

ARTICLE

## The genesis of partisan scholarship: Renato Constantino as a public intellectual and nationalist historian, 1950s–1980s

Francisco Jayme Paolo A. Guiang

### ABSTRACT

Renato Constantino was a historian and a public intellectual whose ideas were often considered as thought-provoking and controversial. Regarded as one of the pioneers in nationalist historiography, he produced a popular yet contentious historical interpretation that was unmistakably Marxist in nature. As a nationalist thinker, Constantino argued that the people's nationalist aspirations can be achieved by introducing them to a partisan form of scholarship. This paper critically examines his idea of partisan scholarship by proving that it was a necessary undertaking that inevitably undermined traditional historical practice and exposed the public to social criticisms and ideological discourse. To understand his intellectual labors, this research contextualizes Constantino during the crucial decades of the 1950s to the 1980s. By looking at his published works within these years, this paper aims to show the conjugal role of his social commentaries and historical expositions in provoking nationalism among readers. Moreover, this research explores the ideological dimension of partisan scholarship. Thus, a more holistic understanding of partisan scholarship could be elicited by interrogating his social commentaries and historical expositions in conjunction with the ideological paradigm apparent in his writings. Finally, this paper examines the impact of Constantino's partisan scholarship by determining major criticisms about his ideas and then identifying the place of his intellectual contributions within the nationalist and, arguably, postcolonial traditions.

### KEYWORDS

partisan scholarship, nationalism, Marxism, people's history, public intellectual

## Introduction

“It is the duty of the nationalist scholar to write history not only from the Filipino point of view but more specifically from the point of view of the Filipino people—the Filipino masses” declares Renato Constantino (1978, 265) in a lecture before the University of the Philippines (UP) History Club on September 18, 1975. He continues with a very controversial assertion that, “official history is written by the ruling class in its own image. It is, in most cases, propagandistic and narcissistic” (266). By that time, Constantino was already an established nationalist scholar who penned articles exposing social ills and revealing concealed truths about the past. Admittedly, Constantino was not the only intellectual who used history for political ends. Jose Maria Sison, also known by his nom de plume as Amado Guerrero, also did the same in *Philippine Society and Revolution* (1971). Though many in the academe consider Sison’s work as an ideological tool for Maoist indoctrination, his use of historical elucidation to underscore the country’s neocolonial condition is remarkably similar to Constantino’s. A decade before that, Teodoro A. Agoncillo, the pioneer of nationalist historiography, had already suggested a reinterpretation of Philippine history using the Filipino lens. Arguably, *The Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan* (1956) and *History of the Filipino People* (originally *A Short History of the Filipino People* co-authored with Oscar M. Alfonso) (1960) were groundbreaking works that inaugurated the nationalist tradition in history writing. Yet, it was only Constantino who asserted the necessity for a partisan form of scholarship. For most academics, partisanship in historical practice is a paradox. Agoncillo himself admitted that though bias could not be avoided, historians should maintain impartiality (2003). In other words, partisanship is a deliberate betrayal of impartiality. According to Eric J. Hobsbawm, a British Marxist historian, partisanship “is the willingness to subordinate the processes and findings of research to the requirements of the researcher’s ideological or political commitment...” (1998, 165). This statement is probably what distinguishes Constantino from Agoncillo. The former had a clear ideological framework in mind, which was aimed at responding to the needs of the time.

Considering these points, this paper aims to understand Constantino’s partisan scholarship by looking into his selected works, and tracing from these works the development of his ideas on social maladies and their historic roots. In addition, this research intends to prove that Constantino’s partisan scholarship was a necessary undertaking that ultimately undermined the norms of academic history and exposed the public to social criticisms and ideological discourse. Admittedly, his bold and often contentious statements about the discipline of history cannot be divorced from the thought-provoking social criticisms that he was known for. Comprehending Constantino’s historical thinking cannot be done without exploring his views on Philippine society, because he used history as a tool to prove his often controversial statements about the status quo. Hence, Constantino’s

partisan scholarship must be studied based on a variety of works—whether about history, society, economy, or politics—which he produced throughout his career after World War II. For the purpose of this research, only selected writings were considered, starting from his early work on Philippine history titled “Our Task: To Make Rizal Obsolete” published on *Manila Chronicle* in 1959 (1971c) and ending with one of his last publications on contemporary events in 1989 titled *Demystifying Aquino*. To fully comprehend the relevance of his ideas to present-day society, it is imperative to situate Constantino and his works in the context of the period. This is done in section one of the paper wherein the sociopolitical milieu of pre- and post-war Philippines is briefly elaborated with respect to its impact on Constantino’s life and works.

The following sections aim to elicit a more holistic comprehension of Constantino’s partisan scholarship. Section two tackles his writings as a public intellectual and interrogates his sociopolitical views. Section three discusses his works as a nationalist historian and expounds on his historical thinking. Section four is devoted to an analysis of Constantino’s works by identifying the ideological underpinnings and essential features of his partisan scholarship. This section seeks to explain the uniqueness of his approach, which underscores the importance of political/ideological bias, particularly the materialist approach in history writing. The fifth and final section examines the impact of Constantino’s intellectual legacy on Philippine historiography. This is done not only by examining the criticisms from his peers but also by locating his contributions within the nationalist tradition of history and the broader area of postcolonial studies.

## **Contextualizing Renato Constantino**

The sociopolitical milieu and upbringing of Constantino were essential factors that shaped his nationalist thinking. His grandparents, for example, were both critical of Spanish and American colonialism (Ofreneo 2001). Moreover, his education, which was spent at Manila North high school and then in UP from the late 1920s up to the 1930s, exposed him to nationalist ideas. In fact, Constantino’s studies for the Associate in Arts (A.A.) degree in the state university introduced him to subjects where various political theories were taught. His English 2 teacher, for instance, was a self-confessed communist who gave lectures on Spengler, Hegel, and Marx instead of grammar and usage. Additionally, the political backdrop of these years saw the rise of various sociopolitical movements, such as the *Sakdalistas* and the *Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas* (PKP) that decried American imperialism. Pressing sociopolitical issues that were frequently articulated in rallies and demonstrations stirred debates even within the academia. In UP, Constantino became known for public speaking after joining the university’s debate team, which confronted various issues on Philippine politics. His editorship of the *Philippine Collegian* in 1939 was his most significant extra-curricular activity, because it prepared him for a career in journalism after the war (Ofreneo 2001). Through numerous broadsheet and

magazine articles, Constantino stressed how colonialism continued to impede the nation's progress in the postwar years (Ofreneo 2001). While writing for the press, he also developed a consistent fondness for the discipline of history.

From the 1950s onwards, Constantino produced works that dispelled the myths of American benevolence. More interestingly, he underscored the need for partisan scholarship to invoke the development of a nationalist consciousness among Filipinos. These views can be seen in various pieces that he produced for the *Sunday Post*, *Manila Chronicle*, and *Graphic*, among others. Some noteworthy writings he penned include "Our Captive Minds" ([1957] 1971b), "The Miseducation of the Filipino" ([1966] 1971a), *Origin of a Myth* (1968), "The Filipino Elite" ([1968] 1970c), "Roots of Subservience" ([1969] 1970b), *Veneration without Understanding* (1969b), and his intellectual biography of Senator Claro M. Recto, *The Making of a Filipino: A Story of Philippine Colonial Politics* (1969a). The political backdrop caused by the Cold War made him a target of the government's "witch hunt" for suspected communists. Various forms of harassment began as early as 1951, when authorities raided his house and confiscated books that were Marxist in nature. In 1961, he was subjected to an investigation led by the Congress' Committee on Anti-Filipino Activities (CAFA), which alleged communist infiltration among faculty members of UP. The accusations hurled at him were dismissed, because the committee failed to produce evidence concerning his supposed communist ties (Ofreneo 2001).

Another turbulent period in his life happened during Ferdinand Marcos's presidency. In the years leading to the dictatorship, Constantino witnessed critical events that shaped the ideological landscape of the country. For example, the Kabataang Makabayan (KM), formed in 1964, challenged the political establishment with their rhetoric on American imperialism, land reform, and government corruption. Thereafter, the KM "reestablished" the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) in 1968 and took the helm of the radical left (Magno 1998). Four years later, Marcos declared Martial Law, which curtailed the freedoms of speech and assembly and silenced his political opposition in the most brutal manner (Magno 1998). Eventually, the opposition—composed of various groups, including the leftists, military, and middle class—toppled the dictatorship through a People Power at EDSA in 1986. Critical steps were taken by the Corazon Aquino administration to restore important political institutions dismantled by the dictatorship, but the new government had to endure antagonisms from the military and the communists who remained unconvinced of the transfer of political power. More so, attempted military coups were staged as early as 1986 up to 1989 while peace agreements with the radical left crumbled after the Mendiola Massacre in 1987 (Caral et al. 1992).

These events affected Constantino's life in many ways. Being a journalist who often criticized the government, the Marcos years proved to be a great challenge to him and his family. A particularly traumatic experience happened in 1972

when uniformed personnel visited the family's residence in Quezon City seeking his arrest. At that time, he and his wife, Letizia, were living in an apartment in Pasay City near the Lopez Museum where he was a curator.<sup>1</sup> The military took his son into custody instead. Immediately, Constantino informed the authorities that he had returned to their Quezon City home and arranged for the release of his son through personal connections in the government. Fortunately, a house arrest for Constantino was agreed upon, which lasted from September 1972 until February 1973 (Ofreneo 2001). The years leading up to the end of the 1970s kept him preoccupied with what would become the most important publications in his lifetime. Moreover, the turn of events related to the 1986 EDSA Revolution provided him the necessary material to observe how society coped with radical changes in politics.

Arguably, the Marcos years were a testament to his mature treatment of history. For example, in 1971, he facilitated the publication of J.R.M. Taylor's *The Philippine Insurrection Against the United States* under the auspices of the Lopez Museum. He wrote an important introduction to this five-volume series (Ofreneo 2001). To date, this work remains one of the most important collections of primary sources concerning the 1896 Philippine Revolution and the 1899–1913 Philippine–American War. Another example was the publication of *The Philippines: A Past Revisited*, essentially a product of the entire Constantino family (Constantino 1975). Both he and his wife enlisted their daughter and son-in-law, Karina and Randy David, to conduct the necessary research for the project. Letizia recalls how tedious the working schedule was with her husband. In fact, they had to move into a two-story apartment in Pasay City, as mentioned earlier, to fulfill an average of seven to eight hours of editing a day. The book, which was the first volume of a series, saw print in 1975 after surpassing the challenge of looking for a publisher (Ofreneo 2001).<sup>2</sup> Such a difficulty was expected, as Constantino was identified by the Marcos government as a subversive. Three years later, the second volume entitled *The Philippines: The Continuing Past*, was printed by Constantinos' own publishing house, Foundation for Nationalist Studies (Constantino and Constantino 1978). Significantly, it already included Letizia as co-author (Ofreneo 2001). It is interesting to note that Rosalinda P. Ofreneo, Constantino's biographer, was able to study the draft of a third volume to the supposed trilogy on Philippine history. Provisionally titled *The Present as Past*, it dealt with contemporary events, such as the Marcos dictatorship. On top of this, Constantino was also involved in a project by Cacho Hermanos in 1985 for the Filipiniana Reprint Series (Ofreneo 2001). This endeavor required him to carefully read through and select primary documents about the American colonial period. Indeed, his keenness for Philippine history influenced his partisan scholarship. This enabled him to understand the effects of colonial experience on contemporary sociopolitical and economic milieu.

## Renato Constantino as a public intellectual

Any discussion about Constantino's partisan scholarship would be incomplete without an examination of his social commentaries. Much of his reputation as a nationalist was due to his opinions about politics, economy, and culture, among others. He was not a mere critic but a public intellectual whose polemics in print media explored the intricacies of social realities. Noticeably, Constantino frequently elaborated on themes about the country's neocolonial condition particularly Americanization, which dominated Filipino domestic affairs and way of life. (Constantino 1971b). This statement in "Our Captive Minds," first published on January 6, 1957, in the *Manila Chronicle*, encapsulates the essence of Constantino's nationalist position and critique of American imperialism. According to Constantino, Filipinos live under America's shadow and blindly regard the United States (US) as a "Big Brother" (Constantino 1971b). This was historically proven when Filipinos accepted (1) unfair trade conditions in exchange for postwar rehabilitation, (2) a colonial education system, and (3) an Americanized popular culture that threatens indigenous culture (Constantino 1971b). Yet, Constantino clarified that not all foreign influence can be considered a threat. Rather, Filipinos "should choose what we [they] want to absorb, carefully and seriously..." by having a clear knowledge of their history and culture to establish an appreciation for who they are as a people (Constantino 1971b, 78–79). Constantino's sweeping analysis presents how decades of Americanization had affected political tradition, economic behavior, and cultural orientation.

Elaborating further on the effects of the neocolonial condition on Filipino culture, he introduces the concept of "synthetic culture" which he describes as detached from its local roots and severely westernized. As Constantino (1985) explains in *Synthetic Culture and Development*, this cultural deformity is caused by mass media as primary purveyors of "information and cultural imperialism." Mass media has been commodified by imperialists and used by them as a tool for social control in order to preserve the status quo that is advantageous to the elite. More so, ordinary Filipinos, who are at the receiving end of all information, are conditioned to accept an environment where inequality thrives. Hence, the individual is transformed into a passive consumer because of the cultural conditioning achieved through the leisure of watching television, reading newspapers, or listening to the radio (Constantino 1985). A synthetic culture ultimately produces a superficial society that distracts its people from addressing their country's essential problems. As a solution, Constantino proposes the development of a counterculture to eradicate cultural deformity. He further argues that such a counterculture should be (1) partisan towards the people's culture in order to negate the dominant elitist culture; (2) nationalist but not xenophobic; (3) democratic because it represents the people; and (4) scientific because it rejects "mysticism, superstition, archaic traditions, and beliefs" (Constantino 1985). However, a counterculture will only be realized if the Filipino's consciousness is reconfigured. This means that they

must recognize the reality and extent of their colonial mentality in order to provoke radical change. The inception of a counterculture is, therefore, an essential component of Constantino's nationalist agenda.

These general observations are trademarks of Constantino's journalism. This type of social commentary became useful in exposing the pertinent issues during the Marcos and Aquino years. Weeks before the declaration of Martial Law, a compilation of Constantino's selected articles from *Graphic* and *Manila Chronicle* was published in 1972 under the title, *Renato Constantino and the Marcos Watch*. The collection was arranged and annotated by Luis R. Mauricio, Constantino's friend and colleague in *Graphic* (Ofreneo 2001). The articles in the anthology elaborated on themes, such as government corruption and political subservience, all directed against Marcos and his cohorts. For example, in one article titled "The Marcos Army," he discussed how Marcos utilized the military to protect the economic interests of American imperialists and the political interests of his clan (Constantino 1972a). In another piece titled "The First Family," he displayed a remarkable talent for political satire. With amusing exaggeration and ridicule, Constantino wrote about the lavishness of the president and the First Lady. He expressed it best by saying that: "This couple have been in office only for five years but they have accomplished a great deal... At the rate they are going, they may remain a first family for a long, long time" (Constantino 1972b, 64). This satirical exposition painted a clear picture of the prevailing milieu during Marcos's time—the ruling elite thrived in opulence while the people toiled under dire socioeconomic conditions (Constantino 1972b).

In the years leading to the demise of the Marcos administration, Constantino delivered two separate speeches—one at the UP College in Cebu on September 19, 1984 and another at the Ateneo de Manila University on December 4, 1984—which foreshadowed American interests in the ensuing transition of power.<sup>3</sup> Constantino discussed how the Americans closely monitored the events that led to the ouster of the dictator and argued that the US government wanted to secure a smooth democratic transition in order to protect their economic interests in the country (Constantino 1986). Aside from these, various groups from the broad opposition contended for political control. He warned about the faction from the center-right whose political interests might betray the ideals of the revolution (Constantino 1986). This idea is further expounded in *Renato Constantino and the Aquino Watch* (1987) and in *Demystifying Aquino* (1989). These anthologies contain Constantino's articles originally published in *We Forum*, *Malaya*, and *Philippine Daily Globe*, which examined the betrayal of the people's aspiration for genuine change post-1986. Though the opposition dismantled the dictatorship, it preserved the tradition of political elitism. Aside from the prevalence of partisan politics and political dynasties, class elitism is ingrained within Aquino's government (Constantino 1989). Indeed, this corrupt political system preserved politicians who enjoyed public service not for its noble cause but for the satisfaction of their personal interests.

Constantino also articulated ideas that many considered unpopular at a time when there was outpouring jubilation for democracy's restoration. In *Renato Constantino and the Aquino Watch*, he took on the difficult task of exposing the failures of the 1986 Revolution. For him, the promise of genuine social change remained unfulfilled. In fact, Aquino's economic policies continued the Marcos programs as evidenced by the strong influence of the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and other transnational companies over the country's economy (Constantino 1987). *Demystifying Aquino* is also filled with articles that tackle similar topics. For example, Constantino discussed the Aquino government's hypocritical leadership in that, akin to the Marcos regime, it had not salvaged itself from allegations of graft and corrupt practices (1989). For Constantino, the ideals that the 1986 Revolution stood for were denigrated by corrupt politicians, who used "democracy" as a rhetoric to win political seats.

### Renato Constantino as a nationalist historian

A characteristic feature of Constantino's writings on Philippine history was how historical elucidation justified his social criticisms. Several writings from the 1950s up to the 1980s dealt with the historic roots of colonial mentality, systemic miseducation, and other social ills, such as political corruption. As with the writings discussed above, his examination of history aimed at reassessing the so-called Philippine–American "friendship." More so, in several remarkable works, Constantino articulated his views on the necessity of a "people's history" and "partisan scholarship," which subverted the norm of academic practice.

Rethinking US–Philippine ties involved recognizing the historic roots of the neocolonial condition, which began with the colonization of the Spaniards. Constantino (1971c) wrote "Our Task: To Make Rizal Obsolete" for the *Manila Chronicle* in 1959 to underscore the problems of the colonial society, as reflected in Rizal's novels, *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo*. He emphasized the necessity of completing Rizal's mission by eradicating the same social ills that continue to impede the development of postwar Philippines. In "The Filipino Elite," Constantino (1970c) explained how the society's elite functioned as enablers of colonialism by collaborating with or kowtowing to the Spanish and American colonizers. He further elaborated on this idea in "Roots of Subservience" by arguing that the significance of the 12 June event, Philippine Independence Day, was, in fact, an affirmation of the elite's mendicancy to colonial authorities, as evidenced by the Aguinaldo government's naiveté or complicity in American colonial machinations (Constantino 1970b). Constantino's extensive historicization of Philippine politics can be seen in his biography of Senator Recto titled, *The Making of a Filipino: A Story of Philippine Colonial Politics*, published in 1969. Aside from an exhaustive narration of the late senator's nationalistic feats and struggles, Constantino (1969a) tackled how Americanization robbed the Filipinos of the chance to chart their own destiny as an independent nation. As discussed by him almost a decade later in



*The Philippines: The Continuing Past*, the American presence in the Asian region created the essential conditions that restored US–Philippine ties in the postwar years. The “atmosphere of colonial acquiescence” became conducive for Filipino leaders to act as “pawns” who advance American interests in the guise of economic rehabilitation (Constantino and Constantino 1978). Working on the premise of helping an important ally in Asia, the US slowly unveiled their imperialist motives while negotiating with the new political order in the Philippines. The Filipino elite, thus, became agents of compromise. Although the Americans had granted the Filipinos freedom in 1946, US imperialist policies continue to affect domestic politics and economic affairs to this day. Indeed, a careful reexamination of Philippine history should be the basis of a genuine reassessment of US–Philippine ties.

Corollary to expounding on the roots of the society’s neocolonial condition was exposing the truth about colonial education—a constant theme in most of Constantino’s writings. On June 8, 1966, *Graphic* published “The Miseducation of the Filipino,” which underscored how the public school system—through the teaching of the English language—facilitated American colonization (Constantino 1971a). This idea was the focal point of *Veneration without Understanding* in which Constantino (1969b) argued how the Americans appropriated Rizal by elevating him to the status of a “national hero” for the purpose of pacifying Filipinos. In the lengthy essay “Identity and Consciousness: The Philippine Experience,” which was delivered as a lecture at the 8<sup>th</sup> World Sociology Congress in Toronto, Canada, on August 20, 1974, Constantino harked back to the Spanish period to locate the problems of colonial education. In that article, he asserted that the Spaniards produced a “legacy of ignorance” among the masses due to education policies that largely benefited the intellectual elite—the eventual articulators of 19<sup>th</sup> century nationalism (Constantino 1974). By the time the Americans occupied the country, education became the means for colonial conditioning where the youth was taught to recognize the superiority of American culture and acknowledge “American society as the model par excellence for Philippine society” (Constantino 1974, 39). In the end, this type of education contributed to the “bourgeoisification” of Filipinos, who wanted to be Americanized. Moreover, children in schools were taught of Spanish abuses while the curricula highlighted American altruism and benevolence. Hence, generations of Filipinos began to consider the US as an ally in freedom, liberty, and democracy (Constantino 1974). Constantino made the same historical inquiry in another essay, “Westernizing Factors in the Philippines,” which was presented at the 30<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North America in Mexico City on 3-8 August 1976.<sup>4</sup> In this work, he reiterated how the Americans peddled miseducation under their tutelage. Documents and narratives regarding anti-American resistance were either downplayed or completely hidden from the public. Instead, schools promoted the Americans as liberators from the backward Spanish colonization. In the long run, Filipinos became proud bearers of the American “benevolence.” They boasted their western

lifestyle and, hence, felt superior over their Asian neighbors (Constantino 1977). Indeed, centuries of colonial westernization became crucial factors that hastened American neocolonial encroachment in postwar Philippines.

As a solution, Constantino proposes the promotion of a “people’s history,” which underscores the collective struggles of the Filipinos in the past and diverts from the conventional view of Philippine history. He explains this in detail in *The Philippines: A Past Revisited*. In its introductory chapter, “Towards a People’s History,” Constantino argues that Filipino historians are captives of Spanish and American historiography; thus, essential truths about the past remain concealed. Although there are efforts to provide a Filipino-centric perspective in history writing, some historians are too obsessed with objectivity that it shrouds the actual purpose of historical elucidation (Constantino 1975). Constantino then defines the concept of a “people’s history” as an account of the collective struggles of the “mass of human beings”—agents of change and movers of history—who aspire for greater freedoms (Constantino 1975). History should thus give focus to the collective lives and struggles of the unsung masses as opposed to narratives that focus on the great men in the past. In doing so, history can give voice to the inarticulate and genuinely resemble the story of the Filipino people (Constantino 1975). Of course, this is not to say that “great men” are unworthy of emulation. However, Constantino asserts that as much as heroes are crucial to the development of history, their feats would not be possible without the efforts of the masses who remain uncredited in annals (Constantino 1975).

Indeed, the inarticulate could only find their way into history books if scholars and historians familiarize themselves with the people’s heroic struggles. The nationalist scholar should, therefore, aspire to achieve the following: (1) liberate the readers from a history written from a colonial perspective, (2) provide a people’s history that would not be based on a history of great men but on the collective struggles of the Filipinos, and (3) rediscover the past through a new perspective, making it reusable for the present and the future generations (Constantino 1975). The third statement probably represents Constantino’s most important view on the relevance of a people’s history. Making the past reusable means using it as a tool to expose the roots of present-day problems. He explains that history should guide the people in understanding their present reality in order for them to unravel the “forces that impede real progress” (Constantino 1975). Constantino thus implies that developing a nationalist consciousness entails a sense of the present, which enables an individual to expose the chronic maladies of the society.

In relation to a history that is biased towards the masses, Constantino had no apprehensions in engaging partisanship for the sake of revising “colonial narratives.” He expounded on this in a lecture delivered before the UP History Club on September 18, 1975 titled “Nationalism and Partisan Scholarship.” Here, Constantino criticizes how the apparent obsession for objectivity compromises the scholar’s ability to make value judgments. Moreover, the study of history has given premium to mere recitation of facts. Thus, students blindly and uncritically

accept knowledge—an attitude that is a by-product of colonial education. For Constantino, historians should adopt a framework that could divorce the discipline from its colonial influences. One way of doing so is to practice a partisan or biased form of scholarship. Although partisan scholarship might be difficult to accept for the conventional academic, it is only through this manner that a counter-consciousness might be implanted unto readers. In fact, partisanship in history is what the Filipino people need as they are still dominated by a colonial mindset/mentality (Constantino 1978).

In the article “Nationalism and History,” published in the *Journal of Contemporary Asia* in 1980, he reiterates the idea that partisan scholarship underscores the people’s struggles; therefore, their history “is one that combats and defends, glorifies and condemns, criticizes and advocates” (Constantino 1988a, 12). More than criticizing, history should advocate for genuine change, and because history must be partisan towards the masses, it unshackles the Filipino from the deep trenches of colonial mentality. This can only be achieved through a partisan form of scholarship that realizes the people’s struggles throughout the years.

## **Ideological underpinnings and essential features of partisan scholarship**

Although Constantino defines partisan scholarship within the bounds of historical practice, it can be argued that the act of using history to produce a more potent social criticism is an invaluable feature of such scholarship. As seen in Constantino’s example, his social commentaries and writings about history were conjugal elements of his undertaking as a partisan scholar. He was both a public intellectual and a nationalist historian, who wrote for the public and not for the academe. His general aim was to provoke a nationalist awakening among Filipinos. As partisanship is an indelible trait of Constantino’s intellectual contributions, the ideological underpinnings of his nationalist thinking are worth examining. It is a known fact that Constantino can be considered a Marxist scholar. This is evident in many of his writings wherein familiar concepts and modes of analyses are done in the Marxist fashion (McFarlane 2000). For example, *The Philippines: A Past Revisited* shows patterns of class struggles in the form of anti-colonial movements. He also took note of nuances among the elite based on their conflicting class interests. There were some who fought alongside the people while others chose to be loyal to the colonizers due to their personal ambitions (Constantino 1975). He characterizes this “confused” elite as those who “formed a fairly broad petty bourgeois stratum which occupied a social and economic position between the peninsulares and the masses” (Constantino 1975, 159). This vacillating nature of the elite is likewise evident in Constantino’s narratives about the politics of the Japanese occupation and the immediate postwar years that followed. For example, he notes that the Japanese-sponsored National Assembly was unsurprisingly

controlled by traditional politicians (Constantino and Constantino 1978). To preserve their socioeconomic stature after the exodus of the Japanese, the political elite then shifted its gaze towards the newly-established Philippine republic, which upheld American interests in Asia (Constantino and Constantino 1978).

Although Constantino did not delve on the technicalities of defining “class” and “class interest” as concepts, he consistently showed how these ideas operated in various phenomena in history. Furthermore, he tackled the concept of nationalism along Marxist lines. In *Nationalism and Liberation*, an anthology of his works published in 1988, he argues that true political independence could only be justified when the country is economically independent. Otherwise, the nation would be “reduced to being a mere implementor of imperialist designs” (Constantino 1988b, 45). Constantino suggests that imperialism, used to exploit another country’s economy, will only be eradicated through social movements spearheaded by nationalists. Thus, he considers nationalism as an anti-imperialist struggle that could pave the way for social liberation (1988b). Consistent with the Marxist rhetoric, the nationalist struggle is a necessary process to gain larger forms of freedom for the society. He opines that “nationalism is the ideological base for national liberation... a step towards real liberation” (1988c, 40).

Interestingly, Constantino’s conceptualization of nationalism is essential to the fruition of internationalism. For him, the latter simply means a broadening of nationalism beyond the confines of one’s country. If nationalism is a “conscious approach of our identity and of our interests...,” then internationalism is “the kinship with the peoples of the world, not with their rulers or their governments” (Constantino 1970a, 63). He explains further in *Synthetic Culture and Development* that a real internationalist is a nationalist who shares the aspirations and struggles of other peoples (1985). Only when Filipinos become nationalists can they understand the struggles of other people and obtain an egalitarian approach towards other countries—one that is not grounded on exploitation (Constantino 1970a). Clearly, Constantino identifies the need for solidarity not only within one’s country but also beyond. This type of national and international solidarity would then give birth to a sense of worldly brotherhood. Although some classical Marxists view nationalism as inherently bourgeois, Constantino promotes a progressive form of nationalism that is consistent with what Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels articulated in the *Communist Manifesto*—a proletariat-led nation devoid of bourgeois undertones (1955). This “national liberation” will eventually come into fruition into a unification of struggles across different nation-states, as evidenced in Marx and Engels’ famous lines that underscore the union of the workingmen of the world (1955). Notwithstanding the fact that Marx and Engels were obviously pertaining to the solidarity of the working class, Constantino’s concept of internationalism revealed Marxist undertones and envisioned a broader solidarity that would germinate from all oppressed and exploited peoples of the world. In this sense, internationalism can become an egalitarian catalyst for different peoples from all walks of life (Constantino 1970a).

Aside from the concepts of class, nationalism, and internationalism, Constantino repeatedly mentioned the concept of “imperialism” in his works. It should be noted that such a concept is not Marxist in origin. Marx did not even mention imperialism in his extensive critique of capitalism. What he did was to provide enough material to highlight the problematic features of the capitalist system which included “theories of accumulation, the rising tide of monopoly, increasing misery, the falling rate of profit, under consumption” and the like (Bober 1965, 226). Succeeding scholars, whether Marxists or non-Marxists, used these observations to build their own arguments about imperialism. One popular work that examined this concept is John A. Hobson’s *Imperialism: A Study* (1902). Norman Etherington (1982) shows how Hobson had provided a non-Marxist critique of imperialism vis-à-vis the political economy of Europe, discussing factors, including the export of investment capital, monopolies, militarism, territorial expansion, and protectionism, to name a few. What followed Hobson’s study was Vladimir Lenin’s 1917 publication, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Lenin ([1917] 1999, 92) posits that “organized finance capital” had divided the world into different “spheres of investment influence.” He further explains this by proposing the five essential characteristics of imperialism: (1) it is a concentration of production and capital that produces monopolies, (2) it is a union of bank capital and industrial capital, (3) it exports capital, (4) it establishes international capitalist monopolies, and (5) it divides the world amongst the greatest capitalist nations (Lenin [1917] 1999). The appraisal done by Lenin influenced the studies of succeeding scholars concerning the effects of capital’s global scope.

In his works, Constantino appropriated both the Marxist critique of capitalism and the Leninist notion of imperialism, expounding on how finance capital affected Third World countries like the Philippines in terms of economic sovereignty. In “Nationalism and Southeast Asia” (1988c) and “Nationalism and Liberation: Some Reflections” (1988b), he exposed the role of transnational organizations like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in creating financial deals that pave the way for economic subservience. The political consequences of these are featured in *Sovereignty, Democracy, and Survival* (1983) and “Unity for Survival” (1981) where Constantino explains how imperialism dragged the Philippines to participate in America’s ideological crusade during the Cold War. In *Synthetic Culture and Development*, Constantino talks about the imperialism of culture achieved through miseducation and exposure to different forms of Western-oriented media (1985). In “Parents and Activists,” he explains that imperialism “has deepened human alienation, cheapened human life and has been responsible for the flagrant degeneration of culture” (1971d, 5).

Another ideological facet of Constantino’s partisan scholarship refers to how the materialist conception of history and the dialectics take a prominent role in his works. Historical materialism is a manner of explaining how material conditions constantly affect social structures and historical phenomena throughout time (Bober 1965; Wood 1984). As Marx and Engels argue, reality is a product of “the

realm of phenomena and objects which we can reach with our senses or instruments” (Bober 1965, 29). This view is in stark contrast to how idealists interpret historical phenomena as a byproduct of human ideas and consciousness. However, more than a product of material conditions, Marx explains that historical materialism is ultimately the result of the interaction between a society’s mode of production and the social relations of production, thereby underscoring the importance of economic structure in historical phenomenon. He expounds this idea in a book published in 1859, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1972, 137):

In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political, and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determine their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determine their consciousness.

Related to the concept of materialism is the role of the “dialectic triad” in history. This triad refers to a process, which involves a “thesis” that is negated by an “anti-thesis” and eventually produces a “synthesis.” Historical contradictions are vital components that produce the dialectic triad because “what generates the contradiction is the thesis; what represents the contradiction is the anti-thesis” (Bober 1965, 32). While all human phenomena occur due to the material conditions, the dialectics and the contradictions that go with it provoke change which, in turn, result in the development of historical events.

The materialist approach and the dialectics were flawlessly weaved into Constantino’s analyses of various events in Philippine history. For example, in the *Origin of a Myth* (1968), Constantino discusses the material conditions—political, economic, and cultural in nature—that forced the Filipino revolutionaries to bend to the pressures exerted by the Americans at the onset of their colonization. That is why Aguinaldo, who decided to trust the Americans initially before taking a hostile stance, was seen with much political naiveté and gullibility by Constantino. In “Westernizing Factors in the Philippines” (1977), the material conditions are dictated by colonial institutions, such as schools and colleges, which influenced generations of Filipino intellectuals in the early twentieth century. Hence, Filipinos think and behave the way they do due to the process of mental conditioning achieved under the American public school system.

Meanwhile, the dialectics can be seen in *The Philippines: A Past Revisited*, which narrates how social contradictions emerged because of subjecting Filipinos under the colonial yoke. This “thesis” necessitated the rise of an “anti-thesis,” beginning

with the series of sporadic revolts up to the time when nationalism was well articulated by the Propaganda Movement in the nineteenth century and expressed by the Katipunan through a revolution in 1896. The discernible “synthesis” should have been apparent in crafting an independent nation but was aborted due to the capitulation of those in leadership. These social contradictions, more importantly, can also be seen as manifestations of conflict in the existing social relations of production during the Spanish colonial period. In *The Philippines: The Continuing Past*, the neocolonial condition of the postwar years serves as the apparent “thesis” while the anti-imperialist sociopolitical movements of the 1950s onwards embody the society’s “anti-thesis.” Furthermore, the contradictions generated by the contending social classes at any given time in the past represent how the dialectics and the social relations of production operate in history. Though often dismissed by critics as an overly simplistic approach to historical analysis, Constantino did not discount the nuances in the society influenced by important overarching factors, such as the Second World War or the Cold War. Nonetheless, what is important about his approach is that he underscores the essential social contradictions that are inherent throughout a given time. This, indeed, makes the materialist and dialectical analysis of history a necessary feature of Constantino’s partisan scholarship.

Given Constantino’s materialist conception of history, it is interesting to inquire how his approach subsumes itself within the larger area of postcolonial studies. Postcolonialism emerged as a field of study that gave prominence to the perspective of the “other” suppressed by the colonial and imperialist project. It essentially rejects Eurocentrism to privilege unheard voices overshadowed by Western literary tradition (Windschuttle 1997). It also engages European concepts, which continue to predominate and influence the human sciences (Chakrabarty 2000). Rommel A. Curaming (2016) of Universiti Brunei Darussalam argues that while the postcolonial tradition thrives in cultural and literature studies, only its key features are evident in the field of history. Renowned literary and cultural critic E. San Juan Jr. defines postcolonialism as an explanation for the “ambivalent and hybrid nature of subjects, their thinking and behavior, in the former colonies of the Western imperial powers...” Aside from providing an alternative view that underscores the experiences of the “suppressed” and “othered” in history, postcolonial theory “seeks to prove that the colonial enterprise is not just a one-way affair of oppression and exploitation, but a reciprocal or mutual co- or interdetermination of both metropolitan master and ‘third world’ subaltern” (2008, 1).

Noticeably, anti-colonialism and anti-Eurocentrism are among the features of postcolonialism that serve as important facets of the Philippine nationalist historiography. In many respects, Constantino’s history writing is evocative of the postcolonial tradition, primarily because it has brought the Filipino viewpoint to the fore and rejected colonial historiography. With respect to postcolonial traces in Constantino’s writings, it should be clear that postcolonial and Marxist adherents have been critical of one another.<sup>5</sup> Among other criticisms directed at this type

of postcolonial theory, San Juan Jr. (2008, 1-2) opines that “it [postcolonialism] claims to be more sophisticated or ‘profound’ than the usual Left or even liberal explanation of colonialism” and, with regard to Marxism, “postcolonialism rejects the historical-materialist critique of imperialism in favor of a highly suspicious and even demagogic claim to rescue the postcolonial subject from its own abject past.”

Despite these postcolonial considerations, the materialist approach remains an essential feature of Constantino’s partisan scholarship, because it offers a distinct reading of Philippine history that stresses how material conditions through the economic base (mode and relations of production) and superstructure influence the society in shaping the events in Philippine history. Thus, the materialist conception of history clearly differentiates itself in theory from the postcolonial rejection of “grand narratives” dominated by colonial perspectives.

A point of interest in Constantino’s appropriation of the Marxist framework would be the fact that he did not openly mention the concept of “Marxism” nor did he quote Marx, Engels, and Lenin in any of the works cited in the current study. Instead, Constantino frequently used concepts, such as “nationalism” and “counter-consciousness” to articulate his views that were evidently Marxist in nature. Readers and researchers interested in Constantino’s scholarship could only speculate about this matter. It must be emphasized, however, that Constantino’s medium was print media, and as such, he probably wanted to relay his social criticism and nationalist message without the technical hurdles of academic jargon. His main audience, after all, consisted of the pedestrian who only read daily newspapers. Whatever the exact reason for this, his partisan scholarship made a lasting impact for generations of activists.

## **Criticisms on partisan scholarship and legacy to Philippine historiography**

Comprehending Constantino’s partisan scholarship may require looking at how his ideas were accepted by his peers. As mentioned above, his stance on historical bias was controversial and had amassed criticisms from the academe. For example, John A. Larkin from the State University of New York made interesting points in his review of *A History of the Philippines: From the Spanish Colonization to the Second World War* (1975; alternative title to *The Philippines: A Past Revisited* published by the Monthly Review Press). For him, Constantino’s book is “more exhortation than explanation” (Larkin 1978, 796) and that his aim to expose historical myths had already been done by scholars before him, such as William Henry Scott, Teodoro Agoncillo, Bonifacio Salamanca, and David Sturtevant. Furthermore, Larkin stated that Constantino raised arguments, which were already worn out or inadequate to cope with the changing times. The increasing interaction of the Philippines with the international community has rendered concepts, such as neocolonialism, vague for the ordinary Filipino. For Larkin, the more potent concerns that should have been tackled by the author were issues connected to demography and ecology/the



environment. He also criticized Constantino's fixation on political and economic history, arguing that his work lacked a discussion on the cultural dimension of history, which could have been crucial in understanding the Filipino's cultural identity.

Noel V. Teodoro, professor of history at UP, agrees with Larkin's position about culture and its essential place in any work of history. Even Constantino's use of the English language, a foreign means of communication, was paradoxical to his aim of crafting a people's history (Teodoro 1977). Similarly, Jaime B. Veneracion (cited in Tenorio 2000, 329), retired professor of history at UP, pointed out that Constantino's idea of nationalism did not shed light on ethnic dimensions but was rather anchored on the "metropole-periphery relations... between a colonizer and a struggling colonized people." His works, Veneracion added, were more focused on the anti-colonial struggle of the Filipino people, but underemphasized the struggle of indigenous peoples (cited in Tenorio 2000). Indeed, the history of the indigenous peoples could have provided a better understanding of their struggles from the colonial period up to the present. If these important topics were given sufficient consideration by Constantino, then his scholarship would have better represented the plight of the marginalized Filipinos.

Among the most comprehensive criticisms against Constantino's writings were provided by John N. Schumacher of the Ateneo de Manila University and Glenn Anthony May of the University of Oregon in their respective reviews of *The Philippines: A Past Revisited*. In his review, Schumacher (1975) argued that Constantino's use of the Marxist framework fails to accurately read the nuances in history. Moreover, his narrative was largely about the people's economic struggles expressed in political and intellectual forms. In short, the complexities of history had been reduced to its economic dimension. Schumacher (1975, 470) also argued that Constantino did not provide a "successful treatment of the Spanish colonial society and of the Philippine Revolution" by leaving out essential references about the period, such as Horacio dela Costa's *The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581-1768* (1961) and important essays edited by Gerald H. Anderson in *Studies in Philippine Church History* (1969). Furthermore, Schumacher posited that Constantino had ultimately committed historical distortions in three levels. First, contrary to Constantino's position, it was difficult to locate empirical evidence proving the undeniable connection between revolutionary consciousness and socio-economic class background. Second, despite Constantino's high regard for the historic role of the "people," he did not clearly define or discuss who the "people" were. They may only exist as an "abstract collectivity," because even their mentality, behavior, and culture lacked ample discussion in the book. Third, Constantino failed to tackle how religion paved the way for the development of ideas, values, attitudes, and even anti-colonial sentiments amongst the people (Schumacher 1975). For Schumacher, Constantino's choice of framework impeded him from using relevant primary sources and conducting proper interpretation.

May's review of the same book was sterner compared to Schumacher's. May (1987, 5) critiqued Constantino's biased approach towards history, which the former considered a manifestation of the latter's "disdain for objectivity." For May, the advocacy of liberating the consciousness of the people through a partisan form of history has eradicated the scholarly nature of the discipline (1987). He then concluded that the Constantino's work can, therefore, be considered "a kind of propaganda; before Filipinos can get balanced history, they must wait until the colonial propaganda has been eradicated by Constantino's propaganda..." (1987, 6). May further argued that Constantino dangerously encouraged historians to criticize first and look at matters of history without its nuances, devoid of critical and careful examination. Moreover, he found it both ironic and unacceptable that Constantino called out other historians for being biased towards colonial historiography where, in fact, he himself betrayed the discipline by promoting a propaganda to satisfy his political ends (1987). Constantino's notion of a "usable past" was also a matter of contention for May. Although May admitted that there was nothing wrong with invoking the proactive nature of history, Constantino's idea that there should be a "proper perspective" of the past was deemed problematic (May 1987). Clearly, May found Constantino too imposing. The latter's treatment of the discipline as an advocacy for counter-consciousness led him to abuse the Marxist framework and commit—unintentionally or intentionally—misrepresentations about the past. May tried to underscore the fact that Constantino had a political agenda, which corrupted the disciplinary nature of the field of study in the process.

The points raised by Larkin, Teodoro, Veneracion, Schumacher, and May provide interesting observations about the nature of Constantino's partisan scholarship. Yet, despite these criticisms, it should be noted that Constantino, by using the Marxist lens, was admittedly inclined to underscore the political and ideological dimensions of Philippine history, particularly in terms of how the material conditions of the past affected Filipinos in their actions and decision-making. Constantino found the materialist approach paramount because it exposed the evidence of colonial machinations in the past, which have repeatedly provoked class antagonisms. The late Edgardo Maranan (1989), then professor of Philippine Studies at UP, affirms that the best feature of Constantino's "liberative consciousness" (counter-consciousness) is its materialist conception of history. Furthermore, it must be emphasized that Constantino wrote not for a specialized community of academics but for the Filipino pedestrian in general. Constantino used print media, namely, broadsheets, magazines, and pamphlets, to convey his views to a wider audience and make his message relatable to many generations of activists. To arouse nationalist sentiments, Constantino's works needed to be deeply entrenched in political and ideological affairs. Whatever the opposition to his intellectual contributions are, those who engage in partisan scholarship must have a clear agenda in mind. Obviously, Constantino's agenda was nationalism, hence the necessity of deviating from the norm of history writing—an act that was

either dismissed as a deliberate attempt to distort the past or considered as a noble and judicious undertaking.

Finally, interrogating Constantino's partisan scholarship involves identifying his place in Philippine historiography. He was, in fact, a known inheritor of the nationalist historiography that Teodoro A. Agoncillo introduced through *The Revolt of the Masses* and the *History of the Filipino People*. Constantino defined this historical approach in his own terms by providing a Marxist version of Philippine history as seen in, for example, *The Philippines: A Past Revisited* and *The Philippines: The Continuing Past*. Admittedly, Agoncillo and Constantino were not alone in providing this form of critique of Philippine history. For instance, Sison, is considered an adherent of nationalism and, to some extent, postcolonial discourse, considering his ideologically charged work, *Philippine Society and Revolution* (1970). However, within the academe, left-leaning historical tradition usually revolved around Agoncillo and Constantino's contributions.

Out of the many criticisms directed at Constantino's intellectual legacy, it was probably Reynaldo C. Ileto's that made a significant impact because a new approach was born out of it. Ileto (1988) argued that Constantino, together with Sison, provided an elitist view of nationalist history after examining mass movements using sources articulated by the elite. A similar criticism by Ileto was directed at Agoncillo for *Revolt of the Masses* (1979). Thus, as an alternative, he proposed a "history from below" approach, which became the focal point of *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840–1910* (1979). Characteristically anti-colonial and subaltern, Ileto's work, on the one hand, underscored the experience of the masses based on sources endemic to them (Ileto 1979; see Spivak 1988). This work was a stark departure from the elitist paradigm of previous nationalist scholars. On the other hand, the use of language—a criticism raised against Constantino's writings—became a prominent feature of another strand of the nationalist tradition years after Ileto's work. In advocating for "a historiography for Filipinos by Filipinos," Zeus A. Salazar's concept of *pantayong pananaw* (the inclusive perspective) promoted the national language (Filipino) as an essential component in relaying the process of indigenization to the masses (Claudio 2013). Undoubtedly, *pantayong pananaw's* anti-Eurocentrism is grounded on cultural holism (Curaming 2016) and completely deviates from Constantino's nationalist but non-nativist approach.

Indeed, the development of the nationalist historiography would be incomplete without Constantino's intellectual contributions. Through his works, he provided a paradigm that inevitably influenced the trends in the nationalist tradition from the 1950s onwards. Working along the postcolonial fashion, his materialist approach did not escape the criticisms from his peers in the discipline. Constantino's partisan scholarship was as controversial as the novel paradigms of scholars, such as Ileto and Salazar, who proposed new and alternative approaches to the nationalist tradition.

## Conclusion

This paper has thus proven that, after examining the essential ideas located in his selected works, Constantino's partisan scholarship is a necessary undertaking aimed at exposing the neocolonial condition of the Philippines. His general aim is to convince Filipinos that nationalism is the ultimate solution to the existing problems of the society. Constantino's noble cause can be understood by the fact that he was a product of his time. His nationalist thinking was a clear influence of the sociopolitical milieu in which he was raised. He lived through the post-war years, which paved the way for the country's neocolonial condition. He witnessed the political vicissitudes of the 1950s to the 1970s, which intensified social contradictions and eventually culminated into a revolution in the mid-1980s.

Evidently, Constantino's social commentaries and historical expositions became the primary means by which he successfully conveyed his message to a wide readership. The social criticisms that he did would not have been so potent without the historical analyses he provided. Hence, Constantino's partisan scholarship had successfully conveyed to Filipinos the historic roots of their country's problems. Furthermore, Constantino was a nationalist historian and a public intellectual, who offered an alternative means for social emancipation different from the one prescribed by, for example, Maoism. Constantino's message became timeless because he used print media—through numerous articles, pamphlets, and books—and even speeches as a primary means to promote the nationalist agenda.

Notably, Constantino was able to fully expound on the nationalist agenda by using Marxism as an ideological paradigm. The advantages of this, as Hobsbawm posits, are that the “peculiarities of Marxism” allow a historian to explain social evolution and its intricacies (1998). Constantino did the same by appropriating Marxism in his historical expositions and social commentaries. As evidenced in the foregoing sections of this paper, Constantino's partisan scholarship has mostly dealt with the historic struggles of the Filipinos vis-à-vis the chronic problems of their society. It is precisely due to this undertaking that most traditional historians pounced on the notion of partisan scholarship. Yet, Constantino's subversion of the academic approach secured him a place as one of the pioneers of nationalist historiography and, arguably, the postcolonial tradition in the Philippines.

Considering these points, Constantino arguably fits the mold of what the Russian historian Aaron I. Gurevich considered an “ideal historian” of the 21<sup>st</sup> century: “a scholar who ponders the past maturely and attentively... a thinker who compares his own world-view, as well as the world-view of his own milieu, with the world-view of the people whom he is studying” (1994, 82).

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Constantino acquired a deeper interest in history after he was employed as a curator of the Lopez Museum and Library in 1960.
- <sup>2</sup> Ofreneo (2000) noted that it was the Constantinos' friends, Prof. Perfecto Fernandez and his wife Albina Peczon Fernandez, who printed the book under Tala Publishing Corporation on February 7, 1975. In the same year, the Monthly Review Press published the book under the title, *A History of the Philippines: From the Spanish Colonization to the Second World War*.
- <sup>3</sup> These speeches were compiled in a pamphlet entitled *The Post-Marcos Era: An Appraisal* (Quezon City: Karrel, Inc., 1986). In these works, Constantino identified the contending forces when Marcos dies: (1) from within Marcos's ranks, (2) from the US government, and (3) from the subgroups within the broad opposition (e.g., the right, center, and left-wing formations).
- <sup>4</sup> Constantino's lecture, published in 1977, had content similar to other essays, such as "The Miseducation of the Filipino" (1966), "Culture and National Identity" (1970), and *Identity and Consciousness: The Philippine Experience* (1974), among others.
- <sup>5</sup> Aside from the Marxist critique of E. San Juan Jr., Vivek Chibber of New York University provided postcolonial criticisms in his book, *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital* (2013). Nikita Dhawan (2018) of the University of Giessen summarizes Chibber's points vis-à-vis the postcolonial view against the "universalist assumptions of historical materialism" which saw colonial capitalism expand and operate uniformly worldwide. In other words, postcolonial adherents, while maintaining the Orientalist framework, assert that capitalism advanced in the postcolonial world through various means. Chibber (cited in Dhawan 2018) argues that "capitalism's universalization does not require homogenization of social diversity or cultural differences, but rather that capitalism can accommodate and sustain cultural or religious diversity."

## References

- Agoncillo, Teodoro A. 1956. *The revolt of the masses: The story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- . 1960. *History of the Filipino people*. Manila: University of the Philippines.
- . 2003. "Interpretation in history." In *History and Culture, Language and Literature: Selected essays of Teodoro Agoncillo*, edited by B.R. Churchill, 30-37. Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press.
- Anderson, Gerald H., ed. 1969. *Studies in Philippine church history*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bober, Mandell Morton. 1965. *Karl Marx's interpretation of history*, 2nd ed. New York: The Norton Library.
- Caral, Jose Emmanuel, Gloria Georgina Jota, Minerva Generalao, and Merci Biluan-Tabafunda. 1992. *The Aquino management of the presidency: In the face of crisis*. Manila: Presidential Management Staff Office of the President.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Chibber, Vivek. 2013. *Postcolonial theory and the specter of capital*. New York: Verso.
- Claudio, Lisandro E. 2013. "Postcolonial fissures and the contingent nation: An antinationalist critique of Philippine historiography." *Philippine studies*, 61, no. 1: 45–75.
- Constantino, Renato. 1968. *Origin of a myth*. Quezon City: Malaya Books, Inc.
- . 1969a. *The making of a Filipino: A story of Philippine colonial politics*. Quezon City: Malaya Books, Inc.
- . 1969b. *Veneration without understanding*. Quezon City: Malaya Books, Inc.

- 1970a. "Diplomacy without policy." In *Dissent and counter-consciousness*, 48–65. Quezon City: R. Constantino.
  - 1970b. "Roots of subservience." In *Dissent and counter-consciousness*, 92–112. Quezon City: R. Constantino
  - 1970c. "The Filipino elite." In *Dissent and counter-consciousness*, 113–123. Quezon City: R. Constantino.
  - 1971a. "The miseducation of the Filipino." In *The Filipinos in the Philippines and other essays*, 39–65. Quezon City: Malaya Books, Inc.
  - 1971b. "Our captive minds." In *The Filipinos in the Philippines and other essays*, 66–80. Quezon City: Malaya Books, Inc.
  - 1971c. "Our task: To make Rizal obsolete." In *The Filipinos in the Philippines and other essays*, 137–151. Quezon City: Malaya Books, Inc.
  - 1971d. *Parents and activists | Mga magulang at mga aktibista*. Quezon City: Malaya Books, Inc.
  - 1972a. "The Marcos army." In *Renato Constantino and the Marcos watch*, 57–59. Quezon City: Karrel, Inc.
  - 1972b. "The first family." In *Renato Constantino and the Marcos watch*, 62–64. Quezon City: Karrel, Inc.
  - 1974. *Identity and consciousness: The Philippine experience*. Quezon City: Malaya Books, Inc.
  - 1975. *The Philippines: A past revisited*. Quezon City: Tala Publishing.
  - 1977. *Westernizing factors in the Philippines*. Quezon City: Malaya Books, Inc.
  - 1978. "Nationalism and partisan scholarship." In *Neocolonial identity and counter-consciousness: Essays on cultural decolonization*, 260–276. London: Merlin Press.
  - 1981. "Unity for survival." In *For Philippine survival: Nationalist essays by Claro M. Recto and Renato Constantino*, 6–13. s.l.: s.n.
  - 1983. *Sovereignty, democracy, and survival*. Quezon City: s.n.
  - 1985. *Synthetic culture and development*. Quezon City: Foundation for Nationalist Studies.
  - 1986. *The Post-Marcos era: An appraisal*. Quezon City: Karrel, Inc.
  - 1987. *Renato Constantino and the Aquino watch*. Quezon City: Karrel, Inc.
  - 1988a. "Nationalism and history." In *Nationalism and Liberation*, 9–18. Quezon City: Karrel, Inc.
  - 1988b. "Nationalism and liberation: Some reflections." In *Nationalism and liberation*, 43–49. Quezon City: Karrel, Inc.
  - 1988c. "Nationalism and Southeast Asia." In *Nationalism and liberation*, 21–40. Quezon City: Karrel, Inc.
  - 1989. *Demystifying Aquino*. Quezon City: Karrel, Inc.
- Constantino, Renato, and Letizia R. Constantino. 1975. *A History of the Philippines: From the Spanish Colonization to the Second World War*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- 1978. *The Philippines: The continuing past*. Quezon City: Foundation for Nationalist Studies.
- Curaming, Rommel A. 2016. "Postcolonial studies and Pantayong Pananaw in Philippine historiography: A critical engagement." *Kritika Kultura*, 27: 63–91.
- de la Costa, Horacio. 1961. *The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581–1768*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Dhawan, Nikita. 2018. "Marxist critique of post-colonialism." *Krisis: Journal for Contemporary Philosophy*, 2: 105–107.
- Etherington, Norman. 1982. "Reconsidering theories of imperialism." *History and Theory*, 21, no. 1: 1–36.
- Guerrero, Amado. 1971. *Philippine society and revolution*. Manila: Pulang Tala.
- Gurevich, Aaron I. 1994. "The double responsibility of the historian." In *The social responsibility of the historian*, edited by François Bédarida, 65–83. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1998. *On history*. London: Abacus.
- Hobson, John A. 1965. *Imperialism: A study*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press. 1902.
- Ileto, Reynaldo C. 1979. *Pasyon and revolution: Popular movements in the Philippines, 1840–1910*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- . 1988. "Outlines of a non-linear emplotment of Philippine history." In *Reflections on development in Southeast Asia*, edited by Lim Teck Ghee, 130–159. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Larkin, John A. 1978. "Review of *A History of the Philippines: From the Spanish Colonization to the Second World War*, by Renato Constantino." *The Journal of Asian studies*, 37, no. 4: 795–797.
- Lenin, Vladimir. 1999. *Imperialism: The highest stage of capitalism*. Sydney: Resistance Books. 1917.
- Magno, Alexander R. 1998. "A confused nationalism." In *A nation reborn*, edited by R. Samson, 73–83. Vol. 9 of *Kasaysayan: The story of the Filipino people*. Hong Kong: Asia Publishing Company Limited.
- Maranan, Edgardo. 1989. "Constantino: Arming the liberative consciousness." In *Partisan scholarship: Essays in honour of Renato Constantino*, edited by Peter Limquenco, 420–429. Manila: Journal of Contemporary Asia Publishers.
- Marx, Karl. 1972. "Preface to *A contribution to the critique of political economy*." In *K. Marx, F. Engels, V. Lenin on historical materialism: A collection*, compiled by T. Borodulina, 136–140. New York: International Publishers. 1859.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1955. *The communist manifesto*, edited by S.H. Beer. Illinois: AHM Publishing Corporation.
- May, Glenn Anthony. 1987. *A past recovered*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- McFarlane, B. 2000. "Renato Constantino." *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 30, no. 3: 302–304.
- Ofreneo, Rosalinda Pineda. 2001. *Renato Constantino: A life revisited*. Quezon City: Foundation for Nationalist Studies.
- San Juan Jr., E. 2008. *Balikbayang sinta: An E. San Juan reader*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Schumacher, John N., S.J. 1975. "Re-reading Philippine history: Constantino's 'A past revisited.'" *Philippine Studies*, 23: 465–480.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. "Can the Subaltern speak?" In *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 271–313. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Tenorio, Arnold S. 2000. "A historian's historian." *Journal of contemporary Asia*, 30, no. 3: 327–329.
- Teodoro, Noel V. 1977. "For whom should history be written?," *The review*, 1: 8–11.

Windschuttle, Keith. 1996. *The killing of history: How literary critics and social theorists are murdering our past*. California: Encounter Books.

Wood, Allen W. 1984. *Karl Marx - The arguments of the philosophers*, edited by Ted Honderich. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

#### **ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

Francisco Jayme Paolo A. Guiang (faguiang@up.edu.ph and faguiang@gmail.com) is an Assistant Professor at the Department of History, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of the Philippines Diliman. He teaches General Education (G.E.) courses on Philippine and Asian history. He also handles Kasaysayan 100: Introduction to World Civilizations. His research interests include Philippine historiography, the history of the Philippine Left, Martial Law studies, and Marxism in history.