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Philippine Film History as Postcolonial Discourse

JOEL DAVID

The paucity of material utilizing the theories of the late French philosopher Michel Foucault for postcolonial studies can be traced to certain crucial factors: not only have certain influential writers, notably Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, repudiated his applicability to questions of postcoloniality, but Foucault himself, in his rare references to the subject, consistently disavowed its significance as an area of (presumably Foucauldian) inquiry. Although this essay upholds the primacy of postcolonial interests, it departs from the deconstructionist direction pursued by Spivak et al. in its insistence on the relevance of Foucault’s findings to issues of postcolonial culture despite the atrociously scant and cavalier attention he granted such topics in his lifetime.

The paradox in juxtaposing Foucault with postcoloniality can be explained by way of an analogous paradox, his conclusion that “We can easily imagine a culture where discourse would circulate without any need for an author” after he had effectively justified a form of authorial presence through his elaboration of the concept of the “author-function.” What this hints at is that, perhaps more in Foucault’s case than in any other major philosopher, one might find more productive applications if one were to work not merely within Foucault’s own paradoxes, but within the larger paradoxes that the mere citing of his name engenders at present.

Within this essay, these paradoxes include the synchronic use of Foucault’s body of work, as per his archaeological prescription in approaching discursive formations, despite the fact that Foucault himself observed a teleological principle in his consistent repudiation of his earlier texts through his later ones. Also paradoxical is the use of analogies, as in the preceding paragraph, in the face of Foucault’s insistence on the primacy of contexts and on the resort to genealogical analyses to shed light on social problematics. Finally (though paradoxically not the last paradox yet), there is the turn toward cultural policy which will be made whenever possible, a tendency that Foucault, in calling it “generative grammar,” considered secondary at best to archaeological analysis.
In considering Foucault in relation to postcoloniality, one might begin with his latter works that deal overtly with issues of governmentality, such as the eponymous essay “Governmentality” as well as “The Political Technology of Individuals.”5 One might also consider a piece by Robert Castel titled “‘Problematization’ as a Mode of Reading History,” which demonstrates a means, though by no means an original one, by which Foucault can be critically approached.6 Castel begins his consideration of Foucault’s *Madness and Civilization* by contesting its assertion that the great confinement in seventeenth-century France indicated a rupture with previous policies pertaining to social outcasts.7 Castel maintains that what occurred was more of a continuity than a rupture, and initiates his rereading by disputing Foucault’s periodization of Louis XIV’s edict in 1657 promulgating the establishment of the *hôpital général*.

Later in his essay Castel turns around on his own findings in order to outline what he calls the perils of problematization, enumerating a pair of criteria whose coexistence may conceivably be formulated in dialectical opposition: first, the “problematization of history must contribute something to what has already been achieved by a classical historical approach,” and second, “what a given problematization contributes to our knowledge of the present...must not come at the price of our knowledge of the past.”8 Castel himself does not proceed further than this, although it might be possible for historiographers to see that even this polemical formulation can be further deconstructed—i.e., that a first-order presentation of an historical account can be done as a problematization in itself instead of serving as raw material for someone else’s project, and that the knowledge of the past is always revised, sometimes radically, in the very act of problematizing it.

With these things in mind one can turn to the aforementioned Foucault texts and try to see what the author was trying to do, not so much to reconsider his own arguments from within his texts, but to see for whose benefit he undertook these projects. Although the danger of delimiting Foucault to his historical specificities can be responded to with the rather flippant observation that that is really what in a sense we all are (i.e., historically specific entities), the consequential constriction of reductionism would be easier to rationalize in this instance than the suspension of historical criticism for the sake of conceptual play and development, if the end-goal were cultural-policy application. In this regard the Foucault of “Governmentality” and “Political Technology” may be seen as not much different from the Foucault of the earlier publications, notably *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and especially *The Order of Things*—i.e., one who roots his discussion of the issues at hand in the historical past of European culture, thus making it difficult for anyone without access to even that culture’s present to critique these works from the author’s standpoint.9 To say, therefore, that Foucault’s critique of the state as a governmentalizing force is more crucial
to an understanding of contemporary political reality than a consideration of what he called the “étaisisation of society” would be tantamount to indulging in the kind of speculation that could only be confirmed through an extended and intensive observation of the political dynamics of First World existence.  

Apparently intended as an introductory lecture, “Governmentality” ends with an opening into a number of problematics outlined by Foucault, and it is one of these that may be utilized in initiating a counter-reading of “Political Technology,” specifically Foucault’s emphasis on population as what the state “both refers itself to and makes use of the instrumentation of economic savoir...corresponding to a type of society controlled by apparatuses of security.” “Political Technology,” for its part, modifies and enlarges this concern in its discussion of the difference between die Politik and die Polizei, in Foucault’s reworking of the account of how the institution of the police emerged.

The manner in which Foucault explains why “modern political rationality is permitted by the antinomy between law and order” is impressive and novel in its reversal of the modern-day concept of the police as a repressive institution. But within the aim of arriving at a “generative grammar,” it would not be productive either to reverse what already is a reversal in the first place, since this would only bring us back to where we started from. Moreover, such a project can best be accomplished by the kind of person that Castel has excluded from his requisites for problematization—i.e., a problematizer uncovering and presenting new historical data to counter a previous interpretation.

Foucault’s attempt to ensure a more complete closure in “Political Technology” than in “Governmentality” reveals the fissure in his argument. In his last paragraph he parenthetically—or we might say timidly—submits that ethnology is not an imperialistic science, offering instead the supposedly more earthshaking consequences of its deployment in political technology. This appears to be a less careful reformulation of the assertion in The Order of Things that, though the “colonizing situation need not be dispensable to ethnology,” ethnological practice “questions not man himself, as he appears in the human sciences, but the region that makes possible knowledge about man in general; like psychoanalysis, it spans the whole field of that knowledge in a movement that tends to reach its boundaries.” If we take this denial in “Political Technology” of the colonial obsessions of the same European centers being historicized for purposes of discussing the rise of the police as an institution, it would be possible for us to read backward through the rest of the essay and account for certain sources of tension in Foucault’s writing. Starting with Foucault’s central point, that the state actually began by utilizing the police in a primarily benign (though still coercive) manner and then only later invested it with more repressive assignations, we can see how the absence of a consideration of colonial administrative systems has enabled Foucault to make such a radical statement—though radical
not in the strictly political sense.\textsuperscript{15} For the concept of "policing" the colonial subject is of course entirely different, entailing as it does the subjugation of native resisters.

As a specific locus of proficient colonial practice, the Philippine experience can be a source of historical details which may be picked at random to illustrate this point. Two examples may suffice for purposes of this argument. The first is the function of the Spanish institution called the \textit{guardia civil} as more of a paramilitary unit that carried out both police functions as we now understand these (meaning in the worse sense) and military functions during the occasional instances of mutinies, uprisings, revolts, and even during the revolution against Spain.\textsuperscript{16} The second is the use of the Spanish clergy as the counterpart of the \textit{polizei} as configured by Foucault (meaning the exhortation of the populace to productivity and even spirituality)—an even more effective institution, if we go by what the Spanish friars were able to get away with.

We can see from this insertion of colonial absences that Foucault’s observation that the police’s true object was man could not be tenable in the larger context, since the subjects were relegated in legal and religious discourse to a lesser Orientalist status, normally objectified, if not demonized, and occasionally feminized.\textsuperscript{17} We would also be able to regard Foucault’s provision of a utopic signification to the \textit{polizei} as made possible in European centers because of an economic sanguinity that was then being attained through colonialist expansion. When it becomes possible for Foucault to make the surprising statement that the police’s objective as an institution is life’s pleasure, what he in effect elides is the reality that the negative extremes of police practice were actually being trained on the outside Others, the population that Foucault does not mention even as he acknowledges that the state’s own concepts of territoriality and sovereignty also began to change during this period.\textsuperscript{18}

It might be possible to respond by saying that these states were just as interested in implementing the notion of the police as a positive institution in their respective colonies, and this much can be seen in the Philippine experience. There is no way, however, that such ideals can resist getting transformed into negativities, as what resulted were such aberrations as the solicitation of the assistance of a collaborating elite—the \textit{principalia}, in the Philippine case—to believe and espouse these and other ideals and profit from them; and in the use of natives as members of the guardia civil even as they were prevented from becoming members of the clergy and had to form a breakaway church of their own.\textsuperscript{19} Hence, in a colonial situation, the discipline of the police force could only be regarded as mercenary even in its conjectural aspects.

Foucault himself opens up this possibility of reinserting what we might call the colonial past’s absence in his call for more, rather than less, political thinking in the face of the failure of today’s major political theories.\textsuperscript{20} He ascribes this failure, though, to a combination of increasing individualization and the rein-
forcement of totality, when the actual cause might be one of these—individualization—coupled with the incomplete presentation of what he has already considered a totality, such as the elision of colonial Othering within purportedly radical discourse. Another of his original reformulations is the impossibility of reconciling law and order, law being the ideal and order being the practical.²¹ This reformulation can be seen as having its counterpart in the colonial outside, in that the categories simply collapsed from the weight of the contradictions, with order emerging at the expense of the observation of law. Hence another recourse to this essay’s controlling device of the paradox: it is the earlier Foucault who appears to have designed more enabling means for what are, to use his term, generative purposes. In propounding the nature of his archaeological approach, he took care to qualify that “archaeology does not deny the possibility of new statements in correlation with ‘external’ events”; neither does it “try to avoid that mobility of discourses that makes them move to the rhythm of events; it tries to free the level at which it is set in motion—what might be called the level of ‘evental’ engagement. (An engagement that is specific for every discursive formation...).”²² One way of understanding why Foucault should be more engaged, in the usual dictionary sense, with politics during this period (late 1960s onward)—or, put another way, why he should be more considerate toward questions of the Other rather than First World oppositional movements—may be the known factors of the tension between his disillusionment with the French Communist Party and the May 1968 uprising of students and workers in France.²³ But, this time an irony rather than a paradox, Foucault was in Tunisia when the May 1968 events were transpiring, and it was his involvement in the simultaneous unrest among students in this Third World setting that Foucault’s acquaintances mark as the start of the philosopher’s politicization.²⁴

In outlining a program of approach to Philippine cinema as an area of possibilities for Foucauldian applications, one might begin by casting Philippine cinema itself in postcolonial terms, proceeding from its beginnings as, first, a technological attraction and, later, an industry brought over by Spain, the outgoing colonial power, and developed by the Americans, the incoming colonizers. The obvious type of formation using this originary detail would be to regard Philippine cinema as an extension of either (or both) European, specifically Spanish, and American cinema. But while certain arguments and examples can be marshalled in support of this view, the larger agenda of accommodating the postcolonial interests of the country in question will be necessarily left out at certain crucial junctures. The other option, considered standard in Third World discourse, would be to regard Philippine cinema as a counterformation, definable in this instance as “not simply an allegory or imaginative vision, but a gestative political structure which the Third World artist is consciously building or suffering the lack of.”²⁵
Areas of postcolonial concern in Philippine cinema should therefore be presented as questions rather than statements, or rather as statements that are not so much inconclusive as they are tentative, premised on the interests of the same enunciating (postcolonial) subject overridden by Foucault in his later views on ethnology. The following list of areas may be seen as corresponding to certain aspects, themselves problematizable, of Foucault's philosophical methodology.

1. “Knowledge” as an issue can be raised in discussing the turn-of-the-century propaganda shorts produced by the American Vitagraph Co., in line with the coverage of the Spanish-American War, examples of which are: The Battle of Manila Bay; reminiscent of other such naval showdowns between the Spanish armada and US battleships in its use of miniatures, with “Manila” depicted as hilly terrain with mountains in the distance; Shooting the Insurgents (the Philippine-American War), which contains footage duplicated in another short supposedly depicting a different setting, Cuban Ambush; and Rout of the Filipinos and Filipinos Retreat from the Trenches, whose impossibly privileged scenes of turning points in mortal combats could only be either milestones in documentary history or, more conceivably, effectively staged amusements. In contrast with the shorts produced by European entrepreneurs in the Philippines showing everyday scenes, the US shorts would be entirely unrecognizable from the perspective of anyone who has seen the country and its inhabitants, and serve to confirm the observation that these were produced mainly for a foreign and highly uninformed audience, thus proceeding from Foucault's differentiation between the history of ideas' tendency toward transcendental interrogation in connaissance and the reliance of archaeology on savoir, described as “a domain in which the subject is necessarily situated and dependent, and can never figure as titular (either as a transcendental activity, or as empirical consciousness).”

2. The early-cinema phenomenon of American producers investing in productions for Filipino audiences and occasionally running into censorship problems with their own government’s colonial administration ostensibly because their depiction of the Philippine revolution against Spain could arouse nationalist fervor against the new foreign occupants can be related to the alleged need for Filipino talent to train in Hollywood, in mental or “extra” capacities, before successfully setting up their production houses in the Philippines. This phenomenon can be subjected to the genealogical principle expanded by Foucault in another essay wherein he describes the “search for descent” as “not the erecting of foundations: on the contrary, it disturbs what was previously considered immobile; it fragments what was thought unified; it shows the heterogeneity of what was imagined consistent with itself.” A decentering of causes and motives in the emergence of Philippine cinema would help supply a better postcolonial perspective to the subsequent development of Filipino filmmakers being sent to other Southeast Asian capitals, notably Vietnam, to assist in their setting up of
film companies, in the sense that it would temper the self-valorizations that could accompany such a claim to initiating filmmaking activity in the region, as well as ensuring the restoration of the realities of foreign intervention. Also, such a critical examination of the motives of early American capitalists in the Philippines (whether they were political mavericks rather than simply profit-hungry producers) would lead to a consideration of other items, such as nationalist plays as well as spectatorship, specifically the question of the representations that were being imposed on the audience (by way of Hollywood and colonial propaganda) and the ones that the audience in turn demanded and made profitable.\textsuperscript{31}

3. A discourse on sexuality, although developed more fully by Foucault in book-length form, was described by him as revealing, “not of course as the ultimate truth..., a certain ‘way of speaking’; and one would show how this way of speaking is invested not in scientific discourses, but in a system of prohibitions and values.”\textsuperscript{32} Relevant to this discussion would be the post-World War II films depicting the fiction of the return of the Americans to “liberate” the country from Japanese invaders in time to preempt the Communist armed movement from accomplishing this function. Only recently were the Japanese able to send back the only film they produced during their occupation, Abe Yutaka’s \textit{The Dawn of Freedom}, which not only reversed the political valences between the two foreign powers but also provided more agency to Filipino characters and took a non-Western attitude toward gender relations in allowing male bonding between Japanese and Filipino characters rather than the American soldier saving the Filipino and bonding sexually with the Filipina.\textsuperscript{33} Such a triangulation among the nominally hierarchized elements of white colonizer, nonwhite colonizer, and nonwhite colonized, with the middle term subsequently downgraded to a colonized element and the last term conferred a limited colonizing stature in the privileging of the masculine over the feminine, would have implications for power relations that go beyond the call to determine the beginnings of these relations, toward topics announced by Foucault as part of his latter-volume studies of sexuality but later modified to conform to his shifts in epistemological and ethical interests.\textsuperscript{34}

4. Field concepts may turn out to be the means by which the flourishing and collapse of a studio system in the Philippines, mirroring the trend toward monopoly and trust-busting in the US Paramount decision, can be analyzed. Foucault distinguishes between the associated field “that turns a sentence or a series of signs into a statement, and which provides them with a particular context, a specific representative content, [that] forms a complex web” and the enunciative field in which a statement “has a place and a status, which arranges for its possible relations with the past, and which opens up for it a possible future.”\textsuperscript{35} The Filipino studio system enforced an era of efficient and regular production during a period, the 1950s, when the neocolonial administration was concerned with enforcing order in the face of the revival of the Communist
anti-Japanese army, this time as an anti-imperialist liberation movement. Innocence and virtue were the recurrent early themes of studio productions, with neorealistic movies being made but strictly for foreign-festival prestige. The repressed underside, meanwhile, was taking place in real life in the perfection of horrific tactics in psywar propaganda. The collapse of the studio system also saw the rise in gangster-genre films, necessitating a reconstitution of the censors board during the 1960s to impose limits similar to the Hayes office’s stipulations, down to what may or may not be shown in film. It may be a matter of designating, say, the Philippine studio system as an enunciative field and Hollywood as its associated field. However, transposing the relations (i.e., the Philippines as the associated field and Hollywood the enunciative field) could also be justified and would yield insights that would be just as valid. Perhaps the larger framework of enunciative coexistence, against which “stand out, at an autonomous and describable level, the grammatical relations between sentences, the logical relations between propositions, the metalinguistic relations between an object language and one that defines the rules, the rhetorical relations between groups (or elements) of sentences” might help us realize not merely the ease, but the necessity as well, in allowing the categorization of such historical fields to observe a sufficient amount of slippage to enable the analysis of grammatical, logical, metalinguistic, and rhetorical relations to enhance and even oppose one another for thoroughgoing critical purposes.

5. The emergence of a marginal area of practice in regional cinema, based in Cebu and using the Cebuano language, would occasion the consideration of the archive, present “in fragments, regions, and levels, more fully, no doubt, and with greater sharpness, the greater the time that separates us from it.” The collaborating elite, based in Manila, spoke Tagalog—hence the US’ imposition of Tagalog along with English and Spanish as national languages despite the former numerical superiority of Cebuano speakers. The Visayas have also been the site of some of the fiercest anti-imperialist encounters waged by pre-Christianized as well as Christianized Filipinos, while another Cebuano-speaking island, Mindanao, is the center of Islamic resistance and separatist movements. Cebuano cinema started as early as the 1920s and grew into a profitable industry well into the late 1970s, but has consistently been elided in Philippine film histories and filmographies, with a few token prizes handed out by the Filipino movie academy for supporting performances. Today, in monopolizing the system of distribution, the Manila-based elite can effectively claim to own any movie shown in any Philippine theater by simply demanding the purchase of exhibition rights by any of the distributors’ favored companies, thus effectively erasing any attempt to decentralize the Manila-based monopoly in film production.

6. Western-style critical practice that began with US-trained formalist scholars during the 1950s, most of whom observed the trend toward nationalism during
the 1960s, raises considerations of an episteme, both “as a totality of relations that can be discovered, for a given period, between the sciences when one analyzes them at the level of discursive regularities” and “a questioning that accepts the fact of science only in order to ask the question what it is for that science to be a science.”42 Here, as in the issue of the studio system, one could also bring in Foucault’s observation of demographic effects on political economy, “which ceaselessly aggravates the poverty of nations that are already poor and, on the other hand, increases the prosperity of states that are rich. For population tends to move in the contrary direction to money.”43 The result in Philippine experience was the imposition by local critics of what may be called nationalist and sometimes anti-imperialist criteria of appreciation on Philippine productions, but without a consistent and rigorous deployment of the same criteria on foreign imports exhibited in local theaters. Also there occurred an adoption of the Hollywood classical-versus-European art cinema dichotomy, valorizing the latter within the spheres of Philippine film practice without explaining how Philippine cinema can function as an alternative in itself (cf. the Third-cinema question), and with even much less regard for the fact that the moviegoing audience much preferred—and still does—Hollywood and Hollywood-inflected Hongkong films.

One last area, which will remain unnumbered because of its culminating position as well as its potential to overturn some of the earlier discussions, proceeds from still another paradox in Foucault: his shift from the conceptualization of the episteme to that of the dispositif (which later still transformed into the “aesthetics of existence,” circa the “Political Technology” essay, but then this brings us back to our rejection of Foucault’s position at this stage). Unfortunately Foucault did not have an extensive methodological discourse on the subject, the way he did with the episteme in The Archaeology of Knowledge; instead he presented it as a theoretical innovation in the first volume of The History of Sexuality, leaving it up to other writers to expound further on it. Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow describe the dispositif as “a grid of intelligibility constructed by the historian. But it is also the practices themselves, acting as an apparatus, a tool, constituting subjects and organizing them.”44 Gilles Deleuze further elaborated on the concept in terms of “a tangle, a multilinear ensemble,... composed of lines,... [that] do not outline or surround systems which are each homogeneous in their own right..., but follow directions, trace balances which are always off balance, now drawing together and then distancing themselves from one another.”45 Deleuze attributes to the dispositif (translated in his essay as “social apparatus”) four dimensions: curves of visibility, curves of enunciation, lines of force, and lines of subjectification—to which he added “lines of splitting, breakage, fracture, all of which criss-cross and mingle together, some lines reproducing or giving rise to others, by means of variations or even changes in the way they are grouped.”46 The problematics begin when Deleuze
ventures to valorize the dispositif, mentioning in his text the consequences of its use as “the repudiation of universals” and “a change in orientation...away from the Eternal and towards the new,” which do not only also characterize the episteme (not to mention deconstructionist methodology), but also contradict his answer to a discussant’s question thus: “Could methods analogous to those of Foucault be used to study oriental social apparatuses [dispositifs] or those of the Middle East? Certainly so, since Foucault’s language [langage], which sees things in terms of parcels of lines, as entanglements, as multilinear ensembles, does have an oriental feel to it.”

While it would be obviously necessary to reject Deleuze’s extramural claims for the dispositif, it might still be interesting, at the very least, to see how it could assist in evaluating the era of 1970s American cinema, which was the period of martial law in the Philippines. This may be configured as a form of culmination of this link between film and politics, in that Ferdinand Marcos was the first Philippine president who popularized himself through cinema, and that his imposition of Martial Law was welcomed first by the American Chamber of Commerce in the Philippines. Among the developments in cinema were the entrenchment of US-importing distributors, with Jack Valenti emerging as a figure powerful enough both to block a bill proposing the limiting of foreign film imports and to lobby for the holding of the Manila International Film Festival despite official World Bank acknowledgement of the country’s worsening economic condition; the reemergence of studio stability to ensure capitalist efficiency in film production as well as to counter government encroachment on production, distribution, and censorship-exemption; and finally government intervention itself, to facilitate a strategic shift on the part of the martial-law administration from showcasing detention centers as proof of democracy to permitting liberal and sometimes critical film productions in the wake of Marcos’s new line that political prisoners were nonexistent in the Philippines.

With the Foucauldian dispositif drawing the preceding areas (as masses of lines, in Deleuze’s terms) together into this historical period, a few things make themselves discernible, even as this whole enumeration of problematics cries out for further investigations and analyses: first and foremost, that Philippine cinema does possess a postcolonial dimension that occasionally surfaced in the past but has remained naturalized for the most part; second, that these issues of postcoloniality can be seen as vital to discourses of Philippine national identity and development, involving as they do the commercial and ideological axes of both global cinema and imperialist capitalism; and finally, that even Foucauldian theory might be able to expect further, perhaps even newer, directions once these areas for historical inquiry have been explored extensively and exhaustively.
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