

Introduction

OSCAR V. CAMPOMANES

Towns/*pueblos*, malls, restaurant menus, t-shirts: the primary material and objects of study for the scholars whose research is featured in this volume might strike detractors of Cultural Studies (CS) as simply tell-tale, the unmistakable signs for signature CS work.¹ What else can and do CS scholars and critics examine anyway except these sorts of things?, some might rhetorically ask with disdainful smirks on their faces. In short, CS as a field (if it can be called one for many) suffers from a lot of misconceptions, often based on scanty knowledge and accumulated stereotypes about it. Positively, however, I take this situation of CS to be quite indexical of its immense success both as an academic movement and research formation, institutionally and internationally. So while already setting firm roots in Cordillera and Philippine Studies, as the essays in this special number of the journal abundantly show, CS still needs to be “introduced” in a Philippine context, the misunderstandings about it addressed (before presenting the kinds of emergent work and local forms of research in it that our published essays in this volume excitingly indicate).

Here, I choose not to rehearse the history or creation myth of CS, given that its genesis, from its beginnings in Birmingham University’s Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies in the 1960s (or in British New Left work and cultural politics, earlier) through its subsequent global spread, is otherwise fairly well-known (if only detractors bothered to read up on it); and several autocritical accounts by venerable ‘founding figures’ like Raymond Williams, Stuart Hall and Richard Johnson, among others, are easily available and remain authoritative for interested readers or new initiates (Williams 1993 [1989]; Hall 1990; Hall 1992; Johnson 1986/87; Johnson et al. 2004). The problem with creation myths, as Hall has argued, is that they tend to privilege certain genealogies (or sequences of events), and foreclose alternative versions, other ways of reckoning with a given narrative of formation. His own emplotments of the CS story, Hall self-reflexively declares, amount to

...neither a search of origins nor a suggestion that Birmingham was the only way to do cultural studies. Cultural studies was then, and has been ever since, an adaptation to its own terrain; it has been a conjunctural practice. It has always developed from a different matrix of interdisciplinary studies and disciplines.... There should be no implication [that] Birmingham did it the right way or that there was any one Birmingham position; indeed,

4 The Cordillera Review

there is no such thing as a Birmingham school. (1990, 11; see also Hall 1992, 278, where he reiterates this point about CS as “a whole set of formations....[with] its own different conjunctures and moments”)

Suffice it to say that from Britain (or despite this presumed provenance), CS as an academic movement and transdisciplinary research complex, in due course, phenomenally swept across the planet, giving rise to distinct and different national/transnational variants, from Canada to Brazil and the Latin Americas, and from Spain to Taiwan and Japan, to indicate only some of its resulting scope from the Global North to South, and from the Global West to East (see Mookerjea et al. 2009; Del Sarto et al. 2004; Graham & Labany 1995; Chen & Huat 2007; Tomari 2006).

The Philippines and the Study of Culture

In the Philippines, two separate trajectories of CS may be upheld as equally valid and veridical, without fear of contradiction, and probably ought to be *articulated* in the true CS sense of the term.²

For one, it may be said that a local variant of CS developed independently from, or almost parallel to, the ‘originary’ British formation. Our National Artist for Literature Nick Joaquin, when he was not penning his poetry, prose-fiction, and plays, was early on already writing, with much erudition and insight, and sometimes under his *nom de plume* of Quijano de Manila, about street language, historical heroes, the old Manila, even popular celebrities and politicians (‘sketches’ of the likes of Joseph Estrada, ‘silhouettes’ of Ronnie Poe, ‘profiles’ of Nora Aunor, ‘etchings’ of Amalia Fuentes, and ‘delineations’ of Gloria Diaz); consider, too, his highly compelling literary/critical essays on Philippine culture-forms and colonial modernity/historical development, idiosyncratic knowledges he was producing outside of academic institutions, as a public intellectual and an avowedly independent scholar.³ Academically (in obverse complement to Joaquin’s work), while and after completing his Indiana University PhD in Comparative Literature, Bienvenido Lumbera was also already producing provocative and prolegomenal studies of Philippine vernacular literature, popular culture, and cinema.⁴ In historical research and history-writing, there was the groundbreaking study, in the 1970s, of late nineteenth-century popular Filipino mentalités and emancipatory millenarian discourses/texts by Reynaldo Ileto (1979; 1984), critical work that is described by Raymundo Rovillos, in his contribution to this issue, as “discursive historiography” (after a term used by Ferdinand Llanes).⁵

For another, some direct links to the British CS tradition may be divined in the various studies of Philippine popular literature and culture (e.g. the 'romance mode' in Philippine writing, and *komiks*) by Ateneo professor Soledad S. Reyes, through her postgraduate studies in the sociology of literature at the University of Essex in 1980–81, although she was clearly developing a mandate for critical studies of Philippine popular and sub-cultures on her own even before such an exposure to CS in Britain (see, for examples, Reyes 1991; Reyes 1997). Where the other trajectory represented by Joaquin, Lumbera, and Ileto does not show a theoretical self-consciousness, a characteristic and conspicuous feature of their self-designed/-developed studies of culture and cultural history, that of Reyes and those who would follow in her wake both engaged British/international CS theories openly, and sought, with varying degrees of accomplishment, to go beyond them by conceptualizing and giving contextual specificity to their own brands of Philippine CS research. For recent and sustained projects after Reyes, I am thinking of Isidoro Cruz's pioneering *Cultural Fictions* (2004) which, through 'stories' and narrativity, analyzed a whole range of texts and processes of Filipino cultural politics/formation; Neferti Xina Tadiar's brilliant critiques of global political economy and contemporary Philippine literary/cultural productions (2004; 2009); and the highly commendable effort of Gary Devilles and Roland Tolentino (2015) to compend a number of representative essays from the two Philippine CS trajectories which I have provisionally mapped here.⁶

For a field, at least in its inaugural British incarnation, that set itself out against (and staged a radical critique of) academic institutionality, and its established divisions of intellectual labor (disciplines), CS has become remarkably institutionalized, a pattern basically replicated here or there, with significant variations, across a variety of national contexts. With this fulsome development, CS seems to have almost desired, and inadvertently laid the ground for its own obsolescence. In other words, it might have become a victim of its own phenomenal institutional success (hence the often precipitate or premature obituaries that latter-day detractors pronounce about it as a 'once-fashionable' field and form of academic research). Yet as early as the late 1980s, when Richard Johnson wrote his now classic and self-critical account of CS as both "a project and a formation," to use Raymond Williams' famous formulary (1993 [1989]), Johnson was already flagging and anticipating some adverse consequences of this institutional "codification," and the possible perils that it posed to the vitality of CS "as a movement or network:"

It has its own degrees in several colleges and universities and its own journals and meetings. It exercises a large influence on academic disciplines, especially on English studies, sociology, media and communication studies, linguistics and history....A codification of methods or knowledges (instituting them, for example, in formal curricula or in courses on "methodology") runs against some main features of cultural studies as a tradition: its openness and theoretical versatility, its reflexive even self-conscious mood, and, especially, the importance of critique. (Johnson 1986/87, 38)

Any work of institutional critique is, indeed, frequently blunted in its edges by some manner of formal incorporation into the very structures and practices that are the object of its crisis-making. A certain strain of conservatism, even 'exclusivism,' among practitioners could begin to set in as, in fact, Johnson himself and some collaborators acknowledge to have occurred, in a later reappraisal of the field (2004, 3 & 22–23).

All told, CS currently finds itself away from the intellectual insurgency that its founding theorists espoused, especially in relation to the established disciplines, settled as something that "now exists within a wider field—that of the *study of culture*" (Johnson et al. 2004, 19; underscoring mine). Its practitioners now seem more modestly positioned as "net learners in new cross-disciplinary exchanges, not, as may have been the case before, net teachers, listening closely—with due skepticism perhaps—to adjacent approaches" (20). This is, if anything, a sprightly transformation of the field, to morph from its initial and inaugural work of anti-disciplinary critique to its general manifestation and adoption of a healthy sense of 'skepticism' about 'adjacent approaches,' i.e. of culture study from neighboring disciplines that have previously and historically reserved it for themselves (anthropology and sociology, on the main). Johnson and company correctly observe that CS has now firmly embedded itself in a network of "complicated, often competitive relations" in the wider study of culture, which makes available to it both "temptations of retrenchment and opportunities for renewal" (22).

Despite these reconfigurations of CS (and the preceding does not exhaust any inventory of them), I think it apropos to recognize and detail some of what Johnson and his colleagues call "the effects of the cultural studies intervention" (2004, 21), the kinds of institutional and multi-disciplinary transformations it enabled across the board and the global academy. One undeniable constant is the work of critique that has been identified to be at the crux of CS research from the very beginning, which also happens to bring up the field's vaunted 'anti-methodological' bent; another concerns the closest to

a philosophy (and thereby, some statement of method) that leading CS scholars have practically propounded, *cultural materialism*, which nicely conduces to the reconceptualizations of its object/s of study: culture and its expressive forms/artifactual objects, processes/practices, and communities/institutions.

Critique and Cultural Materialism

What do CS scholars mean by ‘critique’ as their essential and constitutive mandate for knowledge-production? Here might be the right juncture for us to be reminded that “in the history of cultural studies, the earliest encounters were with literary criticism” and with critical theory in the humanities disciplines (Johnson 1986/87, 38). As an activity, humanist critique is not only hermeneutic in aspiration and approach, i.e. focused on the making and interpretation of meaning/s in language and literary/philosophical discourses, but also distinctly *political*, directed at crisis-making (the unsettlement and breakdown) of its object/s, whatever they are (e.g. texts, traditions, the order of things).⁷ In his 1986/87 assessments of CS, which I consider as among the two or three most authoritative available, Johnson offers a near-programmatic definition of critique, which has the virtue of conjuring the question of ‘method’ that would persistently hound the field from its onset to the point that, in the 2004 account, he and his collaborators could declare: “The story of cultural studies suggests an approach to method in which the requirements of a discipline are deliberately *not* foregrounded” (22; underscoring supplied). Construed methodologically, the work of critique highlights the often misunderstood anti- and transdisciplinarity of CS, its evolved nature as a ‘conjunctural practice’ and theoretical/practical bricolage:

I mean critique in the fullest sense: not criticism merely, nor even polemic, but procedures by which other traditions are approached both for what they may yield and for what they inhibit. Critique involves stealing away the more useful elements and rejecting the rest. From this point of view cultural studies is a process, a kind of alchemy for producing useful knowledge. (Johnson 1986/87, 38)

In the 2004 state-of-the-art and book-length distillation of the field, Johnson and his collaborators map this practice of selective and strategic assemblages of intellectual loans from an array of humanistic and social scientific traditions with more specificity:

[C]ultural studies took a stance that was, in part at least, outside or even against the existing disciplinary map. The concern with culture, power and difference exceeded the brief of any academic discipline. It even crossed the boundary between humanities disciplines, with their intense gaze on questions of language and meaning, and the social sciences, with their preoccupation with social process and society....[CS] assembled a set of approaches drawn, necessarily, from other, older disciplines [and] borrowed in particular from English (or, more broadly, literary studies), sociology (especially from social theory and ethnographic fieldwork) and history (especially a concern with historical contextualization and the movement of larger-scale cultural formations). It also neglected others, especially geography, anthropology, psychology and folklore. (Johnson et al. 2004, 20)

The practice of the combinatory, therefore, proves more important and decisive for CS practitioners than compliance with the regulatory imperatives of any given discipline from which certain methods of culture study are 'borrowed,' even 'stolen.' Doubtless, this stance did not endear CS to disciplinary specialists (anthropologists, in particular, whose academic tribe is centrally preoccupied with culture as its object of research, and who were initially passed over for their more urbane first cousins, the sociologists, in the 'cross-disciplinary exchanges' pursued by first-generation CS); indeed, it could only elicit suspiciousness, if not hostility, from those among them concerned with turfing, or who are unable to appreciate the often surprising transformations or innovations that CS 'poachers' would engender for the characteristic and conventional ways of doing things within the pertinent disciplinary domains.

Yet another salient outcome of 'the cultural studies intervention' is the philosophical approach (which is both epistemologically defining and methodologically determining) called *cultural materialism*, a term credited to, and associated with, the CS oeuvre of Raymond Williams (for more on this, which there is no space in this editorial essay to expound at length, see Prendergast 1995; Milner 2002). Without going into the complicated and fraught relations of CS with classical and neo-marxist social theory (which is, in fact, a major inspiration and stimulus for early-generation CS work) to explain this concept, let me be ludic (seek to be lucid) and share a particular way by which I define it for my CS Theory students at my home institution before I make them plunge into a sampling of the theoretical literature on the subject: some language play on the root word *matter* itself. I tell them that, for CS, "Culture *matters* (it is centrally important), and it has *matter* (concrete forms and expressions, like social institutions and practices)." Culture, however defined, is material, in these respects.

Again, too, without as yet referencing classical and neo-marxist wisdom about culture as part of the ‘superstructure,’ seen as separate from and determined by the ‘base’ of modern/capitalist society, I tell them that this notion of the *materiality of culture* (as a critical take on, or a deliberate troubling of, the base/superstructure distinction in marxisant thought) is probably better implied than explained to be thoroughly understood. And here, I point to our own Nick Joaquin’s decidedly non-marxist and McLuhanite/Spenglerian exegesis on his own ‘cultural materialism’ in *Culture and History* (2004a [1977], 3):

Culture has so come to mean its loftier dicta (like literature and the arts) that we have needed a Marshall McLuhan to remind us that the medium itself is the message. And the message is: metamorphosis. We are being shaped by the tools we shape; and culture is the way of life being impressed on a community by its technics....History then would properly be the study of those epochs that are new tools, or novelties in media, or advances in technique, because such epochs, by altering the culture, alter the course of the community, with vivid effects on its politics, economics and arts.

‘Technics,’ of course, is a term which Joaquin derives from Oswald Spengler’s “philosophy of life” and, in his usage here, seems to refer literally to material culture itself (e.g. technology, ‘tools’). But like Spengler, Joaquin does not take technics to mean merely the material form/extensions of culture “as a way of life;” rather, he regards it as a sign for the effective fusion and interactions between a given cultural community’s imagination and its technological creations. It is, if you like, a certain practice that has social/institutional, indeed *material*, effects (“altering the culture,” in Joaquin’s formulation). As Spengler puts it,

Technics is the tactics of living; it is the inner form of which the procedure of conflict—the conflict that is identical with Life itself—is the outward expression....Technics is not to be understood in terms of the implement. What matters is not how one fashions things, but what one does with them; not the weapon, but the battle. Modern warfare, in which the decisive element is tactics—that is, the technique of running the war, the techniques of inventing, producing, and handling the weapons being only items in the process as a whole—points to a general truth....Every struggle with a problem calls for a logical technique. There is a technique of the painter’s brush-strokes, of horsemanship, of navigating an airship. Always it is a matter of purposive activity, never of things. (1976 [1932], 9-10; underscoring supplied)

Joaquin, then, reframes the question of determination between base and superstructure, which is a central problematic in CS research/critique, if we take ‘technics’ here as a rough equivalent to the marxisant notion of ‘mode of production’ for a given society’s ‘base’ (a proposition entirely possible to maintain interpretively in this case: “*technics is the tactics of living*”), and ‘Life,’ or ‘culture as a way of life,’ as integrally superstructural.⁸ If so, then Joaquin’s cultural materialism, which creatively crosses McLuhan’s ‘mediumism’ and Spenglerian ‘technics’ together, may be said to have developed in an uncanny parallel to Raymond Williams’ own, whose handiest elaboration of it as concept is probably this quite famous passage in *Marxism and Literature* (1977):

From castles and palaces and churches to prisons and workhouses and schools; from weapons of war to a controlled press: any ruling class, in variable ways though always materially, produces a social and political order. These are never superstructural activities. They are the necessary material production within which an apparently self-subsistent mode of production can alone be carried on. The complexity of this process is especially remarkable in advanced capitalist societies, where it is wholly beside the point to isolate ‘production’ and ‘industry’ from the comparably material production of ‘defence’, ‘law and order’, ‘welfare’, ‘entertainment’, and ‘public opinion.’ (93)

In both of these ideologically differing explications, we see an interactivity (an indissociable dynamics and dialectics) between base and superstructure, the *material* (mode of production/tactics of living) and the *imaginative/ideal* (culture/way of life) realms, so much so that the latter ceases to be merely superstructural, indeed, appears as ‘never superstructural,’ in Williams’ emphatic affirmation.

The Culture Concept

Ultimately, the most salutary achievement of CS scholarship was the sustained and vigorous rethinking of its very object, *culture*, that it inspired and magisterially accomplished—especially our concepts of it otherwise set by received understandings from the *sensus communis* or settled by certain humanities and social science disciplines invested in it as a central category for their respective knowledge-productions. CS theoretical and critical discourses de-exoticized culture, made it ‘ordinary,’ explored its lived and embodied aspects, and yes, made it material. In sum, culture, for CS thinkers, is understood as “neither autonomous nor an externally determined field” but always “a site for social differences and

struggles" (Johnson 1986/87, 39).⁹ Without going over much-trod ground, we can probably say with Terry Eagleton, based on the extensive literature about it, that culture as a concept is "a highly complex one," and itself "the site of political conflict" generally, not just of academic turf battles (Eagleton 2000, 23).

Raymond Williams, whom Johnson correctly credits for having "excavated its immense historical repertoire" (1986/87, 43), famously characterizes culture as "one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language" (and, arguably, with its equivalent forms, in any or every modern/natural language). Almost despairing over the semantic intractability of the word while producing his fabled critical etymology of it, Williams once quipped to an interviewer, in mock-ironic tones: "You know how many times I've wished that I had never heard of the damned word?" (qtd. in Campomanes 2004, 21). Eagleton best sums up the difficulties of the word/concept when he describes it as oscillating between an "aesthetic meaning"—Joaquin's *'loftier dikta (like literature and the arts)'*—and "an anthropological one" (culture as "a way of life"), with the former "nebulous" and the latter "too cramping" (Eagleton 2003, 34). Even anthropology itself, the established discipline for culture study, was being mapped by Roger Keesing as early as 1974, as historically torn between a humanistic—or some would now say, semiotic—concept of culture, thus tending "to include too much [and] to be diffuse;" and a scientific one, narrowing it "so that it includes less and reveals more" (cited in Campomanes 2004, 31n20). We might say, in paradigmatic terms, that culture as a disciplinary object of study was being rent apart, at that juncture, by the contradictory pulls of what Clifford Geertz would call "thick description" (1973) and Marvin Harris would designate as "parsimonious definition" (1979).

I, too, was compelled to observe for the Culture and Governance Project of the Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) and the National Commission for Culture and the Arts (NCCA) in 2004 that "the first thing to note about 'culture' is its elusiveness as a concept...and our deployments of the term must therefore endeavor to match its seeming 'undefinability' with deft flexibility, its not operative nimbleness." In support of this stance, I reiterated Richard Johnson's position that "culture has a value as a *reminder* but not as a precise category.... [and] there is no solution to [its] polysemy: it is a rationalist illusion to think we can say 'henceforth, this term will mean....' and expect *a whole history of connotations* (not to say a whole future) to fall smartly into line" (see Campomanes 2004, 22). By "reminder," Johnson here means, as I pointed out on that occasion, that culture is best regarded as "the summation of a kind of history," of what Raymond Williams has called "the complex and still *active*

history of the word" itself, rather than as a rigorous category in need of reduction in the complexity of its usage (*ibid.*, 27).

To our fortune, Williams (and others who followed the trails he blazed like Eagleton) did not give up on the forbidding task and, first, through rigorous critical etymology and, then, through a close examination of a whole variety of discourses about the culture concept from the anthropological and humanistic to the commonsensical and popular, cut through all the dross to make an immensely helpful finding. Williams himself encapsulated the critical insight thusly: "The complex of senses (within the term) indicates a complex argument about the relations between general human development and a particular way of life, and between both and the works and practices of art and intelligence" (*qtd.* in Eagleton 2000, 23). After tracing the relay of meanings of culture from its Latin rootwords and cognates to varieties of early modern English language-usage which shows the metaphorical extension of the 'tending of natural growth, like plants and animals' to a 'process of human development,' Williams was able to problematize modern and late-modern acceptations of the term in a range of domains, from anthropological study to literary criticism (Williams 1983b; for a summary of this canonical account, see Campomanes 2004, 21-27). Building on Williams' critical etymology, Eagleton, to indicate just some of the enhanced and paradoxical understandings we now possess about the concept, elaborates:

It is fashionable these days to see nature as a derivative of culture [but] culture, etymologically speaking, is a concept derived from nature. One of its original meanings is 'husbandry', or the tending of natural growth. The same is true of our words for law and justice, as well as of terms like 'capital', 'stock', 'pecuniary' and 'sterling'. The word 'coulter', which is a cognate of 'culture', means the blade of a ploughshare. We derive our word for the finest of human activities from labour and agriculture, crops and cultivation....'Culture' here means an activity, and it was a long time before the word came to denote an entity....Etymologically speaking, then, the now-popular phrase 'cultural materialism' is something of a tautology. 'Culture' at first denoted a thoroughly material process, which was then metaphorically transposed to affairs of the spirit. The word thus charts within its semantic unfolding humanity's own historic shift from rural to urban existence, pig-farming to Picasso, tilling the soil to splitting the atom. In Marxist parlance, it brings together both base and superstructure in a single notion. (2000, 7)

Eagleton proceeds to spin out even more fascinating senses compacted into the term, that include, among others, the co-constitutive kinship between culture and colonialism (through

the Latin rootword *colere*, and one of its several senses, ‘inhabit’), and how the word also “encodes a number of key philosophical issues [such as] questions of freedom and determinism, agency and endurance, change and identity, the given and the created” (8).

Cordillera Cultural Studies

We are very pleased to present, with this special CS issue of the journal, some of the bumper crop from a cultivation going on in Cordillera studies over the past few years by seasoned and promising young scholars seeking to dialogue, in their work, with CS theory and critique. It is vital work concerned not so much with *pueblos*, malls, restaurant menus, and statement t-shirts as with critical and refreshing notions of space and place, identities and representations. It is signature CS work, in these important respects. Richard Johnson has posited, in answer to the question “What is Cultural Studies anyway?,” that one could understand the field’s formation in three ways: in terms of its tensile but productive relations to the academic disciplines; the theoretical paradigms across these disciplines that it critiqued but also, with much originality, created; or its “characteristic objects of study.” He expressed preference for the third, even as he spoke to the first two at length in his 1986/87 account; and without reducing the “characteristic objects” of CS to the range commonly covered by our published authors here, one can say with confidence that with our author’s work, we see not a return of the ‘same’ as the same but its return as *different*. While they revisit these central problematics of the field, this issue’s contributors bring to it a critical engagement with their chosen Cordillera material, whether historical or contemporary, that simultaneously affirms (and revises) CS theoretical wisdom *and* shows other possible and exciting ways to do Cordillera studies.

Acknowledgements: *My utmost gratitude to Dr. Leah Enkiwe–Abayao, Director of the Cordillera Studies Center (CSC), and the Office of the Chancellor, University of the Philippines Baguio, for the invitation and opportunity to assemble and guest-edit this special number of the journal. I am immensely indebted to the journal’s outgoing Board of Editors for their dedicated labors in vetting and clearing, for peer-review, the submissions to this number, and for their patience with the expected delays in its production: Professors Narcisa Canilao, Alipio Garcia, Anna Christie Villarba-Torres, and managing editor Santos Jose Dacanay III. Initial exchanges with outgoing Editor-in-Chief Delfin L. Tolentino Jr. helped me navigate around the shoals of editorial work for the journal. It has been such a pleasure to coordinate and collaborate with incoming Editor-in-Chief Wilfredo V. Alangui. Ma. Paula Pamintuan-Riva of the CSC Publications Office was incredibly punctual and efficient with the assistance I required throughout the entire process of putting this number together. Finally, a project like this has totally depended on colleagues, who must go unnamed for obvious reasons, and*

who have so generously taken precious time out of their multiple commitments to review the submissions, and make very specific suggestions for improving the work of our contributing authors; it is a source of pride to state their affiliations with a variety of reputable academic institutions: the University of California-Santa Cruz, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, and St. John Fisher College (NY) in the USA; Tsukuba University and the University of Tokyo in Japan; National Tsing-Hua University and the Institute of European and American Studies (IEAS), Academia Sinica in Taiwan; and the departments of English and Filipino at Ateneo de Manila University.

Oscar V. Campomanes, *Issue Editor*
Ateneo de Manila University

NOTES

1. There are legions of such detractors of CS locally, despite (or perhaps, because of) its relative institutionalization in leading Philippine institutions, reflecting the residual hostility against it abroad, especially in the Anglo-American academy where CS is also now, precisely, a firmly established and widely recognized ‘interdiscipline.’ CS courses (theory/practice) and research are regularly covered in the curricula of the College of Mass Communication, the Department of English and Comparative Literature, and other interdisciplinary units of the University of the Philippines Diliman; the College of Arts and Communication of the University of the Philippines Baguio; the Literary and Cultural Studies Program in the Department of English, and certain other departments in the Loyola Schools of Humanities (like Filipino) and Social Sciences (like Communication) at Ateneo de Manila University; De La Salle University’s Department of Literature; and the Communication and Literature graduate programs at the University of Santo Tomas, among others. Recently, I was pleasantly surprised to be asked to serve as an external consultant/mentor for a thesis project in CS and semiotics by a group of students from Bulacan State University in Malolos—indicating to me that one should no longer think it unlikely to discover exposure to (and interest in) CS training and work across various Philippine institutional contexts.
2. As I clarify in a volume on culture and governance that I co-edited, the CS notion of ‘articulation’ is not to be understood in the commensensical sense of a ‘coming to voice’ (of intentionality), or in terms of expressive theories of discourse, but as reciprocal coordination and transformation, as a “metaphor used to indicate relations of linkage and effectivity between different levels of all sorts of things [where] things require to be linked because, though connected, they are not the same.” The resulting “unity is not that of identity, where one structure perfectly capitulates or reproduces or even ‘expresses’ another” but a kind of synthesis that “is, always, necessarily a ‘complex structure,’ a structure in which

things are related, as much as through their differences as through their similarities” (see Campomanes 2004, 29n4; Hall 1980, 321–325).

3. See, for examples, the now-classic *Language of the Street and Other Essays* (1980 [1977]) and *A Question of Heroes* (2004a [1977]), but most especially, the anthology that collects his 1960s–70s essays, some of them controversial, on colonial cultural history, and in contemporary Philippine cultures critique, *Culture and History* (2004 [1988]).
4. For a representative collection of these texts, see *REVALUATION: Essays on Philippine Literature, Cinema & Popular Culture*, originally published in 1984 through the editorial intervention of Delfin L. Tolentino Jr. and P. T. Martin, and reissued by UST Publishing House in 1997, in an expanded edition that now incorporates his studies of Philippine culture/s in the period 1962–1984.
5. Ileo’s work again represents an independent, even prior, Filipino development of what would be recognized as ‘Subaltern Studies’ by CS, especially as fully elaborated by fabled historians of India and the British Raj like Ranajit Guha, the kinds of critical historiography that CS owns up as part of its genealogical or kinship charts; here, of course, I am referring to the canonical E. P. Thompson study, *The Making of the English Working Class* (1964 [1963]); on *Subaltern Studies*, see Guha and Spivak (1988).
6. To date, a comprehensive and detailed account of Philippine CS in its two trajectories, and as a ‘conjunctural practice,’ is waiting to be assayed, but Caroline Hau’s “The ‘Cultural’ and ‘Linguistic’ Turns in Philippine Scholarship” (2003) constitutes an excellent beginning for this major task, and a theoretically dense encapsulation of what could be its main critical points and lineaments.
7. I provide an abbreviated account of critique’s etymological and historical links to crisis (or crisis-making, not its resolution or management), and how crisis-making entails the ‘otherness’ that enables the conditions of possibility for transformation and alternatives in respect to the given critical object ‘under jury,’ in Campomanes, “Kritika | Critique” (2014).
8. It would profit interested readers to triangulate this discussion with Raymond Williams’ related reflections on the materiality of the technological in the essay “Culture and Technology” (1983a).
9. These texts are indispensable reading for those wishing for a basic introduction to the CS debates about the culture concept: Williams 1983b & 1989; Rosaldo 1989; and Eagleton 2000.

REFERENCES

- Campomanes, Oscar V. 2004. "Culture and Governance in Reciprocity." In *Culture and Governance*, edited by Ma. Antoinette G. Virtucio & Oscar V. Campomanes, 6–35. Pasig City: Development Academy of the Philippines; Manila: National Commission for Culture & the Arts.
- . 2014. "Kritika | Critique." In *Kritik/Critique: Essays from the J. Elizalde Navarro National Workshop in the Criticism of the Arts and Humanities, 2009-2012*, edited by O. V. Campomanes. Manila: UST Publishing House.
- Chen, Kuan-Hsing & Chua Beng Huat. 2007. *The Inter-Asia Cultural Studies Reader*. Oxford & New York: Routledge.
- Cruz, Isidoro. 2004. *Cultural Fictions: Narratives on Philippine Popular Culture, Politics and Literature*. Iloilo City: University of San Agustin Press.
- Del Sarto, Ana et al., eds. 2004. *The Latin American Cultural Studies Reader*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Devilles, Gary & Roland Tolentino, eds. 2015. *Kritikal na Espasyo ng Kulturang Popular*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Eagleton, Terry. 2000. *The Idea of Culture*. Malden MA, Oxford UK, & Victoria, AUS: Blackwell.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Graham, Helan & Jo Labanyi. 1995. *Spanish Cultural Studies: An Introduction*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guha, Ranajit & Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. 1998. *Selected Subaltern Studies*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, Stuart. 1980. "Race, Articulation, and Societies Structured in Dominance." In *Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism*, edited by Marion O'Callaghan. Paris: UNESCO.
- . 1990. "The Emergence of Cultural Studies and the Crisis of the Humanities." *October* 53 (Summer): 11–23.
- . 1992. "Cultural Studies & its Theoretical Legacies." In *Cultural Studies*, edited by Lawrence Grossberg et al., 277–294. New York & London: Routledge.
- Harris, Marvin. 1979. *Cultural Materialism: The Struggle for a Science of Culture*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Hau, Caroline Sy. 2003. "The 'Cultural' & 'Linguistic' Turns in Philippine Scholarship." In *The Teaching and Context of Southeast Asian Literary Studies*, 36–70. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Research Publications Office.
- Ileto, Reynaldo C. 1979. *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippine, 1840–1910*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University.
- . 1984. "Bonifacio, the Text, and the Social Scientist." *Philippine*

- Sociological Review* 32 (December), 19–29.
- Joaquin, Nick. 1980 [1977]. *Language of the Street and Other Essays*. Manila: National Bookstore.
- . 2004a [1977]. *A Question of Heroes*. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing.
- . 2004b [1988]. *Culture and History: Occasional Notes on Philippine Becoming*. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing.
- Johnson, Richard. 1986/87. "What is Cultural Studies Anyway?" *Social Text* 16 (Winter): 38–80.
- Johnson, Richard et al. 2004. *The Practice of Cultural Studies*. London UK, Thousand Oaks, CA & New Delhi, India: SAGE Publications.
- Lumbera, Bienvenido. 1997 [1984]. *REVALUATION: Essays on Philippine Literature, Cinema, and Popular Culture*. Manila: UST Publishing House.
- Milner, Andrew. 2002. *Re-Imagining Cultural Studies: The Promise of Cultural Materialism*. London UK, Thousand Oaks, CA & New Delhi, India: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Mookerjea, Sourayan et al. eds. 2009. *Canadian Cultural Studies: A Reader*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Prendergast, Christopher. 1995. *Cultural Materialism: On Raymond Williams*. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Reyes, Soledad S. 1997. *Pagbasa ng Panitikan at Kulturang Popular: Piling Sanaysay, 1976-1996*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 1991. *The Romance Mode in Philippine Popular Literature and Other Essays*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- Rosaldo, Renato. 1989. *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon.
- Spengler, Oswald. 1976 [1932]. *Man and Technics: A Contribution to the Philosophy of Life*. Westport CT: Greenwood.
- Tadiar, Neferti Xina. 2004. *Fantasy-Production: Sexual Economies & Other Philippine Consequences for the New World Order*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press; Hongkong: Hongkong University Press.
- . 2009. *Things Fall Away: Philippine Historical Experience & the Makings of Globalization*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Tamari, Tomio. 2006. "Cultural Studies in Japan: An Interview with Shunya Yoshimi." *Theory, Culture and Society* 23 (7–8): 305–314.
- Thompson, E. P. 1964 [1963]. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Pantheon.
- Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

- . 1983a. "Culture and Technology." In *The Year 2000: A Radical Look at the Future and What We Can Do to Change It*, 177–199. New York: Pantheon Books.
- . 1983b. "Culture" and "Civilization." In *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1989. "Culture is Ordinary." In *Resources of Hope*. London: Verso.
- . 1993 [1989]. "The Future of Cultural Studies." In *The Politics of Modernism*. London: Verso.