



LUND UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Social Sciences
Department of Political Science

STVM01
Master's Thesis (One Year) in Global Studies
Spring Term 2011
Supervisor: Isabelle Cote

The Wandering Nation

A Research on the Discursive Construction of Filipino Identity

Wang You

Abstract

The Philippines is a unique case to study national identity as it's a post-colonial, highly Americanized country constituted by quantities of ethnic groups. Filipino identity emerged from the revolution against Spanish colonization and developed as an anti-colonial movement along with its struggles for independence. However, after independence, the Philippines has been facing a dilemma that, on one hand, it urges to pursue a national identity through post-colonial discourses, especially through de-Americanization, and on the other hand, her deep Americanization underlies her national pride, which results in the lack and confusion of Filipino identity nowadays.

In the process of constructing a national identity, a common history, the feeling of national pride and the combination of “the Other” and “fear” are underlying themes. Also, high standard of living ensures the national pride and identity. In this thesis, the author uses Critical Discourse Analysis developed by Fairclough to reveal how the Filipino identity has been constructed and changed, especially how the Filipino history is changed and taught, the national pride and the fear are produced, by the dominant group. Texts produced by important people and institutions are included, and also comments from ordinary people as complementary.

Key words: Filipino identity, Americanization, Post-colonial, critical discourse analysis.

Words: 9986.

Table of contents

| | | |
|-------------------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction..... | 1 |
| 2 | Theoretical Framework..... | 3 |
| 2.1 | Nation and National Identity..... | 3 |
| 2.1.1 | National identity: a collective consciousness;..... | 3 |
| 2.1.2 | Requires the construction of difference, of pride and fear;..... | 4 |
| 2.1.3 | An instrument for undemocratic power;..... | 5 |
| 2.1.4 | Non-tangible but yet tangible..... | 7 |
| 2.2 | Post-colonial National Identity in RP..... | 8 |
| 3 | Methodology..... | 10 |
| 3.1 | Critical Discourse Analysis as the Method..... | 10 |
| 3.1.1 | Why CDA?..... | 10 |
| 3.1.2 | Fairclough’s three-dimensional model..... | 11 |
| 3.2 | The Choice of the Texts..... | 12 |
| 4 | The Analysis of the Texts..... | 14 |
| 4.1 | The Colonial Period..... | 14 |
| 4.1.1 | The preliminary Filipino identity..... | 14 |
| 4.1.2 | A newborn anti-colonial identity..... | 15 |
| 4.1.3 | An attempt to extricate RP from US..... | 16 |
| 4.2 | Current Filipino Identity..... | 18 |
| 4.2.1 | Anti-colonial history: not valued as before;..... | 19 |
| 4.2.2 | Post-colonial discourses: critiques on the colonial mentality;..... | 19 |
| 4.2.3 | Tagalog and English: two national languages;..... | 20 |
| 4.2.4 | Americanized education: Americanized country;..... | 21 |
| 4.2.5 | Filipinos’ pride: hybridity or Americanization?..... | 22 |
| 4.2.6 | Other perspectives: cultural diversity and pre-colonial history..... | 23 |
| 5 | Conclusion..... | 25 |
| | References..... | 26 |
| | Appendix..... | 28 |
| Appendix 1 | Mabini A.: The True Decalogue, July 1898..... | 28 |
| Appendix 2 | Romulo, C. P.: I am a Filipino, August 1941..... | 29 |
| Appendix 3 | Macapagal, D.: June 12 as Independence Day, 1962..... | 31 |
| Appendix 4 | Lacson, A. L.: I am Filipino, January 2, 2009..... | 32 |
| Appendix 5 | David, R.: On being Filipino, June 13, 2009..... | 34 |
| Appendix 6 | Yabang Pinoy (YP) : We are Filipinos. Filipinos are we., 2010. | 35 |
| Appendix 7 | Hernandez, B.: Kalayaan, June 11, 2010..... | 36 |
| Appendix 8 | Leon, C. D.: Dysfunctionally Pinoy, June 29, 2009..... | 38 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Appendix 9 Alampay, G.: What does it mean to be Filipino? June 12, 2009. | 40 |
| Appendix 10 Julian, P. L.: Body to develop, preserve RP's other languages, June 10, 2007. | 42 |
| Appendix 11 Orejas, T.: Reminder from 'king': Language is identity, September 8, 2010. | 43 |
| Appendix 12 Pazzibugan, D.: Muslim schools to start teaching English, Filipino, September 14, 2004. | 44 |
| Appendix 13 Jambora, A. A.: School kids take pride in RP history, 2003. | 45 |

1 Introduction

National identity is a sort of identity that distinguishes a group of people within a nation, as a community, from other groups. A well-constructed national identity is crucial for a nation-state, as to convince every of its people that she or he shares the same history and culture with the others, thus they belong to the same community and have to defend it, especially when it's in straits.

The Philippines obtained its independence after 48 years of colonization by US in 1946, right before which it was colonized by the Spain for 333 years. For such a newly independent and post-colonial country, an identity with national values is even more vital. On the other hand, the over 7,100 isles of RP (the Republic of the Philippines), which are geographically isolated from each other, are inhabited by more than 90 ethnic groups; aside from local Philippines, there are also descendants of Chinese, Indonesians, Spanish and American, etc., and their mestizos. The linguistic, cultural, religious and ethnic diversity easily prevents the Philippine from achieving a unite identity. In addition, the construction of national identities has been made even more difficult during the last four decades, by the reordering of the world system of nation-states into a more globalized one (Bankoff & Weekley 2004: 4), which is inescapable by the Philippines. All those make the Philippines a unique complex to study. Besides, "much of post colonial literary studies deals with African, Caribbean, South Asian (especially Indian) texts while those from Southeast Asian do not receive much international attention" (Tope 1998: 4). As "the oldest post-colonial state in Southeast Asia" who "was first in the region to wage a war of national liberation" (Bankoff & Weekley 2004: 5), the Philippines make a representative case on studying the post-colonial countries in Southeast Asia.

Compared to Spain, whose language and culture was only permitted to be learned by the elites, the US implemented a whole American economic, military, cultural and educational system, and most importantly, the democratic ideology in the Philippines, his only colony, which has laid a considerable influence on the land, up from the noble families, down to the ordinary people. On the other hand, in this globalization¹ era, no country is escapable from influencing by the US. Thus, to research the construction of the Filipino identity may reveal the

¹ The concept of globalization is filled with controversies. Some say that globalization was started from colonization. Here I use "globalization" as a term different from colonization, as a process going along with the rapid development of the global market in last decades (Beck 1999) which "bears the strong imprint of American political and economic power" (Giddens 2002: 4).

status-quo of the Philippine society and how it has been coped with Americanization, as both aspect of colonization and recent globalization.

Thus, my research question is:

How has the Filipino National Identity been constructed, and how has it changed in the post-colonial era?

I will argue that the Filipino identity has been closely influenced by its colonial experience: before independence, the Filipino identity was constructed by the desire of independence from the colonizers; in recent years, it is constructed by de-colonization, especially de-Americanization.

In this paper, I will first explore the theories about nation and national identity, explain that a national identity is constructed upon a common history, the national pride and the fear of “the Other”. I will also underlie the undemocratic power existing in the process of constructing the national identity, and emphasize the importance of high standard of living provided by the state as a safeguard of national identity. Whereafter, I will investigate further on the post-colonial national identity in the Philippines, which utilizes a critical perspective on its colonial experience, as to redefine its own place.

Subsequently, I will explain that Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis is an appropriate methodology to study national identity as it reveals the unequal power relations in the discursively construction of the latter. Then, I will present the 13 texts I have included and show their importance. By analyzing the texts, I will uncover how the Filipino identity has been constructed and changed from revolution till now, especially how the history is changed and taught, the national pride and the fear are produced, as to reveal how the Filipino identity has been constructed by colonial and post-colonial experience.

2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Nation and National Identity

It is prevalently accepted that Benedict Anderson (2006: 15) defines the nation as “an imagined political community”, people read the same newspapers, watch the same TV programs, and imagine that they belong to a same national community with boundaries; also, since rooted from the French Enlightenment and Revolution, “nation” implies independence, freedom and sovereignty, just as Anderson (ibid) points out, “nations dream of being free, and, if under God, directly so. The gage and emblem of this freedom is the sovereign state”.

Besides the political dimension of the nation, Anderson (2006) also values the inherent cultural attribute of nations, which has always been neglected in practice. As a matter of fact, only after the Enlightenment, when nation-states became the new order of international relations did strangers start to be imagined similar to oneself as, for instance, “French”. That is to say, nation is first of all rooted in culture, it is a “community whose togetherness is constituted by ethnic or other equally deep cultural ties” (Tope 1998: 12), “a system of cultural representations by means of which an imagined community may be interpreted” (quoted in Wodak et al. 1999b: 155). Therefore, as Tope (ibid: 16) summarizes, the *political nation* “may be a multicultural community created by political will and whose formation essentially depends upon the individual’s free will and subjective commitment to it” whilst the *cultural nation* “is founded on commonalities and *does not need to be mediated* by a national state or other political form”, here, “one’s being a member of a nation is decided by *fate or history*”.

In plain terms, national identity is a collective feeling that one belongs to a particular nation. Based on the previous discussion on nation-state and nation, I can investigate national identity from the following aspects:

2.1.1 National identity: a collective consciousness;

National identity is based on the history shared by people in a nation. Wodak (et al. 1999b: 154) believes that “[t]he construction of national identity builds on the emphasis on a common history”, and a common history provides evidence that within the nation, people possess *similars* with each other in race, culture, and so

forth. Further, as Wodak (ibid: 153) regards, national identity is “a sort of habitus”, that is to say, it is “a complex of common ideas, concepts or perception schemes, (a) of related emotional attitudes intersubjectively shared within a specific group of persons; (b) as well as of similar behavioural dispositions; (c) all of which are internalized through ‘national’ socialization.”

Thus, national identity can be defined as a collective consciousness that emerges in the domain of the nation, a belongingness to “a community of congenial similars” (ibid: 154). For instance, when people in the Philippines hear stories from their grandfather about their grandfathers’ experience in the independence war in 1898, the ideas may formulate in their mind that they belong to the country from generation to generation, and they share the glory and suffering of the past; when they learn the same culture from the same history textbooks, they believe that they are similar to each other: they are all happy, helpful person with medium body and brown skin -- though not everyone is like that.

2.1.2 Requires the construction of difference, of pride and fear;

National identity is a sort of “identity”, which “gets its meaning from what it is not, from **the Other**” (Martin 1995: 5). Thus, although national identity is a set of collective ideas which seek for *similars within the community*, it is first of all an “identity”, which also seek for *differences out of the community* from the Other. To illustrate, since nations “are perceived as limited by boundaries and thereby cut off from the surrounding nations” (Wodak et al. 1999b: 154), a national identity is always defined as a distinctiveness and uniqueness from other nations. Martin (1995: 11) defenses, “[t]o become a community, its members need to acquire the feeling that they share something that makes them distinct of other groups in society and that also makes irrelevant other traits which could link them to those other groups”, just as Filipinos are proud of their best English-speaking in Southeast Asia.

On the other hand, an identity is never produced only from inside a group; “a group is formed as much because *others* believe it exists, and attribute certain features to people they put in it, as because its members, or supposed members, identify with it” (ibid: 15). Thus, the international approval is also an important dimension of national identity. For example, from a century ago, Filipinos have begun to work overseas; what they receive from foreigners about their own country contributes to their identity as a Filipino: when people admire that Philippines owns the most beautiful islands and the richest marine resources, or they are praised as helpful, happy and genuine people, they feel proud as Filipinos; when RP is criticized as the most corrupt government in the world, they may defend the country but feel ashamed for it. In other words, this sort of requirement for

distinctiveness and approval from other nations is not only for difference, but more for a *national pride*. Only when a person is proud of the country and his countryman can he feel that he is willing to be a Filipino.

Furthermore, Martin (ibid) points out that “this feeling of belonging together is very often spurred by the perception of a common threat or of an injustice”. A national identity calls for “the perpetuation from generation to generation of the fear of the enemy whose real or imagined hostility threatens the security of the nation” (quoted in Tope 1998: 16). In order to fight against threats or injustices people can reaffirm who they are, and would be willing to be united and represented by the nation-state, such as how the US has attained the unprecedented unity from 9/11. Thus, to combine the Other and *threat* is an effective way to evoke people’s identity as a part of the nation. Hence, to combine “the Other” with “the colonizers” is helpful to establish the Filipino identity, which will be further illustrated in chapter 4.

All in all, the claim of “the Other” reaffirms the national identity, to aware the distinctions of “our nation” compared to other nations creates national pride, and to feel threatened by Others emerges fear and thus unity. Identity politics is “always and necessarily a politics of the creation of difference” (quoted in Wodak et al. 1999b: 154), the creation of both pride and fear.

2.1.3 An instrument for undemocratic power;

Why national identity is urgently to be constructed? Tope (1998: 27) states that national identity “establishes originary grounding and provides a nation with a cultural pillar to which it cleaves when buffeted by historical and political winds. It imbues nationhood with a sacredness resulting from a covenant among individuals to share a sense of self”. Nevertheless, the national identity is not only a vital support for the nation, but also fragile and incoherent, which implies that it is abound with possibilities to be changed, therefore emerges power. Wodak (et al. 1999b: 154) explains that “there is no such thing as *the one and only* national identity in an essentializing sense, but rather that different identities are discursively constructed according to context”; that is to say, “national identities are not completely consistent, stable and immutable. They are, to the contrary, to be understood as dynamic, fragile, ‘vulnerable’ and often incoherent” (ibid). Identity is “a process rather than an artifact or an outcome” (Tope 1988: 213), *national identity is never completely constructed, thus is always in the process of changing*.

To mediate that kind of possibilities as to change the national identity is an utilizable and useful way to possess power; vice versa, powerless people can hardly seize the possibilities. Just as Martin (1995: 13) states:

The identity narrative [...] is a weapon in a struggle for power. [...] the identity narrative channels political emotions so that they can fuel efforts to modify a balance of power; it transforms the perceptions of the past and of the present; it changes the organization of human groups and creates new ones; it alters cultures by emphasizing certain traits and skewing their meanings and logic. The identity narrative brings forth a new interpretation of the world in order to modify it.

However, this is a sort of *undemocratic power* which mastered by the dominant group. Let's look at the national history, which provides a foundation for nation-building and national identity, for instance. "It is not difficult to imagine how the intervention of a motivated historian or cartographer could allow the superimposition of a dominant culture's map on that which belongs to less powerful ones" (Tope 1998: 119). In other words, the history is rather a "usable past" (Bankoff & Weekley 2004: 52) than a neutral truth. Therefore, it can be asserted that to "correct" history can make a chief strategy to establish a national identity. In the 19th century Hindu reformist movements, Hindu intellectuals "revisited the history of India and Hinduism so as to make it congruent with the transformations to which they had to submit the traditions", and "they proposed a long past Golden Age when portents of modern changes could be found" (Martin 1995: 9). Another example is that in 1962, the former president of RP changed its Independence Day from July 4 to June 12 successfully as a means to strengthen Filipinos' revolution identity, which will be further analyzed in chapter 4.

Furthermore, this undemocratic power aims at *creating sameness, eliminating difference* within a community, whereby construct a more stable national identity. As I presented above, nation is not only a political construct, but also has its cultural attribute, which is diverse and preexisting, with no need to be mediated. However, to construct a national identity is inevitably runs hand in hand with the *mediating* by the dominant group and the neglecting of cultural diversity within the nation. For instance, the Philippines has more than 90 ethnic groups and over 179 languages, however "Filipino" is defined by a few majority groups and Tagalog has been made its national language, which neglects the cultural and linguistic diversity of other minority groups. On the other side, that non-democracy happens on the individual level too. A national identity unites people who differ from each other in gender, class, religion and ethnicity; it highlights the national dimension of one's identity, while neglecting other dimensions. The mediating and neglecting is undemocratic and ideological, just as Benhabib (1996, quoted in Wodak 1999b: 154) points out:

What is shocking [...] is not the inevitable dialectic of identity/difference that they display but rather the atavistic belief that identities can be maintained and secured **only** by eliminating difference and otherness. The negotiation of identity/difference [...] is the political problem facing democracies on a global scale.

Nevertheless, what we have to bear in mind is that, national identity has its roots in culture. “Even if identity is nothing but what is told in a narrative, there is no group which can transform itself naturally into a political organization defending a proclaimed identity.” (Martin 1995: 12) A successful construction of national identity requires not only the creation by the dominant group, but also the acceptance and conviction from the ordinary people, which implies the importance of the inherent culture ties. Moreover, people *have* the possibilities for resistance, in spite of the reality that the odds are not that pretty.

In summary, National identity is flexible and can always be changed. As already elaborated above, it is based on a common history and requires the construction of difference, especially pride and fear; thus it is effective for the dominant group to create a common history, a pride or an enemy, or exclude “inharmonious” members from the community, therefore produce a “useful” national identity. However, “as soon as it is elevated to an imaginary collective level, both the construction of sameness and the construction of difference violate pluralistic and democratic variety and multiplicity by group-internal homogenization (of in-groups as well as out-groups)” (Wodak et al. 1999b: 153-154).

2.1.4 Non-tangible but yet tangible.

National identity is a mental construct, a feeling that one belongs to an “imagined community”. However, it is much more than just a set of ideas. This feeling should also be ensured by something concrete. As Wodak (et al. 1999a: 22) point out: “this image is real to the extent that one is convinced of it, believes in it and identifies with it emotionally.” How can one be convinced of it? Bankoff & Weekley (2004: 18) provide the answer: it must “infiltrate people’s lives in material forms in order to constitute the reality they are supposed to represent”.

Besides symbolic and material items such as national flag, national heroes, historic sites and distinctive geographical features, it could be more helpful when people believe that they are living in an excellent and beautiful country, using “national money”, and protecting by the “national army”. As Bankoff & Weekley (2004: 18) argue: “The most politically stable nation-states are those whose nation-making is also state-making, where the citizens daily live a connection with the material rewards of their imagined community.” To secure national identity, especially national pride, the economic and political stability and the standard of living should be secured as a package. If, like the nowadays Philippines, corruption is prevalent in the government and the everyday life is troubling (high rate of poverty, poor public order, etc.), people’s feeling of belongingness to the country can hardly be secured. In addition, good governance and living conditions are always important factors to win international praise, as

to win the feeling of pride. In one word, the national identity is tangible in everyday life.

2.2 Post-colonial National Identity in RP

The Philippine isles were constituted a state only after its colonization by Spain. Soon after its revolution against Spain and the announcement of independence on June 12th, 1898, it was ceded to the US for 20 million dollars according to *The 1898 Treaty of Paris* as the “happy ending” of Spanish-American war. Not until July 4th, 1946 did the US granted the Philippines independence peacefully. Therefore, such a long and profound colonial experience naturally occupies a central position of Filipino identity.

In the colonial time, Filipino identity was tied to anti-colonial emotions and desire for independence. However, after being independent from the colonizer, the colonial country would be confronted with an identity disorder: the sudden deletion of “the Other”. Therefore, same as any other post-colonial country in South Africa and South Asia, the Philippines urged to redefine and reunite the nation after the independence. Just as Tope (1998: 27) indicates, “the historically displaced and disoriented, therefore, sometimes manifest a dismembered, decapitated identity which desires reconstitution and wholeness.” That is to say, a post-colonial Filipino identity has thereby been in need since independence.

According to current post-colonial studies, the post-colonial identity contains critiques upon dominant colonial discourses which marginalized the culture of colonials, and constructed (may be still constructing) the colonial societies; and it “aims to reconstruct the identities of subordinated peoples, give them back their pride of place in history, and with it the confidence to build on the record of their own ‘hybrid position of practice and negotiation’” (ibid: 21). In the Philippines, post-colonial discourses manifest mainly as de-Americanization, for instance, the reflections upon “using English as their educational and academic language” help them to make visible the role that English language played in the colonization, and value their own language, therefore pin a new label on “Filipino”.

At the same time, it has to be highlighted that the concept “*hybridity*” occupies a vital place in the post-colonial identity. Compared to the colonial period when “hybridity” was “a term of abuse, signifying the lowest possible form of human life” (ibid), in the postcolonial identity, hybridity is “celebrated and privileged as a kind of superior cultural intelligence through the advantage of ‘in-betweenness’, the straddling of two cultures and the consequent ability to ‘negotiate the difference’” (ibid). For instance, the Filipinos are proud that they possess both the diligent and honest characters of the East and the democratic

tradition of the West. In other words, the post-colonial Filipino identity legitimizes “differences” in-group as the form of hybridity.

In one word, the post-colonial Filipino identity hold mixing/paradoxical characters that on one hand, it contains critiques on the dominant Western discourses as to recuperate from the former inferior status; while on the other hand, it is also constructed by the pride that Filipinos possess both advantages from East and West, and legitimizes that “differences” within the community.

3 Methodology

3.1 Critical Discourse Analysis as the Method

3.1.1 Why CDA?

Critical Discourse Analysis (often abbreviated to CDA) is a frequently used method when a research on national identities (e.g. Wodak et al. 1999; Chouliaraki 1999; etc.) is conducted. In this thesis, the author likewise follow this tradition. Specifically, I will make use of the CDA developed by Fairclough (1992). “The aim of critical discourse analysis is to shed light on the linguistic discursive dimension of social and cultural phenomena and processes of change in late modernity.” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 67) That is to say, first of all, linguistic dimension lays the heart of critical discourse analysis. According to Martin (1995: 6), “[i]dentities are built on relations, and what makes relationships possible is communication, which especially for the human species, is language”. Thus, national identities are discursively constructed, “by means of language and other semiotic systems” (Wodak et al.1999b: 153). And CDA offers appropriate guidelines to conduct the research on how it is discursively constructed.

Secondly, discourse shapes the social world, and “it does not just contribute to the shaping and reshaping of social structures but also reflects them” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 61). Wodak (2001: 3) clarify three important concepts in all CDA:

[...] every discourse is historically produced and interpreted, that is, it is situated in time and space; and that dominance structures are legitimated by ideologies of powerful groups, [...] dominant structures stabilize conventions and naturalize them, that is, the effects of power and ideology in the production of meaning are obscured and acquire stable and natural forms: they are taken as “given”. Resistance is then seen as the breaking of conventions, of stable discursive practices, in acts of “creativity”.

That is to say, in CDA, discourse reflects the unequal relations between the dominant group and the others, and it aims to criticize on “the role of discursive practice in the maintenance of unequal power relations” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 64), as to seek for possibilities for social change. As already illustrated in the previous chapter, national identity is a weapon for undemocratic power, and is produced and secured discursively by the dominant group: “the idea of a specific national community becomes reality in the realm of convictions and beliefs

through reifying, figurative discourses continually launched by politicians, intellectuals and media people and disseminated through the systems of education, schooling, mass communication, militarization as well as through sports meetings.” (Wodak 1999b: 153) Moreover, the Filipino identity is not only constructed by the dominant group within the nation-state, but also by the colonizers. Thus, CDA makes a useful tool to analyze the struggles for power and the maintenance of unequal power relations in the process of constructing Filipino identity.

3.1.2 Fairclough’s three-dimensional model

The broader CDA consists of several approaches among which there are both similarities and differences. In this thesis, the author will make use of CDA developed by Fairclough. In the view of Jørgensen & Phillips (2002: 89), among all the approaches of CDA, Fairclough “constructed the most sophisticated framework for analysis of the relationship between language use and societal practices in general”. For this thesis, the division of the three dimension, texts, discursive practice and social practice, renders discourse analysis sophisticated yet perspicuous and controllable.

According to Fairclough (1992, explained by Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 61), *discursive practice* is a means by which *texts* are “*produced* (created) and *consumed* (received and interpreted)”, while it is “a form of *social practice* which both *constitutes* the social world and is *constituted* by other social practices”. The analysis thus includes (ibid):

The level of discursive practice: Analysis of the discourses and genres which are articulated in the production and the consumption of the text;

The level of the text: analysis of the linguistic structure; and

The level of social practice: considerations about whether the discursive practice reproduces or, instead, restructures the existing order of discourse and about what consequences this has for the broader social practice.

To be specific, *the analysis of discursive practice* is at a “macro” level, “focusing upon the intertextuality and interdiscursivity of discourse samples” (Fairclough 1992: 231). *Intertextuality* refers to the influence of history on a text and to a text’s influence on history, in that the text draws on earlier texts and thereby contributes to historical development and change. (quoted in ibid: 84) *Interdiscursivity* (constitutive intertextuality) of a text is “the configuration of discourse conventions that go into its production” (ibid: 104). *The analysis of text* focuses on the “micro” level, the linguistic structure, of discourse practice. Here, Fairclough provides many practical tools such as modality, theme, ethos, metaphor, and so on, which will be explained by footnotes when used.

Furthermore, social and cultural theories are necessary in addition to *the analysis of social practice*, since CDA does not apply the logic of discourse to every domain of social practice. Hence, theories of national identity and post-colonial identity as illustrated in the previous chapter will serve well on this level.

The main problem with Fairclough's approach, as Jørgensen & Phillips (2002: 89) point out, is that "the consequences for empirical research of the theoretical distinction between the discursive and the non-discursive remain unclear: how can one show exactly *where* and *how* the non-discursive moments influence and change the discursive moment – and vice versa"? Whereas, Jørgensen & Phillips (ibid) also suggest that "researchers should treat the distinction between the discursive and the non-discursive as an analytical distinction rather than an empirical one: what the researcher points to as non-discursive logics, and where she draws the boundary between the discursive and the non-discursive, is more a result of a theoretical and analytical choice". Hence, in this thesis, the author will take the right and clarify my choices.

3.2 The Choice of the Texts

It is impossible to study all the texts produced in a nation-state, so it is wise to pick the texts which influence the greatest number of people. In chapter 2 it has been illustrated that the construction of national identity reveals the undemocratic power, that the dominant group draw the identity map. Also, Van Dijk (1993: 254) points out that "Those who have social power have greater access to the tools of persuasion (e.g. the media, political office) by which they can use strategies to 'change the mind of others in one's own interests'. Thus, the texts produced by *media, universities, government, elites*, and so on are good candidates; and also the texts of *NGOs* since the Philippines "has the longest experience with institutions of liberal democracy in Southeast Asia" and "its institutions of civil society are numerous and increasingly politically significant" (Bankoff & Weekley 2004: 5).

Since the author is not in the Philippines, the texts are only accessible from the internet, where a large number of recent articles but only most important past ones can be obtained. Therefore, texts written by *three important person* (Mabini, the most profound political philosopher ever; Romulo, the greatest journalist ever in the history of Philippines; and also Macapagal, the former president from 1961 to 1965) *in three important historical periods* (the found of the first RP; in the WWII and before the independence from the US, and; after the US announced the independence yet still impose the sovereignty on the Philippines) that many newspapers and blogs refer to and quote, are included.

In recent time, there are not important texts as such, thus several ones are contained, as to compensate quality by quantity. Most of them are chosen from the website <http://www.inquirer.net/>, the official website of the newspaper **Philippines Daily Inquirer**, which is the most widely read newspaper in RP. Besides, this newspaper produces serious news, especially in-depth reports. It is worth to mention that the slogan of this newspaper is “Philippines news for Filipinos”. Most relevant texts found here are about patriotism and how to be a Filipino, thus out of them, two articles written by *the most famous authors*, who are popular writers and at the same time involved in politics, are included. Also, one article from the blog of *the largest nationalism NGO* in RP names Yabang Pinoy (YP) is contained. This article calls for Philippines’ patriotism and provides plans how that can be achieved in action. The ideas in this text have been expressed by many YP’s influential projects and activities.

It would be more comprehensive if this thesis includes interviews or group discussions of *ordinary people*, to see how they understand and react to the Filipino identity -- the production is not the only step in the construction of national identities, it requires also the maintenance and maybe the destruction, which involves the people who receive it. Since the author is not in the Philippines, the interviews are difficult to conduct, however blog articles and the comments upon them can be utilized to compensate. The blog **Being Filipino** on [Inquirer.net blogs](http://www.inquirer.net/blogs) is a popular blog platform, whose articles always receive more than 100 comments -- consider the population of the Philippines and the percentage of people who can get access to the internet, 100 is a considerable amount. Two relevant texts with most comments (353 and 132) are chosen.

There are also some articles discussing Filipino identity in perspectives of history education, language diversity, and so forth on both the newspaper website and the blog, only five in total, and the authors are from important institutions such as NGOs, universities and the government, so they are all included.

The 13 diverse texts, covering different historical period, different aspects of Filipino identity (language, history, patriotism, etc.) and produced by different subjects (the government, newspapers, universities, NGOs, elites and ordinary people) enable the author to compare national identity discourses in recent years with the past ones, and uncover how it has changed. Limitations here are that no texts in Tagalog or other Philippine languages are contained since the author know none of them; however since English is an important official and academic language in RP, the use of English texts are valid. Also, the author is not a native English speaker, so the linguistic analysis may be insufficient.

4 The Analysis of the Texts

4.1 The Colonial Period

4.1.1 The preliminary Filipino identity

The True Decalogue (Mabini, July 1898)

This text was written when the Resistance Army led by General Aguinaldo defeated Spanish colonizers and founded the first Republic of Philippines. Apolinario Mabini was the most profound thinker and political philosopher ever in the Philippines and drafted the first ever constitution in Asia for the first Philippine Republic. This text is published in the pages following the constitution and aimed to meet the needs of Filipino patriotism for all time. The Decalogue tells Filipinos that: God creates the country, and the country is the foundation of race, family, self-interests and rights.

First of all, the religion discourse is perceived as hegemonic to other discourses, according to the title (word from the bible), to the first sentence “You shall love God and your honor above all things”, to the countless repeats of “God” “honor” and “conscience” in every sentence, and so forth. Thus, as the “only paradise God has given you in this life”, “country” whereby possesses power.

Then, by using obligational modality² (every sentence begins with “You shall”), Mabini places himself (who represents the government) at a higher position, highly devote himself to this utterance, persuade everybody to believe it as the “truth”. On the other hand, kindred discourse is used as reasons to make the use of “shall” more convincible: the country is “the only patrimony of your race”, “her independence constitutes your own liberty”, and so forth; which more or less eases the tense between the producers and the receivers. However, every “for” follows an “only”, leaving the readers no choice, thus maximizes impositions on them, whereby emphasizes the authority of the text producer.

It is interesting that Mabini (who fights against US colonization for a whole life) only interprets country as a foundation for the happiness of self, family and

² Modality is a major dimension of discourse. (Fairclough 1992: 160) Analyses of modality focus on the speaker’s degree of affinity with or affiliation to her or his statement. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 83) It refers to how the speaker express the discourse, using ‘must’ ‘may’ ‘should’ ‘obviously’ ‘definitely’ ‘I think’, using simple present tense, and so forth.

race, without mentioning the revolutions just happened, or distinct characters of the Filipino nation -- which, as elaborated, are conventional ways to evoke patriotism. This implies how fragile the Filipino identity was at that time: one hardly perceived himself as related to others as a countryman (Mabini has to compare “countryman” with “neighbor” to illustrate the notion), while only ideas of family and race are comprehensible and convincing. In other words, the nation ties of Filipinos were loose, while people were mostly related by blood ties. As a matter of fact, the notions of “nation” and “state” was vague in the Philippines then, the revolution against Spain was even not initially for sovereignty, only for a better life, for “self-interests”. The process of revolution had shaped the notions such as “independence” “election” and “Republic” gradually; and the found of the first Philippine Republic promoted the emerging of a Filipino identity.

In summary, this article contains a low level of interdiscursivity, and possesses a high level of imposition on the readers. That reveals how the Filipino identity was in the preliminary level. “*I am a Filipino*” then had a vague meaning, however began to formulate specific meanings.”

4.1.2 A newborn anti-colonial identity

I am a Filipino (Romulo, August 1941)

Soon after General Aguinaldo claimed Philippines’ independence, the US bought the Islands for only 20 million dollars as a trophy from the Spanish-American War and set about colonizing them. The US colonized the Philippines for 48 years until 1946, and in those years, Philippine people never stopped striving for autonomy and independence.

Carlos P. Romulo was the greatest journalist in the history of the Philippines who became the first non-American to win the Pulitzer Prize in Correspondence in 1942; he was the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Philippines from 1950 to 1984 and the country’s representative to the United Nations then. Thus his works are profoundly influential to the Philippine people. This article was written in the WWII, when the Philippines was threatened by Japan; and also when she was struggling for independence from the US. From the title we can tell that it expresses a Philippine national identity explicitly; the use of “I” as subject is an effective way to arouse echo in the readers’ hearts. As a journalist who took patriotism as responsible, Romulo successfully awakened Filipinos’ ambition against colonizers.

Compared to the previous article, this text contains a higher degree of interdiscursivity. It articulates national identity with common forefathers (although actually there were many different groups), rich and beautiful land, and

an anti-colonial history built by many extraordinary heroes; which all turn the idea of “I am a Filipino” tangible, and highlight sameness and pride beard in all Filipinos. On the other hand, colonialism is a sort of threat, as explained in Chapter 2, which is useful to spur the feeling of belonging together. In addition, the heroes and battlefields underlined are mostly related to victories against Spain and America, implying a determination to defeat colonizers in the future.

Metaphors³ are active in this text. The anti-colonial spiritual is compared to “seed”, implies that it is newly born. Compare the Philippines to “child” of the “marriage” of the “East” as “mother” and the “West” as “father” implies that the Philippines harbors intimacy feelings toward both her Asian roots and her mother countries, she accepts the colonial history as non-optional and indelible; however, when Romulo mentions that “the seed I bear” is like “the seeds of Tutankhamen”, the desire to overthrow the “father” reveals.

On the other hand, “seed” and “child” imply young and hope. What is the hope? Democracy, Romulo answers, by describing it as “the sun”, which produces energy for seeds’ growing. Although democracy is an American perception, it has been highly approved by the Philippines as a powerful tool against colonization, and that is the reason why she also feels paradoxical intimacy towards “the West”.

This article can be treated as a direct reaction to WWII, where the Philippines acted as the vanguard of the sleeping East against Japan; whilst, it was also a reaction against the US colonization. That reveals that the Filipino identity began to be tied to anti-colonialism, “*I am a Filipino*” meant “*I am growing to fight the colonizers*” then. Later, that ambition catalyzed the Philippines’ independence from the US in 1946.

4.1.3 An attempt to extricate RP from US

June 12 as Independence day (Macapagal, 1962)

In 1962, Diosdado Macapagal, the former president from 1961 to 1965 who owned power to change the Independence Day according to RP’s constitution, changed the Independence Day from July 4 to June 12, which was a social practice created a new dominant discourse. This article written by Macapagal presents the reason why he changed the National Day, thus how revolution discourses defeated colonial discourses and became dominant -- the “seeds” described in the previous text were blossoming and bearing fruit in this period.

³ When we signify things through one metaphor rather than another, we are constructing our reality in one way rather than another. (Fairclough 1992: 194)

When US granted the Philippines independence, *the Bell Trade Act* was signed as a side condition, in which there were loads of unequal clauses, for instance, RP should never manufacture or sell any products that might come into substantial competition with US (that is why this text is included here as in colonial time); however, US has been its largest trade partner since the colonization. Both two sides force RP economically dependent on the US. That is why “July 4” was articulated with “dependence on the US” and unsatisfied the Philippine nationalists.

Macapagal states that “a nation is born into freedom on the day when such a people moulded into a nation by [...] a sense of oneness born of common struggle and suffering”, this constructs both “sameness” (common) and “threat” (struggle), which is helpful to construct a unite identity. Also, “June 12” combines the discourse of Independence Day with “pride”, with heroes and the victory against Spain. Compared to that, “June 12” elbows “July 4” as “the Other”, as an articulation with the “dependence” and failures against “threat”.

The change of the National Day can be regarded as a reaction to the increasing anti-American nationalism in that period, which resulted from the economical and political context. Firstly, the previous governments had made great effort to cast away from US influence since 1946, especially in the aspect of economy, and also in aspects of education and culture, and so on. Secondly, Philippines was in her rapid development (in 1962, only 1.9 Philippine pesos equal 1 US Dollar), which laid a foundation for its confidence to reduce the level of dependence on the US. As I stated in chapter 2, national identity should be ensured and maintained by tangible objects, among which economic prosperous is of vital significance. On the other hand, to reshape national identity is, as I already discussed, a strategy to pursue power. For a new president like Macapagal, to change the National Day, thus transform national identity from a passive colonial one to a positive revolution one is a proper way to gain popular support.

Filipinos proved their satisfactions toward the change of Independence Day by spectacular celebrations of more than 1,000,000 people, which was one of the largest celebrations in RP till now, while in previous celebrations on July 4, only less than 300,000. Later, that rise of nationalism resulted in several large anti-America demonstrations in 1960s. Then, in 1991, RP refused to extend the US lease at the Subic Bay Naval Station, which was “one giant step toward decolonization” (Tope 1998: 61) and hailed as “the real independence from US” by many historians.

This case also reaffirms that to correct history is an effective way to construct national identity. The “true” history of Philippines’ independence was not important for Macapagal, while what can be “used” was important. As a dominant power, he is able to use the history as a “usable past”, change and “correct” it, and

claim “the history fact is [...]”; thus to achieve a “right” identity, which would serve the unity of the nation and support to the government.

To sum up, to correct history is a chief strategy to construct the national identity. Change the National Day from July 4 to June 12 is an emphasis upon revolution, which makes Filipinos on one side proud of their glorious past, on the other side remembers the fear. In the process of the transformation, the US was trying to be excluded as “the *Other*”; by setting the Philippines as non-American, the Filipino identity was reaffirmed. The rapid growth of economy and steps toward military independence then ensured that identity. At that time, the Filipinos’ feeling of belongingness was strong, and the meaning of “*I am a Filipino*” was specific and diverse, includes “*I share a common glorious and suffering past with other Filipinos*” and especially “*We are independent from the US*”.

All in all, after the analysis of colonial and newly independent identity of the Philippines, we can see that a “common history” (which serves as the base of national identity) of the Filipino nation, was indivisible from, or even equal to the “anti-colonial history”. Thus, the Filipino identity was constructed along with increasing anti-colonial emotions in the colonial period.

4.2 Current Filipino Identity

After the abandonment of the Bell Trade Act and the lease of Subic military base, RP was in fact a sovereign country. However, from another perspective, the Philippines was suddenly bereft of the colonizer -- “the *Other*”, who gave meaning to the anti-colonial Filipino identity; before she can catch her breath, she was again engulfed by the flood of the rapid economic globalization. It seems that the Philippines has not handled those challenges well, as in nowadays, there is a consensus that the Philippines is lack of national identity.

That consensus is displayed in most of the texts. Alampay introduces an art exhibition with the theme of “what does it mean to be Filipino?” He does not simply introduce the exhibition, but combines promotional discourses with national identity discourses, such as “it is an engaging, and completely relaxed environment, especially on Sundays when the whole place is closed to traffic, and joggers jog, children play [...]”. Also, loads of questions are used to attract interests from the readers. By combining advertising, Alampay aims to “sell” the exhibition to readers, which can be seen as a reaction to the dilemma that it is not easy to get Philippine people interested in the topic of national identity.

At the same time, David mentions “Filipinos did not always imagine themselves as distinct people”; YP also says that “Sadly, few are conscious of this invisible thread between men and country”; and Jambora even indicates that “unlike the rest of the Asia, we seem to have *no* identity, culture and patriotism”. All those negative words -- “cannot” “did not always” “incomplete” “Sadly” and “no” -- pass passive messages, therefore reveal that the lack of Filipino identity is prevalently admitted.

Then how is the Filipino identity constructed now? What has been changed in the post-colonial era compared to the colonial period? What challenges are it confronted with? What is discouraging the construction of a unite identity in RP?

4.2.1 Anti-colonial history: not valued as before;

Hernandez lays the reason of weak Filipino identity on the improperly taught history. He claims: “Properly taught, we are supposed to have a clear sense of who we are as Filipinos.” Using “are supposed to” shows that he deeply believes that proper history education is the fundamental element of a Filipino identity. He points out that “History is no longer taught as fascinatingly in today’s classrooms”; it is obvious in the context that using the word “no longer”, he is comparing the current situation with when he was in primary school, President Macapagal declared June 12 as the Philippine Independence Day; which implies that the feeling of belongingness to the Philippine nation is no longer so strong as in 1962 since the colonial history is not properly taught now: History tends to be confused with Civics in primary schools and is mostly taught in high school when many Filipino school children do not even get to that level.

That status-quo reveals that unlike in colonial time when Filipino identity was based on the revolution history, the anti-colonial discourses are not key elements to construct Filipino identity any more.

4.2.2 Post-colonial discourses: critiques on the colonial mentality;

As elaborated in Chapter 2, national pride is an essential factor in constructing the national identity. However, some Philippine people are still ashamed or unwilling to be Filipinos because they consider “Filipino” as inferior. As Leon points out, “the concept of being proudly Filipino was taught to us in abstract and vague terms. We never really know what to be proud of” while “colonial mentality was more concretely demonstrated to us”, which implies that the colonial mentality is linked to the opposite of “proud”, to “inferior” or “shame”. He demonstrates that “a perfect example was how popular I was with my high school teachers and classmates, just because I spoke fluent English. I highly doubt they would have looked up to me as much had I been just as skilled at speaking Tagalog.” Thus, speaking Tagalog is considered as post-colonial, while speaking

English as colonial; the word “look up” and the two “just”s uncover that the social practice -- his teachers and classmates made him popular -- is shaped by the discourse that speaking fluent English is superior than speaking Tagalog; however, “highly doubt” show his critical reflections upon that phenomenon: colonial discourses and post-colonial discourses are competing with each other to construct the Filipino identity.

YP also blames the colonial experience that “the Philippine’s long history is a severe narrative of colonization, subjugation, and domestication, dulling our senses and sensitivities” while criticizes on that discourse that “more than a century thus passed; obsolete and unconvincing already is the excuse of colonial mentality.” Upon the name of the exhibition “Looking for Juan”, Alampay asks: “Juan is a Spanish name, [...] Do we reject ‘Juan’ as a non-Filipino name? Or do we embrace it as an undeniable part of who we are today given our history?” He gives the two answers by questioning them again, therefore reveals that two kinds of situation are both existing in current Philippine society, as colonial and post-colonial and struggling with each other. The comments upon the two articles (Leon and Alampay) also reveal that most people are aware that they are constructed by the colonial discourses; some of them still consider being Filipino as a shame and blame the government a lot, while more of them criticize upon those ideas and express the sense of proud as Filipinos.

In one word, high degree of interdiscursivity in all the texts and comments above implies a tendency of change that post-colonial discourses may replace colonial discourses as dominant. It is not easy for the Philippines to escape from that long colonial experience in such a short time; however the Filipinos has started rethinking their colonial mentality and trying to critic on it, thus rebuild their pride.

4.2.3 Tagalog and English: two national languages;

English was made the official and educational language in the Philippines right after US conquered her in 1910, underlying the success of Americanization in the Philippines. Colonization begins in language, and language lays the heart of the identity, as already illustrated in chapter 3. “By displacing native languages, by imposing a criterion hostile to any local contribution, colonialism cancels the native’s right to articulate in his own way.” (Ashcroft et al 1995: 283) Thus, to judge English and value the Philippine language is a vital post-colonial move to establish a Filipino identity. From 1993, Tagalog⁴ was included as another official and educational language in the Philippines, and the government has been promoting the language as “Filipino”. At the same time, the cultural diversity of Philippines’ more than 90 minority groups and the linguistic diversity of more

⁴ Tagalog is a majority group in the Philippines, and is the most rich and modern group.

than 179 dialects may be eroded as “the unavoidable orphans of decolonization and nation-building” (Tope 1998, pp.26-27).

The news written by Orejas quotes Alzadon’s words: “If I stop speaking and writing in Kapampangan, I am no longer a Kapampangan. My language is the symbol of my identity.” He then emphasizes that “let’s save it from death”, which exaggerates the intensesness of the struggle between speaking national languages and speaking Kapampangan, however reflects the dominant position of the former. Pazzibugan’s article shows a compliance to that dominance: the Muslim schools start “teaching English, Filipino and other mainstream subjects to their students”, to prevent their students from “becoming foreigners in their own country”, and it also means “our students can go to univerisity”. The word “mainstream” reveals the meaning of “dominant”, and “university” is also a dominant institution in a country.

In a word, a unite Filipino identity is now constructed by making Tagalog a dominant language whereby achieve the “similar” with the country, and also a post-colonial tool whereby reestablish the Filipinos’ pride of speaking their own language. However, English has been remained as the other official language in the Philippines, which will be further analyzed later; Tagalog (as post-colonial) has not succeed challenging the importance of English (as colonial), which contradicts the result in the previous section. This brings further discussion about Americanization: does it only mean colonization to the Philippines?

4.2.4 Americanized education: Americanized country;

In the three newspaper articles written by Lacson, David, and YP, a dominant discourse is uncovered as “to be Filipino is to be responsible for the country”. Lacson points that “loving ourselves as Filipinos is not only patriotism of nationalism” while “it is primarily about stewardship”; David states the same opinion that Filipino identity “allows us not only to share in the glory of the nation’s achievement, but also to feel accountable for its ruin”; the words “primarily” and “but also” make clear that the authors consider “stewardship” and “accountability” as the more important part of Filipino identity. YP states that “progress starts not from drastic changes in the political system, but in changing every Filipino’s mindset”, which deny the importance of government promotion, however pin the responsibilities on “every Filipino”.

Those ideas of citizenship remind the author of one famous claim by John F. Kennedy: “Don’t ask what the country can do for you, ask instead what you can do for the country.” How those ideas possess dominant position reflects how deep the US ideology influences the Philippines. Further, this influence is conducted mainly through the Americanized education.

“American colonization was unique in the sense that it espoused the contradictory values of colonial authoritarianism and democracy” (Torres 2010: 186), which legitimized “invasion” and “plundering” by claiming to “help” the Philippines get “freedom” and “equality”. As soon as US conquered the Philippines, he implemented a whole American education system on her, in English, teaching American history, culture, science and ideology. Along with the education was the project of “Filipinization” (Brands 1992) aimed to teach the Philippines how to conduct democracy herself, therefore achieve the self-Americanization. Therefore, ideas of democracy and civics have stuck its roots deeply into the Philippines. Nowadays, Philippine schools remain English as teaching language and still value US ideologies. For instance, according to the research by University of the Philippines (Diokno 2009), “there is an overwhelming emphasis on civics at the expense of Philippine history” and “The civic values tend to essentialize the Filipino as stereotype and myth”.

In summary, the Philippines is inevitably highly Americanized through the Americanized education. However, in spite that democracy was considered a powerful tool to pursue independence in the colonial time, as illustrated in the analysis of Romulo’s article; why the Philippines still reserves her American characters in the education as dominant after independence?

4.2.5 Filipinos’ pride: hybridity or Americanization?

In Lacson’s poem, he says: “The beauty and richness of my country lured many mighty powers of the world to invade our shores. So today, my blood is a mixture of the best and the finest of the West and the East.” The way he naturally connect the two sentences reveals that Lacson even appreciates the “invasion” since it brought “the best of the West”. In Romulo’s text, we can see that Filipinos harbors intimacy feelings toward the West in colonial time since they brought advanced technology and so on, however that discourse never challenged the dominant position of anti-colonial discourse. From the positive words “best” and “finest”, it is obvious that in the post-colonial time, Filipinos are proud of that “mixture”, which has already been illustrated in Chapter 2 as “hybridity”. However, is this really only a pride upon Filipinos’ abilities to deal with “differences”?

While criticizes on the colonial discourses, Julian and Leon legitimize English -- the most effective tool of US colonization -- as advantages. Julian shows that “English, as one of the country’s official languages, would also be enhanced” along with the preservation of RP’s other language. Leon also admits that “not that speaking foreign languages, flying to other countries, and learning from other people is a bad thing. It’s one of our biggest assets [...] especially since the advent of globalization”. Also, the comment upon Julian by “gloria” replies that “our official language must be English that made Filipinos well verse, well adjusted,

well known”. Those disconnect “English” with “colonial” but articulate it with “advantages in globalization”: Only because the Filipinos speak good English can tourism makes the main industry in the RP, can she attracts more Foreign investments and possesses advantages in the global market, and can OFW work in the foreign countries and contribute over half of the foreign currency reserves to the Philippine government every year. Moreover, not only English, but also the degree of democratization is a vital source of Philippine national pride. As Bankoff & Weekley (2004: 118) explain, “the Philippines holds a unique place in a region of mostly less-than-democratic neighbors, [...] this has long been one of the important external sources of national pride for the Philippines.” In other words, since RP is a newly independent country, its period of independence overlaps the recent wave of globalization; thus, its high level of Americanization is more articulated with “globalization” than “colonization” in the post-colonial time.

To summarize, even though the Philippines has to rebuild its pride by post-colonial discourses, by criticizes on American language and ideas; its pride is more based on its Americanization, as the hegemonic power and competitive tools in this globalized and Americanized world.

4.2.6 Other perspectives: cultural diversity and pre-colonial history.

When Hernandez discusses about the History education, “History” means only the colonial history. Also, Leon quoted a professor’s utterance directly that “I have to admit that I’ve always had a very colonial mindset. [...] if we were to go back our roots, the result would be entirely regressive.” Obviously, by “roots”, the professor means rather their Malay ancestors but their colonial history. Just as Jambora raises, “studies in history have focused mainly on postcolonial Philippines and the revolution” while neglects “the ethnicity and culture similar to other Asian countries in the precolonial period”. All those reveal that the construction of Filipino identity has always centers on colonial experience, therefore centers on “the West”. Jambora points out, “Filipinos have no sense of identity because we never really look at our connection with Southeast Asia”, which provides us a brand new perspective to find Filipino identity out of the Western-centric order of discourses.

Also, it is pleased to find in Julian’s article that a centre preserves RP’s diverse languages has established. Julian quotes the interview of Nolasco that “the national language should be developed and enriched by the lexicon of the country’s other dialects and languages”, which shows that the linguistic diversity has been paid attention and tried to be merged with the dominant languages. As response, most of the comments agree the text, and also reveal a harmony -- for instance, the comment by “gloria” says: “Language is one of the tools who made

us unique as people in the Philippines. The preservation of RP's other language is a great move." According to the context, the first "language" means "linguistic diversity", which reflects that multi-language (the differences in-group) can be legitimized as a uniqueness which distinguishes Filipinos from *others*, thus construct the Filipino identity from another new perspective.

All in all, the current Filipino identity is no longer based on the anti-colonial history as before independence. Filipinos are aware that colonial discourses has been constructed their identity and has begun to criticize upon them, thus rebuild their identity by post-colonial discourses. In that process, Tagalog is promoted as the national language, different from the colonial time when only English was the official language. However, English and US ideology are still retained as the most competitive power in the global market and the Americanized world, whereupon retains the colonial culture. That paradox makes Filipino identity awfully fragile, thus brings about the lack of Filipino identity in recent years. "***I am a Filipino***" thus means "***I try to reflect on my colonial mentality***" however "***I am proud to be Americanized***", paradoxically.

Actually, no matter the Filipino identity is constructed by the colonial mentality or critiques upon it, by colonization or globalization, it can never escape from the West-centric configuration. As a Southeast Asian country, to pursue the Filipino identity in its own diverse culture and pre-colonial history may be more essential and practical.

5 Conclusion

In the thesis, the author firstly lays a theoretical foundation, illustrating that national identity is constructed upon a common history, national pride and fear of “the Other” by dominant group. It is also illustrated that in post-colonial time, national identity aims at critiquing on the colonial discourses as to regain pride. Secondly, Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis is justified as an appropriate method to reveal how history, pride and fear are constructed.

With that foundation, the analysis upon 13 texts has been conducted. The preliminary assumption -- before independence, the Filipino identity was constructed by the desire of independence from the colonizers; in recent years, it is constructed by de-Americanization -- is thus half proved. It is obvious that in colonial time, the Filipino identity was constructed by Filipinos’ increasing anti-colonial desire. However, recently, the Philippines is confronted with a more complicated situation. On one hand, Americanization for her was colonization, and the post-colonial discourses are needed to help her recuperate from the colonial inferior, thus rebuild the pride; on the other hand, Americanization for her is globalization, therefore her high level of Americanization provides power in the globalized world, therefore underlies her pride. The Philippines chooses to retain the US influence in its national identity, however, the paradox resulted from that choice makes the Filipino identity awfully fragile.

Nevertheless, as already explained in the beginning of the thesis, although the nation is inevitably mediated by the dominant group, it is first of all rooted in culture; therefore to pursue the national identity in the original culture rather in the unequal power relations may be more essential. Philippine culture diversity can be “differences” in-group which restrains the Filipino identity from uniting, or uniqueness which distinguishes Filipinos from “others”. It can be fairly puzzled to choose between a de-Americanized and an Americanized identity, or just simple to refuse both, jump out from the Western-centric order of discourses and pursue the Filipino identity in the culture of Southeast Asia. Those could make good perspectives to conduct research on the Filipino identity in the future.

References

Abueva, J. V. (1992) *Filipino politics, nationalism and emerging ideologies: background for constitution-making*. Manila: Modern Book.

Anderson, B. (2006, 3rd ed.) *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (1995) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bankoff, G. & Weekley, K. (2004) *Celebrating the centennial of independence: post-colonial national identity in the Philippines*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.

Beck, U. (1999) *What Is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brands, H. W. (1992) *Bound To Empire: The United States and the Philippines*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chouliaraki, L. (1999) 'Media discourse and national identity: death and myth in a news broadcast', In M. Reisigl and R. Wodak (eds), *The Semiotics of Racism*. Vienna: Passager Verlag.

Chouliaraki, L. & Fairclough, N. (2000) *Discourse in Late Modernity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Dijk, T. V. (1993) 'Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis'. *Discourse & Society*, 4: 249–83.

Diokno, M. S. (2009) 'History in basic education', *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, <http://opinion.inquirer.net/inquireropinion/columns/view/20090912-224797/History-in-basic-education>, September 12, 2009.

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (2002) *Runaway World: How Globalisation is Reshaping our Lives*. London: Profile Books.

Greene, T. P. (ed.) (1955) *American imperialism in 1898*. Boston: Heath.

Hidalgo, C. P. & Legasto, P. P. (1993) *Philippine Post-Colonial Studies: Essays on Language and Literature*. Diliman, Q.C.: Dept. of English Studies and Comparative Literature, University of the Philippines and the U.P. Press.

Hoogvelt, A. (2001, 2nd ed) *Globalization and the postcolonial world : the new political economy of development*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Jørgensen, M. & Phillips, L. (2002) *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: SAGE.

Lichauco, A. (1973) *The Lichauco paper: imperialism in the Philippines*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Lomba, A. (2005, 2nd ed.) *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. Oxon: Routledge.

Martin, D.-C. (1995) 'The Choices of Identity', *Social Identities*. 1(1): 5–20.

Mongia, P. (ed.) (1997) *Contemporary postcolonial theory: a reader*. New York: St Martin's Press.

Thiesse, A. M. (1997) 'Inventing a National Identity', *Le Monde Diplomatique*, June.

Tope, L. R. R. (1998) *(Un)Framing Southeast Asia: nationalism and the postcolonial text in English in Singapore, Malaysia and the Philippines*. Diliman, Q.C.: University of the Philippines, Office of Research Coordination.

Torres, C. E. (2010) *The Americanization of Manila, 1898-1921*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. & Liebhart, K. (1999a) *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. & Liebhart, K. (1999b) 'The Discursive Construction of National Identity', *Discourse & Society*. 10(2): 149–173.

Wodak, R. (2001) 'What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments', In Wodak, R & Meyer M. (eds) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE.

Appendix

Appendix 1 Mabini A.: The True Decalogue, July 1898.

<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/14660/14660-h/14660-h.htm>

First. Thou shalt love God and thy honor above all things: God as the fountain of all truth, of all justice and of all activity; and thy honor, the only power which will oblige thee to be faithful, just and industrious.

Second. Thou shalt worship God in the form which thy conscience may deem most righteous and worthy: for in thy conscience, which condemns thy evil deeds and praises thy good ones, speaks thy God.

Third. Thou shalt cultivate the special gifts which God has granted thee, working and studying according to thy ability, never leaving the path of righteousness and justice, in order to attain thy own perfection, by means whereof thou shalt contribute to the progress of humanity; thus; thou shalt fulfill the mission to which God has appointed thee in this life and by so doing, thou shalt be honored, and being honored, thou shalt glorify thy God.

Fourth. Thou shalt love thy country after God and thy honor and more than thyself: for she is the only Paradise which God has given thee in this life, the only patrimony of thy race, the only inheritance of thy ancestors and the only hope of thy posterity; because of her, thou hast life, love and interests, happiness, honor and God.

Fifth. Thou shalt strive for the happiness of thy country before thy own, making of her the kingdom of reason, of justice and of labor: for if she be happy, thou, together with thy family, shalt likewise be happy.

Sixth. Thou shalt strive for the independence of thy country: for only thou canst have any real interest in her advancement and exaltation, because her independence constitutes thy own liberty; her advancement, thy perfection; and her exaltation, thy own glory and immortality.

Seventh. Thou shalt not recognize in thy country the authority of any person who has not been elected by thee and thy countrymen; for authority emanates from God, and as God speaks in the conscience of every man, the person designated and proclaimed by the conscience of a whole people is the only one who can use true authority.

Eighth. Thou shalt strive for a Republic and never for a monarchy in thy country: for the latter exalts one or several families and founds a dynasty; the former makes a people noble and worthy through reason, great through liberty, and prosperous and brilliant through labor.

Ninth. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: for God has imposed upon him, as well as upon thee, the obligation to help thee and not to do unto thee what he would not have thee do unto him; but if thy neighbor, failing in this sacred duty, attempt against thy life, thy liberty and thy interests, then thou shalt destroy and annihilate him for the supreme law of self-preservation prevails.

Tenth. Thou shalt consider thy countryman more than thy neighbor; thou shalt see him thy friend, thy brother or at least thy comrade, with whom thou art bound by one fate, by the same joys and sorrows and by common aspirations and interests.

Therefore, as long as national frontiers subsist, raised and maintained by the selfishness of race and of family, with thy countryman alone shalt thou unite in a perfect solidarity of purpose and interest, in order to have force, not only to resist the common enemy but also to attain all the aims of human life.

Appendix 2 Romulo, C. P.: I am a Filipino, August 1941.

<http://carlospromulo.org/tag/filipino-identity/>

I am a Filipino - inheritor of a glorious past, hostage to the uncertain future. As such I must prove equal to a two-fold task- the task of meeting my responsibility to the past, and the task of performing my obligation to the future. I sprung from a hardy race - child of many generations removed of ancient Malayan pioneers. Across the centuries, the memory comes rushing back to me: of brown-skinned men putting out to sea in ships that were as frail as their hearts were stout. Over the sea I see them come, borne upon the billowing wave and the whistling wind, carried upon the mighty swell of hope- hope in the free abundance of new land that was to be their home and their children's forever.

This is the land they sought and found. Every inch of shore that their eyes first set upon, every hill and mountain that beckoned to them with a green and purple invitation, every mile of rolling plain that their view encompassed, every river and lake that promise a plentiful living and the fruitfulness of commerce, is a hallowed spot to me.

By the strength of their hearts and hands, by every right of law, human and divine, this land and all the appurtenances thereof - the black and fertile soil, the seas and lakes and rivers teeming with fish, the forests with their inexhaustible wealth in wild life and timber, the mountains with their bowels swollen with minerals - the whole of this rich and happy land has been, for centuries without number, the land of my fathers. This land I received in trust from them and in trust will pass it to my children, and so on until the world no more.

I am a Filipino. In my blood runs the immortal seed of heroes - seed that flowered down the centuries in deeds of courage and defiance. In my veins yet pulses the same hot blood that sent Lapulapu to battle against the alien foe that drove Diego Silang and Dagohoy into rebellion against the foreign oppressor.

That seed is immortal. It is the self-same seed that flowered in the heart of Jose Rizal that morning in Bagumbayan when a volley of shots put an end to all that was mortal of him and made his spirit deathless forever; the same that flowered in the hearts of Bonifacio in Balintawak, of Gergorio del Pilar at Tirad Pass, of Antonio Luna at Calumpit; that bloomed in flowers of frustration in the sad heart of Emilio Aguinaldo at Palanan, and yet burst fourth royally again in the proud heart of Manuel L. Quezon when he stood at last on the threshold of ancient Malacañang Palace, in the symbolic act of possession and racial vindication.

The seed I bear within me is an immortal seed. It is the mark of my manhood, the symbol of dignity as a human being. Like the seeds that were once buried in the tomb of

Tutankhamen many thousand years ago, it shall grow and flower and bear fruit again. It is the insigne of my race, and my generation is but a stage in the unending search of my people for freedom and happiness.

I am a Filipino, child of the marriage of the East and the West. The East, with its languor and mysticism, its passivity and endurance, was my mother, and my sire was the West that came thundering across the seas with the Cross and Sword and the Machine. I am of the East, an eager participant in its struggles for liberation from the imperialist yoke. But I also know that the East must awake from its centuried sleep, shake of the lethargy that has bound his limbs, and start moving where destiny awaits.

For, I, too, am of the West, and the vigorous peoples of the West have destroyed forever the peace and quiet that once were ours. I can no longer live, being apart from those worlds now trembles to the roar of bomb and cannon shot. For no man and no nation is an island, but a part of the main, there is no longer any East and West - only individuals and nations making those momentous choices that are hinges upon which history resolves.

At the vanguard of progress in this part of the world I stand - a forlorn figure in the eyes of some, but not one defeated and lost. For through the thick, interlacing branches of habit and custom above me I have seen the light of the sun, and I know that it is good. I have seen the light of justice and equality and freedom and my heart has been lifted by the vision of democracy, and I shall not rest until my land and my people shall have been blessed by these, beyond the power of any man or nation to subvert or destroy.

I am a Filipino, and this is my inheritance. What pledge shall I give that I may prove worthy of my inheritance? I shall give the pledge that has come ringing down the corridors of the centuries, and it shall be compounded of the joyous cries of my Malayan forebears when they first saw the contours of this land loom before their eyes, of the battle cries that have resounded in every field of combat from Mactan to Tirad pass, of the voices of my people when they sing:

*Land of the Morning,
Child of the sun returning. --
Ne'er shall invaders
Trample thy sacred shore.*

Out of the lush green of these seven thousand isles, out of the heartstrings of sixteen million people all vibrating to one song, I shall weave the mighty fabric of my pledge. Out of the songs of the farmers at sunrise when they go to labor in the fields; out of the sweat of the hard-bitten pioneers in Mal-ig and Koronadal; out of the silent endurance of stevedores at the piers and the ominous grumbling of peasants Pampanga; out of the first cries of babies newly born and the lullabies that mothers sing; out of the crashing of gears and the whine of turbines in the factories; out of the crunch of ploughs upturning the earth; out of the limitless patience of teachers in the classrooms and doctors in the clinics; out of the tramp of soldiers marching, I shall make the pattern of my pledge:

I am a Filipino born of freedom and I shall not rest until freedom shall have been added unto my inheritance - for myself and my children's children - forever.

Appendix 3 Macapagal, D.: June 12 as Independence Day, 1962.

<http://www.bibingka.com/phg/documents/whyjun12.htm>

“A nation is born into freedom on the day when such a people, moulded into a nation by a process of cultural evolution and sense of oneness born of common struggle and suffering, announces to the world that it asserts its natural right to liberty and is ready to defend it with blood, life, and honor.”

The promotion of a healthy nationalism is part of the responsibility of the leaders of newly independent nations. After they lay the foundation for economic development, they promote nationalism and spur the search for national identity. This we can do by honoring our distinguished forebears and notable periods in our history. A step we took in this direction was to change the date for the commemoration of Philippine Independence day.

When I was a congressman, I formed the opinion that July 4 was not the proper independence day for Filipinos and should be changed to June 12-- the date General Emilio Aguinaldo proclaimed the independence of the Filipinos in Kawit, Cavite, in 1898.

Having served in the foreign service, I noted that the celebration of a common independence day with the United States on July 4 caused considerable inconvenience. The American celebration dwarfed that of the Philippines. As if to compound the irony, July 4 seemed tantamount to the celebration of Philippine subjection to and dependence on the United States which served to perpetuate unpleasant memories.

I felt, too, that July 4 was not inspiring enough for the Filipino youth since it recalled mostly the peaceful independence missions to the United States. The celebration of independence day on June 12, on the other hand, would be a greater inspiration to the youth who would consequently recall the heroes of the revolution against Spain and their acts of sublime heroism and martyrdom. These acts compare favorably with those of the heroes of other nations.

In checking the reaction to my plan to shift independence day to June 12, I found that there was virtual unanimity on the desirability of transferring the celebration from July 4. Likewise, there was a preponderant view for choosing June 12 as the proper day.

A few suggested January 21, the opening day of the Malolos Congress in 1899, or January 23, when the Malolos Congress, ratifying the independence proclamation of June 12, established a republican system of government. The reason for this view was that the government temporarily by Aguinaldo when he proclaimed independence on June 12 was a dictatorship.

There was no difficulty in adhering to June 12, however, because although Aguinaldo Government was a dictatorship in view of the military operations he was then leading, he led in converting it into a republican Government in the Malolos Congress. Moreover, the celebration of independence refers to its proclamation rather than to the final establishment of the government. In the case of America, when independence was proclaimed on July 4, the American Government was still a confederation and it was much later when it finally became a federal government.

The historical fact was that the Filipinos proclaimed their independence from foreign rule on June 12. Even the national anthem and the Filipino flag which are essential features in the birth of a nation were played and displayed respectively at the independence proclamation in Kawit.

[...]

Appendix 4 Lacson, A. L.: I am Filipino, January 2, 2009.

One of the most important things we need today as a people is a beautiful way of looking at ourselves as Filipinos, a positive and healthy image of ourselves, a wonderful definition of ourselves as a people. Our children especially need to believe that there is greatness and beauty in us as a people and as a race.

So much beauty and greatness can spring from a beautiful mind and a faithful heart.

But loving ourselves as Filipinos is not only patriotism or nationalism. There is a reason higher than that. It is primarily about stewardship. It is loving what God has given us. God gave to each one of us the Filipino and the Philippines, for us to love and care for. But how is the Filipino in our hands today? How is the Philippines, the land God gave to us as a people, in our hands today?

It is for this reason that I wrote the poem below. I give this poem as my humble gift to all of you, my fellow Filipinos. You are the brothers and sisters, the family of people, God gave to me.

It is my hope that this poem will help develop in us and in our children a healthy sense of faith and love in the Filipino, in ourselves as a people. For truly, our Creator wants us to have faith in and love for the Filipino.

Here it is:

I am Filipino. I am a child of the One God who is the Creator of all that is in our world and the universe. I am as perfect and as beautiful as my Creator planned me to be, for God created me in His image, out of His perfect love.

I am a beloved child of God, like everyone else in our world, no less than the stars above or anyone else below. As such, I have equal right and claim to all the beauty and bounty that God provided in my country and in the world.

I am an equal part of the family of humanity. I am therefore a sibling to all the men and women of our world, brethren to all Christians, to all Muslims, to all Jews, to all Buddhists, and all other peoples whose faiths lie somewhere else.

I am Filipino. My Creator planted me on a specific spot on earth, where the sun always shines, in an archipelago of 7,107 wonderful islands, which the whole world calls the "Pearl of the Orient." Pilipinas is the country God gave to me and my people. It is the birthplace of my race. It is the home of the Filipino.

The beauty and richness of my country lured many mighty powers of the world to invade our shores. So today, my blood is a mixture of the best and the finest of the West and the East. My mind is an heir to all the great thoughts of the West, and the great virtues of the East. My heart beats with the romanticism of the West and the passion of the East.

I am Jose Rizal, Andres Bonifacio, Juan Luna, Ninoy Aquino and all those who fought for our land to become a nation of free people. I am the grandeur of Banaue, the enchantment of Boracay, the serenity of Manila Bay, and the depth and breadth of Tubbataha Reef.

I am Filipino. My Creator's plan is for me to live my life as a Filipino and therefore, in my heart and in my mind, I shall always be a Filipino wherever I may be in the world. God wants me to belong to the Filipino family and as such, I am a "kapatid" [brother] to anyone and everyone who is Filipino, wherever he or she may be on earth.

You will know me by the word "po" in my sentences. You will know my children by their "mano po." You will know me by the smile on my face and the warmth of my hospitality. Most important of all, you will know me by my loving and caring heart when you are in need of help, even if you are a stranger.

As a child of God, my Creator has a beautiful story for me and my people. And the story we see today is but a fleeting portion of that beautiful story that has yet to fully unfold before the eyes of the world.

I am Filipino. I am who I am today because of the role God wants me to play.

I am born to succeed. God has equipped me, within me and around me, with all the essentials I need to succeed in this world. God truly wants the highest, the best, and the most beautiful for me, because I am His child.

I am destined to be great. God planted seeds of beauty and greatness in me. He truly wants me to be great and beautiful, for God truly wants me to add more beauty and greatness to our world.

I am Filipino. I am born of freedom, in a free country. As such, I dedicate my freedom to ensuring that my people and country shall always remain free. I shall use my freedom to help other peoples, in my country or in other parts of the world, gain their own freedom.

I am born of love, out of God's immeasurable love, in a country and in a world that can only be made beautiful by love. Love is the reason why God made me. It is what He wants me to bring into this world, so love shall be who I am.

I am born as part of the whole, as part of the answer to the question, as part of the solution to the problem, as part of the hope to our people. I am born to help the Filipino become great not only in the eyes of the world but, more so, in the eyes of our Lord.

I am Filipino. I am a faithful child of God. I shall live my life to do God's work on earth, to help build a beautiful country for my Filipino family, and a better world for all humanity. And soon the world shall see the full measure of the greatness of Filipino, for truly the world has yet to see what God can do to and through a child, like the Filipino, who is faithful to the Lord.

I am Filipino.

Alexander Lacson is author of the Book “12 Little Things Every Filipino Can Do To Help Our Country.”

Appendix 5 David, R.: On being Filipino, June 13, 2009.

<http://opinion.inquirer.net/inquireropinion/columns/view/20090613-210237/On-being-Filipino>

The awareness of being Filipino does not come naturally. We may be surrounded by all the symbols of nationhood—the flag, monuments, maps, pictures of our national heroes and the historic events in which they figured—but, though these may conjure stirring images of the nation, they do not necessarily bind us to the nation. We may sing the national anthem and recite the pledge of allegiance every day, but these do not automatically evoke in us a consciousness of being part of the nation.

To be part of the nation is to care about what happens to it. It is to see our personal lives as inextricably linked to its successes and failures. This identification allows us not only to share in the glory of the nation’s achievements, but also to feel accountable for its ruin. Otto Bauer, the Austrian social democrat, put it this way: “When I become aware that I belong to a nation, I realize that a close community of character ties me to it, that its destiny forms me and its culture defines me, that it is an effective force in my character.”

A national identity is one of many affiliations into which we are involuntarily thrown in the course of our lives. Some of these affiliations become salient to us insofar as we acknowledge and weave them into our own personal narratives. The nation penetrates our consciousness by producing consequences in the way we think, feel or act, and, indeed, in how others treat us.

A Filipino may see his identity as both an asset and a liability. If our country is at war, the government may call on every Filipino to defend the nation, and our conscience may prompt us to come to its defense as a matter of duty. At immigration counters abroad, we may be rudely awakened to the fact of our Filipino identity when we are made to step aside for a closer scrutiny of our travel documents. In foreign lands, we may find solidarity and security in the bosom of fellow Filipinos. But others may experience embarrassment in their company. When the country is praised or criticized by foreigners, or when a Filipino is singled out for adulation or ridicule by the rest of the world, we may grow in self-esteem or wither in shame. Either way, our consciousness of being Filipino is sharpened.

Filipinos did not always imagine themselves as a distinct people. This realization was a very slow process. It came as a function of their historic struggle against colonial oppression. Outside their own families, our ancestors tended to think of themselves as belonging to small tribal or ethno-linguistic groups. Under Spanish colonialism, they thought of themselves as children of the Church, or as subjects of Mother Spain. When they resisted Spanish oppression, they did so initially as separate communities. These isolated revolts began to fuse into a national uprising only with the rise of the Katipunan. The colonial powers were aware of the divisions among them and fully exploited them.

The thinkers of the Philippine revolution believed that the struggle against colonial domination could not be won unless the Filipinos learned to think of themselves as one nation. Thus, the ideological task of the anti-colonial war focused on the creation of a strong Filipino identity—a positive consciousness and acceptance of the responsibilities of being Filipino. Apolinario Mabini’s work “The True Decalogue” was a tool that was explicitly developed to prepare Filipinos for nationhood.

Here is an abridged version of Mabini’s “Ten Commandments for the Filipino”:

[...]

To revisit Mabini’s Decalogue today is not only to see how the imagination of this great thinker was so far ahead of its time. It is also to realize how incomplete the project of the Filipino nation remains 111 years after Emilio Aguinaldo declared Philippine Independence.

Appendix 6 Yabang Pinoy (YP) : We are Filipinos. Filipinos are we., 2010.

<http://www.yabangpinoy.com/blog/>

We are Filipinos. But how do we define ourselves? How do others define us? How does being Filipino define who we are as individuals?

In 2005, when it was still uncommon to talk about nationalism, a group of young Filipino idealists formed Yabang Pinoy to make Filipinos realize that a strong sense of national pride is the key to real progressive change in the country. It aimed to spark nationalism, to convert each Pinoy into not just a proud Pinoy but a shouting proud Pinoy from inside out—sa isip, sa salita, sa gawa. Its signature abaca band, a visible reminder and a conversation piece, has since been on the wrists of some 70,000 Filipinos here and abroad. The pioneering movement has implemented programs that educated countless schoolchildren about Philippine biodiversity, history, culture and the arts, language, and myriad more topics. It emboldened entrepreneurs to create original ideas, concepts, products, and services that elevate the standards of being tagged “Filipino.” It also encouraged Filipino consumers to complete the virtuous cycle by being mindful of where they spend their every peso. Throughout all of these, Yabang Pinoy has constantly believed that progress starts not from drastic changes in the political system, but in changing every Filipino’s mindset.

Five years have passed since the establishment of Yabang Pinoy and a lot has changed. The movement has steadily driven the momentum and inspired other groups to join the cause. Now, it is suddenly fashionable for people to literally wear their national pride, so that many don the colors of the national flag in many forms and interpretations. But at the end of the day, is that the best you can do?

Nationality is an unavoidable, indispensable aspect of one’s own identity. To be part of a nation is to feel a sense of accountability over its fate, to rejoice with our countrymen’s victories, and share the burden of their hardships. Our individual sense of self is, and should be, inseparable from how we define ourselves as a people.

Sadly, few are conscious of this invisible thread between man and country. The Philippines’ long history is a severe narrative of colonization, subjugation, and domestication,

dulling our senses and sensitivities. Against this condition even Jose Rizal cautions in *The Indolence of the Filipino*: “The lack of national sentiment brings (an) evil...which is the absence of all opposition to measures prejudicial to the people and the absence of any initiative in whatever may redound to its good.”

More than a century thus passed; obsolete and unconvincing already is the excuse of colonial mentality. Now is the time to take ownership and responsibility for our own fate and the fate of the whole country. Yabang Pinoy again poses a challenge to all Filipinos: integrate the “May Yabang Ako” battle cry of nationalism into everything you do, let it define your existence and manners, and make nation-building a daily habit and lifestyle. In today’s highly globalized world, it has never been more important for Filipinos to act with an inherent national pride in doing things, from the littlest to the most ground-breaking, from crossing the street to paying taxes, from being the best in school or at work to engaging in social entrepreneurship. Only when people attach being Filipino within themselves will they realize their vital role in continuously defining and re-defining what Filipino means and what it stands for.

We are Filipinos. Our country is the Philippines. Let’s make its progress and development happen now.

Appendix 7 Hernandez, B.: Kalayaan, June 11, 2010.

<http://opinion.inquirer.net/inquireropinion/columns/view/20100611-275138/Kalayaan>

INDEPENDENCE DAY PARADES WERE SUCH A treat when I was in grade school. The marching bands, the PMA cadets in immaculate dress gray, the spectacular floats: I watched them all pass by, totally mesmerized. Back then, schools were already open because Philippine Independence Day was on July 4, which meant there were no classes on that day, which was also one more reason why my classmates and I looked forward to it.

When I was in Grade 4, President Diosdado Macapagal signed a law declaring June 12 as the Philippine Independence Day. That didn’t sound too good to us, because what kind of holiday would that be if you were still on your summer vacation? Our history teachers however, told us a really gripping story about what happened on June 12, 1898.

On that day, from the balcony of his home in Kawit, Cavite, Emilio Aguinaldo, commander of the Philippine Revolutionary Forces, proclaimed that after 300 oppressive years, our forefathers were at last free from Spanish colonial rule. However, Spain and the United States were still at war, and Spain’s defeat was inevitable. Both countries refused to recognize Aguinaldo’s historic declaration. Instead, Spain ceded the Philippines to the United States for \$20 million when they signed the Treaty of Paris in 1898. The United States then became our new colonial masters until July 4, 1946 when the American government felt it was time to give us our “independence.” This is why June 12 is so important to us, our teachers said. We were victors on that day.

History is no longer taught as fascinatingly in today’s classrooms. This is a glaring deficiency, because history taught well is invariably a key component in high performing education systems. More importantly, decades of research show that graduates with a strong

sense of legacy have a greater tendency to apply what they have learned, to make their own country better, politically, economically and socially.

In their policy paper titled “Making A Case for History in Basic Education,” Dr. Maria Serena Diokno and a team from the University of the Philippines’ Department of History found out that at the basic education level, History tends to be confused with Civics.

“History as a subject is taught in only one year at the elementary level (fifth grade), and shares the Makabayan subject (grades one to three) with civics and culture, geography, music and the arts, health education, home economics, and good manners and proper conduct. In upper elementary school (grades four and six), History shares the Hekasi subject with geography and civics. For the most part, therefore, the elementary Social Studies curriculum consists of civics,” says Doctor Diokno.

The review team asks: “How is consciousness as a Filipino to be learned when Social Studies is not grounded in our shared history as a people?” Ruel Pagunsan, who reviewed the Grade 3 textbooks found out that “all the civic values are illustrated in fictional, situational stories” despite the fact that History has better—and infinitely more interesting because they are real—stories.

Mercedes Planta, who reviewed Grade 6 textbooks, found out that out of 54 units in the Grade 6 textbooks, only three deal with history, consuming a total of 14 pages. Yet even here, the emphasis is civics rather than history.

Doctor Diokno emphasizes how serious this is. “Without a historical foundation, the selection of civic norms and values is left entirely to the discretion of government. In such a situation, only two forces can direct the educational agenda: politics, as we experienced during martial rule, and/or ‘tradition’. In the case of the Social Studies curriculum today, recourse to traditionally held notions appears very strong, coupled with deferential—unhistorical—caution in treating political events in the past, such as our colonial experiences and martial law,” says she.

Properly taught, we are supposed to have a clear sense of who we are as Filipinos. The policy paper interviewed history majors, who said that through grade school and high school, they learned two different symbols for the national bird: the maya in elementary school and haribon in high school. The older ones in the group aged 19-20, were taught that the national dance is the tinikling, while more recent graduates learned that the indigenous national dance is the cariñosa. “Which batch, then, is the ‘truer’ Filipino?” the policy paper asks.

History is mostly taught in high school but many Filipino schoolchildren do not even get to that level. In 2009, about 12 million pupils were enrolled in public grade schools but only about 5 million in high school. The policy paper points out that “our children grow up and take their place in society with little inkling of our past.”

This year, in the 112th celebration of Philippine Independence Day (which the National Historical Institute themed “Kalayaan, Tagumpay ng Bayan”), we will once again enjoy the spectacle of a civic-military parade at the Rizal Park, complete with floats and marching bands. Everything looks great, but the historical significance is somehow diminished: the parade will feature 10 floats highlighting the 10-point agenda during the nine-year term of President Macapagal-Arroyo.

Butch Hernandez (butchhernandez@gmail.com) is the executive director of the Foundation for Worldwide People Power.

Appendix 8 Leon, C. D.: Dysfunctionally Pinoy, June 29, 2009.

<http://blogs.inquirer.net/beingfilipino/2009/06/29/dysfunctionally-pinoy/>

I RECENTLY attended an anthropological lecture on Philippine tribes by Prof. Cherubim Quizon at the UP College of Arts and Letters. But what interested me more was not the lecture itself, but the very first question posed by a woman in the audience, a professor in speech communication. Her words:

"While I honestly enjoyed learning about our ancient origins, I have to admit that I've always had a very colonial mindset. Because it seems that if we were to go back to our roots, the result would be entirely regressive. I don't even know how to answer my students' queries on nationality; because when they graduate, the only jobs waiting for them are those in call centers. So kindly help me out. Right now I can't see the point in cultivating who we really are as Filipinos."

It was a question I have also been asking myself--and I wondered if anybody in the room was capable of answering it objectively. And not with irrelevant passion and poetry, which was all being Filipino had become to me.

A man in the audience stood up and started his speech by clarifying that he was not a nationalist, but a humanist. He said he specialized in analyzing the structure and maximizing the potential of the human being.

Referring to Quizon's lecture, he re-stated that three very important words in the Filipino psyche are 'kamag-anak' (kinship), 'kasama' (companionship), and 'kakilala' (acquaintanceship).

To more effectively explain the given terms, he gave both new and old examples, like how he once brought home a can of corned beef, knowing it was his family's favorite. He returned a week after to find the can untouched. Why didn't they eat it, he asked, and they explained that the neighbors might catch a whiff of the food as they cooked it, and then they'd feel obliged to share.

He also cited how hospital rooms in our country have to have two beds--one for the patient, and another for the bantay (caregiver). And if you plan on bringing a get-well-soon gift, it must be food so that the bantay can have some as well.

The fact that we like to eat in groups was also taken into consideration. Whether it's lunch, dinner, or merienda at a fishball stand, we like to invite other people to eat along. And when we see a friend eating by himself, we ask why he is alone and if he's alright, even offering him our company.

If you've ever thrown a party, you probably know the frustration when no one calls the R.S.V.P. number. Now the thing about R.S.V.P. is that you're asking the person individually if he/she is coming to your party. But Filipinos don't like the thought of showing up alone at

social gatherings. As a result, all the days leading up to the party are spent asking around and waiting for confirmation from friends on whether or not they are going as well--because as guests we want to make sure we'll have enough people to talk to (kausap) when we get there.

The speaker also gave examples highlighting our other traits, like how we prefer to have all the sauces and seasonings laid out before us so we can concoct our own dips, as opposed to how in restaurants abroad, people simply eat the food as it is served.

He added that even the recurring tendency among Filipinos to be late for everything, such as dates, classes, meetings, and appointments, is due to how we've always had a timeless concept of time. The terms "sharp" and "on the dot" most certainly didn't come from us. In band rehearsals, for example, the processes of tuning up and making music often overlap; there is no definite end to the former and beginning to the latter.

Recall too how at the end of social gatherings, we linger in each other's company. Even the goodbyes take forever. One moment we're saying goodnight, the next we're laughing and sharing a short anecdote, which for some reason we forgot to tell earlier when it was still time for exchanging stories.

The speaker summarized, "As a people, we've always been highly relational and participatory. We are not innately individualistic and authority-centered as the Americans are--as we've been trying to be. That's why most of us don't follow traffic rules, and we throw our trash where the sign says we shouldn't--because we're not used to simply being told what to do by some "other." Instead, we're geared towards co-creation and cooperation when setting goals and accomplishing tasks. But sadly, these qualities have not graduated into a civic consciousness. (Not to mention that) we have absolutely no national consciousness."

Hearing him say these things, I began to understand that perhaps the real problem lies not in how we've been falling short of certain standards, but in how we still knock ourselves out trying to be something that we're not.

For the most part of my life, I've been guilty of having (and denying) a colonial mindset. But I don't blame myself for it because as a young and eager-to-learn student, it was all I was made to understand. The concept of being proudly Filipino was taught to us in abstract and vague terms. We never really knew what to be proud of.

Colonial mentality, however, was more concretely demonstrated to us. A perfect example was how popular I was with my high school teachers and classmates, just because I spoke fluent English. I highly doubt they would have looked up to me as much had I been just as skilled at speaking Tagalog. It was only in my college years at the University of the Philippines that patriotism started to make practical sense, and was no longer just a sentimental, moral obligation.

As music majors, though we studied the works of western classical composers, we were also educated on and constantly reminded to practice and cultivate our own music--especially if we were to go on international tours.

"So what if you can give them a perfect rendition of, say, Bach's choral works?" one of my professors used to say. "They've heard such pieces countless of times before. And don't

you think it would be absurd to travel all the way to these faraway countries just to give them yet another taste of their own music?"

If you apply the same reasoning to how we look up to English-speaking people, you'd realize how pathetic and inferior it is for us to prize something that is so common to the British and Americans--which is why I have since ceased to be ignorantly cocky about being ingglisera (English-speaking).

Not that speaking foreign languages, flying to other countries, and learning from other people is a bad thing. It's one of our biggest assets: how easily we can communicate, relate, and adapt to other cultures, especially since the advent of globalization.

But we're also urgently in need of finding our true identity. And until we do, we'll be perpetually stuck trying to fit into governmental and societal structures handed down to us by our colonial captors. Until we figure out a system of living that will truly work for us, especially in this modern age, our society will remain just as dysfunctional as it has been for the longest time, with most of our fresh and highly educated graduates trying hard to ease into fake, second-rate American accents in order to get by.

Comments (omitted)

Appendix 9 Alampay, G.: What does it mean to be Filipino? June 12, 2009.

<http://blogs.inquirer.net/beingfilipino/2009/06/12/what-does-it-mean-to-be-filipino/>

It could all begin with the fact that we are an archipelago, a collection of islands--some big, some small, some gone when the tide is up--separated from one another, and bound together only by legal fiction.

Similarly, as a people, we are more like a collection of tribes or regions or provinces. It is easier to talk about the traits, quirks, and stereotypes (fair and unfair) of Batanguenos or Ilocanos or Ilonggos or Muslims or the people from Imperial Manila, than it is to define what exactly it is to be a Filipino.

So ask the ordinary man or woman on the street what binds all these disparate folks together beyond an arguably common shared history, and we will get various, even conflicting, responses.

There are our traits. Are we condemned by crab mentality? Or are we uplifted by our sense of bayanihan?

Are we famously resilient because we can laugh at ourselves and our problems? Or are we hopelessly hampered by an inability to take things seriously, laughing even when there is nothing to laugh about?

Is our faith--and the Church--our saving grace, or our ironic cross?

Who is Juan? Who is Juana? Or maybe it is the name itself? Juan is a Spanish name, one that did not exist in these Islands before we were conquered. Do we reject "Juan" as a

non-Filipino name? Or do we embrace it as an undeniable part of who we are today given our history?

It is easy to stereotype the OFW as a prototypical Filipino today. Counting OFWs and their friends and loved ones left behind, they comprise a huge majority of our population who share common experiences--the displaced sense of family, the heroic notion of sacrifice, the pasalubongs when one returns, the jeepney loads of relatives that accompany them to the airport when they leave, and of course, the remittances that collectively keep this country afloat.

And yet, we all know the Filipino is more than just the OFW. There are millions of farmers and fisherfolk, thousands of youthful call center agents and ICT workers, and dwindling numbers of indigenous peoples. They, too, are Filipinos.

So, what does it mean to be Filipino? What does it matter? Why does it matter?

The answer to this question is important, not least because the lack of a common and shared sense of identity could be one major reason why we cannot seem to get our acts together, and live up to our full potential as a nation.

This is a basic theme that we should explore and discuss, and most importantly, pose to anyone (especially the young) who might listen--if only so that they will not take their identity for granted.

Unfortunately, the question also often sounds hackneyed (*gasgas na gasgas na*) and, indeed, corny. Worse, many times even, the people calling for unity (many of them in government, the church, and the media) are only self-interested, and are those we would really rather ignore.

We need to ask the question, and to propose some answers--but in a manner that is not off-putting or intimidating, and in a way that allows people to seek and find the answers just for themselves without feeling awkward or forced.

The Center for Art, New Ventures and Sustainable Development's (Canvas) Looking for Juan Outdoor Banner Project--opening at the University of the Philippines' Academic Oval on Independence Day (June 12, 2009)--is an attempt to provide that venue, that opportunity.

We asked dozens of artists, writers, musicians, and poets to provide--through their art, words and music--their answers to the question, What does it mean to be Filipino? Their responses were then transformed into art banners and will be displayed so that people can enjoy them as they walk, bike, or drive around a 2.2 kilometer oval under the magnificent acacia trees of the University of the People.

It is an engaging, and completely relaxed environment, especially on Sundays when the whole place is closed to traffic, and joggers jog, children play, and families come out to relax and just be with one another. It will be fun, and we hope to see you there.

And best of all, the answers (and sometimes even more questions) are given almost subliminally by artists, writers, poets and musicians who, by definition, are engaged in work and lifestyles that force them to think and express thoughts and things bigger than they are.

We also like to think that this show is even more special in that, collectively, it gives a snapshot of what some of the best young creative talents think when asked about what it means to be Filipino, at this particular point in our nation's history.

In the end, of course, there is no single correct answer to the question, What does it mean to be Filipino?

Which is as it should be, because for many of the important issues confronting us today--as individuals and as a nation--understanding the questions is often more important than providing the answers.

(Canvas is a nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting greater awareness and appreciation for Philippine art, culture and the environment. For more information, visit the Canvas website at www.canvas.ph or its blog: www.lookingforjuan.com. You may also email info@canvas.ph.

The Looking for Juan Outdoor Banner Exhibit will be on view from June 12 to July 11, 2009 around the University of the Philippines' Academic Oval in Diliman, Quezon City.

At the end of its run, the banners will be converted into tote bags by two women's communities in Antipolo and Laguna, and sold as original works of functional art. Proceeds from the sale will benefit Padyak, a UP Mountaineers-led movement to promote cycling and environmentalism as healthy lifestyles, as well as other Canvas efforts to promote greater awareness and appreciation for Philippine art, culture, and the environment.)

Comments (omitted)

Appendix 10 Julian, P. L.: Body to develop, preserve RP's other languages,
June 10, 2007.

<http://blogs.inquirer.net/beingfilipino/2007/06/10/body-to-develop-preserve-rps-other-languages/>

Northern Luzon Bureau, BATAAC, Ilocos Norte--

Instead of focusing solely on the national language, Filipino, the Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino (KWF or Commission on the Filipino Language) has revised its vision toward the development, propagation, and preservation of the country's more than 179 dialects and regional languages.

"The KWF leadership has agreed to establish a center for information, documentation, and research on the languages and various literatures of the Philippines," said Dr. Ricardo Ma. Nolasco, KWF chairman. Nolasco, a Bicolano who spoke in Filipino, delivered the keynote address in a recent international gathering here of 182 Filipino educators, scholars, and writers from the Ilocos, Cagayan Valley, Cordillera, the United States, and Japan. Called "Nakem" (consciousness or maturity in Iloko), the three-day affair tackled, beside the Ilocano diaspora, the state of Philippine dialects and languages, and was held at the Mariano Marcos Memorial State University here. Nolasco said the center, to be established within three years, will create original and model dictionary, grammar, and orthography (spelling), scholarly journals and literacy materials and references for teaching various disciplines. He said the center will be a

storehouse of data on various dialects and languages, equipped with audio and video recording of communicative events, including annotations and commentaries.

The project is in line with the policy, "Isang Bansa, Maraming Wika" (One Nation, Many Languages), which is the basis for this year's language theme, "Many Languages, Strong Country," Nolasco said. He said English, as one of the country's official languages, would also be enhanced. He said the policy has been formulated in keeping with the fact that the Filipino is multi-lingual and multi-cultural and that the country's having more than 170 dialects and regional languages is not a handicap but a big advantage. "It is ordinary for a Filipino to know how to speak two or more languages," Nolasco said, citing the case of President Macapagal-Arroyo who can speak Kapampangan, Sinebwano, Iloko, Tagalog, English, and Spanish. He said, however, that the country has a national language, Filipino, that has become a common language for various ethno-linguistic groups.

He nevertheless admitted that Filipino is simply Tagalog in syntax and grammar, with no grammatical element or lexicon coming from Iloko, Sinebwano, Ilonggo, and other major Philippine languages. This is contrary to the intention, he said, of Republic Act 7104 that requires that the national language should be developed and enriched by the lexicon of the country's other dialects and languages. The KWF is working toward that direction and would conduct research and studies not only on the national language but also on the country's dialects and languages, Nolasco said.

Comments gloria, August 20, 2007.

Language is one of the tools who made us unique as people in the Philippines. The preservation of RP's other language is a great move. As though our official language must be English that made Filipinos well verse, well adjusted, well known, language gifted.

Go on! We are proud being Filipino here in China.

(others omitted)

Appendix 11 Orejas, T.: Reminder from 'king': Language is identity,
September 8, 2010.

<http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/inquirerheadlines/regions/view/20100908-291080/Reminder-from-king-Language-is-identity>

Central Luzon Desk ANGELES CITY – Why speak Kapampangan?

Seven times or so, Renato Bonus Alzadon posed this question to the crowd that gathered on August 28 for the Aldo ning Amanung Sisuan (Day of the Native Language).

He is in the right position to ask. Alzadon, 61, is the Ari ning Parnaso (King of Poets) in the Kapampangan-speaking areas of Pampanga, Tarlac, Bulacan and Bataan.

Honor is secondary to the title that the college of 15 poets laureate conferred on him after an elaborate process of election in 2009. On Alzadon fell the task of articulating the "noblest ideals" of the Kapampangan people, for life.

“The government has required us to speak in English and [Filipino]. The media seldom use Kapampangan. Speaking it is not even a qualification for a job,” he said. “If I stop speaking and writing in Kapampangan, I am no longer a Kapampangan. My language is the symbol of my identity.”

People at the Holy Angel University theater, hushed by his single, all-important question, broke into applause when he appealed, “Let’s save it from death.”

That same night, Alzadon led the launch of two anthologies of poems “Kaspunggul a Sampaga (Volume 2)” and “Kawatasan: Obrang Poeta Laureado.”

Alzadon is the successor of Vedasto Ocampo who died in June 2009, continuing the tradition that Amado Yuzon and Jose Gallardo carried out to defend the Kapampangan language and sustain local literature.

A native of Capas, Tarlac, Alzadon is different from his predecessors.

While Yuzon, Gallardo and Ocampo performed in Crissotan (public events where extemporaneous metered or free verse poems were recited) and used local radio after World War II to bring poetry to a wider audience, Alzadon has been using the Internet to bring his poetry to young and old Kapampangans in the country and abroad.

Appendix 12 Pazzibugan, D.: Muslim schools to start teaching English, Filipino, September 14, 2004.

http://news.inq7.net/breaking/index.php?index=2%26story_id=10907

THE MADARIS or traditional Muslim schools would soon teach English, Filipino and other mainstream subjects to their students.

"Opening up our madrasah (singular of madaris) would disabuse the government from thinking that its a breeding ground for terrorists," said Maulama Faisal Abdullah of the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao's (ARMM's) Department of Education (DepEd).

"This is a giant step. This is a landmark accomplishment," said Manaros Boransing, education undersecretary for Mindanao affairs.

The madaris, which follow the Middle East curriculum, have remained unrecognized by the government. This will soon change.

Integration plan

A DepEd team led by Boransing and Muslim educators have been collaborating for the last three years to integrate the madaris into the mainstream educational system.

Last month, they finally came up with a standard curriculum for elementary public schools in the ARMM and the privately-run madaris.

"Public schools do not include Arabic language and Islamic values so Muslims are ignorant of their religion and the language of the Holy Qua-an," the DepEd pointed out. "On the other hand, private madaris do not follow the Philippine education curriculum, so their students become foreigners in their own country."

Under the standard curriculum, which will be implemented next school year, the madaris would teach English and Filipino alongside their regular subjects of Arabic, Bangsamoro history and Islamic studies. The following subjects would also be taught: Math (Hisab), Science and Health (Oloom was Sihhat) and Makabayan (Ijtimaiyah) which consist of Muslim culture and history, Physical Education and the Arts.

Islamic values

Also starting next school year, public elementary schools in the ARMM, would also teach Arabic and Islamic values alongside the regular subjects of English, Filipino, Science and Health, Math and Makabayan.

Like the public schools, the madaris have six years in the elementary level.

"We want our students to learn Arabic so they'll understand the Koran," Abdullah said.

"And since they'll be learning English, this means our (madaris) students can go to university," he said.

The DepEd team said it aimed for a "smooth transfer of students from public schools to private madaris and vice versa."

The new curriculum would "unify the long history of dichotomy among Muslims, promote Filipino national identity, and at the same time preserve the Muslims' cultural heritage," the team said.

The order for the standard curriculum was one of the last documents signed by former Education Secretary Edilberto de Jesus before he stepped down on Sept. 1.

Appendix 13 Jambora, A. A.: School kids take pride in RP history, 2003.

http://www.inquirer.net/globalnation/sec_fea/2003/oct/24-01.htm

OUR source of pride is also our source of insecurity, a paradox that is the bane of every Filipino. We speak and write better English than any of our Southeast Asian neighbors. Most of us practice western religions. But unlike the rest of the Asia, we seem to have no identity, culture and patriotism.

"Reconstructing the Past: In Search of the Roots of the Filipino identity in Southeast Asia" is the ambitious project of the University of the Philippines- Manila's College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) for a new teaching curriculum, recently instituted by the Department of Education. The new module adds precolonial Philippine history to the current Makabayan curriculum.

Studies in history have focused mainly on postcolonial Philippines and the revolution, but the UP-CAS team believes that ethnicity and culture similar to other Asian countries are more defined during the precolonial period. If Filipinos knew of their precolonial roots and its linkages to their Asian countries, they would better appreciate their ethnic past and take pride in their cultural heritage, according to the team. Ethnicity, after all, is the heart and soul of national identity.

The team, led by UP-CAS dean and molecular biologist Marilou Nicolas, has integrated its study, including Filipino values and patriotism, in the primary and secondary education. The team is composed of Dr. Celestina Boncan and Professor Grace Estela Mateo, historians; Professor Louise Bolunia, archeologist; Professor Teresa de Guzman, anthropologist; and Professor Deborah Lozada, behavioral scientist. "

Filipinos have no sense of identity because we never really look at our connection with Southeast Asia," she says. Spanish and American colonizers brought with them their language, religion, custom and tradition that Filipinos absorbed like a hungry sponge and "disastrously came out in the image and likeness of their colonizers."

The influences of these western nations are so deeply embedded in the Filipino psyche and culture that they inevitably made us think we are second-class citizens, Nicolas says. "We would rather become somebody else—we change our citizenships, our residencies, our homes... All these talk about love for country is mere lip service. The number of professional Filipinos migrating to other countries is growing," Nicolas notes.

Although Philippine precolonial history, largely ignored for years by many historians, is yet to be fully written, Nicolas believes that its story should now be taught in schools as extensive research is also underway. "We can't wait for the research to be finished before we start to integrate it in our education," she says.

Better to start them early, she says. The project, Nicolas says, aims to help Filipinos find their identity in the Southeast Asia context and hopes that a new generation of Filipinos will one day emerge—proud and knowledgeable of their heritage. "[Our country's] progress depends on us finding our identity," she says. If we are not confused with our identity, we take pride in our being a Filipino and therefore love our country, Nicolas says.

The project seeks to make today's children progressive thinkers in the future, who some day will look for ways to develop the country instead of abandoning her. "If the message gets through to 100 out of one million students, and if these 100 will become leaders some day, then there's hope for the Philippines," Nicolas optimistically notes.

She says education plays a major role in fostering national pride and identity. One of the many flaws in the system, particularly in teaching history, is that teachers focused mainly on the event's dates -- the who, what, when, and where. Exams in grade school and high school, in fact, consist mostly of memorizing dates instead of understanding historical events. If instructors concentrate more on the whys of history and dissect major events, then Filipinos would have a better sense of identity and patriotism, Nicolas says.

"In five years time hopefully there will be a trickle effect on the students, and we'll see where this study will further lead us," Nicolas says. "Teachers have a great influence on their students. History must be properly taught."

Nicolas says the project was inspired by her trips abroad, when she observes, as most Filipinos often do when they're away from their country, foreigners seem to have a strong sense of heritage, pride and identity. Children in Japan, for Other Stories School kids take pride in RP history Lessons from 'Magno Rubio' success Wake up and smell locally grown coffee New women of Bacolod Local firm's 56-year success story turns into sad tale instance, paid their way to visit national museums- and not because they were required by their schools. They simply are proud of their culture, and would like to learn more, she says.

"Inquirer columnist Conrado de Quiros said Filipinos have a 'national amnesia.' But before we completely forget ourselves, before we lose ourselves [in globalization], we have to go back to the past to know who we are," Nicolas says.