

- Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception. In *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, edited by M. Horkheimer, T. W. Adorno, and G. S. Noerr. Stanford: Stanford UP (reprinted).
- Hedman, Eva-Lotta E.; and Sidel, John T. 2000. *Malling Manila: Images of a City, Fragments of a Century. In Philippine Politics and Society in the Twentieth Century: Colonial Legacies, Post-colonial Trajectories*, edited by Eva-Lotta E. Hedman and J. Sidel. London: Routledge.
- Liechty, Mark. 2003. *Suitably Modern: Making Middle-class Culture in Kathmandu*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Livingston, Paul. 2007. Wittgenstein, Kant and the Critique of Totality. *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 33(6): 691–715.
- Van Dongen, Peter. 2005. *Rampokan: Java*. Amsterdam: Oog & Blik.
- . 2008. *Rampokan: Celebes*. Amsterdam: Oog & Blik.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 1985. *Classes*. London: Verso.

|| José S. Buenconsejo. *The River of Exchange: Music of Agusan Manobo and Visayan Relations in Caraga, Mindanao, Philippines*. 2008. 75 minutes, color, DVD. Produced by the author. Distributed through Amazon.com, <http://www.amazon.com>. In English, some Cebuano and Manobo with English subtitles. ||

This ethnographic video investigates the contemporary life of the Agusan Manobo, a minority group living in Southern Philippines, through their musical expressions in rituals and songs. It was filmed in a small town named Loreto, which is in the middle of the Agusan Valley, in the interior of Mindanao Island that flows into Umayam River, a tributary of Agusan River. These rivers have been used as an exchange route between inland and coastal people for centuries. The life of the Manobo in this area has largely changed due to the influx of Visayan settlers, particularly during the logging boom

of the 1950s, who brought their cultural practices such as sedentarization, intensive wet rice cultivation and so on. The author understands changes in Manobo musical expressions as a result of this sociocultural transformation in the area and carefully investigates Manobo relationships with their others, especially Visayan settlers who brought and introduced modernization inland.

The work consists of 19 chapters. Chapter 1 points out the importance of personalism in the Philippines, which is shared by the Manobo, and raises a question: How does musical expression create the conditions to avoid social violence, i.e., how does it endorse an ethics of group recognition? This question is investigated as a theme within the whole work and is elaborated in the following chapters.

Chapters 2 to 9 describe the socio-geographic environment of Loreto (2, 3 and 5) and the contemporary sociocultural situation of the Manobo living there (4 to 9). The latter includes two important points that are related to the following chapters. One is Manobo relationships with outside groups which are represented in Manobo cultural expressions. Manobo connections with native groups from the mountains and upriver areas appear as their drum and gong music which is played in those groups' styles and employed in traditional ritual, while their acceptance of Visayan culture appears as a Visayan spirit in their contemporary ritual and is symbolized by objects in the ritual that are parts of Visayan culture.

The other is the dominance of Visayan culture and the marginalization of traditional Manobo culture. For example, rice fields for intensive cultivation are located in the town, while traditional Manobo swiddens are located in the barrios far from Visayan presence. A corollary to this is that traditional ritual is performed only in the barrios, while contemporary Visayanized ritual is held in the town. Like contemporary Manobo ritual and the coexistence of animism and Christianity in the Manobo body, Manobo culture has changed by absorbing the dominant Visayan culture.

Chapters 10 to 13 investigate the Manobo tradi-

tional song called *tud-om* (10 and 11) and spirit possession ritual for healing (12 and 13). Here the author presents interesting interpretations based on Manobo cultural conventions of facing another person. The improvised “speaking-in-song,” *tud-om* can be used both in secular and ritual performances. In a secular context, the singer uses his/her personal voice to indicate his/her presence to his/her related others facing him/her. He/she then discloses his/her thoughts in the song that “gives a small favor,” or conveys messages that are difficult to articulate in speech. In the latter, *tud-om* is used as an art form to avoid violence. Through the song, negative emotions between the singer and the listener are channeled in a positive direction. In ritual performance, *tud-om* means the sung voice from the medium’s body with incarnated spirits. It is the physical presence of the patient, face to face with the medium, that transforms the “negative” identity of the spirit into a compassionate person who responds to the request from a patient. This is marked by the song. It is the presence of participants that brings about the renewal of harmonious human relations. This is symbolized in some scenes through rituals which show offerings shared by participants.

Chapters 14 to 18 investigate the cultural value of personalism that is subscribed to by the Manobo and Visayan settlers (14 and 15) and the changes in traditional Manobo ritual (16 to 18) that is performed in the town center. To give some examples, the former is manifested in the Christian *compadrazgo* relation, an interdependent human network among patrons and clients expressed in Christian rituals, drinking parties that nurture friendship between the Manobo and Visayans, and the use of amplified sounds to disseminate the honor of the host of the event and the party. The latter discusses two cases. One is the appearance of a Visayan spirit in a possession ritual which is officiated by a medium living in the town center. The spirit possessing the medium is invited to join in the drinking of beer and the smoking of cigarettes that are displayed on the table, mirroring the drinking parties. The Visayan spirit dances to guitar accompaniment. The

spirit is a copy of Visayan persons with authority such as officials and local leaders speaking in public. The Visayan spirit also gives moral lessons as real Visayan persons would do. The other is the performance of a traditional spirit possession ritual in a modern “town ethnic festival.” Here the original purpose for healing is transformed by being put in service of modern institutions such as local government. These changes within Manobo rituals clearly show the current situation of the Manobo in the town who have already incorporated the dominant Visayan sociocultural power.

Chapter 19 sums up the investigation of the former chapters, emphasizing the importance and the universal value of human recognition that Manobo musical expressions convey.

Because of the focus on these broad contents, this ethnographic work is a welcome and interesting resource for researchers of ethnomusicology, anthropology, and so on, and in particular, for those interested in the transformation of cultural expressions in the social context of a minority group vis-à-vis powerful others. The work allows viewers to interpret this particular majority-minority dialectic relation from various points of view. For example, it is possible to interpret the complete erasure of sounds of traditional Manobo culture in the town and their marginalization from a perspective in which research on social power and soundscape studies intersect.

In comparison to other ethnomusicological or anthropological research done in other Asian countries like Indonesia, there are not so many studies that focus on Philippine culture. Documentations of Manobo culture such as works by Garvan and Buenconsejo [Garvan 1941; Buenconsejo 2002] are even fewer. Therefore, this video-work can be considered a very important and rare resource of sounds and visuals that deepen our knowledge of cultural expressions produced by a minority group in the Philippines.

However, there are some problems that can hinder the viewers’ understanding. First, there are some parts which are difficult to understand without basic knowl-

edge of Philippine culture. For example, it is difficult to understand the human relation behind the *compadrazgo* system discussed in Chapter 14 without basic knowledge of it. It seems that target viewers of the work are Filipinos or researchers who work in Philippine Studies. Notwithstanding, the work is of benefit to researchers from other various fields. Additional explanations would have made the work more accessible to a wider audience, such as researchers doing similar kinds of studies in other places.

Second, Chapter 10 about *tud-om* is difficult to understand due to insufficient explanation. The narrator states that “In general, the song’s messages center on the expression of politely refusing the guest to whom the song is addressed.” But the meaning of this statement is difficult to understand in terms of what is explained in this chapter. In his former book, the author explains this issue differently, arguing that this is a rhetorical effect in which the singer articulates difficulty in the song text, thus enlarging the value of giving expressed in the singing [Buenconsejo 2002: 309–310] This is one of the more important points that require detailed explanation to understand the social function of *tud-om*.

This work employs two kinds of effects of visuals and sounds; 1) The symbolic effect of visual images with sounds, and 2) poetic visual effects. For example, the former appears in the DVD menu as an image of the hands of two persons passing betel nut and the background music of a bamboo zither playing in the style of the 19th century’s Spanish *fandango*. The hands show the main theme of the video, which is the value for human recognition of the Manobo, while the *fandango* suggests the long history of their acceptance of Visayan culture. The latter appears as the layered use of images from *tud-om* performance and the rainy scene in Chapter 10. This effect compels the viewers to imagine the singer’s mind and his song performance as a metaphor for the “washing away” of negative emotion in human beings, just as rains wash away the soil. These kinds of visual effects thus help to articulate the contents of the work to viewers in a more engaging manner.

This work is recommended not only for advanced researchers of ethnomusicology, anthropology and other related fields but also for whoever shares an interest in these fields.

(Taguchi Motohide (田口雅英)・Freelance Composer)

References

- Buenconsejo, José S. 2002. *Songs and Gifts at the Frontier: Person and Exchange in the Agusan Manobo Possession Ritual, Philippines*. New York: Routledge.
- Garvan, John M. 1941. *The Manobos of Mindanao*. Memoirs of the National Academy of Science 23. Washington: United States Government Printing Office.

鍋倉 聡.『シンガポール「多人種主義」の社会学——団地社会のエスニシティ』世界思想社, 2011, 302p.

はじめに

シンガポールを訪問し、オーチャード通などの中心地だけではなく、少しでも郊外に足を延ばしたことがある人は、林立する高層の公共団地群に眼を見張った経験を持っているだろう。シンガポールでは人口の82%が政府の住宅開発庁（Housing Development Board）が建設した高層の公共住宅に住んでいる（2008年）。HDBフラットと呼ばれるこの公共住宅の約95%が分譲（持ち家）であり、日本の持ち家率が60%（2004年）であることを考えると、シンガポール人の持ち家比率の高さは驚くべきものである。

シンガポールは、このように総団地化、総分譲化を実現した団地社会であるとともに、「華人」「マレー人」「インド人」「その他」という多様な住民から成る社会でもある。シンガポール政府は敢えてこの分類に人種（race）を用い、例えば、住民に携帯が義務付けられる身分証には人種が明記され、学校教育の第二言語（第一言語は英語）には華人は華語、マレー人はマレー語、インド人はタミル語などというそれぞれの「母語」を選択させ