Filipino “area specialists” never have a direct knowledge and understanding of other cultures save via the American point of view as encoded in English translations of those culture’s original works. Thus “Japan Studies” at U.P.’s Asian Center is one that is taught in English and Japanese works are read only in English translation. His own view advocates a more direct manner of relating to others, hence:

Ano’ng ibig kong sabihin sa pakikipag-ugnay? Ibig sabihin, magkakaroon tayo ng mga eksperto na hindi sinasanay sa Amerika kundi sinasanay sa atin at marunong ng wika at kultura ng bawat bansa sa ating rehiyon. (What do I mean by establishing relations [with others]? What I mean is we should have more experts who are not trained in America but trained by us here and who will be proficient in the language and culture of every country in our region.) What do we know about Japan? What we know about Japan is what we read in *Newsweek*, *Time Magazine*, American books. We do not make our own books on Japan based on our direct experience. We need that direct experience *na* that we report in our own language (Salazar, 1998d, 348).

The same holds true with the Department of English Program in Comparative Literature -- only literary works from other countries with available translations in English end up being read or taught even in graduate level courses. Consequently, Salazar believes that Filipinos have yet to lose their American lenses and begin to view the world from their own eyes, using their own language as the medium of perception, communication, and understanding. Covar (personal communication, June 1999) likewise notes that for as long as Filipinos remained enamored with the viewing lenses of others, they will remain as nothing more than kibitzers, hangers-on, mere passengers in a journey whose destination or direction they have no part in charting or determining. Both Salazar and Covar believe that the language imperative dictates that Filipinos must learn to set the agenda in any discourse about themselves by insisting on commanding the medium of communication. Outsiders who wish to participate in the national discourse should be compelled to do the adapting and not the other way around, thus for once reversing the centuries-old practice of Filipinos always deferring to, and bending over backwards, to accommodate others often to the point of self-marginalization and national detriment. On the question of how the intellectual and literary tradition carried on in the colonizer’s language is viewed by proponents of *Pilipinolohiya*, there appears to be no problem recognizing the role that such has played in the initial phase of (counter-)cultural formation. Under domination, both mimicry, as well as more consciously resistive communicative acts performed in the language of the master, are deemed necessary coping or survival mechanisms for a subject people. The need to contest, to prove equality, or to counter allegations of inferiority or non-personhood meant addressing one’s dominant other, and consequently needing to speak in that other’s language. As Salazar (1998e) wryly observes in this regard, “As Indio, he had to show Spaniard and American alike that he could be at least as good as they *in their game* of culture and socio-political forms” (page 101, emphasis in original). But to launch the second phase of the struggle for liberation -- that of self-empowerment -- means changing the communicative context: from one directed at one’s dominant other to one carried on among one’s fellows, in solidarity with those who have gained neither position nor privilege to master the colonizer’s language. Hence, the mandated adoption of the subject people’s language(s) and perspectives in a powerful symbolic act of separation from the master’s signifying codes.

In his essay, “*Pilipinolohiya: Pagtatakda at Pagpapaibayo*,” (*Pilipinolohiya: Prospects and Transformations*), Salazar (1998d) traces the history of Philippine Studies to attempts by Filipino patriot and hailed national hero, Jose Rizal, to establish linkage with European and American scholars studying the Philippines (called *philippinistes* or Filipinists) as early as the 1800s. It was ostensibly part of a strategy within the Philippine Propaganda Movement against Spain to win support for the struggle of Filipinos for independence. Salazar credits Rizal with attempting to pioneer Philippine Studies in its two senses: one, as a field of study, albeit with an outsider’s point of view, and the other, in the sense of *Pilipinolohiya* with a view to serving and prioritizing the interests and welfare the Filipino people in

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

its approach and philosophy. The goal of Salazar and Covar is to strengthen the latter sense and establish the discourse's basis as an indigenously-conceived discipline that would better serve and do justice to Filipino interest and subjectivity.

Bases for an Indigenously-Conceived Discipline

Covar's motivation in this regard comes from his own experience of disillusionment with the Western disciplines' failure to shed light on the dynamics of Filipino culture and society. He notes that far from helping Filipinos achieve greater self-knowledge and understanding, it appears that with the way the knowledge is structured within the Western disciplinary discourses, Filipino scholars are merely enticed "to contribute to theory, method, and content of the disciplines, but are not themselves permitted [given the assumptions of the disciplines] to arrive at just and adequate representations of Filipino thought, culture, and society" (1991, 40, as translated from the Filipino original).

Covar narrates his personal experience in this regard. Researching for his master's thesis in Sociology in U.P. on *Watawat ng Lahi* (roughly, Emblem of Our Race), an indigenous religious movement whose core belief revolves around the veneration of Filipino national hero, Jose Rizal, he was hard put to find relevant literature that could shed light on the subject. For a long time, no one among his American professors could direct him to the proper literature in sociology, unable to categorize the phenomenon he was studying. The group could not be classified as a religious system because it simply did not fit the normative criteria for a legitimate "religion;" rather, it was labeled "superstition" or "fanaticism" based on the existing literature. Finally, on his own, Covar discovered that the place to look was in a whole area in sociology called "sociology of deviancy" (personal communication, June 1999). But Covar then thought, deviant from whose point of view? According to whose standards of "normalcy"? He figured then that from this framework, most native practices and other indigenous phenomena would be most likely consigned to the lunacy bin, if not judged as "misguided," "unenlightened," or simply, "barbaric" and "uncivilized." In effect, he began to see that it was this system of normative, but really arbitrary, classification that conveniently produced Filipinos as infantile primitives in need of colonialism's "civilizing mission." This implicit view was surreptitiously smuggled into Filipino students' consciousness through the naturalizing explanations of the so-called social "sciences."

But although it may appear that indigenization scholars have a knee-jerk aversion toward anything "foreign" in their prescribed process of knowledge-construction, a deeper grasp of their logic of reasoning shows this not to be the case. Rather it is merely to urge vigilance in the matter of whose controlling reference point is employed in the conduct of scholarship. Salazar (1998d) for instance, insists on the need to develop a healthy skepticism toward concepts and theories that have become almost sacrosanct in Europe and America instead of immediately taking them as universal and indiscriminately aping and applying them to the Filipino context. That he is not opposed to taking and appropriating (*pag-aangkin*) from other cultures is shown by his openness to indigenizing or contextualizing borrowed theories and knowledges provided these are properly nuanced or critically appropriated to suit the Filipino context.²⁵ Furthermore, he notes that the effectiveness of appropriation depends on the "spirit of adaptation and originality [with which] Filipinos as individuals and as a nation" do the adapting (page 332). As he stipulates in one of his essays (Salazar, 1998b) dealing with the "matter of 'influence,'" there are "laws" that must govern cultural borrowing. Quoting the European scholar, Hamilton Gibb who wrote to explain Islamic influence on European civilization in medieval times, Salazar writes,

- (1) ... cultural influences (... genuinely assimilated elements) are always preceded by an already existing activity in the related fields, and... it is this existing activity which creates the factor without which no creative assimilation can take place.

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

- (2) The borrowed elements conduce to the expanding vitality of the borrowing culture only so far as they draw their nourishment from the activities which led to the borrowing in the first place.
- (3) A living culture disregards or rejects all elements in other cultures which conflict with its own fundamental attitudes, or aesthetic criteria (page 60).

Salazar's approach, however, is more of a cautionary attitude than an enthusiastic endorsement when it comes to borrowing conceptual categories from outside sources given Filipinos' lingering penchant for revering anything coming from the West as better. He cites an example in psychology where Freudian psychoanalysis is adopted wholesale as though it were a culturally-transcendent, framework that can work regardless of context. What gets occluded in such reckless appropriation, Salazar warns, are the vast differences in cultural logic and contextual particularities between the theory's locus of origin, that is, in predominantly bourgeois patriarchal, puritanical 17th and 18th century Europe, and the relatively matriarchal non-Western culture of the Philippines. Surely, he notes, it shouldn't take much to suppose that the two would most likely differ in notions of sexuality and/or sexual norms. He asks,

Mailalapat nga ba talaga ang eros ng Europeo sa atin, gayong may sarili tayong konsepto ng "libog"? Hindi pa natin ito nasusuri nang masinsinan. Sa pahapyaw, alam lamang natin na tayo'y napapangiti sa ating "libog," samantalang may pagkamistikong may halong takot at pangamba ang pagtanaw ng mga Europeo sa kanilang "eros" na kanila pa ngang ikinakabit sa thanatos: ang kamatayan (1998d, 333).

(May we indeed apply the European concept of *eros* to our case, when we have our own concept of *libog*? To think that we haven't even begun to examine this concept carefully. At a glance, we simply know that we tend to smile when we hear the term *libog*, whereas there's a certain mysticism combined with a sense of fear and anxiety associated with the European notion of *eros* to the extent that they even tend to associate it with *thanatos* or [the] death [instinct].)

Salazar thus warns that it is crucial to understand fully this basic opposition or difference in spirit (or consciousness) in the way issues of sexuality are regarded in the two cultural contexts before venturing to apply an alien framework arising from other psychological imperatives rooted in another cultural context. However, should Filipino scholars ever find reason to believe that Filipino sexuality can be explained in Freudian terms, Salazar (1998d) admonishes that they must then take care to determine "at what level, to what extent, and in what way" Freudian psychoanalysis would be applicable to Filipino notions of sexuality. By no means must the theory be simply mechanically invoked as canon (page 333).

And yet, after all is said and done, Salazar himself would not count such endeavor (*i.e.*, theory adaptation) all that worthwhile to prioritize at this point. Not when Filipinos have yet to learn to explore their own reality with their own eyes and not merely from the authoritative dictates of the disciplines. Indeed, he cannot underscore enough the dangers in Filipino scholars getting easily mesmerized by imported theories from Europe and the West. He cringes, for example, at the way such scholars often dare invoke the same, jargon and all, if only to display their newly-acquired erudition and cosmopolitanism that often turns out in the end to be only so much sophistry and nothing more (personal communication, July 1999). To these individuals he poses the challenge: "But think of what could happen if the psychoanalyst or psychologist were to approach a Filipino [and allow her psychic reality to be the ground of his theorizing]? What do you suppose will happen to theory then?" (page 333, as translated from the Filipino original). He cautions,

As far as adaptation is concerned... I don't think that such should be undertaken in the spirit of merely wanting to prove [already established] theory [from elsewhere] by

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

means of data gathered on Filipinos... Rather, the central concern must be Filipino culture, Filipino experience, and the Filipino[‘s overall] context. In any case, no theory should be deemed all that authoritative to be exempt from critique. The ultimate test is whether or not it holds up to Filipino experience” (page 334, as translated from the Filipino original).

From Constitution of Self as “Other” to Ethno-Centering

The project of *Pilipinolohiya* then has to do with the centering of the Filipino nation, its experiences as a people, and its culture and society in the systematic construction of knowledge in the Philippine academy. Whereas in “Philippine Studies” the Philippines and its people were made mere objects of study of other nationalities and cultures interested in learning about them for their own purposes and interests, *Pilipinolohiya* aims to designate the study of *Pilipinas* for itself and for its own interest, using its own conceptual categories as the vantage point for interpretation. In Salazar’s (1998c) words, under “Philippine Studies,”

Pilipinas is “the Other” for others but *is not* and *cannot* be for itself! *Pilipinolohiya* thus studies *Pilipinas* as the Filipino collective national Self, an endeavor which other nationalities carry out implicitly for themselves, generally without the support of various “area studies” for the understanding of the world around them.

As “the Other,” *Pilipinas* is not and cannot be the vantage point, much less the primary focus of Philippine Studies. Philippine Studies has varied vantage points, since it starts from the needs, images, and problems and ways of seeing things of a wide variety of cultures, mainly Western. *Pilipinas* just happens to be the meeting ground of several national-cultural “consciousnesses” (if such a plural exists), each with its own world-view, understanding, and agenda, which the term “Philippine Studies” more or less summarizes. In that sense and in contrast, *Pilipinolohiya* is concerned (happily) only and primarily with *Pilipinas!* (page 314, emphasis in original).

This self-centering -- in a gesture of wresting determination of self from the control of other’s gaze -- in the view of *Pilipinolohiya* advocates, requires no less than the use of terms and categories of thought of Filipinos as encoded in their languages. This is a recurrent theme throughout both Covar’s and Salazar’s writings. The tragedy of the continued use of English among other Filipino scholars as yet unpersuaded by the indigenization imperative is graphically described by Salazar (1998a) thus:

Para maintindihan ang mga manunulat sa Ingles, kailangan ng karaniwang Pilipino na matutunan ang buong “literaturang pandaigdig” (i.e., sa pagkaunawa nito ng Kanluran!), sa wikang Ingles-Amerikano man lamang -- ibig sabihin, kailangan muna ang kaawa-awang Pinoy na manirahan sa Amerika at maging mala-Amerikano, at pagkatapos makabasa ng libu-libong libro sa Ingles na paggagastusan ng libu-libo ring pisong pinaghirapan ng Bayan sa iba’t-ibang uri ng pag-papaalipin sa iba’t-ibang dako ng daigdig! (page xx).

(In order for the writer of English to be understood, the ordinary Filipino first has to learn the entire canon of “world literature” (that is, from the point of view of the West!), even only in American English -- in other words, the hapless Pinoy²⁶ first has to sojourn in America and become like an American, and then read thousands and thousands of books in English and be funded by thousands and thousands of pesos that the nation would have had to raise painstakingly by all sorts of enslavements in different parts of the world!)

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

Within the framework of *Pilipinolohiya*, not until Filipino academics learn to speak in the language(s) of the vast majority (*i.e.*, the bottom half of what is now normatively known in indigenization circles as *Ang Dambuhalang Pagkakahating Kultural* [The Great/Monstrous Cultural Divide between the elite and the Filipino masses]²⁷ can they hope to fulfill their role²⁸ as producers of knowledge that will first and foremost benefit the majority of Filipinos whose shared idiom is not English, but rather, Filipino (along with their own respective regional languages).²⁹

Today, the program appears to have suffered a temporary setback with the change in administration and the reversion back to *Araling Pilipino* (direct translation of “Philippine Studies”) as the official title of the degree program. But Salazar and Covar are undaunted, convinced that no matter the name change, the distinction between *Pilipinolohiya*, on the one hand, and of *Araling Pilipino*, on the other, would have become clear in people’s minds by now, it need not be belabored. As far as proponents of *Pilipinolohiya* are concerned, the dynamic of indigenization and knowledge transformation in the academy has already begun and will continue, with or without formal institutional support and recognition.³⁰

Pantayong Pananaw/Bagong Kasaysayan

A Communication-Based Framework for Historiography

Undoubtedly by far the most theoretically advanced and productive in terms of research output within the indigenization tradition is the discourse of what is called *Pantayong Pananaw*. *Pantayong Pananaw* is a communication-based theoretical innovation coming out of the field of Philippine historiography. This new paradigm refers to the normative speaking context within which scholars in the movement seek to help forge a “national” discourse on civilization. Conceptualized by Salazar (1991) together with history professor Jaime B. Veneracion and other younger members of the History Department of U.P. Diliman, the goal of *Pantayong Pananaw* is to contribute to the flourishing of a “*talastasang bayan*,” that is, a national discourse. A descriptive etymological explication of the Filipino term for “discourse” or *talastasan* is provided by Atoy M. Navarro, Mary Jane B. Rodriguez, and Vicente C. Villan (1997) and by Navarro (2000) using Salazar’s conceptualization. *Talastasan* is alternatively understood in the two referenced works as coming from the root word *talas*, pertaining to “sharpness” or “refinement,” and *talastas* referring to “knowing,” “being persuaded,” or “realizing,” (unfortunately, there are no exact equivalents of the terms in English). It is also understood as having the notion of *tastas*, meaning “to unravel,” as in the unraveling of a stitch. In other words, by discourse is meant “a collective endeavor to know, to fathom, to realize, to be sharpened in one’s understanding of an idea or thought with the hope of further refining it and making it better” (Navarro *et al.*, 1997, as translated from the Filipino original). It also means the critical examination of ideological formulations for the purpose of unraveling their constructed naturalness and exposing their sutured seams and hidden contradictions. In this sense, the English word “discourse” is regarded as paling by comparison in that the latter merely signifies a back-and-forth exchange of ideas without the corresponding notion in *talastasan* of a deliberate intent of refining and sharpening the subject of discussion. Together with the notion of history as *salaysay* which carries with it the notion of the nation’s *pag-uulat sa sarili* or the nation reporting to itself, *Pantayong Pananaw* hopes to create an ethos or climate whereby the nation can share in one encompassing discourse, one that would lend a sense of *kabuuan* or “totality,” not in the reified sense of totalizing uniformity,³¹ but rather a shared understanding of the nation’s history that can give force and direction to a collective vision of the future. More will be said later on the normative methodology for attaining this goal.

The term *pantayo* comes from the root word *tayo*, one of the pronouns marking the first person plural, “we,” and the prefix *pan-*, roughly the equivalent for the prefix “for.” With *Pananaw* translating to “perspective,” *Pantayong Pananaw* can be roughly (awkwardly) phrased in English as “A

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

For-Us Perspective.” However, an important revision to this literal translation into English is Ramon Guillermo’s (2003) formulation, namely, “a from-us-for-us perspective.” In this reformulated translation, Guillermo underscores that the cultural nation is not only the subject and goal of the discourse, but it is also the source of it. Taking the various pronoun referents and their equivalent terms which are remarkably present in their fine distinctions in all the Filipino languages and dialects, namely, *kayo* (you-plural), *kami* (we-speaking to others), *sila* (they), and *tayo* (we-speaking among ourselves), Salazar chooses the last pronoun referent *tayo* as his basis for building a theoretical foundation for his perspective. He explains his choice by referring to the taken-for-granted speaking contexts of the various pronoun categories. The two contending possibilities among the four pronoun referents are *kami* (we-speaking to others) and *tayo* (we-speaking among ourselves). Salazar chooses the latter because *kami*, he reasons, implies a context where one is discoursing with an “other.”³² Within this discursive context, one must constantly take the other’s context and perspective into consideration in any communicative transaction. Such is the case in (de-)colonization in that the self is constantly aware of an outsider’s presence. This is an outsider who, far from friendly and sympathetic, happens to be the self’s very own demon-tormentor.³³ This outside entity is seen at once as the cause of one’s identity distortion and crisis, and yet, one still powerful enough (whether in actuality or through habitual psychic conditioning) to harm if not somehow catered to. As long as this outsider is included in the conversation, he or she remains an influential determinant of the tone, direction, content, and rules to be set in conducting the discourse. Likewise, the constraint placed on the speakers by a context where the “other” or “others” are constantly included even just as overhearers, in Salazar’s view, ensures that the discourse on nationhood by Filipinos will remain unproductive and trapped in a reactive mode, unable to move forward or to create new initiatives.

A Closed Circuit of Interaction

What *Pantayong Pananaw* proposes then, if only figuratively speaking, is a “closed circuit” of interaction. This is a context where a discourse is to be carried on only by, and among, Filipinos without the inclusion (constant intrusion or meddling) of outside participants or dominant perspectives inimical to Filipino interests. That way, he argues, Filipinos can discourse and communicate freely -- in their own terms, in their own language, using their own thought patterns and manner of relating and, most importantly, with their own interests (as Filipinos) kept in mind first and foremost. While this call for a closed circuit of interaction appears retrogressive in comparison to the outward-looking thrust of, say, the newly-democratizing countries of Eastern Europe, proponents of *Pantayong Pananaw* see the move as a much-needed first-time marking of boundaries, if only ideologically, by a people whose former all-inclusiveness (borne not so much of generosity as of a distorted prioritizing of others’ interest above one’s own in a kind of reverse ethnocentrism) serve to work only to its own detriment.

Traditionally, for instance, what succeeded in getting established as “the” Filipino “nation” is one constructed by a national elite under the banner of “official nationalism.” This brand of elite nationalism is seen as harking back to a mode of acculturation which prevailed throughout history among Filipinos whose exposure to Euro-American culture and civilization is deemed to have led to their total absorption into a different mode of thinking even while wishing to work for an independent *Filipinas*. Thus, their sentiments, loyalties, mode of consciousness, and interests are found to have greater affinity with the liberal ideologies of Europe than with the thinking and revolutionary philosophy of the Filipino people.³⁴ Under these elites’ leadership, the country is deemed to have succeeded only in being steered along the same beaten path to neocolonialism and dependency, unable to chart its own course. Stuck in a purely reactionary mode, the nation is indicted as being locked in global discourses without an agenda of its own to place on the table. Only by instituting such a closed circuit interaction do proponents of *Pantayong Pananaw* envision the possibility of a “truly” Filipino consensus emerging, participated in widely by formerly excluded voices from the diverse Philippine cultural communities.

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

In what follows, I outline the constitutive elements of the framework of *Pantayong Pananaw*.

Philippine History from the Lens of Pantayong Pananaw

Historically, Salazar (1991) argues, there was not, prior to the coming of Spain, one unified *Pantayong Pananaw* among the estimated 80 ethnolinguistic groups in the Philippine archipelago. He traces the constitution of the Philippines into a national political entity to the efforts of the elites in the Christianized areas to attain reforms and eventual independence toward the end of the Spanish colonial regime. These elites he refers to as “the acculturated group” or the *ladino* class (page 51). By his account, these *ladinos* had very complex and convoluted transactions and acculturative collaborations with the Spanish colonizers: not only were they responsible for helping the Spaniards insert their culture into the lives of Filipinos by indigenizing and translating Spanish works into Tagalog (one of the Philippine languages), they were also instrumental in the Hispanization of the Filipino culture by promoting the learning of Spanish. Because of their privileged status as culture brokers knowing both Spanish and Tagalog, they prospered during the Spanish regime. Eventually, they also emerged as the elite during the American occupation. Included in these ranks, in Salazar’s estimation, are the Filipino propagandists who, in the latter part of the Spanish period, became exposed to liberal and progressive ideas in Europe and launched a movement (the Propaganda Movement) for reform against Spanish abuses and oppression. Although not discounting their contribution to the initial phase of the resistance struggle, Salazar regards the Propaganda Movement as still portraying primarily a *pangkami* (we-speaking-to-others) form of discourse, not to discount their contribution to the initial phase of the struggle. This is because the Filipino propagandists wrote mostly in Spanish, directed their writing toward the Spaniards, and used mostly concepts and ideas they learned from the liberal traditions of Europe which the Spaniards understood as well, as grounds for their fight for parity and independence. Ultimately, such reactive nationalism, while perhaps inevitable given the phase of the struggle, would prove inadequate, falling short of the desired goal of a radical striving for independence on the people’s own terms.

Since the American period, the elite have continued to derive from the ranks of *ladino*-descended and European-educated propagandists, with the addition today of Fulbright scholars and other intellectuals sponsored by American foundations, Japan, and other foreign countries. Salazar contends that because such scholars and intellectuals continue to discourse in English and use alien constructs in their study of Philippine society adopted mostly from their graduate studies abroad, their scholarly practice serves to marginalize Filipino culture in their own eyes, that is, even when they desire to work for national liberation. Whether from the ideological left or right, Salazar finds that the discourse of these individuals (labeled “National Culture from Propaganda” in the framework) largely unrelated to the larger discourses of the majority of the Filipino masses whose mode of consciousness and communication remains rooted in the indigenous traditions and languages of their respective ethnic communities. Indeed, Salazar finds the elite to be suffering from what he calls as a case of “cultural schizophrenia,” in that they are at once “being[s] *of* and *against* the West while longing for [their] ‘native’ roots.” While the common Filipino would ordinarily be spared such neurotic complex, the fact that all means of social mobility, as well as all institutions of power (from the state bureaucracy to the economy and the entire educational system), are controlled and run on the basis of an elitist ideology, ensures that anyone going through the system is bound to undergo a measure of the same cultural alienation and fracturing of consciousness. This is so given the exposure to alien modes of knowing and being represented as *the* normative ideal of what it means for Filipinos to become worthwhile human beings. To participate in, and be educated at all under such an unreformed system, is to be forcibly alienated from one’s native language and culture which one is taught to regard as “inferior” and “inadequate” compared to the superior language(s) and culture(s) of the West. From there follows the internalization of the implicit assumption of Western racial superiority with all its normative presumptions as to what counts for desirable, “civilized” ways of being, knowing, and doing. Coupled with the relentless bombardment of Western popular culture products through cable television

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

and the globalized media, the stage setting is complete for the furthering of Western hegemony -- making the task of cultural re-rooting and re-centering an even greater imperative, if fought with more challenge.

Theorizing the "Great Cultural Divide"

Herein then lies what proponents of *Pantayong Pananaw* deem responsible for the phenomenon they refer to in the framework as "The Great Cultural Divide" (*Ang Dambuhalang Pagkakahating Kultural*). Maggay (1995) offers a representative expression:

Perhaps the greatest single source of anomie in this country, there exists in the Philippines an invisible yet impermeable dividing line between those who are able to function within the borrowed ethos of power structures transplanted from without and those who have remained within the functional meaning system of the indigenous culture. Termed by academics as the "great cultural divide," this sharp disjunction in sensibility has on top a thin layer of culture brokers known as the "ladino" class, often co-identical with the economic and political elite but also including middle class intellectuals and technocrats sufficiently educated and domesticated into the formal systems of power introduced into the country by its colonial past. The vast bottom half [actually vast "majority"] consists of that supposedly silent and inert mass whose universe of discourse is limited to the indigenous languages and whose subterranean consciousness has remained impervious to colonial influence. Thus is a situation where the grammar of power is conducted within the terms and the structures of a language alien to the people's way of thinking and feeling, rendering centers of power not only inaccessible but profoundly uninteresting, a political sideshow that interfaces only tangentially with what to the poor is the more serious business of survival (page 3).

It is this monstrous cultural divide -- which translates into a similar chasm on every other level (*i.e.*, on the level of economics, class, and political interest) between the country's elite and the rest of the Filipino people -- that *Pantayong Pananaw* seeks to bridge so that the nation can move forward in a singular direction. In attempting to close this gap, however, it is the elite nation (*nasyon*) that *Pantayo* scholars hope to compel to accede to the demands of the Filipino nation (*bayan*) even as the latter is empowered to assert its will over the determination of the nation's destiny. Urgent priority is given to *pagbubuo* (construction of a "totality" or national consensus), first, in order to construct a shared framework for differently making sense of the past. This shared historical framework may then serve as a basis for charting a common future, all the more important because without such, the nation may not continue to hold its own (in fact, has yet to do so) amidst other totalities in the region all with their own strong national identities and sense of destiny, notably, Taiwan, Indonesia, Malaysia, and other neighboring countries. Salazar warns, "If in the twenty-first century, we fail to constitute a free Philippines, with a firm determination and common weal, we might find ourselves easily destabilized and prone to other enticements and led to follow other dubious destinies" (personal communication, July 1999, as translated from the Filipino original).

While at the moment only the individual Filipino ethnic communities may be said to have their own respective *pantayong pananaw*, Salazar envisions that a "universal" *Pantayong Pananaw* discourse unifying all Filipinos in one purpose may yet emerge through efforts to transform Philippine education toward more culturally-grounded production of knowledge and less dependence on foreign ideological conceptualizations of the world. Given the strength, vibrancy, and close interrelatedness of the cultures of the various indigenous communities, it is believed that ethnolinguistic diversity, far from hindering unity, can serve as a positive contribution to the formation of a multi-accented national discourse. In Arnold M. Azurin's (1993) view, where earlier colonial policy exploited ethnic differences as part of its strategy of divide-and-rule, much can be said for "calibrating ethnicity progressively into

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

nationhood” (page 12). Part of this process is to view ethnic distinctions and dichotomies not as always and already given or permanent, but, as Azurin suggests, as “shifting, [at times] superficial, and situational,” that is, the result of certain expediencies in one’s context or environment (Azurin, 1993, 53, citing Padilla).

An even more fruitful approach from a historical perspective that scholars of *Pantayong Pananaw* are already pursuing in the consolidation of a national identity is to trace and underscore, the pre-colonial interethnic linkages through trade and migratory contacts between and among the different highland, midland, and lowland tribal settlements in the islands. For as long as each group’s right to exist is protected and not impinged upon by exploitative acts or repressive impositions, ethnicity is not seen as contradicting the thrust toward nationhood but rather complementing it. Here, the notion of there being a basis for the conception of what Azurin (1993) calls, “intersecting ethnicities” or “correlative cultures,” located not necessarily in a correspondence of cultural traits and characteristics but in the historically continuous and continuing interethnic transactions that have created bonds of commonality and identification between and among the various communities, is an even stronger base for constituting national unity.

Strategies toward the Constitution of a National Discourse

What is the methodology of *Pantayong Pananaw*? Proponents clarify that *Pantayong Pananaw* is not an already finished or pre-packaged product to be merely sold and marketed to the nation from the academy. Rather it is “a work in progress,” constituted in dialogue and contestation (Salazar and Navarro, from various personal communications, August 1999). In other words, only parameters are given; the substance emerges in the course of engagement in dialogue. One non-negotiable parameter is the insistence on Filipino as the medium of exchange and communication within the discourse of *Pantayong Pananaw*. The assumption is that an indigenous perspective cannot emerge without employing the codes, concepts, and meanings commonly shared by all. Since a truly national discourse requires participation from all sectors of society, a common language becomes an indispensable tool in its construction.

Proponents of *Pantayong Pananaw* have been hit hard on this unbending language prerequisite and charged with advocating a form of “linguistic essentialism.” Objectors to this requirement decry that it would appear then that it doesn’t matter much what sort of ideological persuasion is proffered, for as long as the thought is expressed in Filipino, such is acceptable within the framework of the *Pantayong Pananaw* discourse. One critic (Diokno, 1997) protests in this regard, “Is expanding the arena of discourse through the use of the Filipino language the sole consideration in the construction of indigenous history? Does not content figure at all?” (page 10-11). Is it justified, she asks, to hold “dependence on foreign aid and rejection of imperialism [as, in effect] ‘paradoxical’ expressions of the same ‘attitude of dependence upon external forces’... [?]” quoting Salazar’s own words (page 10). Academics opposed to this perceived dogmatic stance on language are further indignant that the normative presumption of native language -- once accepted -- would imply diminishment or invalidation of the historic and exemplary contributions of, say, Filipino activists of the Propaganda Movement against Spain or of other more contemporary nationalist writers³⁵ simply because they wrote in other languages (e.g., Spanish and English) rather than Filipino.³⁶

When one considers the seeming smugness and indifference of *Pantayong Pananaw* scholars in the face of such objections, the charge of “dogmatism” would appear warranted. In my numerous conversations with *Pantayong Pananaw* proponents, who by now have gained a measure of ascendancy beyond the History Department and have been publishing prodigiously in Filipino, I find that they often cared little to explain themselves to others, *i.e.*, much less to their detractors who refuse to address them in Filipino. It is as if to say, “You want to enter the discourse of the nation? Then speak in the language of the people, *i.e.*, in the language of that vast bottom half of the Great Cultural Divide who

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

for so long have had to endure marginalization in their own country by your strange academic ramblings in a strange foreign tongue.”

Indeed, when controversy broke out over American writer-professor Glenn Anthony May's 1997 book publication, *Inventing a Hero: The Posthumous Recreation of Andres Bonifacio* alleging “fakelore” and “mythmaking” in the nationalist historians' hailing of Bonifacio, leader of the Katipunan mass movement,³⁷ as the true Filipino revolutionary versus the reform-minded elite *ilustrados*, *Pantayong Pananaw* scholars found no need to respond at all. Their reason is that “to respond is to legitimize [May] as part of the national discourse. The thing is... he is not... since by writing in English, he is likely to be read and understood only by the elite *Ingliseros* who participate with him in the same discourse” (Navarro, personal communication, July 1999). The only time one of the *Pantayong Pananaw* scholars ever reported feeling compelled to address the issue was when it finally broke out in the local press as one tabloid bannered in Filipino, “Bonifacio Fake in the End.” Even then, Navarro clarified, the response was never intended to rebut May (as they couldn't care less about his opinion), but rather to speak with the Filipino people who are now forced to think about the issue by one tabloid's unwitting translation of the controversy into Filipino thus bringing it onto the national discourse agenda. Navarro would end up discussing the issue in class and instructing his students to write their response to the controversy (as goes without saying) in Filipino.

Incidents such as this illustrates that not even the hegemonizing of a *Pantayong Pananaw* can keep foreign-originated ideas or agenda from entering the nation's discursive boundaries (*i.e.*, boundaries are always inevitably transgressed). However, within *Pantayong Pananaw*, discoursing about such in the native language can now allow ordinary Filipinos to address such issues directly on their own (because translated in a language they understand) instead of having the educated “*Ingliseros*” constantly broker for them and hand them only pre-digested interpretations.

Clearly, then, language as a controlling element in the *Pantayong Pananaw* discourse is seen to have its own corrective mechanism. That is to say, one might enter the *talastasan* bringing what might be considered a “reactionary” agenda, but that is quite alright for as long as the people are given a chance to consider it on their own terms. And such is possible only when the medium of expression is in their language. In other words, in order to be part of the *talastasang bayan* (national discourse), one must address not merely one sector of the national society (for example, the educated elite), but the vast majority, using the same codes, the same framework of intelligibility, as the rest of the national community. To the extent that mastery of English has been the sole prerogative of the country's educated elite, *Pantayo* scholars believe that no informed public opinion can be expected to emerge. This will be the case for as long as the majority of folk are kept out of the circuit of official national discourse through linguistic marginalization and exclusion from participation. And without strong and informed public opinion, democracy is deemed to exist only in form, not in substance.

Over the past decade-and-a-half, a change in awareness and practice in this regard has been noted as most television and radio programming began shifting their linguistic medium to Filipino. Indeed on my trip back to the country in the summer of 1999 to conduct research for this project (after four years of being away), I was pleasantly surprised to find serious discussions of public issues on television for the first time being conducted in Filipino. One talk show, for example, which focused on the economy, was being hosted in Filipino by a well known academic, former government economic adviser and U.P. economics professor Solita Monsod, whose first language (judging by the peculiar accent) was obviously not Tagalog but most likely either English or another regional dialect. Yet, she struggled gamely to explain complex economic issues in Filipino. When I queried one *Pantayong Pananaw* scholar about this phenomenal change, I was told that the trend started right after the 1986 People Power Revolution, mostly in recognition of what Navarro calls

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

... *kapangyarihang bayan sa kamay ng tao, tawag natin, yung pagkilala ng kakayahan ng Pilipino anuman ang kanyang uri, anuman ang kanyang kasarian o anupaman, na makilahok* (Navarro, personal communication, July 1999).

(... the power of the nation in the hands of the people, what we call recognizing the capacity of every Filipino, regardless of class, gender, or any other group identification or belonging, to participate.)

The trend was apparently spearheaded by the largest television network, ABS-CBN, following the euphoria of the 1986 People Power Revolution which toppled the twenty-year Marcos dictatorship. Navarro notes that the station apparently decided to switch its programming to Filipino in honor of the ordinary Filipino masses' remarkable achievement in this extraordinary event. The audience response was tremendous and the channel ratings dramatically shot up. Soon, other television stations had no choice but to follow suit if only to keep up with the competition. Where before serious discussions of public issues were almost always exclusively conducted in English (save for one or two programs), today, even formerly non-Filipino speaking talk show hosts are forced to learn the language and use it. Notwithstanding the (still) heavy American twang of some of the commentators, the viewers -- now broadened beyond the usual A, B, and C audiences to include D and E audiences³⁸ (even as studio participants) -- don't seem to mind at all.

There is a sense in which the ingenuity of this linguistic prerequisite can be easily elided in its stark banality. But when one considers how for centuries, access to the discourse on knowledge and civilization has been denied the majority of the Filipinos who never quite acculturated to the alien cultures of the colonizers, the implications assume radical proportions. Much of the impact of this phenomenon operated on the psychic level and, historically, it appears that the Americans, much more than the Spaniards, appreciated the tremendous efficacy of linguistic conquest as a form of subjugation. Calling the imposition of English as "the master stroke" in America's intent to use education as the centerpiece of its colonial policy, Constantino (1997) puts it simply:

Language is a tool of the thinking process. Through language, thought develops, and the development of thought leads to the further development of language. But when a language becomes a barrier to thought, the thinking process is impeded or retarded and we have the resultant cultural stagnation. Creative thinking, analytic thinking, abstract thinking, are not fostered because the foreign language makes the student prone to memorization. Because of the mechanical process of learning, he is able to get only a general idea but not a deeper understanding. So, the tendency of students is to study in order to be able to answer correctly and to pass the examinations and thereby earn the required credits. Independent thinking is smothered because the language of learning ceases to be the language of communication outside the classroom. A student is mainly concerned with the acquisition of information. He is seldom able to utilize this information for deepening his understanding of his society's problems (page 142).

The "language problem" then, within the *Pantayong Pananaw* framework, is at the heart of the "Great Cultural Divide" between, on the one hand, the nation's acculturated elite (*i.e.*, acculturated to colonial cultures) who control the institutions of power, and on the other, the vast majority of the Filipinos whose only hope for upward mobility is through an elitist and colonial education oriented toward parasitic dependence on an alien culture to gain the status of *may pinag-aralan* (an "educated person"). In this regard, Salazar (1997a) cites a 1968 survey that bears out parents' reasons for preferring English to Filipino, namely: "1) in order to be more proficient in conversation, 2) to show that one is an educated person, 3) to get a better job, 4) to be able to travel, 5) to learn more easily, and 6) to maintain dignity and self-respect" (as cited and translated from the Filipino original in Salazar, 1997a, 18-19). It is this linking of the accouterments of education, prestige, sophistication,

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

and (tragically) even dignity and self-respect with the acquisition of the colonizer's language and culture, that *Pantayong Pananaw* scholars believe will keep the nation hostage to elitist and alien interests, and its attainment of a genuine Filipino intellectual and scientific tradition in the country, virtually impossible (Salazar, 1997a). Dutch scholar Niels Mulder (1996) who has had numerous conversations with Filipino indigenization scholars bears this out in his remarks regarding the effects of U.S. colonialism on Philippine cultural history: "Once a native history and identity had been driven out, cultural production [becomes] largely sterile, imitative, and superficial" (page 198).

In the last three decades that the framework of *Pantayong Pananaw* has been in use at U.P. Diliman, it appears that the shift in speaking context from a *pangkami* (we-speaking to others) to a *pantayo* (we-speaking among ourselves) frame of reference is the one crucial theoretical move required for each of the disciplines to begin the indigenization process and release the culture's own internal dynamic. I refer to this theoretical transformation resulting from such a move as "the politics of speaking contexts." What happens when formerly colonized peoples finally turn from having to defend and explain themselves to others and instead begin to concentrate speaking together among themselves? What different sort of problems, topics of conversations, issues, and concerns arise when they no longer have outsiders to constantly reference, address, please, scapegoat, or, simply, react to? How differently might the dialogue proceed and what different sorts of stories would be told? What differing priorities would be set? How differently would knowledge construction about themselves and the world proceed? Salazar (1983b) asks,

Indeed, what would happen if... Filipinos ceased to be the object of [other powers'] historical moulding? Clearly, they would then acquire an historical will of their own, constituting themselves into a different historical unit which possessed its own model of action in the world (a destiny, in fact), an explanation for such an independent historical activity" (page 110).

Rather than a forced homogenization from having to fight a common enemy, perhaps, a "remaking [of] the nation in its complex cultural and ideological heterogeneity" could ensue (Werbner and Modood, 1997, 235).

Bagong Kasaysayan: The New Historiography

The corpus of work that has been taking shape within *Pantayong Pananaw* in response to these questions is what is now called *Bagong Kasaysayan*, or the New Historiography. This work, now spanning three generations of scholars,³⁹ appears to have succeeded in establishing a solid foundation for a new intellectual tradition in Philippine historiography written and taught entirely in Filipino. Navarro (personal communication, July 1999) notes that for most young people entering college, this is now the dominant paradigm taught with only a minority of the faculty still teaching in the old Western tradition. As a disciplinary discourse, *Bagong Kasaysayan* now has a well-developed methodology grounded in the indigenous/native conception of history ("*kasaysayan*") as focused on drawing out the *saysay* (meaning, sense, or relevance) of events for a constituent people. But it is not unacquainted with the Western conception of history (*historia*) either, a methodology introduced at the U.P. History Department as early as 1910. This latter's primary emphasis is on the mere reporting (*ulat*) of the results of a critical examination of events (*siyasat*) without explicit reference to any constituent audience or identified sets of interests. Salazar (1983b) explains that while the tradition of *kasaysayan* began in the oral literatures of the ethnic communities, *i.e.*, in the *awit* (songs), *epiko* (epics), and *mitolohiya* (mythology), it began taking on a critical turn in the revolutionary writings of Bonifacio and other *Katipunan* leaders. Today, in formal historiographic training and practice, elements from the tradition of *historia* are appropriated into the methodology of *kasaysayan* but framed critically. To reiterate Salazar's (1983b) notion of *kasaysayan*:

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

Kasaysayan comes from *saysay* which means both “to relate in detail, to explain” and “value, worth, significance.” In one sense, therefore, *Kasaysayan* is story (like the German *Geschichte* or another Tagalog term, *salaysay*, which is probably simply an extended form of *saysay*). But *kasaysayan* is also “explanation,” “significance,” or “relevance” (as in *may saysay* “significant, relevant”; or its negated meaning of *walang saysay* or *walang kasaysayan*, meaning “irrelevant; senseless”). What was then important to us was the story and its significance, in so far as this could be explained and made relevant to a particular group (page 108).

Historia, on the other hand, carries with it the three senses of: “1) history as chronicle, or the sequential occurrence of events; 2) history as a discipline based on positivism which is mostly limited to the use of the scientific method in examining written records; and finally, 3) the Anglo-American notion of ‘history’ as interpretation which is still premised on an outsider’s ethnocentric point of view” (Navarro *et al.*, 1997, 4; Navarro, 2000, 10-11 as translated from the Filipino original). In effect, *Bagong Kasaysayan* seeks to combine the indigenous perspective on history as *kasaysayan* and the Western historiographic methods but with the important difference of having *Pantayong Pananaw* serve as the controlling framework of interpretation. In a move rejecting the notion that Filipino nationhood is nothing more than the product of its experience of, and reaction to, colonial imposition and initiative, *Bagong Kasaysayan*, in its various research studies, strives to surface the cultural nation’s own internal dynamic and encourage the flourishing of the same by adequately representing it in its theorizing practices. As Covar comments in this regard, the movement for indigenization is a “concerted, deliberate effort to establish a new order of life [of which]... [c]olonization is merely a temporary detraction” (Covar in Azurin, 1993, xii). Thus, even periodisation within this tradition would differ from the normative mode of cutting up Philippine history according to whichever colonial power dominated it at any given moment, for example, “Spanish Period,” “American Period,” or “Japanese Interlude,” which had the effect of imbedding the colonial element ever more deeply in the historical imagination. Instead, periodisation in the New Historiography seeks to highlight the Filipino native culture’s own internal dynamics, achievements, and persistent thrust toward preserving their *kabuuan* (“totality”) and integrity. Periodisation in the *Bagong Kasaysayan* then would proceed as follows: 1) the period of the reign of *pantayong pananaw* among the ethnolinguistic communities prior to contact with Europe (pre-1565); 2) the persistence of the power of *pantayong pananaw* during the period of colonial and neocolonial domination or *historia* (1565-1970); and 3) the period of the construction of *Bagong Kasaysayan* (1970-present). A defining principle in this radical revisioning of historical periodisation is the recuperation of the repressed history (story) of the Filipino people themselves and the tracing of this internal story’s stubborn persistence, triumph, and continuity through all attempts to extinguish and supplant it with an alien *historia*. Therefore, it is a story told by Filipinos to fellow Filipinos for the benefit of Filipinos using their own models of telling and making sense.

Another direction taken by *Bagong Kasaysayan* is the development of a *Pansila* discourse (*sila*, meaning, “they” or “others”). This is envisioned to be the equivalent of “Area Studies” in Western discourse. It goes without saying that knowledge production in *Pansila* is conducted in Filipino and viewed from a *pook Pantayo* or the standpoint of *Pantayo*. This is the movement’s way of expanding its body of knowledge about the world by building its own discourse on other nations. Under the *Pansila* project, the goal is to develop a Filipino discourse on other cultures and civilizations in ways that collectively benefit the Filipino people -- a taken-for-granted project in the case of every other nation with its own *kabuuan* or a comprehensive sense of who they are as a people. Areas of expertise currently being developed in this regard are on the neighboring Asian countries, especially those of Southeast Asia, and on countries that have strategic on-going relations with the Philippines, in particular, those hosting large Filipino populations (mostly Filipino overseas contract workers), notably, the Marianas Islands, Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, Guam, and West Asia. Ferdinand C. Llanes (1994) explains in this regard,

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

Where, before, historians were generally limited to Philippine relations with the United States or Spain, now we could see a reorienting of this perspective. Not only would such a step pull us away from the old school of Philippine diplomatic relations (that is, limited to the United States) but also bring us to the Austronesian context of our civilization in Southeast Asia. The Malayo-Polynesian foundation of our language, for example, which we share with our closest neighbors, is one strand of that context that we are also seeking to bring into focus (page 8).

With Filipino interest serving as the controlling principle in the study of the “other,” the resulting area expertise hopes to cease to be a mere mirror-image of its U.S. counterpart (as has been the norm in the past). The aim is to produce a body of knowledge directly accessed from a distinctively Filipino perspective and rendered useful/usable to the Filipino people.

In a way then, having one’s own strong sense of *kabuuan* (totality) now allows for appropriation (*pag-aangkin*) of foreign knowledge without being unduly overwhelmed or impressed by such and without reinscribing psychic domination. This is now possible because the spirit and direction of appropriation is clear (that is, it is clear as to whose organizing principle is employed in the act of appropriating). *Pantayo* scholars insist that appropriation is useful only when made with the end in view of benefiting Filipinos at all times. While this self-oriented bias is merely a given in other nation’s relations with, and study of, others (Japan, for example, is cited as having a well-developed store of knowledge on the Philippines encoded in its own language and interpreted from a distinctively Japanese perspective; likewise, France, Germany, United States, and many other countries), the Philippines has yet to constitute its own ethno-centered point of view or *kabuuan* both in regard to its own understanding of itself and its understanding of others.

It is this that makes three decades of *Pantayong Pananaw* and more than a decade of *Bagong Kasaysayan* seem like barely scratching the surface, so to speak. The task is no longer just one of revision (which still implies reaction only to what exists) but of totally new attempts at (re-)construction, at “‘tracing’ or ‘revealing’ that which has never been written about because we were following leads set for us by another foreign discourse” (Salazar, personal communication, July 1999). It appears then that the work of *Pantayo* scholars has barely just begun, but the momentum having thus started, the thrust toward historical revival and recovery seems to be well on its way and today vibrantly continues.

One offshoot of that dynamic is the formation of a nationwide movement which extends beyond the walls of the academy called *ADHIKA ng Pilipinas, Inc.*, (roughly meaning, Aspiration/Vision for the Philippines) or *Asosasyon ng mga Dalubhasa, may Hilig, at Interes sa Kasaysayan* (Association of Specialists and those with Inclination Toward and Interest in History). Founded in 1989, its membership extends to elementary school teachers and local community leaders, along with scholars in the university. The goal of *ADHIKA* is “to foster transformation in the social sciences and philosophy in general, and in historiography, in particular” (*ADHIKA* brochure, as translated from the Filipino original). According to its statement of purpose:

Pinahalagahan ng ADHIKA ang bagong metodolohiya na isinasaalang-alang ang katutubong kultura at kaalaman upang maunawaan ang mga kaganapan at masilip ang pagpapakahulugang Pilipino. Hindi na mula sa mata ng banyaga ang pag-unawa, kundi batay sa sariling panamdang at pananaw. Ang pananaliksik ay hindi lamang batay sa dokumento kundi sa kabuuan ng lipunan (ADHIKA brochure).

(*ADHIKA* values the new methodology that takes into consideration the indigenous cultures and knowledges so that these may be understood and their meanings apprehended from the Filipino point of view. Understanding is no longer from the

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

perspective of foreigners. And research is no longer just based on documents but on the whole of society.)

Part of the group's staple activities are annual conferences that feature educational trips to historic places in the provinces where the history and culture of the locality is studied and promoted. A sample of its convention themes since its inauguration in 1989 shows a focus on formerly neglected issues and their relevance and implications for the contemporary period. It has dealt with topics such as "Filipino Historiography," "Commemorating the Centennial of *Fili* [one of Filipino nationalist Jose Rizal's anti-Spanish novels]," "Commemorating the Women and the Minorities in the Revolution," "Mindanao [southernmost region of the Philippines] and the Muslims in the 1896 Revolution," and "Bonifacio 100, the Making of a Filipino Consciousness: The Revolution in the Formation of the Nation" (as translated from the Filipino original).

From *Pantayong Pananaw's* original conceptualization in the early 1970s to its elaboration by subsequent generations of scholars, the discourse appears to have succeeded not only in effectively evolving its own disciplinary tradition of historiography in the nation's leading state university. More importantly, it has demonstrated the possibility of producing a whole new body of knowledge in the native language that has potential for transforming knowledge production in the academy in general. Notably, its core theoretical perspective, together with its methodological rigor, once adopted by any other discipline, has the potential of producing a whole new discourse on Filipino culture and civilization.

In the last decade or so, the discourse of *Pantayong Pananaw/Bagong Kasaysayan* appears to have reached a level of maturity and sophistication beyond its initial articulation by Salazar. What has helped in this regard is the confidence of second- and third-generation of *Pantayong Pananaw* scholars to take the discourse onto other levels and other arenas of engagement not necessarily sanctioned by the movement pioneer, Salazar, albeit inspired by the latter's original thought. Another is the engagement of scholars who, while appreciative of the discourse's basic perspective, have likewise offered critical feedback with regard some of its perceived weaknesses and (intended or unintended) foreclosures. A helpful critique in particular is Guillermo's critical essay, "Exposition, Critique, and New Directions for Pantayong Pananaw" which appeared in the 2003 issue of the online *Kyoto Review of Southeast Asia*. Here, Guillermo raises important theoretical and methodological concerns that *Pantayong Pananaw* adherents would do well to wrestle with and take seriously. Some of these concerns have to do with tensions between "understanding" and "explanation," the "problem of ideology" and the power relations that characterize the gulf between scientific discourse and popular practice, and the plural (non-unitary) interpretation/conceptualization of social phenomena that precludes the unproblematic assumption of a nativist position in defining a singular "Filipino" historiographic perspective as normative.⁴⁰ Guillermo's critique, as well as *Pantayong Pananaw* proponents' response to such (e.g. Navarro, 2005), may yet model a type of productive engagement that can push theorizing in the tradition of *Pantayong Pananaw* towards new and even more exciting directions.

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

Endnotes

¹ For decades, long after direct American rule ended in the Philippines in 1946, English served as the official language of state bureaucracy and education in the Philippines. As Enriquez (1992) notes, “The English language and the American system of education proved to be the most efficient instruments for the noble purpose” of realizing U.S. President William McKinley’s mission to “civilize and Christianize the islanders” (page 9). Only with the ratification of the new Philippine Constitution of 1987 did the Filipino language gain adoption as the official Philippine language, but still alongside English. Not until May 29, 1989 did the UP System vote to adopt Filipino for use in its classrooms, thus ending English’s near century-old linguistic hegemony in the premier state educational institution (cf. Abueva, 1995).

² Now Protacio-De Castro.

³ A version of this personality test is said to still be in use and found “effective” for testing potential hires in the industry (Cipres-Ortega, personal communication, July 1999).

⁴ These three -- Enriquez, Covar, and Salazar -- would constitute the triumvirate in the indigenization movement, each making strategic contributions to the common endeavor of constructing a national discourse on civilization.

⁵ At the time of his death in 1994, he had a pending contract to teach at the University of Michigan as Visiting Professor.

⁶ A term taken ambivalently. *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* distinguishes “nationalism from below” (grounded in people’s discourse) versus “official state nationalism” (premised on the elitist discourse) aligning itself with the former and repudiating the latter.

⁷ Literally, wooden shoes -- the usual footwear of ordinary folk.

⁸ An intentional corruption of the local name “Pedro” or “Peter” in English, giving it a distinctly Filipino accent.

⁹ Note this characteristic expression (reminiscent of Fanonian discourse) from one advocate:

Ang “kultura” ng mga mapagsamantalang uri ay hiram, artipisyal, at di magiging sarili kailanman, sapagkat kumakatas lamang ng sustansya sa banyaga, nakikingatngat lamang sa ibang kalamnan. Linta sa paghuhuthot ng dugong bayan sa larangan ng kabuhayan, ang mapagsamantalang “lipunan” ay linta pa rin sa paggaya, pagsunod, at pagpakita ng napulot lamang sa larangan ng kalinangan (Salazar, 1997a, 15).

(The “culture” of the ruling class is borrowed, artificial, and, till kingdom come, will never be its own. This is because it only sucks nourishment from the colonizer, parasitically feeding upon a rotting carcass. Like leeches sucking the nation dry of its wealth, such exploiters of society are pathetic in their utter mimicry, subservience, and display of nothing more than the crumbs of sophistication they happen to have picked up from other cultures.)

¹⁰ For other examples of this massive attempt to execute a reversal on the negative system of stereotypes on Filipino values, see Jocano (1997) and the monograph publication series of an interdisciplinary group of Filipino scholars, *Mamamathala* (Seekers of the Divine), on Filipino spiritual culture and Filipino leadership (too numerous to list here, published in pamphlet format without any publication information).

¹¹ From the saying, “*Ang kapwa ay sarili rin*” (the “other” is also oneself). It connotes the shared being of all humanity. De Leon clarifies in this regard, “Thus, *pakikipagkapwa* (the act of sharing one’s being) is always for the good, always for a positive purpose. It is in essence a sacred act. There is never an instance in *pakikipagkapwa* for something negative or evil” (personal communication, June 1999).

¹² From one of my conversations with Maggay in this regard, she expressed her belief that every culture has its own “inherent giftings.” These unique inherent giftings in her view may undergo *formalistic* transformations in the course of time and in engagement with various exogenous influences, but that they are nonetheless “enduring.” When I questioned what a multicultural society such as the United States might have by way of such an “inherent cultural gifting,” she replied unequivocally, “the art of mass production” -- an observation I found quite interesting (personal communication, June 1999).

¹³ See Fanon’s (1963) eloquent depiction of the effects of colonialism:

Colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native’s brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of the people, and distorts, disfigures and destroys (page 210).

¹⁴ See Cipres-Ortega, 1980; De Leon, 1981, 1990; Sevilla, 1982; Samson, 1982; Mataragnon, 1982; Pe-Pua, 1982, 1990; Salazar, 1983a; Alejo, 1990; Avila-Sta. Maria, 1996; Pe-Pua and Protacio-Marcelino, 1998, among others.

¹⁵ The normal semestral teaching load for UP faculty is 4/4 a year.

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

¹⁶ The fact that most *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* faculty have already secured their tenure and are now in the phase of moving on to other midlife priorities than career seems to afford them the choice of slowing down on publications, unlike the younger untenured group of Western-trained and oriented faculty who are left with no choice but to “publish or perish.”

¹⁷ The controversy as to whether diasporic Filipinos are to be considered “foreigners,” or -- within the scope of what is broadly defined as “Filipino identity” -- still part of the Filipino national community, is one of the contentious points in the theorizing of Filipino identities.

¹⁸ Cf. Protacio-Marcelino, Dela Cruz, Balanon, Camacho, and Yacat, 2000; Protacio-Marcelino, Dela Cruz, Camacho, and Balanon, 2000; Dela Cruz, Protacio, Balanon, Francisco, and Yacat, 2001; Dela Cruz, Protacio-De Castro, Balanon, Yacat, and Francisco, 2002; Protacio-De Castro, Balanon, Camacho, Ong, Verba, and Yacat, 2002; Protacio-De Castro, Camacho, Balanon, Yacat, Galang, and Ong, 2003; Balanon, Puzon, and Camacho, 2003; Trinidad, Cloma, Ong, and Bunyi, 2003; and Cloma, Ong, Bunyi, Balanon, and Yacat, 2003.

¹⁹ Cf. Aguilin-Dalisay, Mendoza, Santos, and Echevaria, 1995; Aguilin-Dalisay, Mendoza, Mirafelix, Yacat, Sto. Domingo, and Bambico, 2000; and Aguilin-Dalisay and Jagmis-Socrates, 2000.

²⁰ Cf. Javier, 2000; Maggay, 2002; Antonio and Tiamson-Rubin, 2003; and Torres-Yu and Aguirre, 2004.

²¹ Cf. Obusan and Enriquez, 1994; Orteza, 1997; Aquino, 1999; Protacio-Marcelino and Pe-Pua, 1999; Pe-Pua and Protacio-Marcelino, 2002; Salazar, 2004; Javier, 2005; and Pe-Pua, 2005.

²² Despite his fluency in other languages, upon coming back from his studies abroad, Salazar began teaching in Filipino. This was as early as 1968.

²³ It must be noted that within the general framework of indigenization, difference as such need not spell a barrier to national unity (cf. Azurin, 1993). For that matter, even the Muslim separatist challenge in Southern Philippines needs to be put in perspective. When understood complexly as constituted not merely by an internal dynamic of self-determination by a people claiming inherently separate histories and exclusive domains from the Philippine nation but as much a product of insidious manipulations of ethnic loyalties by the American colonial policy of divide-and-rule at the turn of the century, one begins to gain appreciation for the kind of meticulous historical recuperation enabled by more indigenous, decolonized perspectives that give access to a very different kind of reading (see Azurin, 1996, for a compelling account of the suppressed story behind the dominant narrative of Moro history as being one long continuous resistance to colonial rule).

²⁴ Again, not to presume a pre-constituted internal homogeneity, but rather a consensus built (or in the process of being built) from the ground up, that is, out of the plural cultures and traditions of the various ethnolinguistic communities speaking together and undertaking responsibility for their own knowledge production.

²⁵ Compelling evidence of this is his recent annotated translation into Filipino of Karl Marx’s *Communist Manifesto* from the German original (cf. Marx and Engels, 2000).

²⁶ A colloquial term for “Filipino.”

²⁷ More will be said later on the particular theorization of this notion of the divide between the elite and the majority of the Filipino masses.

²⁸ In Gramsci’s (1971) terms, as “organic intellectuals.”

²⁹ Ironically, Constantino (1997) himself, while a consistent writer in English, similarly affirms in this regard: Certain directions can help in the assertion of unique Asian ways of thinking and living. One is for intellectuals to insist on the use of the national language. As Jose Rizal once declared, “Whoever does not love his or her own language is worse than rotten fish.” For language is the expression of culture and the embodiment of national power. The first thing that colonizers did to quell resistance and erase racial memory was to impose their own language on the colonized. Invariably, anti-colonial struggles were carried forward by the use of the national language to assert a distinct identity and a clear sense of nationhood” (page 7).

³⁰ Currently, a Tri-College Faculty set-up with a rotating Chair and Committee has been approved in principle by the participating units in UP Diliman, namely, the Asian Center, KAL, and DAPP. This arrangement is meant to service the Philippine Studies Program and accommodate faculty not housed in a particular department (such as Covar who is now retired); however, to this writing, the plan has yet to be implemented.

³¹ Cf. Kellner’s (1989) clarification of Critical Theorists’ notion of “totality” for a similar notion of the term (pages 47-48).

³² Salazar and I at one point debated on whether or not the pronouns *kami* and *tayo* corresponded to the “we-exclusive” and “we-inclusive” distinction in English. He believes they do, but I begged to differ in that my own thought is that they are in fact inversely correspondent. And this is because if *tayo* means “we-inclusive,” it would

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

in effect be including outsiders, whereas in the context of *kami* or “we-exclusive,” one excludes them. In the end, he did straighten out my confusion by clarifying that in the context of *pantayo*, “outsiders don’t exist, whereas in *pangkami*, they exist and they are central to our thought although you’re excluding them” (personal communication, June 1999). In other words, in *Pantayong Pananaw*, both the speakers and the addressees belong to the same discursive community sharing the same codes, interests, context, and meaning, *i.e.*, a situation prevailing in a closed circuit of interaction.

³³ Rimonte (1997) notes, “The other is the colonizer, representative of everything one regards as superior and therefore longs for” (page 42). She quotes W.E.B. DuBois on the phenomenon of the internalized other:

It is a peculiar sensation, this double consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels this twoness... two souls, two unreconciled strivings, two warring ideals in one dark body whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder (page 42).

³⁴ Cf. Salazar’s (1997b) diagram on the parallel but distinct tracks of the *ladino/creole/ilustrado*-led agitations for reforms from the 1700s onwards, on the one hand, and the *barangay*-led ethnic uprisings that culminated in the 1896 nationwide revolutionary uprising of the *Katipunan* mass movement fighting for no less than total independence, on the other. The former movement, inspired by the ideals of the French and Latin American revolutions, is deemed to have led to the formation of the “official” *nacion*. The latter, on the other hand, is seen as constituting the birth pangs of a “cultural” nation or *bayan* rooted more in the people’s indigenous cultures and traditions (page 11).

³⁵ For example, the likes of Iletto, 1979, 1998; Agoncillo, 1956, 1960; Agoncillo and Guerrero, 1977; Constantino, 1975a, 1975b.

³⁶ Such scholars’ consternation is further aggravated by tauntings from *Pantayong Pananaw* proponents openly labeling English-speakers as “*Ingliseros*,” a derogatory term connoting a bunch of “wannabes.”

³⁷ That is, the movement that launched the 1896 nationwide uprising against Spain.

³⁸ A system of classification used by media practitioners to segment audiences based on economic status; A, B, and C, referring to upper, upper middle, and middle classes, and D and E to the lower income brackets.

³⁹ Cf. Navarro *et al.*, 1997, 187-192 for a comprehensive listing of representative publications including master’s theses and doctoral dissertations covering the last three decades. Some of the more recent publications include Santillan and Conde (1998), Salazar (1999), and Marx and Engels (2000).

⁴⁰ At most, Guillermo advocates only a “broadly nationalist and critical viewpoint towards the development of an autonomous dynamic for the development of Philippine social sciences closely articulated with the aspirations of the Filipino people.”

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

References

- Abueva, J.V. (1995). *Filipino sa Siglo 21*. Quezon City: Sentro ng Wikang Filipino, University of the Philippines.
- Agoncillo, T.A. (1956). *Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Agoncillo, T.A. (1960). *Malolos: The Crisis of the Republic*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Agoncillo, T.A. and Guerrero, M.C. (1977). *History of the Filipino People*. 5th Edition. Quezon City: R.P. Garcia Publishing.
- Aguiling-Dalisay, G. and Jagmis-Socrates, N. (2000). *Usapang Lalake; Paglalahad ng mga Lalaking Cuyonon*. Quezon City: Pambansang Samahan sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino.
- Aguiling-Dalisay, G.; Mendoza, R.M.; Mirafelix, E.J.L.; Yacat, J.A.; Sto. Domingo, M.R.; and Bambico, F.R. (2000). *Pagkalalake; Men in Control? Filipino Male Views on Love, Sex & Women*. Quezon City: Pambansang Samahan sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino.
- Aguiling-Dalisay, G.; Mendoza, R.M.; Santos, J.B.; and Echevaria, A. (1995). *Luto ng Diyos; Mga Kuwento ng Buhay Mag-asawa*. Quezon City: Akademya ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino Publishing House. Revised edition, Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- Aguiling-Dalisay, G.; Yacat, J.A.; and Navarro, A.M. (2004). *Extending the Self: Volunteering as Pakikipagkapwa*. Quezon City: Center for Leadership, Citizenship and Democracy, National College of Public Administration and Governance, University of the Philippines.
- Alejo, A.E. (1990). *Tao po! Tuloy! Isang Landas ng Pag-unawa sa Loob ng Tao*. Quezon City: Office of Research and Publications, Ateneo de Manila University.
- Aquino, C.C. (1999). *Mula sa Kinaroroonan: Kapwa, Kapatiran at Bayan sa Agham Panlipunan. Professorial Chair Paper*.
- Antonio, L.F. and Tiamson-Rubin, L. (editors) (2003). *Sikolohiya ng Wikang Filipino (Mga Simulain, Pamamaraan at Nilalaman)*. Quezon City: C & E Publishing, Inc.
- Avila-Sta. Maria, M. (1996, December). Is the Indigenization Crisis in Philippine Social Sciences Resolved in Sikolohiyang Pilipino? *Layag*, 1 (1).
- Azurin, A.M. (1993). *Reinventing the Filipino Sense of Being and Becoming*. Quezon City: CSSP Publications and University of the Philippines Press.
- Azurin, A.M. (1996). *Beyond the Cult of Dissidence in Southern Philippines and Wartorn Zones in the Global Village*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press and Center for Integrative and Development Studies, University of the Philippines.
- Balanon, T.; Puzon, M.; and Camacho, A.Z.V. (editors) (2003). *Emerging Good Practices: A Documentation of the Experiences and Learning of Save the Children UK's Programme for Abused and Exploited Children*. Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies Program on Psychosocial Trauma and Human Rights, University of the Philippines.

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Cipres-Ortega, S. (1980, May 6). Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Mga Implikasyon sa Pagtuturo at Pag-aaral. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines*. Philippine Normal College, Manila.

Cloma, E.; Ong, M.G.; Bunyi, P.; Balanon, F.A.G., and Yacat, J.A. (2003). *Training Manual: Teaching Peace, Human Rights and Conflict Resolution*. Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies Program on Psychosocial Trauma and Human Rights, University of the Philippines.

Constantino, R. (1975a). *The Philippines: A Past Revisited*. Quezon City: Tala Publishing Services.

Constantino, R. (1975b). *A History of the Philippines: From the Spanish Colonization to the Second World War*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Constantino, R. (1997). Globalization and Intellectual Tradition. *Diliman Review*, 45 (1).

Covar, P.R. (1991). Pilipinolohiya. In V.V. Bautista and R. Pe-Pua (editors), *Pilipinolohiya: Kasaysayan, Pilosopiya at Pananaliksik*. Manila: Kalikasan Press.

Dela Cruz, M.T.; Protacio, E.; Balanon, F.A.G.; Francisco, C.; and Yacat, J.A. (2001). *Trust and Power: Child Abuse in the Eyes of the Child and the Parent*. Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies Program on Psychosocial Trauma and Human Rights, University of the Philippines.

Dela Cruz, M.T.; Protacio-De Castro, E.; Balanon, F.A.G.; Yacat, J.A.; and Francisco, C. (2002). *Small Steps, Great Strides: Doing Participatory Action Research with Children*. Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies Program on Psychosocial Trauma and Human Rights, University of the Philippines.

De Leon, Jr., F.M. (1981). Towards a People's Art. *Lipunan*, 3.

De Leon, Jr., F.M. (1990). The Roots of a People's Art in Indigenous Psychology. In V.G. Enriquez (editor), *Indigenous Psychology: A Book of Readings*. Quezon City: Akademya ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino.

Diokno, M.S.I. (1997). Philippine Nationalist Historiography and the Challenge of New Paradigms. *Diliman Review*, 45 (1-2), 8-13.

Enriquez, V.G. (1976). Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Perspektibo at Direksyon. In L.F. Antonio, E.S. Reyes, R.E. Pe, and N.R. Almonte (editors), *Ulat ng Unang Pambansang Kumperensya sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino*. Quezon City: Pambansang Samahan sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino.

Enriquez, V.G. (1978, January-December). Kapwa: A Core Concept in Filipino Social Psychology. *Philippine Social Sciences and Humanities Review*, 42 (1-4).

Enriquez, V.G. (1985). The Development of Psychological Thought in the Philippines. In A. Aganon at M. David (editors), *Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Isyu, Pananaw at Kaalaman (New Directions in Indigenous Psychology)*. Manila: National Book Store.

Enriquez, V.G. (1989). *Indigenous Psychology and National Consciousness*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

- Enriquez, V.G. (1990). *Indigenous Psychology: A Book of Readings*. Quezon City: Akademya ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino.
- Enriquez, V.G. (1991). *Ang Sikolohiyang Malaya sa Panahon ng Krisis*. Quezon City: Akademya ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino.
- Enriquez, V.G. (1992). *From Colonial Liberation to Liberation Psychology: The Philippine Experience*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Enriquez, V.G. (1994). *Pagbabangong-Dangal: Indigenous Psychology and Cultural Empowerment*. Quezon City: Akademya ng Kultura at Sikolohiyang Pilipino.
- Enriquez, V.G. (1997). Filipino Psychology: Concepts and Method. In H.S.R. Kao and D. Sinha (editors), *Asian Perspectives on Psychology*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Fallows, J. (1987, November). A Damaged Culture: A New Philippines? *Atlantic Monthly*.
- Fanon, F.O. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, Inc.
- Gerlach, L.P. and Hine, V.H. (1970). *People, Power, Change: Movements of Social Transformation*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Q. Hoare and G.N. Smith (editors and translators). New York: International Publishers.
- Guillermo, R.G. (2003, March). Exposition, Critique, and New Directions for Pantayong Pananaw. *Kyoto Review of Southeast Asia*, 3.
- Ileto, R.C. (1979). *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Ileto, R.C. (1998). *Filipinos and Their Revolution: Event, Discourse, and Historiography*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Javier, R.E. (editor) (2000). *Filipino ang Wika; Pilipino ang Diwa*, Quezon City: Pambansang Samahan sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino.
- Javier, R.E. (2005). Pangpamamaraang Kaangkinan ng Pakikipagkuwentuhan. *Binhi*, 2005-2.
- Jocano, F.L. (1997). *Filipino Value System*. Metro Manila: Punlad Research House, Inc.
- Kellner, D. (1989). *Critical Theory, Marxism, and Modernity*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Licuanan, P. (1988, April 27). A Moral Recovery Program: Building a People-Building Nation. Study submitted to Senator Leticia Ramos-Shahani. Senate of the Philippines, Manila.
- Llanes, F.C. (1994, September 18-22). A New National Perspective in Filipino Historiography. Paper presented at the *International Workshop on Historiography and National History*. Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Negara Brunei Darussalam.
- Maggay, M.P. (1993). *Pagbabalik-loob: A Second Look at the Moral Recovery Program*. Quezon City: Akademya ng Kultura at Sikolohiyang Pilipino.

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

- Maggay, M.P. (1995). *Pahiwatig: Di-Tuwirang Pagpapahayag sa Konteksto ng Kulturang Pilipino*. Doctoral Dissertation in Philippine Studies. University of the Philippines.
- Maggay, M.P. (2002). *Pahiwatig: Kagawiang Pangkomunikasyon ng Filipino*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Marx, K and Engels, F. (2000). *Manifesto ng Partido Komunista*. Z.A. Salazar (editor and translator). Quezon City: Palimbagan ng Lahi.
- Mataragnon, R.H. (1982). The Case for an Indigenous Psychology. In R. Pe-Pua (editor), *Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Teorya, Metodo at Gamit (Filipino Psychology: Theory, Method and Application)*. Quezon City: Surian ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino.
- May, G.A. (1997). *Inventing a Hero: The Posthumous Recreation of Andres Bonifacio*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- Mignolo, W.D. (1999). Globalization, Civilization Processes, and the Relocation of Languages and Cultures. In F. Jameson and M. Miyoshi (editors), *The Cultures of Globalization*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Mulder, N. (1996). *Inside Southeast Asia*. Amsterdam: The Pepin Press.
- Navarro, A.M. (2000). Ang Bagong Kasaysayan sa Wikang Filipino: Kalikasan, Kaparaanan, Pagsasakasaysayan. *Bagong Kasaysayan*, 11.
- Navarro, A.M. (2005, March). Externalizing Pantayo or Localizing Pantayo: A Review of *Pook at Paninindigan: Mga Ugat ng Talastasang Sosyalista sa Rebolusyong Pilipino* by Ramon Guillermo. *Kyoto Review of Southeast Asia*, 6.
- Navarro, A.M.; Rodriguez, M.J.B.; and Villan, V.C. (editors) (1997). *Pantayong Pananaw: Ugat at Kabuluhan; Pambungad sa Pag-aaral ng Bagong Kasaysayan*. Mandaluyong City: Palimbagan Kalawakan. Revised edition, Quezon City: Palimbagan ng Lahi, 2000.
- Obusan, T.B. and Enriquez, A.R. (editors) (1994). *Pamamaraan: Indigenous Knowledge and Evolving Research Paradigms*. Quezon City: Asian Center, University of the Philippines.
- Orteza, G.O. (1997). Pakikipagkuwentuhan: Isang Pamamaraan ng Sama-samang Pananaliksik, Pagpapatotoo, at Pagtulong sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino. *PPRTH Occasional Papers Series No. 1*. Quezon City: Philippine Psychology Research and Training House.
- Pe-Pua, R. (editor) (1982). *Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Teorya, Metodo at Gamit (Filipino Psychology: Theory, Method and Application)*. Quezon City: Surian ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino.
- Pe-Pua, R. (1990). Pagtatanong-tanong: A Method for Cross-Cultural Research. In V.G. Enriquez (editor), *Indigenous Psychology: A Book of Readings*, Quezon City: Akademya ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino.
- Pe-Pua, R. (1991). UP Pioneers in Indigenous Psychology. In B.A. Aquino (editor), *The University Experience: Essays on the 82nd Anniversary of the University of the Philippines*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Pe-Pua, R. (2005). Kros-Katutubong Perspektibo sa Metodolohiya: Ang Karanasan ng Pilipinas. *Binhi*, 2005-1.

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

- Pe-Pua, R. and Protacio-Marcelino, E. (1998, August). Sikolohiyang Pilipino (Filipino Psychology): A Legacy of Virgilio G. Enriquez. Paper presented at the *IACCP Conference on Forty Years of Cross-Cultural and Indigenous Research in the Philippines*. Bellingham, Washington State, USA.
- Pe-Pua, R. and Protacio-Marcelino, E. (2002). *Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Pamana ni Virgilio G. Enriquez. Binhi, 2002-1*.
- Pletsch, C.E. (1981). The Three Worlds, or the Division of Social Scientific Labor, circa 1950-1975. *Comparative Study of Society and History*, 23 (4).
- Protacio-De Castro, E.; Balanon, F.A.G.; Camacho, A.Z.V.; Ong, M.G.; Verba, A.G.; and Yacat, J.A. (2002). *Integrating Child-Centered Approaches in Children's Work*. Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies Program on Psychosocial Trauma and Human Rights, University of the Philippines.
- Protacio-De Castro, E.; Camacho, A.Z.V.; Balanon, F.A.G.; Yacat, J.A.; Galang, M.T.; and Ong, M.G. (2003). *Handbook for Social Workers on Basic Bio-Psychosocial Help for Children in Need of Special Protection*. Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies Program on Psychosocial Trauma and Human Rights, University of the Philippines.
- Protacio-Marcelino, E.; Dela Cruz, M.T.; Balanon, F.A.G.; Camacho, A.Z.V.; and Yacat, J.A. (2000). *Child Abuse in the Philippines: An Integrated Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography*. Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies Program on Psychosocial Trauma and Human Rights, University of the Philippines.
- Protacio-Marcelino, E.; Dela Cruz, M.T.; Camacho, A.Z.V.; and Balanon, F.A.G. (2000). *Torture of Children in Situations of Armed Conflict: The Philippine Experience*. Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies Program on Psychosocial Trauma and Human Rights, University of the Philippines.
- Protacio-Marcelino, E. and Pe-Pua, R. (editors) (1999). *Unang Dekada ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Kaalaman, Gamit at Etika*. Quezon City: Pambansang Samahan sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino.
- Rimonte, N. (1997). Colonialism's Legacy: The Inferiorizing of the Filipino. In M.P.P. Root (editor), *Filipino Americans: Transformation and Identity*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Salazar, Z.A. (1983a). Ethnic Psychology and History: The Study of Faith Healing in the Philippines. In Z.A. Salazar (editor), *The Ethnic Dimension: Papers on Philippine Culture, History and Psychology*. Cologne: Counselling Center for Filipinos, Caritas Association for the City of Cologne.
- Salazar, Z.A. (1983b). The Legacy of the Propaganda: The Tripartite View of Philippine History. In Z.A. Salazar (editor), *The Ethnic Dimension: Papers on Philippine Culture, History and Psychology*. Cologne: Counselling Center for Filipinos, Caritas Association for the City of Cologne.
- Salazar, Z.A. (1991). Ang Pantayong Pananaw bilang Diskursong Pangkabihasan. In V.V. Bautista and R. Pe-Pua (editors), *Pilipinolohiya: Kasaysayan, Pilosopiya at Pananaliksik*. Manila: Kalikasan Press.
- Salazar, Z.A. (1997a). Ang Pagtuturo ng Kasaysayan sa Pilipino. In A.M. Navarro, M.J.B. Rodriguez, and V.C. Villan (editors), *Pantayong Pananaw: Ugat at Kabuluhan; Pambungad sa Pag-aaral ng Bagong Kasaysayan*. Mandaluyong City: Palimbagang Kalawakan.

Mula sa Atoy Navarro at Flordeliza Lagbao-Bolante, eds. *Mga Babasahin sa Agham Panlipunang Pilipino: Sikolohiyang Pilipino, Pilipinolohiya, at Pantayong Pananaw*. Lungsod Quezon: C&E Publishing, 2007, 241-297.

Salazar, Z.A. (1997b). Si Bonifacio at ang Kabayanihang Pilipino. *Bagong Kasaysayan*, 2.

Salazar, Z.A. (1998a). Introduksyon. In Z.A. Salazar, *The Malayan Connection: Ang Pilipinas sa Dunia Melayu*. Quezon City: Palimbagan ng Lahi.

Salazar, Z.A. (1998b). Konklusyon: Bagong Historiograpiya: Kapilipinuhan at Kamalayang Malayo. In Z.A. Salazar, *The Malayan Connection: Ang Pilipinas sa Dunia Melayu*. Quezon City: Palimbagan ng Lahi.

Salazar, Z.A. (1998c). "Philippine Studies" and Pilipinolohiya: Past, Present, and Future of Two Heuristic Views in the Study of the Philippines. In Z.A. Salazar, *The Malayan Connection: Ang Pilipinas sa Dunia Melayu*. Quezon City: Palimbagan ng Lahi.

Salazar, Z.A. (1998d). Pilipinolohiya: Pagtatakda at Pagpapaibayo. In Z.A. Salazar, *The Malayan Connection: Ang Pilipinas sa Dunia Melayu*. Quezon City: Palimbagan ng Lahi.

Salazar, Z.A. (1998e). The Malay World: Bahasa Melayu in the Philippines. In Z.A. Salazar, *The Malayan Connection: Ang Pilipinas sa Dunia Melayu*. Quezon City: Palimbagan ng Lahi.

Salazar, Z.A. (1999). Ang Kartilya ni Emilio Jacinto at ang Diwang Pilipino sa Agos ng Kasaysayan. *Bagong Kasaysayan*, 6.

Salazar, Z.A. (editor) (2004). *Sikolohiyang Panlipunan-at-Kalinangan: Panimulang Pagbabalangkas ng Isang Larangan*. Quezon City: Palimbagan ng Lahi.

Samson, J.A. (1982). Is there a Filipino Psychology. In R. Pe-Pua (editor), *Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Teorya, Metodo at Gamit (Filipino Psychology: Theory, Method and Application)*. Quezon City: Surian ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino.

Santillan, N.M.R. and Conde, M.B.P. (editors) (1998). *Kasaysayan at Kamalayan; Mga Piling Akda Ukol sa Diskursong Pangkasaysayan*. Quezon City: Limbagang Pangkasaysayan.

Sevilla, J.C.C. (1982). Indigenous Research Methods: Evaluating First Returns. In R. Pe-Pua (editor), *Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Teorya, Metodo at Gamit (Filipino Psychology: Theory, Method and Application)*. Quezon City: Surian ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino.

Trinidad, A.; Cloma, E.; Ong, M.G.; and Bunyi, P. (2003). *Teaching Manual: Teaching Peace, Human Rights and Conflict Resolution*. Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies Program on Psychosocial Trauma and Human Rights, University of the Philippines.

Torres-Yu, R. and Aguirre, A.C. (2004). *Sarilaysay: Danas at Dalumat ng Lalaking Manunulat sa Filipino*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Werbner, P. and Modood, T. (editors) (1997). *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*. London: Zed Books.