

CSEAS



NEWSLETTER


Center for Southeast Asian Studies
Kyoto University

NO.70 | AUTUMN 2014



CONTENTS

- 004 Editorial
- 005 Marking a Turn: Thoughts on a Generation of
Philippine Scholarship
Professor Resil B. Mojares
- 009 Religion, Sacrifice and Transnational Labor
in the Philippines
Julius Bautista
- 012 *Bushido, Genro* and Murayama: Japanese
Influences on a Philippine Strategic Thinker
Marites D. Vitug
- 015 A Non-nationalist National History?
Lisandro E. Claudio
- 016 Interview with Fujita Koichi
Chief Editor of *Southeast Asian Studies (SEAS)*
- 018 Fellows
- 019 Publications
- 020 Library
- 022 Visual Documentary Project 2014



Editorial


In this issue we bring together a group of scholars who are dedicated to Philippine Studies. In March 2014, CSEAS hosted the Philippines Studies Conference in Japan (PSCJ) and over 140 scholars traveled to the Center to participate in an unprecedented gathering here in Kyoto. Under the theme “Emerging Philippines: New Frontiers, Directions, Contributions” the conference brought together scholars from across the disciplines to discuss and rethink Philippine politics, economy, society and culture in historical, contemporary, comparative, regional and transnational terms. It offered an unparalleled chance to introduce to Filipino scholars the Japanese scholarship in the Philippines and created an important networking platform for young Filipino scholars many of whom traveled to Japan for the first time.

Also, in April, Professor Kono Yasuyuki succeeded Professor Shimizu Hiromu as the new Director for CSEAS. Under his leadership CSEAS will continue to address issues affecting the region by drawing upon the Center’s knowledge and evidence-oriented approach to research and fieldwork. Ultimately over the coming years, CSEAS will engage in theory-building and promote perspectives that are attuned to the exigencies arising from Southeast Asia and that are capable of being refined and shared across regions.

In this newsletter, Emeritus Professor Resil Mojares presents us with a nuanced overview of the state of Philippine Studies and asks us to consider a deeper appreciation of the Philippines in the world that makes greater use of the scholarship now being done in Japan, Spain and other nations (as well as that done in the U.S.). Julius Bautista (soon to join CSEAS faculty) shares with us his research conducted on Overseas Filipino Workers (OFW) and provides us with a detailed reading of an “economy of sacrifice.” Marites Vitug offers us an introduction to ongoing research she is conducting on the Japanese influences on Jose Almonte, a retired general and national security advisor to the former Philippine President Fidel Ramos. Finally, Lisandro E. Claudio, a researcher based at CSEAS offers an overview of research for a book that will attempt to deal with the paradoxes of writing a history of the Philippines from a non-national perspective.

CSEAS has been making progress for the inaugural international conference that will be held in Kyoto in December 2015. The secretariat received nearly 800 applications from over 260 institutions from 28 countries. This level of interest is indicative of the need for a Consortium based in Southeast Asia and a testament to the desire for people to share research knowledge within the framework of a rapidly evolving region. CSEAS is also making preparations for its 50th anniversary which it will celebrate back to back with our conference in 2015. CSEAS is the oldest and most well provisioned Center dedicated to Southeast Asian Studies in Japan and has continuously pioneered interdisciplinary approaches to contemporary issues of academic concern that the region faces. We very much look forward to the events that will be held at the Center to commemorate this historical milestone.

The Editors



Marking a Turn: Thoughts on a Generation of Philippine Scholarship

Professor Resil B. Mojares

If there is the sense that Philippine studies is taking a “turn,” we have to ask where it has been before asking where it is going. The question of where Filipino scholars have been came to me a few months ago when I was asked to write the introduction to a festschrift for the country’s leading theater scholar, Nicanor Tiongson (Chua *et al.* forthcoming). This reminded me that we are indeed in a time of commemorations. This started sometime back, with the festschrifts for William Henry Scott, Doreen Fernandez, and Fr. John Schumacher, and it has ominously heightened, with similar tributes to the contributions of scholars like Soledad Reyes and Isagani Cruz. And last year, Ateneo de Manila had commemorative events on the works of Reynaldo Ileto and Vicente Rafael.¹

Thinking about Nic Tiongson reminded me that Nic and I belong to the same generation (the men and women who set out to be writers and scholars at the end of the 1960s), and that it is a generation coming to a close. And that while we can rightly (if immodestly) claim that it has been one of the most vibrant and productive generations in the country’s intellectual history, it is not quite clear what its work has amounted to (I am thinking here of the social sciences and the humanities although I imagine this claim can be extended). What has been gained, missed, left unclarified or unfulfilled? And what do these suggest of directions, new or renewed, that Philippine scholarship can or should take?

Conjunctures in Recent Philippine History

In 1970s Philippines, widespread disillusion with the state in the context of a deepening economic and

political crisis was marked, for instance, by the violent elections of 1969, regarded at the time as the most degraded and corrupt in Philippine history. Vicente Rafael calls this period “the long 1970s,” by which he means the Marcos years, from 1965 to 1986.² The paradox of this period is that, beyond its political stereotyping as “the dark years of the dictatorship,” it is in fact one of the most intellectually dynamic periods in Philippine history. One can cite several reasons for this: that the largely unprecedented experience of martial rule (“the years of living dangerously,” both in fantasy and reality) was not just stultifying but mentally fertilizing as well; that Marcos was our most intellectually-minded president and that could not but invite an intellectual response; that Marcos authoritarianism was not, after all, the hegemonic kind that existed, for instance, in Central European states; or that Filipinos are equipped with a large reserve of survival skills, adept at creating spaces of autonomy under conditions of restriction and repression.³ However one will explain it, the fact is that the long 1970s was, in creative terms, truly an “interesting” time.

A great deal has been written on how the Marcoses sought to exploit the mystifying power of culture and the arts through patronage, state institutions, and other instrumentalities. But the most important initiatives were undertaken outside state circuits. As Rafael narrates of his own intellectual formation in Manila in the late martial-law period, disaffection and risk-taking fueled a great deal of excitement and creativity in popular music, theater, and cinema, as well as the informal sites and networks of artistic and intellectual exchange.⁴ Many of these initiatives were linked to the anti-Marcos opposition but many

(Rafael says) were simply “conjunctural and contingent,” as well as “counter-cultural,” ambivalent in their relation to authority whether that of the Marcos government or the Communist Party. In any case, they nurtured and preserved that space of creativity and autonomy that is largely unacknowledged (because of the focus on the “event” of the Benigno Aquino assassination) as the cultural groundwork for the 1986 “People Power” uprising.

By the late 1980s, after “People Power,” the mood became less polarized and more pluralist. There was a great deal of intellectual excitement with the so-called “opening up of democratic space,” and much interest in providing the new government of Corazon Aquino and a newly-self-conscious “civil society” with the academic and intellectual support for the post-authoritarian transition to democracy. But the situation also became more diffuse and fragmented, with the flourishing of new Western theories and the diversification of scholarship, with the interest (often sector-bound) in such fields as gender, migration, and in particular foreign aid-driven development studies.

In the above context, as the sociologists Virginia Miralao and Cynthia Bautista see it, Philippine studies moved “from polarization to pluralism and convergence.” Greater tolerance and dialogue among different perspectives tempered the rabid ideological and factional partisanship of the 1970s, and there has been a convergence of methodologies as scholars attempt integrative discourses that cut across disciplines. This assessment is rather generous since one can point to countervailing facts as well: much scholarship remains discipline- or subject-bound, with little conversation across disciplines; much empirical research, unenergized by fresh theoretical perspectives, remains dreary and unimaginative; and theoretically-smart studies are frequently empirically thin (subsisting, like orchids, on air rather than grown out of the rich loam of local data and knowledge).

Still, it can be said that Filipino scholarship has truly come into its own. The past half-century in the Philippines has witnessed the expansion and diversification of academic disciplines, advances in the volume, range, and quality of research and publishing; the emergence of academic professional societies and research institutions, and by implication a larger, more diverse community of scholars and academics.⁵

One can, for instance, compare two state-of-the-field assessments of Philippine studies, one done in the 1970s by the Center for Southeast Asian Studies of Northern Illinois University (NIU) in the US and the other in the 1990s by the Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC).⁶ Separated by some 20 years, the NIU and PSSC reports are not quite comparable

because of the particular circumstances of their production, yet the differences are nevertheless telling. The NIU assessments, produced primarily as guide for American researchers in the field, are almost entirely written by Americans and mostly cover English-language works. On the other hand, the PSSC volumes, addressed primarily to Filipinos in the self-conscious context of celebrating national scholarship, are done by Filipinos. The NIU reports of the 1970s leave the impression of an American-dominated field. In a list, for instance, of 47 “major” works in Philippine historiography between 1955 and 1976, 23 were authored by Americans, 20 by Filipinos, 3 Spaniards, and 1 Australian. Of the 20 Filipino works cited, eight were US dissertations. And 31 of the 47 works were published in the US.⁷ On the other hand, the PSSC reports of the 1990s, simply by the sheer density of their content, clearly indicate that the field’s center of gravity has shifted from the US to the Philippines (assuming that it was ever in the US in the first place).

Impact on Scholarship

Unlike popular forms like cinema and theater, or such types of intellectual work as policy studies, action-oriented research, journalism, or polemical writings, the impact of much scholarship is rarely direct and dramatic, and much more difficult to trace and assess.

In their overview of Philippine studies, Miralao and Bautista cite Marxism and the “indigenous movement” as the two major themes of social science scholarship in the 1970s and 1980s (and this can well be said of the humanities as well).⁸ These themes can be viewed as expressions of the much broader current of “nationalism”—a word that I use here as shorthand for what is in fact a variously conceived and contested idea, as well as the heated context in which it played out in the Philippines. The paradox is that while nationalism is the engine of scholarship of “the long ‘70s,” it is also one that biased and constrained the scholarship of the period.

This was the case with studies in local history and regional literatures. Stimulated by the popular-democratic sentiments of the 1970s and subsequent efforts at decentralization after 1986, these studies were driven by the hope of redefining the nation as one more inclusive, people-centered, and broadly based.⁹ These studies, it can be said, helped create a more inclusive awareness of the country’s regional or subnational units, and an understanding of the national literature and history geographically wider and empirically thicker.

But whether “significantly new,” I am not too sure.

While there are exemplary exceptions, much of the work in historical and literary studies has remained distinctly “local.” There are very few cross-regional, cross-national, and integrative studies, little direct, critical engagement with established conceptions of the “nation” or its constituent units, and a low level of theorization, such that much work in this area (as some have complained) does not significantly reconfigure the familiar, dominant national narratives.¹⁰

Nationalism and Certain Tendencies

One of the tendencies of nationalism is the readiness to take the nation as a given and thus address oneself to simply inscribing into the received narrative the marginalized and the excluded without critically interrogating or revising the form and logic of this narrative (as Reynaldo Ileto has argued). Another is the tendency to essentialize the nation—whether strategically or not—in the struggle to define it as something other than what dominant discourses (whether that of the elite, the authoritarian state, or the “West”) have claimed it to be. Thus, there is the predisposition to short-circuit or gloss over internal social divisions and disjunctures to claim the authority of what is unitary, organic, and encompassing.

Related to the privileging of the “nation” is the privileging of the “popular.” While the bias in favor of the marginal and the excluded was a necessary one, it also occasioned gaps in research, a bias for certain research problems (particularly in history and anthropology) that left subjects of privilege and power relatively unexamined.

In today’s more open, pluralist environment, how compelling is the idea of “nation”? To what extent has this obsession been overtaken by the realities of the country’s prospects for an economic breakthrough, the pressure of globalizing forces that are redefining ideas of identity, territoriality, and structures of economic and political power?

Indeed, there is quite nothing like “progress”—with the confidence and cosmopolitanism it brings—more conducive to an “internationalizing” scholarship. Yet, the country still finds itself mired in the old, tenacious realities of poverty and inequality, the rule of predatory elites, large-scale corruption, and chronic natural and man-made disasters. And if progress internationalizes, there is quite nothing like poverty and inequality—with the feelings of oppression, dependence, danger, and vulnerability they foster—more conducive for the appeals of nationalism.

The dilemma is not a case of one or the other. My own sense is that “nationalizing” and “internationalizing” forces in the intellectual field need not be viewed as antithetical or a case of *pre* and *post*, but as part of a simultaneous process. Instead of dichotomies

of global/local, center/periphery, or inside/outside, we need to hold both in view at the same time without blurring their distinctness or subordinating one to the other. If studies of local histories, local literatures, and native mentalities have reached a theoretical impasse, it is because such studies—in an intellectual form of “protectionism”—have tended to draw circles around themselves instead of building outwards. While this can be understood as a necessary mode of concentrating and building up local intellectual resources, it has to be done as well in vital conversation with the rest of the world.

“Toward a More Expansive Approach”

We have been asked “to think ourselves beyond the nation.”¹¹ Such thinking need not mean we now begin to do transnational or post-national studies. My own proposal is quite modest and proceeds from what has already been accomplished. We can begin by deepening our appreciation for the “world” within the “nation,” by investigating the linkages, connections, and correspondences that extend beyond the territorial borders of the nation and its localities, by undertaking more comparative and multi-site studies, or by simply making greater use of “world” scholarship in better understanding the nation and its localities. This crucially includes cultivating greater interest in studies on the Philippines done in Japan, Spain, the United States (unavoidably), and other places, not only for how these studies augment or affirm what we know about ourselves but, more importantly, because these studies—with the particular advantages of their location—can do things we cannot do and see what we do not quite see.

As a “home scholar,” I fully appreciate the tremendous constraints in a more expansive approach to Philippine studies (constraints that include opportunities to do research outside one’s locality, or even simple access to information resources). That is why when we speak of accumulating and building intellectual resources, we mean not just the mental but the material as well—in terms of the infrastructure for education and scholarship, like research support institutions, publishing houses, and a large and active community of readers, scholars, and writers.

There is a measure of bad faith in urging a country that has been colonized by foreign powers to “globalize,” since by definition a nation colonized is globalized. Ultimately, the imperative lies in whether it is being globalized in ways that people are critically aware of, and in terms that they can effectively negotiate with or command.

Notes

This article is adapted from a keynote paper that was presented at the Philippine Studies Conference in Japan (PSCJ), Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan, February 28 – March 1 2014.

¹ See Jonathan Chua, ed., *Feasts and Feats: Festschrift for Doreen G. Fernandez* (Quezon City: Office of Research and Publications, Loyola Schools, Ateneo de Manila University, 2000); Jesus T. Peralta, ed., *Reflections on Philippine Culture and History: Festschrift in Honor of William Henry Scott* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2001); Eduardo Jose Calasanz et al., eds., *Thought the Harder, Heart the Keener: A Festschrift for Soledad S. Reyes* (Quezon City: Office of Research and Publications, Loyola Schools, Ateneo de Manila University, 2008); David Jonathan Bayot, ed., *Inter/Sections: Isagani R. Cruz and Friends* (Metro Manila: Anvil Publishing, 2010); "Festschrift in Honor of Fr. John N. Schumacher, S. J.," *Philippine Studies*, 58: 1–2 (2010); [Symposium on Vicente L. Rafael's *Contracting Colonialism* in celebration of the twenty-fifth year of its publication], *Philippine Studies*, 61: 4 (2013), 477–520. On February 4, 2013, "Historiography and Nation since *Pasyon and Revolution*: Conference in Honor of Prof. Reynaldo Ileto" was held at Ateneo de Manila University, under the sponsorship of Ateneo's *Philippine Studies* and Department of History and Kyoto University's *Southeast Asian Studies*.

² Vicente L. Rafael, "Contracting Colonialism and the Long 1970s," *Philippine Studies*, 61: 4 (2013), 477–94.

³ In 2000–01, the US Social Science Research Council's Southeast Asia Regional Advisory Panel (of which I was a member) organized roundtables in Bandung and Kuala Lumpur, in which selected scholars from Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, and the Philippines narrated how their involvement in a revolutionary movement influenced their intellectual careers. What was striking was the difference between the serious, tense, and inhibited presentations of the Thai, Malaysian, and (to a lesser extent) Indonesian participants, and the candid but funny and self-deprecatory narrations of the Filipinos. Not that the Filipinos' "confessions" were devoid of "deep" emotion or less honest, they were (apart from the contextual differences in the experiences narrated) simply more skilled in the arts of distancing and detachment.

⁴ Rafael (*Contracting Colonialism* and the Long 1970s) cites five characteristics of the developments in what he calls "the long 1970s" (1965–1986): they were conjunctural and contingent; "counter-cultural"; "modernizing" (in the sense of consciously seeking to reinvent traditions); "obsessed with the collection and archiving of artifacts of all sorts"; and characterized by a kind of "cosmopolitan nationalism" as well as "nationalist cosmopolitanism."

⁵ This is illustrated in the founding of the Philippine Political Science Association (1962), Philippine Economic Society (1962), Psychological Association of the Philippines (1963), Philippine Sociological Society (1963), Linguistics Society of the Philippines (1969), and Ugnayang Pang-Agham Tao (Anthropological Association of the Philippines) (1977). In 1968, the Philippine Social Science Council was established as a coordinating body of the country's social science associations.

⁶ Donn V. Hart, ed., *Philippine Studies: Geography, Archaeology, Psychology and Literature: Present Knowledge and Research Trends* (DeKalb: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University, 1974); *Philippine Studies: History, Sociology, Mass Media and Bibliography* (DeKalb: Center for

Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University, 1978); *Philippine Studies: Political Science, Economics, and Linguistics* (DeKalb: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University, 1981). These volumes collect papers presented at the 1973 Association for Asian Studies Conference, the 1977 Midwest Conference on Asian Affairs, and the 1980 First International Conference on the Philippines at Western Michigan University. See *The Philippine Social Sciences in the Life of the Nation*, ed. V. A. Miralao (Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council, 1999). Conceived in the Fourth National Social Science Congress in Quezon City in 1998, as part of the celebration of the Centennial of Philippine Independence. This is a condensed view of the disciplines surveyed in *Philippine Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council, 1993), 5 vols.

⁷ Bruce Cruikshank, "Philippine Historiography: Accomplishment and Promise, 1955–1976," *Philippine Studies: History, Sociology, Mass Media and Bibliography*, 1–97.

⁸ Virginia A. Miralao, "The Philippine Social Sciences in the Balance: Reflections at the Close of the Century," and Cynthia Rose B. Bautista, "The Social Sciences in the Philippines: Reflections on Developments and Prospects," *Philippine Social Sciences in the Life of the Nation*, 344–80, 381–409.

⁹ For early statements for what local historical and literary studies aimed to accomplish, see John A. Larkin, "The Place of Local History in Philippine Historiography," *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, 8: 2 (September 1967), 317, and Bienvenido Lumbera, "The Rugged Terrain of Vernacular Literature," *Revaluation: Essays on Philippine Literature, Cinema & Popular Culture* (Quezon City: Index, 1984), 103–115. Lumbera's essay, an agenda-setting statement on vernacular literary studies, was delivered as a lecture at the University of San Carlos, Cebu City, in 1976 and first published in 1977. In the case of regional literary studies, see Resil B. Mojares, "The Rugged Terrain: The State of Literary Research in the Philippines," *Illumined Terrain: The Sites and Dimensions of Philippine Literature*, ed. V. N. Sugbo (Manila: National Commission for Culture and the Arts, 1998), 6–14.

¹⁰ Alfred W. McCoy, "Introduction: The Social History of an Archipelago," *Philippine Social History: Global Trade and Local Transformations*, ed. A. W. McCoy and E. C. de Jesus (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1982), 1–18. Looking beyond local history, McCoy calls for comparative work within and beyond Southeast Asia as well as studies that are not necessarily tied to the local/national axis. This has not quite happened.

¹¹ Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 158; Umut Ozkirimli, *Contemporary Debates on Nationalism: A Critical Engagement* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 195–205.

Religion, Sacrifice and Transnational Labor in the Philippines

Julius Bautista | Former Visiting Researcher CSEAS |

Good Friday observance in Barangay (barrio) San Pedro Cutud, in San Fernando, Pampanga, Philippines



In April, 1988, the then Philippine President Corazon Aquino stood before Overseas Filipino Workers (OFW) in Hong Kong's Saint Margaret's Church to assure them of her government's assurance of absolute support for their welfare. "It is not only your relatives who are grateful for your sacrifices," she said, "but also the entire nation." For indeed OFWs were not merely overseas workers. She called them "*bagong bayani*,"—the "modern-day heroes" of the nation who, through the economic benefits generated by their "sacrifices" are ensuring the very survival of the Philippine nation itself (PMS 1992). In December 1990, the President herself officiated the ceremonies for the Bagong Bayani awards, delivering a speech that again commemorated the sacrifice (*pagsa-sakripisyo*) and suffering (*pagmamalasakit*) of the OFW. In that speech, *bagong bayani* were explicitly lauded for the economic returns of their efforts, giving the distinct impression that the beneficiary of the OFWs sacrifice was "above all, the economy" (Tigno 2012, 25–26).

Historians Vicente Rafael (2000) and Reynaldo Ileto (1998) have argued that the discourse of heroism in the Philippines is not simply premised on a notion of organic patriotism *per se*, but built upon the example of a pantheon of nationalist-martyrs like Jose Rizal and, significantly, Aquino's own late husband, Ninoy. These were individuals whose lives, as Rafael put it, "merge into a single narrative frame that harked back to the themes of the [Passion of Christ] ... of innocent lives forced to undergo humiliation at the hands of alien forces" (2000, 211). It makes sense, then, that many Heads of State since Corazon Aquino have made constant and frequent

references to the "suffering" and "sacrifice" of OFWs. For these are terms that resonate with a widely shared cultural and religious idiom in which a Filipino brand of heroism and idealized constructions of Christ-like sacrifice are two sides of the same coin.

Aquino's conflation of economic and soteriological returns of overseas labor is a rhetorical expression of what I would call an "economy of sacrifice." This is an ethos that, to be sure, seeks to perpetuate the inward flow of foreign capital through the systematic and sustained deployment of productive transnational agents. Just as significantly, it is a religious ethic in which the pursuit of capital is seen as a form of both ethical and pious virtue—an association that is rationalized through rhetorical endorsements of sacrifice as a positive value. However, as opposed what Weber (1905) described as a Protestant ethic that extolls the virtue of frugality and financial reticence, the OFWs are lauded as heroic sufferers in generating capital, and are encouraged to partake in modes of virtuous hyper-consumption. As Aguilar puts it, this is a form of transnational religious agency that is sustained by the "balm of commodities and the consumption of modernity" (1999, 98).

There have been several scholarly works that have discussed the OFW experience in neoliberal contexts. There has been a strong emphasis on the social outcomes and costs of overseas labor, particularly where OFW experiences are conditioned by specific ideological notions of Filipino race and gender (Aguilar *et al.*, 2009; Choy 2003; Constable 1997; 2007; Guevarra 2010; McKay 2013; Ong 2006; Parreñas 2008; 2001; Pertierra 1992; Tyner 2000). Other works have highlighted the process in which

state policies on labor migration craft, and in some ways compel, specific commitments to the nation in spite of OFW dislocation (Franco 2011; Hau 2004; Rodriguez 2006; 2010; Tadiar 2009; Weekly 2004). Relatively fewer works have gone into great detail about how the Filipino remittance economy is an inflection of religious agency, particularly among men. In spite of the rich scholarship, more work needs to be conducted on this theme in the same vein as the contributions of McKay (2011) and Pinggol (2001), who have analyzed the “re-masculinization” of OFW heroism, and that of Aguilar (1999), Johnson and Werbner (2010) and Lopez (2012), who consider the OFW experience with respect to the affective and religious aspects that condition socio-economic motivations.

A positive step in this direction is to unpack the discursive conditions that undergird the idiom of OFW hero-martyrdom. Firstly, one could argue that the extent to which an economy of sacrifice can resonate with a religious idiom of Christ-like martyrdom relies upon the state’s ability to obfuscate its own role in contributing to the volatility of transnational work, as well its failure to mitigate the need for labor export in the first place (Franco 2011; Tadiar 2009; Tyner 2000). This, in turn, is premised upon the promulgation of a discourse in which the casualties of overseas deployment are valorized as the paragon of the highest civic and pious virtues. Roman Catholic institutions in the Philippines play a crucial role in legitimizing the state’s neoliberal discourse by further infusing the ideal of modern-day heroism with notions of Christ-like martyrdom. This infusion, typically through official pastoral letters and published bishop statements, forms the ideological basis for a discourse that valorizes the bodies of victimized transnational agents as “fallen martyrs.” In the discursive linkage of remittance capital to both immediate and transcendent reward, the economy of sacrifice is packaged as new space on which OFWs can channel all sorts of nationalistic and pious agencies. In this way, the Church institution and the state in the Philippines depict the necessary demands and contingencies of global capital as coterminous with the soteriological ideal of Christian salvation.

It can also be argued, secondly, that the economy of sacrifice is sustained not just through a conflation of patriotism and martyrdom but through actual corporeal regimes as well. This occurs as part of a process of “labor brokerage” which, following Guevarra (2010) and Rodriguez (2010), refers to the activities of non-governmental institutions working in concert with the state in molding OFW bodies into productive economic units. This involves, among other things, the regimented implementation of body techniques in the process of pre-departure training, through

which OFWs have been trained to deploy certain ethical and moral values about Christian self-effacement and humility onto translational domains. Such programs are designed to enhance the export-competitiveness of Filipino OFWs, fashioning them into transnational agents who have been trained to externalize moral values and comportments of docility and subservience in the pursuit of overseas work. It is, as Foucault has put it, an “investment of the body, its valorization, and the distributive management of its forces” (1977, 138) towards the cultivation of what I would term “export-quality martyrs”—agents of transnational capital whose tradable labor power is premised upon their embodiment of Christian virtues of willing, servile obedience.

Thirdly, the effectiveness of these investments of the body is, to an extent, contingent upon the process in which OFWs have looked to their ritual acts as a distinct arena of corporeal and sentimental self-fashioning, both before and during the pursuit of overseas employment. Ritual is a way of crafting modern selfhoods and a source of courage, strength, perseverance and fortitude for OFWs. This is the case among OFW men who have engaged in Holy Week Passion rituals of self-mortification in the province of Pampanga. These rituals, which include the performance of self-flagellation and nailing by a wide range of Roman Catholic devotees (both men and women), are ways in which Kapampangan OFWs channel modes of empathy (*daramé*), not only with Christ, but with relatives, friends and others. It is in having actually embodied Christ’s own Passion that ritual flagellants confront an export economy that is rationalized by rhetorical pronouncements about sacrifice and suffering. To the extent that the rituals channel those virtues of humility and self-effacement that are resonant in the disciplinary regimes of labor brokerage, self-mortifiers embody have shown that rituals of pain infliction in the Philippines are not just anachronistic imitations of medieval piety, but acts constitutive of *modern* selfhoods. Through their ritual agencies, OFWs craft a sense of reliance and perseverance in transnational domains, even while they are encouraged, by the state, the Church and its brokers, to accept the potentially fatal consequences of their economic roles.

Concluding Notes

I do not argue that all OFWs are effectively self-mortifiers, or that participating in the economy of sacrifice is physically tantamount to ritual pain infliction. However, I do argue that the mechanisms of the state, the Church and Roman Catholic passion rituals are similar in that they are arenas in which transnational labor power is cultivated as modes of reli-

gious agency. Both the process of labor brokering and the rituals of self-mortification are disciplinary regimes that construe the body as both the object and vehicle for the cultivation of ethical and pious dispositions. In this sense, we can place Corazon Aquino's statements about *bagong bayani* into a more ethnographically nuanced perspective. In the pursuit of overseas labor, OFWs craft their own modern religious subjectivities. In this sense, their responsiveness to a political economy that monetizes their labor power cannot simply be reduced to a mere susceptibility to the state's rhetorical claims, nor can it be explained exclusively as a pursuit of economic rationalism.

References

- Aguilar, Filomeno. 1999. Ritual Passage and the Reconstruction of Selfhood in International Labour Migration. *Sojourn* 14(1): 98–139.
- Aguilar, Filomeno; Peñalosa, John; Liwanag, Tania; Cruz, Resto; and Melendrez, Jimmy. 2009. *Maalwang Buhay: Family, Overseas Migration, and Cultures of Relatedness in Barangay Paraiso*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Bagong Bayani Foundation Official Website (BBF). Bagong Bayani Foundation Inc.: Paying Tribute to OFWs. <http://www.bbf.com.ph/about-us/> (Accessed 15 April, 2014).
- Choy, Ceniza. 2003. *The Empire of Care*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Constable, Nicole. 1997. Sexuality and Discipline among Filipina Domestic Workers in Hong Kong. *American Ethnologist* 24(3): 539–558.
- . 2007. *Maid to Order in Hong Kong. Stories of Migrant Workers*, 2nd edition. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Franco, Jean. 2011. The Politics of Language in Labor Export: A Discourse Historical Analysis of Bagong Bayani and Overseas Employment Policies. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of the Philippines.
- Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon Press.
- Guevarra, Anna Romina. 2010. *Marketing Dreams, Manufacturing Heroes: The Transnational Labor Brokering of Filipino Workers*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Hau, Caroline S. 2004. *On the Subject of the Nation: Filipino Writings from the Margins, 1981-2004*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Ileto, Reynaldo Clemeña. 1998. *Filipinos and Their Revolution: Event, Discourse, and Historiography*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Johnson, Mark; and Werbner, Pnina. 2010. Introduction. Diasporic Encounters, Sacred Journeys: Ritual, Normativity and the Religious Imagination among International Asian Migrant Women. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 11 (3-4): 205–218.
- Lopez, Mario. 2012. Progressive Entanglements: Religious Intimacy in Japanese-Filipino Marriages. *Philippine Studies: Ethnographic and Historical Viewpoints* 60(2): 261–90.
- McKay, Dierdre. 2013. *The Virtual Village: Coping with a Global World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- McKay, Steven. 2011. *Re-masculinizing the Hero: Filipino Migrant Men and Gender Privilege*. Asia Research Institute Working Paper Series No. 172.
- Ong, Aihwa. 2006 *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar. 2001. *Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration and Domestic Work*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . 2008. *The Force of Domesticity: Filipina Migrants and Globalization*. New York: New York University Press.
- Pertierra, Raul, ed. 1992. *Remittances and Returnees: The Cultural Economy of Migration in Ilocos*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- Pinggol, Alicia. 2001. *Remaking Masculinities: Identity, Power, and Gender Dynamics in Families with Migrant Wives and Househusbands*. Quezon City: UP Center for Women's Studies.
- Rafael, Vicente L. 2000. *White Love: And Other Events in Filipino History*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Republic of the Philippines Presidential Management Staff (PMS). 2002. *The Aquino Management of the Presidency: Her People's Emissary*. Manila: Office of the President of the Philippines.
- Rodriguez, Robyn. 2006. Migrant Heroes: Nationalism, Citizenship and the Politics of Filipino Migrant Labor. *Citizenship Studies* 6 (3): 341–356.
- Rodriguez, Robyn Magalit. 2010. *Migrants for Export: How the Philippine State Brokers Labor to the World*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tadiar, Neferti X. M. 2009. *Things Fall Away: Philippine Historical Experience and the Makings of Globalization*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Tigno, Jorge. 2012. Agency by Proxy: Women and the Human Trafficking Discourse in the Philippines. In *Labour Migration and Human Trafficking in Southeast Asia*, edited by Michelle Ford, Lyons Lenore, and Willem van Schendel. Oxford and New York: Routledge.
- Tyner, James. 2000. Migrant Labour and the Politics of Scale: Gendering the Philippine State. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 41: 131–154.
- Weber, Max. 2002 [1905]. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Weekley, Kathleen. 2004. Saving Pennies for the State? A New Role for Filipino Migrant Workers. *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 34(3): 349–364.

***Bushido, Genro and Murayama:* Japanese Influences on a Philippine Strategic Thinker**

Marites D. Vitug

**Former Visiting Researcher CSEAS
and Editor-at-Large of Rappler**



Photo taken during interviews for the book, 2013 and early 2014 (Photo by Riziel Cabreros)

When Jose Almonte, a retired general, was national security adviser to President Fidel Ramos, among the gifts he received was a Japanese knife used for ritual suicide. Some Japanese friends gave it to him as a souvenir. Almonte took a liking to it; he displayed it in his office, behind his large desk, greeting guests as they met with him. John McBeth, a reporter from the *Far Eastern Economic Review* who interviewed him at the time, saw it “sitting incongruously among three painted portraits of Jesus Christ.” McBeth apparently asked him about the distinct gift and Almonte laughed and said he could “not imagine the circumstances that might tempt him to turn the exquisitely crafted knife on himself.” Almonte, after all, is a Catholic, far from being a nominal one, and a deeply spiritual person.

The Japanese knife is only the glistening tip of the iceberg. Almonte’s life philosophy and thinking have been shaped, to a certain degree, by the ideas of Inazo Nitobe, in his book, *Bushido, The Soul of Japan* and the vision of Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama for a “human-centered society.” He was also inspired by the Meiji Restoration and how sweeping changes washed over Japan during that epic period and started the Asian country’s path to modernization.

During the six years that he was in office, from 1992 to 1998, Almonte was the architect of strategic reforms that targeted the Philippine oligarchy, the few families and members of the business elite that controlled the economy and invested in national poli-

tics—by bankrolling election campaigns of presidents and lawmakers—to keep the status quo. The Ramos government pried open business monopolies, from telecommunications to inter-island shipping and liberalized trade, among others.

Since Almonte was the leader of Ramos’s brain trust, the President’s closest adviser, and since he spoke openly against the “irresponsible elite” and the oligarchs, he was a favorite target of criticism. He was the most controversial public official of the Ramos administration and the most demonized by the media, many of which were owned by big business, threatened by the changes.

My research project at the Center for Southeast Asian Studies, from April to September 2014 focused on the life of Almonte. I have completed the manuscript on his memoirs as told to me, a journalist. The book is scheduled to be published in the Philippines early next year. In this project, I sought to answer questions on what led Almonte, a soldier, an unlikely policy-maker and reformer, to become a strategic thinker committed to building a nation of Filipinos who pride themselves in having dignity and, among others, strong institutions.

In this essay, I will share a fragment of the influences on Almonte’s mind, centered on Japan, mostly in his own words, from his own perspective. My stay here in Kyoto has made me take notice of this. Perhaps if I were writing this book in Manila, Almonte’s connection to Japan would not have pre-

sented itself as sharply as it did in Kyoto.

A Few Words on Methodology for the Book

Together with my researcher, I interviewed Almonte 17 times. These are all recorded on video, each lasting about three hours and all have been transcribed. Fortunately, Almonte's memory is still sharp. Ninety percent of what he has told us checked out. Whenever he said something which I thought was significant, we looked for news clippings and researches to corroborate his statements, gather more details, and provide context. We looked for reports quoting him to check for consistency. We also interviewed people he had worked with closely to add more substance and color.

Almonte has a long history in government. Before he became national security adviser, he was in the Army. He was first assigned to the Sierra Madre, fighting the Huk communist guerillas in the late 1950s. In the 1960s, he was sent to Vietnam as member of the Philippine Civic Action Group. In between these, he worked out of Fort Bonifacio as an Army instructor and in Malacañang as aide to President Diosdado Magapagal and later, in the Marcos years, as assistant to Executive Secretary Alejandro Melchor. After Vietnam, he went on to the University of the Philippines where he headed a think tank that worked for President Ferdinand Marcos, got disillusioned and actively planned and mobilized groups to oust him in what became an unexpected people power revolt in 1986 that caught the world's attention. Almonte joined the government of President Corazon Aquino as head of an anti-smuggling office, and then returned to the Palace where he was national security adviser of President Ramos. In all, he has worked with four presidents.

Spiritual Guide

Bushido is one of three books that have served as Almonte's spiritual guideposts in his years in public service. The two others are *Mere Christianity* by C.S. Lewis, a former atheist, and *Confessions of St. Augustine* by St. Augustine. Now in his 80s, he still refers to these books.

Talking fondly about *Bushido*, he said:

The search for solutions, both in thought and deed, has defined my life, guided by my Christian faith and the *Bushido* code—knowing what is right and standing by it, knowing how to live and die, with honor. I did things by instinct, what I believed was right and I was always ready to accept the consequences.

The book, *Bushido: The Soul of Japan*, has inspired me with a perspective that everything is defined by only one value: what is right. Courage, for instance, is giving one's life if necessary to a cause that is right. Loyalty is attachment to something, to a vision that is right.

It is not difficult to have a strong sense of what is wrong and what is right. Others say that what is right is relative. But I have always believed that when one makes a decision in favor of the people, the nation, that that is what's right. Anything that goes against the people is not right. One of my favorite passages from the *Bushido* is how it defined true courage: "to live when it is right to live and to die only when it is right to die."

Peoples 2000

The vision and reform program of the Ramos government, which Almonte and his team drafted, was called Philippines 2000. Put in the simplest terms possible, it had two main components: global competitiveness and people empowerment. He involved government officials as well as civil-society groups and those from the business community in shaping this platform.

The core group behind Philippines 2000 continued to meet even after it was launched. They promoted it through seminars in various government offices and in the private sector. They became its invisible champions, an informal network of leaders which spread the gospel of Philippines 2000 without calling attention to themselves or taking any credit. They were called Peoples 2000.

Almonte explained:

This idea of having champions of reform within government was inspired by the Meiji Restoration. Serafin Talisayon, my deputy, and I had studied this landmark period in the history of Japan when feudalism collapsed, leading the way to the country's modernization. The *genro*, a group of elder statesmen during the Meiji Restoration, played a leading role. They occupied important positions in the bureaucracy and worked with a wide network of alliances in various sectors to make their institutions work. Peoples 2000 was patterned after the *genro*.

Nations before us, like Japan, had demonstrated a way of developing themselves. For every generation, the challenges are different but each is guided by earlier models such as the Meiji Restoration. There really is no secret in nation-building.



With President Ramos, 1992–98 (Courtesy of Jose Almonte)

Human Security

Almonte presided over the most extensive remake of the office of the national security adviser. The concept of national security was expanded to include economic and social issues, away from the conventional and narrow thinking that it was only limited to defense and the military. Later, Almonte included human security in his framework but he did this quietly because of the opposition to what was perceived as his penchant to extend his military tentacles to the civilian government.

He was inspired by Japan Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama, who in 1995, addressed the World Summit for Social Development and spoke on his vision of Japan as a “human-centered society.”

...in which each individual citizen is treated equally, endowed with opportunity to fully develop his or her potential, and enabled to utilize fully his or her capacity through employment and participation in society....

Murayama stressed this again in a statement during the 50th anniversary of the United Nations on the same year.

What is required of us if the United Nations is to play such a role is that we not limit our concern to the nation-state level, but that we also focus our efforts on the well-being of each and every one of “Earth’s citizens.” ...Hence a new concept of “human security,” in addition to that of national security, has emerged as a major challenge for the United Nations. This concept, which embraces respect for the human rights of every citizen on this earth and protection of each of us from poverty, disease, ignorance, oppression and violence, is consonant with my own political principles....

Reflecting on this, Almonte said:

I salute Prime Minister Murayama for pushing this. I was not brave enough to put it in writing because I knew I would get so much flak. I could already hear

the critics saying that I was going to take over even the spiritual well-being of the country, that I was playing God. So when a Japanese leader said it, I seized the opportunity and added it to our program.

The fundamental assumption of human security is human dignity. We can never take this for granted. When human dignity is threatened, national security is threatened. When human dignity is transgressed by poverty, heinous crimes, disease, and human rights violations, national security becomes a common concern.

Valor is Universal

Almonte believes in the value of valor and respects an enemy who manifests this. He saw this up close in the case of Lt. Hiroo Onoda, the last hold-out of the former Japanese Imperial Army who surrendered in 1974 after 29 years of living in the jungle of Mindoro. Onoda kept faith with the final order given him in 1945 to fight the US forces however long it would take. Throughout this unimaginably long period, Onoda survived, kept his rifle intact and evaded the police and other search parties.

It was a big story and a planeload of Japanese reporters came to Manila. By accident, Almonte was the one designated to escort him to President Marcos in Malacañang. Onoda was wearing his tattered uniform and an old military cap. He was small and wiry and sported a wispy moustache and a rough beard. He handed his sword to Marcos who returned it and told him to keep it—to remind him of his loyalty and bravery. To finish with some closing words, Almonte narrated what he saw, which left a lasting impression:

President Marcos expounded on the theme that valor is universal. He cited Onoda as the “highest symbol of a Japanese soldier fighting for his emperor and the homeland.” Marcos also expressed admiration for the Japanese soldiers whom he had fought for four years.

In his eloquent manner, Marcos said he extended “full and complete pardon to Lt. Onoda for any violations he may have committed during and after the war, not only in recognition of his courage but also in the hope that the world will be able to ban wars completely and establish brotherhood among nations, especially those in Asia.” He congratulated the Japanese people and government for having such a gallant soldier.

This idea has stayed with me for many years as much as Onoda.

In building a nation, leaders and thinkers are shaped by other countries’ experiences. For Almonte, Japan loomed large as a source of ideas, a fountain of inspiration.

A Non-nationalist National History?

Lisandro E. Claudio

Researcher CSEAS



Can one write a non-nationalist, even anti-nationalist, history of the nation? In my two years as a post-doctoral fellow here at the Center for Southeast Asian Studies, I will grapple with this paradox by attempting to write that history. In a book co-authored with Patricio N. Abinales, we will explore the substrates of Philippine history that have evaded the attention of historians who take the nation for granted. What would Philippine history look like if seen, for instance, from the perspective of a Sabahan smuggler with a Philippine passport? Or from the perspective of a modernist visual artist whose visions prove too abstract to represent a specific national identity?

In a way, there is a contradiction in our project, as writing about the nation affirms it and calls it into being. Merely writing about a nation is already a form of methodological nationalism.

Traditional national histories have been written for the nation, and, in telling the story of a country, historians reify its existence. Some even project the nation's history to times before it emerged, thus turning ancient histories into essential threads of a national narrative. For these historians, the Egypt of Cleopatra is the same as that of Nasser's and the people who built the Parthenon belong to the same imagined community as those who currently suffer from the European financial crisis.

Despite their contributions to national narratives, however, many historians are distinctly aware of the provenance of contemporary nations, for it takes writers aware of the past to grasp what the past constructs. This has, however, not been the case with general introductions to Philippine history.

Early textbooks, written in the wake of American colonization, may have been pro-colonial, but they affirmed the unity of the Philippines and the Filipino people. In fact, many of these accepted the racist assumptions—which can be traced to the historical work of national hero Jose Rizal—of the Philippines as being the nation of a “brown” or “Malayan” race.

In the 1960s and 1970s, historians like Teodoro Agoncillo and Renato Agoncillo began writing radical, anti-colonial histories. This new cohort of nationalist historians foregrounded the corrupting effects of colonialism of “Filipino” identity, which turned them into slaves of American “neocolonialism.”

The radical nationalism of the era was instrumental in shaping the perspectives of leftwing movements organizing against the dictatorship of Ferdinand Marcos, in particular the Maoist Communist Party of

the Philippines and its various legal fronts. Unlike their Western counterparts, Philippine Communists have been profoundly uncritical of nationalism, many times conflating “the nation” with the poor, the downtrodden, and the proletariat. This thinking was largely a product of the historical work that informed their activism. Leftwing historians performed a magic trick in their histories by assuming that the downtrodden and the marginalized—the victims of colonialism—were the bearers of a “true” national spirit.

And since the Left—which in other countries challenges nationalism from an internationalist perspective—has a love affair with the nation, who is left to criticize it? To expose its lapses?

Contrary to the assumptions of the radical nationalists, the nation and the marginalized cannot be conflated. Take for example the Moros of Mindanao, who are by any measure one of the most downtrodden people in the Philippines. The Moros—systematic victims of the Philippine state—do not share the anti-Americanism of Manila-based leftists, for America too many of them represents a colonizer more beneficent and wealthier than Filipinos.

The case of the Muslim Moros is illustrative of a broader phenomenon within the historical profession, one that wishes to deny narratives inconvenient to the development of a unified nationalism. For while Communists and nationalist historians continue to complain about the deleterious effects of US Empire on Philippine sovereignty, the broad masses wish to seek a better life in America. A recent global poll revealed that the country that loves the US the most is the Philippines. It took the number one spot, beating out the US itself, which took second place.

Amid this, the people most wedded to the nationalist project have been elites, from corrupt politicians seeking political independence to strengthen their own domestic power to Manila-based academics who wish to impose a homogenous Tagalog culture on a diverse country.

What would happen if a national history took non-national phenomena seriously? Would introducing these stories to a national history explain contemporary problems better? Perhaps it is the myopia of previous histories to have ignored the fragmentary experiences and thoughts lying within the Philippine geobody, but outside its discursive terrain.

As yet, I have no answers to these questions. But I hope to have two productive years to figure things out.

Interview with Fujita Koichi

Chief Editor of *Southeast Asian Studies (SEAS)*

CSEAS launched an all-English academic journal, *Southeast Asian Studies* as a sister journal of *Tonan Ajia Kenkyu* which had been published as a bilingual quarterly journal since 1963. *Southeast Asian Studies* aims to promote excellent, agenda-setting scholarship and provide a forum for dialogue and collaboration both within and beyond the region. Since 2012, 43 articles, 2 research reports, and 71 book reviews have been included. The journal has also published three special issues and one special focus: De-institutionalizing Religion in Southeast Asia, edited by Kataoka Tatsuki (Vol. 1, No. 3); Upland Peoples in the Making of History in Northern Continental Southeast Asia, edited by Christian Daniels (Vol. 2, No. 1); Reconstructing Intra-Southeast Asian Trade, c.1780–1870: Evidence of Regional Integration under the Regime of Colonial Free Trade, edited by Sugihara Kaoru (special focus) (Vol. 2, No. 3); and The Politics of Technocracy in Southeast Asia, edited by Teresa S. Encarnacion Tadem, Khoo Boo Teik, and Shiraishi Takashi (Vol. 3, No. 2).

This spring, Professor Fujita Koichi took over the position of Chief Editor from Professor Caroline Sy. Hau who oversaw the transition period and its launch. Shitara Narumi, managing editor, interviews Professor Fujita to introduce the journal.

—. As part of the Center for Southeast Asian Studies' (CSEAS) aim to internationalize and reach out to a larger international audience of scholars and academics engaged in Southeast Asian Studies, the Center launched a new English journal in 2012. What was the major impetus in creating this new international journal?

Fujita: Since 1963 CSEAS had been publishing our quarterly journal *Tonan Ajia Kenkyu* (*Southeast Asian Studies*) until 2011 (Vol. 49) with a total number of 199 issues. It's not an exaggeration to say that *Tonan Ajia Kenkyu* had been a leading journal for Southeast Asian area studies in Japan as shown by the fact that it has been indexed in Scopus by Elsevier. However, although it was bilingual, accepting English articles along with Japanese ones, it never achieved a high level of popularity among foreign scholars including Southeast Asians, due to its format. As part of our Center's drive to internationalize we decided



Professor Fujita Koichi Chief Editor of *Southeast Asian Studies*

to separate the previous journal and launch an all-English journal in 2012.


—. What are the journal's main aims and perspectives?

Fujita: CSEAS has a distinctive characteristic that separates it from other similar research institutes in the world. Since its inception, it has been promoting multidisciplinary area studies for and within Southeast Asia, not only within the humanities and social sciences, but also the natural sciences. Such a characteristic is becoming more essential in today's globalizing world where environmental issues jeopardize human life and survival. Of course, we recognize that achieving real multidisciplinary studies is no easy task, but we continue to constantly challenge ourselves to do it. In the medium and long term, we are eager to create a real multidisciplinary and highly qualified, innovative, and stimulating journal for Southeast Asian area studies.

—. The journal also welcomes Research Reports. Can you explain what is the distinction between articles and Research Reports and what kind of manuscripts does the committee expect authors to submit?

Fujita: Research Reports are shorter but fully peer-reviewed articles that present original findings from specific research projects or collaborative research outcomes. However, I must emphasize that Research Reports are not less-quality papers, inferior to articles. We expect Research Reports to present totally new and innovative ideas or hypotheses. CSEAS has a long tradition in field science. We believe that realities are much more complex and interesting than

Vol. 3 No. 3 December 2014 (Forthcoming)



Articles

Thak Chaloemtiarana

“Are We Them? Textual and Literary Representations of the Chinese in Twentieth-Century Thailand”

Piyada Chonlaworn

“Contesting Law and Order: Legal and Judicial Reform in Southern Thailand in the Late Nineteenth to Early Twentieth Century”

Simon BENEDIKTER

“Extending the Hydraulic Paradigm: Reunification, State Consolidation, and Water Control in the Vietnamese Mekong Delta after 1975”

TRINH Ly Khanh

“Trade Union Organizing Free from Employers’ Interference: Evidence from Vietnam”

Research Reports

Mujiburrahman

“Islamic Theological Texts and Contexts in Banjarese Society: An Overview of the Existing Studies”

Ian G. BAIRD

“Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) and Access and Exclusion: Obstacles and Opportunities in Cambodia and Laos”

Book Reviews

existing theories. Thus the aim is to create new theories from the ground through a birds’ eye view. We place more weight on unsophisticated but stimulating papers rather than sophisticated but conventional ones.

— . Looking back to the inaugural issue published in 1963, the very first article in *Tonan Aja Kenkyu* offered a stimulating discussion on the definition of “area studies” within a Japanese context. Fifty years have passed since then and the field has evolved. How do you perceive present day area studies?

Fujita: Contrary to my expectations, the percentage of stimulating and innovative papers seems to be decreasing. There are many factors contributing to this which are beyond our control. But I believe that the *raison d’être* of CSEAS lies in providing new ideas and perspectives by breaking the barriers of

Open Access Online Journal

All the articles are available on line. You can read articles in all three major e-book formats: EPUB, MOBI, PDF. Please visit our site from your smart phone and/or tablet device, too.



existing disciplines. Area studies offer a good potential to such a necessary task in the present world and Japan.

— . Could you offer some advice to scholars who plan to submit their articles to *Southeast Asian Studies*?

Fujita: So far I have emphasized the importance of academic innovativeness. We accept all kinds of manuscripts from all over the world, if they are related to Southeast Asian area studies. Please do not hesitate to submit your manuscripts to our new journal. By submitting your manuscripts to us you will receive high-quality feedback through our rigorous referee system. We look forward to all future submissions.

Fellows


Visiting Research Fellows, Visiting Researchers, and Visiting Project Researchers at CSEAS

Each year CSEAS accepts applicants about 14 positions for scholars and researchers who work on Southeast Asia, or any one of the countries in that region, to spend 3 to 12 months in Kyoto to conduct research, write, or pursue other scholarly activities in connection with their field of study. Since 1975, more than 330 distinguished scholars have availed themselves of the Center's considerable scholarly resources and enjoyed the invigorating atmosphere of scenic Kyoto, the ancient capital of Japan and the main repository of the country's cultural treasures, to pursue their interests in Southeast Asian Area Studies. The Center's multi-disciplinary character and the diverse research interests of its faculty offer visiting scholars an ideal opportunity for the exchange of ideas and the cultivation of comparative perspectives. The highly competitive selection process has brought to the Center in recent years researchers from Southeast Asian countries, Bangladesh, China, Korea, and western countries including the United States and France. The visiting fellows represent various basic disciplines in their study of Southeast Asia, and their official posts in their home institutions

include teacher, researcher, librarian, journalist, and NGO worker. Information and Technology (IT) experts who conduct research on Southeast Asia are also joining the Center, not only to manage various database systems but also to construct academic networks for area study throughout the world. Successful applicants receive an appropriate stipend to cover international travel, housing, and living expenses in Kyoto. Research funds will also be provided to facilitate his/her work. Funds will also be allocated for domestic travel, subject to government regulations, and a number of other facilities are available to visiting scholars. Fellows will be expected to reside in Kyoto for the duration of their fellowship period. Fellows are normally invited to deliver a public lecture during their term at the Center and encouraged to submit an article for possible publication in the Center's journal, *Southeast Asian Studies* and to contribute to the online journal *Kyoto Review of Southeast Asia*. CSEAS also received researchers, both Japanese and foreign, who visit on their own funds or on external fellowships.

Name	Period	Affiliation/Position	Research Title
Kimura Ehito	2014/3/1-2014/7/30	Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, College of Social Science, University of Hawai'i at Manoa	Transnational Justice in Southeast Asia
Bondan Widiatmoko	2014/4/1-2015/3/31	Research Centre for Regional Resources, Indonesian Institute of Sciences	Between Environmental Sustainability and Communal Conflict: The Role of Islam in Coastal Community
Porphant Ouyyanot	2014/4/5-2014/4/14	Associate Professor, School of Economics, Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University	Contemporary Thai Problems in the Perspective of Economic History
Marie Teresa Danguilan Vitug	2014/4/7-2014/9/30	President, Journalism for Nation Building Foundation	Reducing Inequality in the Philippines
Agus Suwigno	2014/5/1-2014/5/20	Lecturer at the History Department, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Gadjah Mada University	Collective Memories of the Survival Strategies of Tsunami Victims: Banda Aceh and Sendai Compared
Agus Hendrawan Medita	2014/7/14-2014/7/23	Editor-in-Chief of Journal "GEO ENERGY," Vice-Editor-in-Chief of Journal "Maritim"	The Role of Media and Independent Committees in the 2014 General and Presidential Elections in Indonesia
Charnvit Kasetsiri	2014/6/1-2014/11/30	Professor Emeritus, Southeast Asian Studies, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Thammasat University	Thailand: A New Monarchy under King Bhumibol: Rama IX
Justin Thomas McDaniels	2014/6/1-2014/8/31	Professor, Department of Religious Studies, University of Pennsylvania	The Thai Digital Manuscript and Monastery Project
Missita Sompong	2014/8/1-2015/1/31	Librarian Head, Acquisition and Cataloging Department, Sanamchandra Palace Library, Central Library, Silpakorn University	The Model of Collaboration between Lecturers and Librarians for Information Literacy of Undergraduate Students Majoring in Japanese: A Case Study of Silpakorn University
Kabir Md. Enamul	2014/8/1-2015/1/31	Professor, Forestry and Wood Technology Discipline, Life Science School, Khulna University	Plant Diversity and Carbon Assessment for the Bangladesh Sundarbans Mangrove: An Address towards Biodiversity Conservation, Climate Change and Livelihood Options
Pongponrat Kannapa	2014/9/1-2014/11/30	Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Lecturer, Service Innovation Program, College of Innovation, Thammasat University	Volunteer Tourism to Support Disadvantaged Population: A Case Study of Tsunami Disaster in Japan 2011


Publications



Kyoto CSEAS Series on Asian Studies No. 11

Migration Revolution: Philippine Nationhood & Class Relations in a Globalized Age


Filomeno V. Aguilar Jr. 2014. NUS Press and Kyoto University Press.



Kyoto Area Studies on Asia (in Japanese) No. 27

The Making of Large Landholding in the Mekong Delta during the French Colonial Period


Yoko Takada. 2014. Kyoto University Press.



Kyoto CSEAS Series on Asian Studies No. 12


The Chinese Question: Ethnicity, Nation, and Region in and beyond the Philippines

Caroline S. Hau. 2014. NUS Press and Kyoto University Press.



Aging, Disease and Health in the Himalayas and Tibet: Medical, Ecological and Cultural Viewpoints: Studies on Arunachal Pradesh, Ladakh, and Qinghai


Kiyohito Okumiya, ed. 2014. Rubi Enterprise.



Kyoto CSEAS Series on Asian Studies No. 13

Identity and Pleasure: The Politics of Indonesian Screen Culture

Ariel Heryanto. 2014. NUS Press and Kyoto University Press.



Good Coup Gone Bad: Thailand's Political Developments since Thaksin's Downfall

Pavin Chachavalpongpun, ed. 2014. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS).

Library

Appraising the Research Value of the Cambodian Official Gazettes

Sasagawa Hideo

Associate Professor, College of Asia Pacific Studies, Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University

Introduction

Since the early 1990s, Cambodia has dramatically improved its research environment. Although the country experienced a prolonged civil war that continued for over 20 years and suffered under the tyranny of the Pol Pot regime, a peace agreement was signed in 1991 and a new kingdom established 2 years later. Due to changes, since the late 1990s, it has been possible to carry out fieldwork in various places, and written documents have been made available to scholars for research purposes.

Along with archives in France, especially the Centre des Archives d'Outre-Mer in Aix-en-Provence, researchers have been able to access documents preserved at the National Archives of Cambodia (hereafter, NAC), the National Library of Cambodia, the Buddhist Institute, and the National Museum Library. Among them, NAC stores important documents for those who want to scrutinize modern Cambodian history. Firstly, NAC possesses dossiers that were issued and received by the Résident Supérieur au Cambodge (henceforth, RSC) who was the head of the colonial authorities in Cambodia. The RSC documents contain not only those issued by French authorities, but also those of the royal government and local administrative units, and even stores petitions from ordinary people. These local documents are extremely important and help to shed light on detailed histories which cannot be explored through the records kept in France.

However, from the late 1940s when France recognized partial autonomy in Cambodia, the post of the RSC was superseded by the Haut Commissariat, and the number of documents issued by the latter decreased drastically. After independence in 1953, ministries and government offices began to preserve official papers, and these are not accessible to researchers partly because many of them were unfortunately lost during the civil war. Under these

circumstances, the utilization of the official gazettes is of vital importance in order to follow the historical stream of particular themes in modern Cambodia.

Publication of the Official Gazettes in Cambodia

Before publishing the domestic version of the official gazettes in Cambodia, in 1889 the Gouverneur Général de l'Indochine (hereafter, GGI) started the *Journal Officiel de l'Indo-Chine* which would later be renamed as the *Journal Officiel de l'Indochine*. The NAC owns the issues between the years 1895 to 1951, and these carry the GGI decrees and records of personnel affairs.

In 1902, the RSC inaugurated the Cambodian version of the official gazette in French under the title of the *Bulletin Administratif du Cambodge*. Not until 1911 was the Khmer version *Reach Kech* launched by the royal government, though early issues were abridged forms of the French version, because only a part of the royal ordinances were regarded to be significant.

Political upheaval during the Second World War altered the bilingual system of publication. On March 9, 1945, the Japanese army disarmed the French, and three days later, the then king Norodom Sihanouk declared nominal independence even though there was sustained Japanese influence. Due to independence, the French version changed its title into the *Journal Officiel du Cambodge* whose publishing body was transferred to the royal government. Although the Japanese defeat annulled independence on December 14 of the same year, France concluded a modus vivendi with Cambodia on January 7, 1946, and approved domestic autonomy. Thus, the Cambodian government was able to continue the *Journal Officiel du Cambodge*, while the colonial authority changed its name into the Haut Commissariat which commenced a new French version entitled the *Bulletin Administratif Français du Cambodge*.



Even after the second independence of 1953, French was used as an official language in the realms of administration and judiciary. As a result, the royal government kept on issuing the bilingual gazettes. Founded on March 18, 1970, the Lon Nol regime renamed the country into the Khmer Republic, and the words concerning the kingship were rejected. The Khmer version, therefore, changed its title to *Roat Kech* in order to avoid the word “reach” whose original meaning was “king.”

Overthrowing the Lon Nol regime on April 17, 1975, the Pol Pot regime (Democratic Kampuchea) ceased to publish the official gazette. The People's revolutionary party, which had overthrown the Pol Pot regime on January 7, 1979, resumed issuing only in the Khmer language in 1985 with the same title as the Lon Nol regime, since the party fought against the anti-government alliance including the royalist Front Uni National pour un Cambodge Indépendant, Neutre, Pacifique, et Coopératif (FUNCINPEC). After a prolonged civil war, 1993 saw the establishment of the new kingdom, and the official gazette in Khmer returned to its original name *Reach Kech*.

The frequency of publishing the gazettes gradually increased. In the beginning, both the French and Khmer versions appeared in monthly print. Both of them became biweekly from 1935, weekly from June 1942, and came out more frequently from 1961.

Possession of the Official Gazettes and Their Utility for Research

Although NAC are missing a few issues during the colonial era and under the Lon Nol regime, almost all the volumes are stored in paper form. Besides, NAC have already prepared a microfilm master copy of a part of the French version in the colonial period (1904–15); that of the Haut Commissariat and all the French volumes issued by the Cambodian government. From 2010 to 2011, I organized a research project named “State Formation and Local Communities: A Comprehensive Study Based on the Cambodian Official Gazette” under the auspices of the International Program of Collaborative Research (IPCR) at the Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS), Kyoto University. In the first year of the

project, we purchased all the copy rolls of the aforementioned microfilm, and delivered them to the CSEAS library. Currently, these microfilms are searchable through the nationwide OPAC of the National Institute of Informatics called CiNii Books, and other researchers outside of the original research team are also able to utilize them.

Lastly, I want to turn to the research value of the official gazettes. The RSC documents preserved at NAC mainly contain the dossiers of particular incidents, so the process of discussion among those concerned can be seen in the files. On the other hand, the official gazettes tell us merely the final results of when and what kind of decrees were proclaimed. Despite this disadvantage, the gazettes are useful for following the transition of personnel matters, and investigating the processes in which specific policies diffused to local areas. In other words, qualitative data can be collected from RSC documents, and quantitative data from the official gazettes.

To date, I have conducted data collection on certain topics found in them. Firstly, I have found descriptions of the membership of the Cultural Committee which took part in the coinage of modern vocabulary from the late 1940s, and connected them with the word list the Committee had announced in a Khmer language magazine *Kambuja Suriya*. Secondly, participating in a research project at the Center for Integrated Area Studies (CIAS), Kyoto University, I gathered all the data concerning religious affairs in the gazettes, and analyzed the policies toward Buddhism in the colonial period and after independence. At this moment, these works are published only in Japanese, but I plan to translate them into English to make the results available to other scholars.

Apart from these works, several young Japanese scholars specializing in Cambodian Studies are reading the gazettes at NAC and Kyoto University, and continue to conduct research on the personnel affairs at the law courts as well as the vicissitudes of the clauses relating to nationality. It is my sincere hope that more researchers will make use of these valuable documents to develop Cambodian studies.



PEOPLE AND NATURE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

SCREENING 2015.01.14

Centennial Hall, Clock Tower, Kyoto University

VISUAL DOCUMENTARY PROJECT, 2014

From the sky to the mountains, forests to mangroves, fields to orchards and animals to insects, what is the relationship between people and nature in Southeast Asia? How do people connect with their environments? In what ways do they think about, feel, touch, speak and share their surroundings in their societies, and through their cultures?



For more information please contact

Marioivanlopez@cseas.kyoto-u.ac.jp
<http://sea-sh.cseas.kyoto-u.ac.jp>





You can read articles in all three major ebook formats: EPUB, PDF, and MOBI. Please visit our site from your smart phone and/or tablet device, too.




SOUTHEAST ASIAN STUDIES

Published three times a year April/August/December

ISSN 2186-7275

OPEN ACCESS ONLINE JOURNAL

<http://englishkyoto-seas.org/>



Since its first publication in 1963, the bilingual quarterly *Southeast Asian Studies* (SEAS), Kyoto University has reflected the Center for Southeast Asian Studies' strong commitment to publishing the best of empirically grounded, multidisciplinary, and contemporary research on Southeast Asia and related areas.

In 2012, we re-launched *Southeast Asian Studies* as an all-English journal, alongside its Japanese sister journal, *Tonan Ajia Kenkyu*. Intended for a regional as well as global readership, *Southeast Asian Studies* is published three times a year.

The new journal aims to promote excellent, agenda-setting scholarship and provide a forum for dialogue and collaboration both within and beyond the region. *Southeast Asian Studies* engages in wide-ranging and in-depth discussions that are attuned to the issues, debates, and imperatives within the region, while affirming the importance of learning and sharing ideas on a cross-country, global, and historical scale. An integral part of the journal's mandate is to foster scholarship that is capable of bridging the continuing divide in area studies between the social sciences and humanities, on the one hand, and the natural sciences, on the other hand. To this end, the journal welcomes accessibly written articles that build on insights and cutting-edge research from the natural sciences. The journal also publishes research reports, which are shorter but fully peer-reviewed articles that present original findings or new concepts that result from specific research projects or outcomes of research collaboration.



Send submissions to english-editorial@cseas.kyoto-u.ac.jp
Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University,
46 Shimoadachi-cho, Yoshida, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan



Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, 46 Shimoadachi-cho, Yoshida, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan
Tel: +81-75-753-7302 Fax: +81-75-753-7350

京都大学東南アジア研究所 〒606-8501 京都市左京区吉田下阿達町46 Tel: 075-753-7302 Fax: 075-753-7350

Editors: Mario Lopez, Shitara Narumi 〈編集〉マリオ・ロペス 設楽 成実

Date of Issue: 30.11.2014

ISSN 2185-663X