The Cordillera Review: Journal of Philippine Culture and Society 12 (1–2): 3–12.
https://doi.org/10.64743/EQSP5541

INTRODUCTION

OSCAR V. CAMPOMANES

This back-to-back number of the journal was designed as an open-themed one, unlike the Special Issues in Cultural Studies (Vol. IV, No. 1/March 2016) and Literary Studies (Vol. VII, No. 1/March 2018) which I had the privilege to guest-edit, and in Indigenous Studies (Vol. VI, No. 2/September 2016) guest-edited by colleague Padmapani L. Perez. In our call for submissions to this expanded issue, we assured prospective contributors of the unrestricted consideration of manuscripts in Cordillera and Philippines studies on any topics and deploying any

social-scientific and humanistic approaches appropriate for them. We did, however, encourage specifically theoretical discussions (which may be irrespective of field and area), with the only expectation that they be of some demonstrable serviceability to the advancement of Cordillera and Philippine studies as research traditions.

Some of the general rubrics which we also suggested as possible parameters for the framing of prospective contributions included (but were by no means limited to) the following:

1. region and ethnicity (including transregionality and polyethnicity) in the examination of Filipino and Cordillera cultural formations;
2. concepts of the endogenous and exogenous in the analysis of local, regional, national, and global forms of community-building;
3. the historical and transdisciplinary study of coloniality and post-/decoloniality, especially in reference to Philippine communities and cultural politics/practices;
4. new methods or approaches (e.g. comparativity and contrapuntality) to the study of Filipino cultures and socio-economic development; and
5. critical interrogations of vernacularization and the vernacular as historical, socio-cultural, and political phenomena and processes among and across Philippine communities.

We were delighted to receive a considerable number of submissions, including expressions of interest from aspiring contributors (I, as Guest Editor, had offered to guide the development of the prospectuses of those interested into submissible papers; and there were some takers). In the end, our review processes yielded a substantial crop of eight contributions, two of them co-authored, and three of them semi-monographic in length.

Happily, our featured studies here surfaced some common themes and concerns, despite the wide range of topics which they cover, and research traditions (old and new) from which they come. In terms of the general and parametrical rubrics we had posed for it, this number of the journal allows (in fact, encourages) us to consider and contemplate at least three matters of great import to both Cordillera and Philippine studies: theory and terminology, sources and methods, and positionality. One unmistakable sign that a given academic field is leveling up is when its scholars and students dare and manage to produce theoretical knowledges (paradigms and categories/terms) by which to formulate the central problematics and guide practical research projects in it. Such endeavors may involve the pursuit and development of new or unusual concepts and categories in the field (to challenge, even revise, if not overhaul pre-existing or older ones; or more ambitiously, to re/set the terms for research).

In Philippine studies in general, and Cordillera studies in particular, there have been prescriptive movements in this direction (that is, in the five rubrics posed above and which I am foreshortening here as matters of "theory and terminology, sources and methods, and positionality"), and manifold possibilities or opportunities for their development, in recent years. These movements and possibilities of theoretical knowledge-production in our field/s, I am pleased to report, are discernible in (if not richly suggested by) this issue's contributions. For purposes of convenience, I discuss and classify them in two forms: modes and problematics. In making emerge these instantiations of theorizing present (no matter how embryonically so) in our issue's contributions, I use as pretexts, and riff on, some theoretical pronouncements of proven consequence and continuing currency for the work we do as Cordillera and Philippine studies scholars/students.

Modes

In what modalities or ways do we cognize/recognize the phenomena and processes of cultural/community and ethnolinguistic formation, for instance? Some central ideas in this regard which emerged from the theoretical work of the historian and critic of anthropological discourse James Clifford in the 1980s-90s are worth revisiting for the striking manner in which several of our contributions here are virtually testing or extending such ideas, taking them in directions perhaps not anticipated by Clifford himself. In one work, Clifford reconceptualizes culture and community in terms of a parallel rethinking of the anthropological mode of knowing or research traditionally dedicated to the study of both, the *ethnography*. In another and related work, the critique is focused on the latter but with some loop back to culture/

community as object of research. In "On Collecting Art and Culture," Clifford avers that "'Cultures' are ethnographic collections," and we must "see ethnography as a form of culture collecting." To see cultures as ethnographic collections and ethnography as culture collecting, Clifford elaborates, "highlights the ways that diverse *experiences* and facts [including art and artifacts] are selected, gathered, detached from their original temporal occasions, and given enduring value in a new arrangement" (1993/94, 61; emphases supplied).

In his other work which, like the first, has become a classic in its field, "Travelling Cultures" (1992), we find a critique of ethnography as activity and methodology in disciplinary anthropology and traditional culture study, in addition to the critique made of museums/art galleries and other institutions and practices (concerned with culture/s as object of analysis, possession or appropriation, and contestation) already made in the first essay. The most trenchant critique of anthropological practices of culture study in "Travelling Cultures" is reserved for the classical approaches to cultures as "patterned wholes" whose parts can be made to represent them, in a metonymic manner, in that document of cultural description, the ethnography, as well as for old conceptions of the *space* and *site* of culture collecting called "the Field" (the enduring theoretical critique of these approaches and the notion of Field is the chapter "The Erosion of Classic Norms" in Renato Rosaldo's *Culture and Truth* [1989, 25-45]).

Experience of the Field for anthropologists usually meant "dwelling" in it for a regulation period to immerse themselves in the object community while regarding it from a certain distance (a position of privilege as the empowered investigators) to be able to generate 'culture description' objectively, and to engage in the 'culture collecting' necessary to write and produce the ethnographic account. Clifford proposes that investigators or students of culture and community must look into "relations of travel," rather than "relations of dwelling," so as not to replicate the problematic dimensions and power relations involved in classical anthropology; or more accurately, he says, we must be able to think about and approach culture/s in terms of "travel-in-dwelling" and "dwelling-in-travel," pointing to the ways in which objects and subjects, natives and anthropologists, never really stay in one place, often migrate or move, and get mutually transformed in the "ethnographic encounter/exchange."

Several essays in this issue directly deal with the mode of *collecting* to reflect on what counts as Igorot (or Cordilleran) culture/s, and the positionalities from which they had been, are, and can be regarded as such. In "Capitalizing on Savage Acts," Caroline Tacata-Tardibone offers a critical narrative of the epic American colonial enterprise of literally collecting native bodies, "savage acts," ritual performances, and material culture objects for the exhibitionary complex (world's

fair exhibits, travelling shows, popular amusements) developed by empires, both old and new, between the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, to represent their colonial others to themselves and to the world. Such spectacular exhibitions or representations were also meant to project their power and success in the conquest of their subject populations. In "Commodifying Cultures, Negotiating Identities," Fernan Talamayan examines a contemporary (and explicitly non-colonial) enterprise in collecting 'Cordilleran Cultural Heritage' and performances of it in Baguio's popular 'living museum' of Tam-awan Village, to educate and entertain tourists and interested citizens, and to practice non-exploitative or non-derogatory representations of Igorot cultural distinctiveness or otherness. In "Formation of an Everyday Object Collection," Sakiko Kawabe presents her fieldwork findings about the "perspectives" of an individual Ifugao collector (and his "contributors") in an independent or personal quest of accumulating "everyday objects" from the community to save them for posterity and to promote intergenerational pedagogy on Ifugao cultural traditions and folkways.

But for each author, in his or her own turn, while the cultures at stake or being collected might have that ethnographic dimension that Clifford emphasizes, it is important to ask *who is doing the collecting and for what purpose/s*. It also matters for them greatly what *kinds* of collecting are being undertaken in their respective cases. In short, *whose and what sort of ethnography*? And literally, for what *wages* or, more intangibly, *meanings/values* are these activities of culture-collecting being undertaken? Hence, Tacata-Tardibone foregrounds the aspect of the 'native' performers in the Igorot colonial exhibits and travelling shows as *laboring*, not just performing, *bodies*. It was not the case that they were alone reduced to a state of abjection and powerlessness by fair organizers or entertainment entrepreneurs but that they were actively performing for the wages and returns that participation could yield them, among other practical and personal considerations. Hence, Talamayan brings up the aspect of cultural commodification and the Cordilleran performers' pragmatic "negotiations of identity" and rearticulations of Cordilleran cultural heritage in his analysis of Tam-awan Village's assemblage of exhibited objects, and *exhibiting* ("performing") subjects. And hence, Kawabe focuses on the Ifugao collector-subject's dynamic, or non-reifying, "preservation" of material culture and everyday objects from his community, resituating them within the new arrangement that his collecting activities create so as to vouchsafe these and the cultural practices they embody from dereliction and for the next generations, for posterity.

What's more, ethnography (understood as culture-collecting) is now no longer the exclusive preserve of the colonial ethnologists of an earlier era or the modern anthropologist of ours, a form of knowledge-

production or representational power considered far too important to be left to them. Members of the object community can now perform as ethnographers and collectors of their own culture/s, in their agentive attempts to set the terms for producing knowledges about them and for their self-representations. The collecting and exhibition of culture can now be seen as *performances* (dynamic, if at times self-conflicted) of it, which then pries such culture loose from the tight grip of outside institutions or empowered investigators, and can now be "selected, gathered, detached from their original temporal occasions and given enduring value in a new arrangement" by such community ethnographers and collectors themselves. In Earl Alan Cura's "The Blessings of Missionary Failures," and his "phenomenological portraiture" of three Cordilleran alumni of CICM schools, we see such possibilities of self-empowerment and self-voicing operationalized in the author's gesture of regarding his subjects as "co-researchers," his collaborators, rather than as key-informants, in the project of curating their personal narratives of self-transformation and indigenous identity/cultural politics under the impact of "mainstream" or "missionary" education and their own subsequent careers as community pedagogues.

Problematics

If there is one problematic central to Cordillera studies (and the mother field of Philippine studies as well), it is that of *indigeneity*. As leading Philippine linguist Lawrence Reid posed it in his keynote address before the 1st International Conference on Cordillera Studies in 2008 (revsd. and publ. in the 2009 inaugural issue of *TCR*): "Who are the indigenous?" "Where did the indigenous come from?" (2009, 4 & 9). Although Reid provided truly complex answers to these organizing questions, drawn exhaustively from linguistic and archeological evidence, and some of which proved to be quite troubling, more and related questions arose (something he ostensibly meant to happen as a provocation). Going through some preliminary, revised, and established definitions (from the typical dictionary entry, the United Nations, the International Labor Organization, the World Bank, and the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act/National Commission on Indigenous Peoples), Reid took on the various ambiguities which these precedent definitions left unclarified or to which they inevitably led. I will not rehearse his discussion here as the address/article is best read directly for its systematic, critical, and lucid expositions on the subject. But I will selectively draw some basic propositions from it to clarify what, to my mind, is at issue and at stake. One thing is certain after Reid's highly consequential intervention: this problematic of indigeneity has been opened up for unwavering and sustained interrogation in our field/s.

But as recently as 2016, Padmapani Perez, in her Introduction, as Guest-Editor, to the *TCR* Special Issue in Indigenous Studies, would summarize our understandings of indigeneity as a form of "tenuous knowing" (3):

> Indigenousness is a slippery thing. Like water, it takes the shape of the container that holds it. And, like water, it can breach walls that were meant to keep it on course or in place … After decades of debate scholars, activists, politicians and indigenous peoples do not agree on a definition, much less a unifying theory. One definition cannot possibly encompass the diversity of peoples around the world who call themselves indigenous. However, there exists a shared understanding (though not unproblematic) around indigenousness, and boundaries (though not static) around who can claim to be indigenous and who cannot. In other words, when someone says "indigenous" we somehow know what she or he means.

The near-instinctuality of this "knowing" is probably best expressed or recognized in the secondary dictionary definition for 'indigenous' which Reid first cites for his own critical discussion (2009, 4):

> 2. innate; inherent; inborn. **Syn.** original, native, aboriginal.

Apart from what the American ethnic studies scholar Werner Sollors (1987) once called the "biological insiderism" (innate, inherent, inborn) that attaches to claims of indigeneity or race/ethnicity, the synonymous meaning of original/aboriginal or, more especially, "native," has underlain the subconsciousness concerning indigeneity/indigenousness that Perez had flagged for us. Those who were once derogatorily called "natives" ('original/aboriginal Filipinos') by the colonizers, like 'Igorrotes' or the 'indios' of the Spanish conquista and the 'little brown brothers and sisters' of American Benevolent Assimilation, may now be more positively called or described as indigenous. As Reid annotates the secondary dictionary definition, and the synonymy of *indigenous* with *native*, the principle of the precedence in the inhabitation of a given territorial area by a given group (the original/aboriginal or *first* inhabitants of said area/s and their descendants) blurs the sociocultural and historical distinctions that the term supposedly and otherwise enables (2009, 4):

> [T]his definition … creates a problem, because we might also claim that in the Philippines, any people who are the first inhabitants of a given area are indigenous, and that their language is therefore an indigenous language, so that Ilokano could be claimed to be an indigenous language, because it is spoken by the original inhabitants of the Ilocos provinces, but do we know that the Ilokanos… are the original inhabitants of the areas they now occupy?

On this score, as Reid notes, the UN's 1972 working definition also generates a certain indistinction between what is indigenous and what is not:

> "Indigenous populations are composed of the existing descendants of the peoples who inhabited the present territory of a country wholly or partially at the time when persons of a different culture or ethnic origin arrived there from other parts of the world, overcame them, by conquest, settlement or other means, reduced them to a non-dominant or colonial condition; who today live more in conformity with their particular social, economic and cultural customs and traditions than with the institutions of the country of which they now form part, under a state structure which incorporates mainly national, social and cultural characteristics of other segments of the population which are predominant."

Reid rightly characterizes this as a definition "that applies mainly to pre-colonial populations… [i]n effect, under this definition all Filipinos, during the periods of Spanish and American colonization would have been indigenous…" (ibid., 5). It was only with the UN's addition of a qualifier in 1993 concerning the aspect of "isolation" of certain communities from "other segments of the country's population," allowing them to retain "almost… intact the customs and traditions of their ancestors" that the UN's definition/s could begin to seem specifically applicable for Cordillerans and the Cordilleras (ibid.).

The consequences of history – colonial and political – now get factored into the narrative of development (here, on the important level of discourse) of indigeneity/indigenousness. When not called 'natives,' those who are now designated as Indigenous Peoples (IPs) were also once called, given the administrative mediations of the colonial and later post-independence State, 'cultural minorities.' We are familiar with how this was later changed to 'national minorities' once the extremely problematic connotations of the former term immediately became evident. For not only were such cultures or communities degraded by it as *minor* but were/are, in effect, with each use of the phrase, actively *minoritized* in the imagined Philippine-

national community and, even with the substitution of 'national' for 'cultural,' by the juridical discourses of the postcolonial State (for the State's "legal pluralism" esp. in relation to "ancestral land rights" and "ancestral domains," see Prill-Brett 2015, 171-190).

Practically all the contributions to this issue have something on offer regarding indigenousness, understood in terms of the semantic ambiguities identified by Reid and Perez. In particular, in their proposition to mine the Historical Data Papers (HDP) to map, via the Geographical Information System (GIS), the patterns of migration and settlement in the Ilocos region, and by the very terms they use to track, in snapshot fashion, this region's history of inhabitation, Ryan Pawilen and Bernardo Arellano III resonate the problematic of 'origins,' the nativity to a place, raised by Reid. With the *settlement*, and the intra- and cross-regional *migrations* of Ilocanos and Igorots alike, they do not assume the precedence in inhabitation of the Ilocos provinces by any community, including the Ilocanos themselves. With their hypothesis of "intercultural interactions" between and among Ilocano and Igorot settlements, the patterns of inhabitation of the Ilocos region, which they successfully translate into visual maps, become less of definite origins and certain destinations than of continuous movements and the contingent mobility of its various populations (for historical accounts of such 'lowland-highland' interactions, the classic to consult is, of course, Scott 1974; Yoneno-Reyes, in a forthcoming essay, presents a historiographic critique and deconstruction of the 'lowland-highland' dichotomy itself).

In an equally snapshot account of a comparable multicultural repopulation in recent history, that of "Baguio and its environs," as a consequence of the swift urbanization of a formerly transient and skeletal colonial hill station following the "gold boom" of the 1930s, Jose Mathew Luga richly suggests a more complicated process of the inhabitation of the Baguio area than is conventionally known. Soon to develop from that point on as a services hub and the virtual metropole for Northern Luzon, Baguio, after the gold boom and its "integration into the world-economy" with it, would also be radically reconfigured into the "community of migrants and settlers" that we now know it as. Tantalizingly, Luga speaks of the Ibaloys and Kankana-eys of Benguet, assumed to be its "local native population," as having moved from their former coastal settlements in Pangasinan to the mountain region, "in search of the gold mines of Southern Benguet," and becoming the first discoverers of the area's mining sites.

The call now, all told, and as our authors construe it with their projects here, is for more developed and textured local/localized histories and studies to enable us to appreciate the complex and multi-faceted development of our communities in their "intercultural interactions." Such critical narratives will have to be plotted along

multiple axes (the regional, the national, the global) as, for example, Luga essays it here in Baguio's urban historiography: a formidable challenge, no doubt, but one to which this number's contributions rise as exemplary responses. Yet another challenge involves the question of sources and methods in the production of new knowledges in our fields. Pawilen and Bernardo show how fragmentary sources like the HDP reports can be innovatively augmented by mapping and geographic plotting. In "The Vigan Heritage Charter," Eric Zerrudo and Fr. Hermel Pama construct a critical narrative of the methods and sourcing by which a policy document for Vigan as a "World Heritage City" was produced, employing what they term a "value-based and interdisciplinary approach," notable for its two prongs of 'contextual development' and 'content development,' especially around the value of cultural authenticity (a term as much of a problematic in Cultural Heritage Studies as indigenousness is in Indigenous Studies). Finally, in Isa Lacuna's "Kundiman and Catastrophe," the genre analysis of the Tagalog song is supplemented by ecocritical and philological or tropological techniques to access the "weather-knowledge" and political allegories otherwise archived beneath its conventional thematics of romance. With this venturesome compound of methodologies, the folk kundiman is found to encode the very mode of reading it for such content, what Lacuna calls "meta-modality." The source may, with this creative approach, emerge as the very fount of method/s itself.

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

Acknowledgements *This back-to-back issue of the journal is dedicated to, and meant in honor of, Dr. Raymundo Rovillos, Chancellor of the University of the Philippines Baguio for three terms (2012-21), and under whose watch the TCR experienced two major innovations: the production of Special Issues, and the shift from print to open-access online publishing. I am specially thankful to the Editorial Board (Editor-in-Chief Jimmy Fong, and Associate Editors Drs. Priscilla Macansantos, Dr. Third Dacanay, and Prof. Junley Lazaga) for their dedicated work in screening our submissions for peer review, and to Dr. Leah Enkiwe-Abayao, Managing Editor, for her close and patient supervision of the editorial process. I could have not accomplished my guest-editorship of this issue without the considerate editorial assistance and closely-engaged reviews provided, despite extremely difficult working conditions ushered by the pandemic, by colleagues and peers from four Philippine, five North American, and two Western European*

universities. Finally, my gratitude to outgoing Director of the Cordillera Studies Center Dr. Ruth Tindaan and incoming Director Dr. Tala Ramos, and to the Office of the Chancellor, University of the Philippines Baguio, knows no bounds. It was a distinct honor to be asked by them to serve a third time as Guest-Editor of the journal.

REFERENCES

Clifford, James. 1993/94. "On Collecting Art & Culture." In *The Cultural Studies Reader*, edited by Simon During, 49-73. New York & London: Routledge.

____. 1992. "Travelling Cultures." In *Cultural Studies*, edited by Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson & Paula Treichler, 96-116. New York & London: Routledge.

Perez, Padmapani L. 2016. "Introduction." *The Cordillera Review: Journal of Philippine Culture and Society* 6.2 (September): 3-5.

Prill-Brett, June. 2015. "Contested Domains: The Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act and Legal Pluralism." In J. Prill-Brett, *Tradition and Transformation: Studies on Cordillera Indigenous Culture*, edited by Delfin L. Tolentino Jr. Baguio: Cordillera Studies Center.

Reid, Lawrence. 2009. "Who are the Indigenous?: Origins and Transformations." *The Cordillera Review: Journal of Philippine Culture and Society* 1.1 (March): 3-26.

Rosaldo, Renato. 1989. *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon.

Scott, William Henry. 1974. *The Discovery of the Igorots: Spanish Contacts with the Pagans of Northern Luzon*. Quezon City: New Day.

Sollors, Werner. 1987. *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Yoneno-Reyes, Michiyo. Forthcoming (2022). "Highland-Lowland Dichotomy in Philippine Studies: Colonial Roots and Counter Narratives." In *Colonialism and Modernity: Re-mapping Philippine Histories*, edited by Oscar V. Campomanes, Yoshiko Nagano, and Nobutaka Suzuki. Naga City: Ateneo de Naga University Press.