



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Sonic Experiments of Postcolonial Democracy

Listening to José Maceda's Udlot-udlot and Ugnayan

Yamomo, M.

Publication date

2022

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Southeast of Now

License

CC BY-NC

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Yamomo, M. (2022). Sonic Experiments of Postcolonial Democracy: Listening to José Maceda's *Udlot-udlot* and *Ugnayan*. *Southeast of Now*, 6(2), 133-146.
<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/871494>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Sonic Experiments of Postcolonial Democracy:

Listening to José Maceda's *Udlot-udlot* and *Ugnayan*

MELÉ YAMOMO

Abstract

I write this article not as an expert on José Montserrat Maceda. It is an analysis of how contemporary exploration of sound and sound performance practices in Southeast Asia offer proposals for new ways to understand epistemology and aesthetics—in which Maceda has paved the way through his avant-garde music projects. In this paper, I examine José Maceda's Udlot-udlot and Ugnayan, and their context in Manila and Southeast Asia. I 'listen' to Maceda's aesthetic sonic experimentations within the postcolonial Philippine nation and the much broader global and transnational context of experimental artistic practices of the second half of the twentieth century. I situate his artistic and musical experimentations within the sponsorship of the Marcos regime and the cultural diplomacies of the 1970s and 1980s Cold War cultural politics. Maceda's work can be seen within the three intersecting threads of: (1) an emerging transnational avant-garde market, (2) the international ambition of the Philippine dictator Ferdinand Marcos and the cultural diplomacy-savvy First Lady Imelda, and ultimately (3) the Philippines'

[**Southeast of Now**
Vol.6 No.2 (October 2022), pp. 133–46]

political dependency on its former US colonizer. How did Maceda's music compositions experiment with postcolonial modernity within such conditions? How did his musical and artistic trajectory intersect with the burgeoning postcolonial aspirations of the late twentieth century in Southeast Asia? What new paradigms arose from the intersection of the ethnomusicological discipline and twentieth-century sonic aesthetics?

Introduction

In writing this contribution to this special issue, I write not as an expert on José Montserrat Maceda, one of Manila's and, by extension, Southeast Asia's most influential composers, performers, and ethnomusicologists. Instead, I speak as a scholar interested in how contemporary exploration of sound and sound performance practices in Southeast Asia offer proposals for new ways to understand epistemology and aesthetics, for which Maceda has opened the path through his avant-garde music projects. This article is a draft of thoughts on the intersections of artistic/musical modernity, the postcolonial movement, and experimental aesthetics of the second half of the twentieth century.

In this article, I 'listen' to Maceda's aesthetic sonic experimentations within the postcolonial Philippine nation and the much broader global and transnational context of experimental artistic practices of the second half of the twentieth century. Maceda's music education and career were situated in an emergent global artistic mobility system enabled by Cold War cultural politics.

Immediately succeeding colonial independence, the birth of the Southeast Asian nations and the region as a whole is inextricably linked to the rise of the Cold War. Nowhere else was the Cold War felt the hottest as in the Southeast Asia. Experimenting with their new national identities, the postcolonial states played their allegiances with the Cold War powers. The triumph of US capitalist imperialism over the ideological war at the end of the twentieth century would have shaped the aesthetic matrix of a new postcolonial global imaginary implicating formerly colonized countries and communities within the logic of the 'free market'. However, by inverting the historical telescope, one might catch a glimpse of other postcolonial global imaginings and the processes of translocal flows of aesthetic values and international mobilities of artists and artistic practices enabled by the cultural warfare of the era.

An important aspect to note is how such experimentations were mainly made possible through the benefactors' support of the Marcos government

and the cultural diplomacies of 1970s and 1980s Cold War cultural politics. José Maceda's work can be seen within the three intersecting threads of: (1) an emerging transnational avant-garde market, (2) the international ambition of the Philippine dictator Ferdinand Marcos and the cultural diplomacy-savvy First Lady Imelda, and ultimately (3) the Philippines' political dependency on its former US colonizer. How did Maceda's music compositions experiment with postcolonial modernity within such conditions? I use the term 'avant-garde' here to refer to a notion of a temporal aesthetic shift from older artistic conventions and traditions that American and West European artists and art institutions have been capitalizing on in the twentieth century. I also situate this notion of 'innovation' and 'newness'—of the perpetual reinvention of the modern as an economic logic of a market economy of the arts that intends to transfer the system of compounding interests to art as a commodity. Within this polemical relationship between new and old, Maceda's work circles back to the indigenous as an avant-garde strategy.

Pianist, Ethnomusicologist, Composer

José Montserrat Maceda (Manila, 1917–2004) started his career as a concert pianist after graduating from the Academy of Music in Manila in 1935 and later from the *École Normale de Musique de Paris* studying under Alfred Cortot. In 1950, he went to the US to pursue studies in anthropology, musicology, and ethnomusicology at the University of Columbia, the University of Chicago, and Indiana University. On his return to the Philippines in 1952, the University of Philippines appointed him to a faculty post in the Piano and Ethnomusicology departments. From 1957 to 1963, Maceda undertook a PhD in ethnomusicology with Mantle Hood at the University of California Los Angeles.

Maceda's music profession straddled three dimensions: ethnomusicological research, piano concerts, and music composition (in the context of Western art music).

In the 1950s and 60s, Maceda continued to perform piano concerts and recitals. Composer and music researcher Michael Tenzer shared from their personal correspondence Maceda's internal crisis arising from his European music career and his Southeast Asian context:

In 1947 he played a series of recitals featuring Beethoven's *Appassionata* sonata before many of Manila's cosmopolitan acolytes

of European culture. In preparing and performing, as he told me, he was repeatedly provoked by an interior voice posing what was for him an epiphanic and previously unasked question, 'What has all of this got to do with coconuts and rice?' With his inner sense of contradiction and conflict, he may as well have asked: what have Western musical values to do with Asian ones, what has composition to do with ethnomusicology, and what had placed him in the position of feeling impelled to resolve these issues.¹

Driven by this question, Maceda undertook ethnomusicological research and extensive fieldwork in the Philippines, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, Brazil, Uganda, and Ghana in the 1950s and 60s. His recordings would later comprise the majority of the University of the Philippines Center for Ethnomusicology's collection.

Alongside these sound recording projects, Maceda's ears were tuning into the emerging musical modernism in continental European art music. In 1958, Maceda spent significant time at the Groupe de Recherches Musicales in Paris, a collective founded by the avant-garde composer Pierre Schaeffer, dedicated to the study of *musique concrète*. He worked with Schaeffer on *musique concrète* projects at French radio stations in Paris.² In the same year, he attended the 1958 Brussels World Fair, where he encountered Edgar Varèse's *Poème Electronique* installed in the Philips pavilion designed by the architect Le Corbusier. The eight-minute, three-channel tape composition played on 350 speakers incorporated gongs, percussion, voice, and electronic tones.³ In 1961, while attending the East-West summit in Tokyo, he met Greek émigré to Paris, Iannis Xenakis (1922–2001), and listened to the music of Xenakis, Luciano Berio, and Bruno Madema introduced to Japan.

To understand the milieu in which Maceda created his works, it is important to provide the socio-political context of Manila of the time. During the 1960s and early 1970s, the state supported large-scale projects to conduct ethnographic research of indigenous arts, music, dance, and performance cultures throughout the 7,641 islands of the Philippine archipelago. José Maceda was at the forefront of such a project, and his intertwined career as an ethnomusicologist and composer culminated with the performance of daring, massive avant-garde music and performance works. Sponsoring these projects were the then dictator President Ferdinand Marcos and art and cultural benefactor, the First Lady Imelda. This perfect storm of scholarly aspiration and grandiose artistic projects was at the centre of Marcos's tempestuous ideology of the *Bagong Lipunan* (New Society).⁴ Such an ostentatious enterprise must also be understood within the bigger scheme of the

global cultural Cold War, where societies like the Philippines were imagining their future as a free society in a postcolonial capitalist world.

In his engagement with the avant-garde music of Edgard Varèse and Iannis Xenakis, Maceda found in their works an aesthetics that transcended the constraints of a Western musical-ideological framework. Through such musical iconoclasm and the use of Philippine indigenous sonic elements based on his ethnographic fieldwork, Maceda sought a medium of art music composition that represented the modern Philippine nation. For example, in 1963, the year he completed his PhD in ethnomusicology at UCLA, Maceda premiered his first large-scale avant-garde composition, *Ugma-ugma* (Structures). In this piece for voice and several Filipino, Chinese, Japanese, and Indonesian instruments, he employed native taxonomic timbral interaction intended to showcase native Filipino conceptions of music. The sonic spectrum formed what Philippine ethnomusicologist Ramon Santos calls a human expression of *musique concrète* without the electronic component).⁵ In the works that follow, *Agungan* (Gong Sounds for Six Gong Families) in 1965 and *Kubing* (Music for Bamboo Percussion and Men's Voices), he continued with this aesthetics in what can be seen as Maceda's attempt to free avant-garde musical practices from their European forebearers.

The sonic shift away from Western musical logic is at the centre of Maceda's modernist experiments. Tracing Maceda's encounters with Varèse and Xenakis, Michael Tenzer connects how the "absence of tonality and twelve-tone rows in works like *Integrales* appeared to Maceda to unshackle Western music from its moorings in Western culture".⁶ Tenzer argues that Maceda saw "the language of Varèse and Xenakis as a vehicle that could be reharnessed to serve a different culture and way of life".⁷ From this perspective, Maceda sees the potential of "avant-garde music to take on a progressive social function in the Philippines by articulating the repressed voices and aesthetics of its marginalized peoples in a reinvigorating modern way".⁸

Coconuts and rice, and the Cold War

In 1963, the year he graduated with his PhD, José Maceda premiered his first mature composition in Los Angeles, *Ugma-ugma*. One could say that *Ugma-ugma* was his first attempt at answering his question, "What has all of this got to do with coconuts and rice?" *Ugma-ugma* is a piece performed on an ensemble of different musical instruments from the Philippines, Indonesia, China, and Japan. After the premiere of this work, Maceda continued to write other compositions: *Agungan* (1965), *Kubing* (1966), *Pagsamba* (1968), *Cassettes 100* (1971), *Ugnayan* (1974), *Udlot-udlot* (1975), among others. In

this quest for indigenous materials and cultures in his musical composition, it is also valuable to listen to his works within the broader postcolonial and global cultural politics of the second half of the twentieth century.

On the capitalist side of the postcolonial world in the 1960s and 70s, an ethos of Western scholarship-trained artists drawing from the indigenous resources of their home country complicated the emerging cultural cosmopolitanism of the Cold War era. In reflecting on the wider contexts of the avant-garde and experimental art in the second half of the twentieth century, it is timely to expand the bigger arcs of contemporary Southeast Asian entanglements with global art history beyond the binary of colonial and postcolonial eras. What emerges is a macro cultural history narrative of an international community framed by the United Nations promoting unity of a colourful diversity through emblematic cultural representations. In this new matrix of global order, the newly independent former colonies were involved. Concomitant to this, we also have micro-histories of official nation-states drawing from their indigenous communities and materials for their national identity building. Such cultural identity politics can almost be observed as a requisite for conducting international trade.

By the end of World War II, the two victors—the US and the USSR—were contending for global control, each advocating their version of global modernization. In recently liberated postcolonial Southeast Asia, the two hegemons sponsored nation-state-building projects and cultural modernization infrastructures with their rival visions of modernity.⁹ Southeast Asian cultural historian Tony Day argued that culture functioned as “one of the major battlegrounds of the Cold War ideological conflicts”.¹⁰ It is important to caution, as Southeast Asian historians Karl Hack and Geoff Wade point out, that the Southeast Asian Cold War “was constituted by local forces drawing on outside actors for their own ideological and material purposes, more than by great powers seeking local allies and proxy theatres of conflict”.¹¹ Thus we need to consider how many Southeast Asian artists and artistic institutions developed aesthetic and cultural solutions that “antedated, outlasted, and never became entirely aligned with the ideologies of either bloc”.¹² Ultimately, both the capitalist US agenda and the Soviet folk nationalism instigated the development of indigenous nationalisms in the region. Such indigenous nationalism would also become prerequisite to the theatre of a ‘United Nations’ pageantry as a ticket to a multinational capitalist global economy.

The Marcos dictatorship in the Philippines enterprisingly performed to the world stage how it managed to wield totalitarian control over the archipelago of 7,100-plus islands and 180 languages (and thus ethnolinguistic cultures). Through the artistic sponsorship of the then First Lady Imelda

Marcos, this constructed national unity was staged through the pageantry of the Bayanihan Dance Company through suites of folk and ethnic dances in a spectacular Broadway fashion that toured the different popular theatres around the globe. Yet, perhaps more ingeniously, in supporting the contemporary experimental art projects of high art institutions, the Marcos regime found a footing in the elite, multinational political economy that traded through cultural diplomacy and currencies of the ‘fine arts’.

José Maceda’s works—consciously or incidentally—were produced within this context. I examine two of his seminal works in this article: *Ugnayan* (1974) and *Udlot-udlot* (1975). I listen to how the aesthetics and new understandings of sound emerged from his musical experiments.

***Udlot-udlot* (Hesitations)**

The first work that we will listen to is *Udlot-udlot* (Hesitations, 1975). In this piece, Maceda explored the idea of community music-making that involves hundreds or thousands of participants. *Udlot-udlot* is a music-theatre open-air ritual for hundreds or thousands of performers; the larger the size of participants, the wider the spread of the sound. “Variations of rhythmic drones are played on wooden percussion sticks (kalutang), bamboo buzzers (balingbing), bamboo stamping tubes (tongatong), bamboo flutes (ongiyong) and voices, singing drones of two short vocal phrases—one a descending slide, and the other a descending melody of 5 tones.”¹³ In this work, Maceda explored musical ideas that invoke the sounds of nature in which music identifies with nature at a time of increasing technology and commercialism. Arsenio Nicolas describes the architectural structure of the piece as “a shared human activity by as many people as there are present in one occasion, reminiscent of the atmosphere of rituals in villages where people converged in the central square, in megalithic arenas, in rice fields, in sacred water springs and trees, in village temples or crossroads, in mountain sanctuaries, in ancestral graves and monuments, where powerful spirits reside and preside over the affairs of humans”.¹⁴

Udlot-udlot has been staged in cities in the Philippines, Indonesia, Japan, the US, and Germany. It has been performed in different spaces, contexts, and configurations. The most recent version performed in 2018 was a reduction of the original 800 performers to a 30-participant ritual done in the inner courtyard of Archive Books in Berlin.

José Maceda’s ethnomusicological research in the 1950s and 60s helped create an archive of Southeast Asian indigenous sounds, which until today serves as an important resource of ethnomusicological scholarship. This

archive also served as his own source for modernist sonic experimentations. Having one foot in the local nationalist art scene in the Philippines and another in the global avant-garde scene, he strategically linked a Southeast Asian metropolis to the bigger free-market cosmopolitan art world. The combination of Maceda's training in the classical music world, his interest in the ethnomusicological fever of the twentieth century, and the financial support of the Philippine aspiration for capitalist triumphalism strategically placed him at the forefront of the institutional and aesthetic zeitgeist.

Against this historical background, I return to my question of sound and decolonization strategies. Can we, therefore, ask if Maceda's avant-garde music and performance practices resonate with the decolonial artistic strategies of today? How did his work resist the epistemic violence of the neocolonial structures of the Cold War system? To what extent did his aesthetics replicate the dominant system?

In her book *Musical Renderings of the Philippine Nation*, musicologist Christi-Anne Salazar Castro argues that the hegemony of tonality "could be read as analogous to the imposition and eventual localization of colonial values, not the least of which assumed the superiority of the West [...] It was as if sonic difference could answer, in part, the question of what Filipino could have been were it not for colonial influence."¹⁵

In *Udlot-udlot*, we hear Maceda "drawing from the minority arts as a 'pool of source materials' in constructing a musical representation of the modern Filipino". In such a *musique concrète* composition, Maceda employed the native sounds for their pure sonic value removed from their social contexts. As ethnomusicologist Neal Matherne points out, they "become empty signifiers robbed of their "native value [...] The sounds simultaneously represent presence within and absence from the constructed Philippine nation."¹⁶ Thus, the "very presence of native instrumentation compels the listener to place them in the nation, of the nation, and within a newly formed canon of Filipina/o sounds".¹⁷

Sound artist and noise musician Tad Ermitaño, in a paper delivered for a panel presentation for noise music, traced Maceda's work as a precursor to the 'noise' movement in the Philippines. He finds the parallelism to the working-class urban street protest noise barrages against the state violence of the dictatorship a poetic counterpoint to Maceda's folk and ethnic soundscape. He elaborates that "Maceda saw noise as a chance to portray rural villages and their relatively unspoilt natural environs."¹⁸ In contrast, "CPN [Contemporary Philippine Noise] is perhaps rooted in the image of a Southeast Asian megalopolis, a cramped, noisy, polluted space filled with machinery and loudspeakers."¹⁹

Ugnayan (Relations)

Michael Tenzer and Christi-Anne Castro argue that Maceda used Philippine tribal musical aesthetics and practices in his compositions as experimentation with the incorporation of ethnic minorities into the national imagination.²⁰ Such experimentation, however, also needs to be viewed and listened to within the matrix of the two concomitant developments of (what Benedict Anderson calls) “cacique” democracy²¹ vis-à-vis a nascent cultural globalization. And nowhere else was this most ingeniously displayed but in Maceda’s most ambitious piece, *Ugnayan*.

From Maceda’s earlier exploration of native music as materials for ‘live’ *musique concrète*, *Ugnayan* was the natural evolution of his thinking as he moved towards using recorded music. The Filipino word *ugñayan* translates in English to ‘correlation’. He envisioned this piece both as a challenge to Western art music convention and as a unifying populist musical expression. *Ugnayan* has the reputation for being Maceda’s most controversial piece. It is a 51-minute, 20-channel piece broadcast over 33 radio stations. It premiered on New Year’s Day in 1974 under the patronage of the Cultural Center of the Philippines (CCP) and with the support of then First Lady Imelda Marcos.

Ugnayan was performed through 20 Manila radio stations which simultaneously broadcast sections of the piece. The choice to air on 20 radio stations, according to Maceda, was based on the existing number of broadcast stations operating in the Metropolitan Manila area.²² A massive print and broadcast promotion campaign was carried out to reach as wide an audience as possible. The official letter sent to the residents of Metro Manila provides an insight into how the piece was explained to the public:

Dear Barrio Residents,

The Cultural Center of the Philippines in association with the government and private institutions has the pleasure to invite you to the world premier [sic] of a unique socio-musical presentation UGNAYAN, a simultaneous broadcast by 20 radio stations, each playing one instrument of an orchestra, performing a musical composition prepared for this occasion. The 20 stations heard simultaneously over 20 loudspeakers will blend in to a symphony to be heard on January 1, 1974 at the Roxas Triangle, Makati Avenue. The Program will start at 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. while the actual broadcast will start at 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.²³

Similar letters were also sent to residents of Rizal, Bulacan, Pampanga, Laguna, Bataan, and Cavite—the neighbouring provinces of Metro Manila.

Philippine arts and cultural scholar and journalist Rosalinda Orosa reported that an estimated 2 to 20 million listeners tuned in to the radio stations and participated in the 142 *Ugnayan* centres across Metro Manila. It was estimated that each centre was attended by an audience of 15,000–35,000.²⁴

As a huge multi-part piece, the composition was very structured. The entire production planning and preparation of the event took nine months. The music-writing took more than a month to complete, and the entire recording was realized in ten days. Maceda himself directed the performance and recording of each individual part.²⁵ For each radio station, Maceda prepared a unique set of ‘village music sounds’. In each section (recorded pieces played for one radio station), seven types of indigenous musical instruments were used: the bamboo zither, bamboo nose flute, bamboo horn, brass gong, and *bangibang*.²⁶ The use of heterogeneous instruments from multiple Philippine ethnic groups in this massive Maceda composition is metaphorical if not reflective of the Philippine state’s overreaching ambition to exert authority over multiple and multifarious cultural groups.

The reception of *Ugnayan* was equivocal. Musicologist and composer Ramon Santos, who was also Maceda’s colleague at the University of the Philippines, wrote that the general public would have heard the piece as confusing. The lack of rhythm, meter, and harmony would have been perceived as disorienting by the general listeners. The ubiquity of the transistor radio in 1970s Manila may have offered a medium to reimagine the indigenous communal rituals into the collective listening of residents of the Philippine metropolis. Using ‘ethnic’ musical instruments composed in a modernist soundscape, broadcast on 20 different radio stations, the completion of such a sonic composition becomes the task of the listeners accessing the sound technology. In mass broadcasting, the individual becomes indistinguishable within a crowd. As ethnomusicologist Neal Matherne describes, “by participating in *Ugnayan*, the listener is simultaneously anonymous, inscribed in a social hierarchy, yet receiving an individualized message (depending upon where she is standing and which way her head is facing)”.²⁷ He further argues that “[t]he participants of *Ugnayan* within this crowd are simultaneously thrown into an un-grouped mass and temporarily unaware of each other’s ‘place’ in the social structure”.²⁸ This means that, the “myth of class absence, so prevalent in Filipina/o identity construction is simultaneously present and hidden. The telecommunicative fantasy [...] is based on the assumption that the voiceless individual could speak to the oppressive power structure”.²⁹

Coda

Udlot-udlot and *Ugnayan* were created and produced within the context of the 1960/70s Philippine postcolonial nation's autocratic ambition to put itself on the cultural map of the global Cold War. It is not clear if Maceda favoured the Marcos government. However, his artistic and musical projects were highly favoured by the regime and received generous funding from the state. His works were publicized nationally and internationally through the sponsorship of the Marcoses. So, whether or not Maceda aligned with the Marcos ideologies, his work and his aesthetics served the needs and purposes of the cultural politics of the regime.

For the Marcos government, the Maceda compositions that they sponsored were celebrated as important national and international successes. Philippine art historian Patrick Flores citing the 1974 report of the Bureau of National and Foreign Information, wrote how *Ugnayan* was hailed as a milestone: "the sum effect of the 50-minute program was a memorable reflection of the nation's musical heritage, dazzling in its totality of musical sound enriched as never before by large-scale audience participation and active involvement".³⁰ Elaborating on one of the meanings of the word *ugnayan* in Tagalog—"interlinking"—Flores argues that the "piece brought together many aspects involved in its production: musical, social and the ideological underpinnings of an administration with its own political agenda that gave its all-out support to such an experimental undertaking".³¹

BIOGRAPHY

meLê yamomo is Assistant Professor of Performances Studies, Sound Studies, Artistic Research and Decoloniality at the University of Amsterdam, the author of *Sounding Modernities: Theatre and Music in Manila and the Asia Pacific, 1869–1946* (2018), and project leader and principal investigator of the projects Sonic Entanglements and Decolonizing Southeast Asian Sound Archives. meLê is resident artist at Theater Ballhaus Naunynstrasse, where his creations *Echoing Europe*, *sonus*, and *Forces of Overtones* are on repertoire. meLê also curates the Decolonial Frequences Festival and hosts the Sonic Entanglements podcast. In his works as artist-scholar, meLê engages the topics of sonic migrations, queer aesthetics, and post/de-colonial acoustemologies.

NOTES

- ¹ Michael Tenzer, "José Maceda and the Paradoxes of Modern Composition in Southeast Asia", *Ethnomusicology* 47, no. 1 (2003): 94.
- ² *Ibid.*, p. 100.
- ³ *Ibid.*, p. 98.
- ⁴ The former Philippine dictator Ferdinand Marcos Sr. rationalized his declaration of martial law with the need to reform and guide the undisciplined society under the control of a 'benevolent dictator'. This social engineering programme was called *Bagong Lipunan* or 'New Society'. Books, education, and cultural programmes were created to enforce these ideologies. For more information, see: Alex B. Jr. Brillantes, *Dictatorship & Martial Law: Philippine Authoritarianism in 1972* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Diliman School of Public Administration, 1987).
- ⁵ Ramon Santos, "José Montserrat Maceda: Rebellion, Non-Conformity, and Alternatives". In *Tunugan: Four Essays on Filipino Music* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 2005), pp. 125–78.
- ⁶ Tenzer, "José Maceda and the Paradoxes of Modern Composition in Southeast Asia", p. 100.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁹ See: meLê yamomo and Basilio E. Villaruz, "Manila and the World Dance Space: Nationalism and Globalization in Cold War Philippines and South East Asia", in *Theatre, Globalization and the Cold War*, ed. Christopher B. Balme and Berenika Szymanski-Düll (Transnational Theatre Histories. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 307–23.
- ¹⁰ Tony Day, "Cultures at War in Cold War Southeast Asia: An Introduction", in *Cultures at War: The Cold War and Cultural Expression in Southeast Asia*, ed. Tony Day and Maya Hian Ting Liem (Ithaca: Southeast Asia Program Publication, Cornell University, 2010), p. 2.
- ¹¹ Karl Hack and Geoff Wade, "The Origins of the Southeast Asian Cold War", *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 40, no. 3 (September 1, 2009): 443, <http://oro.open.ac.uk/18829/>.
- ¹² Tony Day, "Cultures at War in Cold War Southeast Asia", pp. 1–20, 4.
- ¹³ Arsenio Nicolas, "From Ugnayan to Udlot-Udlot—The Music of José Maceda", in *The 1st International Conference on Ethnicity in Asia: Life, Power and Ethnicity on the Occasion of the 25th Anniversary of Naresuan University* (Mahasarakham, 2015), p. 1.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁵ Christi-Anne Salazar Castro, *Musical Renderings of the Philippine Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 53.

- ¹⁶ Neal Matherne, “Naming the Artist, Composing the Philippines: Listening for the Nation in the National Artist Award” (University of California Riverside, 2014), p. 83.
- ¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁸ Tad Ermitaño, “José Maceda and the Semiotics of Noise”, *WSK Festival: Feedback Forum* (Quezon City, 24 October 2019), p. 12.
- ¹⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁰ Castro, *Musical Renderings of the Philippine Nation*, p. 53.
- ²¹ See: Benedict Anderson, “Chapter 09. Cacique Democracy in the Philippines”, in *Spectre of Comparisons: Nationalism, Southeast Asia, and the World* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2004), pp. 192–226.
- ²² José Maceda, “What Is Ugnayan”, *Philippines Quarterly*, no. 45 (1974): 46.
- ²³ JM 587 Letter to San Lorenzo barrio residents.
- ²⁴ Rosalinda L. Orosa, “A World Happening in Music: Ugnayan”, *Philippines Quarterly* 40 (March 1974): 40.
- ²⁵ Ibid., p. 39.
- ²⁶ Ibid., p. 40.
- ²⁷ Matherne, “Naming the Artist, Composing the Philippines”, p. 88.
- ²⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁹ Ibid.
- ³⁰ Patrick D. Flores, “‘Total Community Response’: Performing the Avant-Garde as a Democratic Gesture in Manila”, *Southeast of Now: Directions in Contemporary and Modern Art in Asia* 1, no. 1 (2017): 24.
- ³¹ Ibid., p. 23.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict. “Chapter 09. Cacique Democracy in the Philippines”. In *Spectre of Comparisons: Nationalism, Southeast Asia, and the World*, pp. 192–226. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2004.
- Brillantes, Alex B. Jr. *Dictatorship & Martial Law: Philippine Authoritarianism in 1972*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Diliman School of Public Administration, 1987.
- Castro, Christi-Anne Salazar. *Musical Renderings of the Philippine Nation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Day, Tony. “Cultures at War in Cold War Southeast Asia: An Introduction”. In *Cultures at War: The Cold War and Cultural Expression in Southeast Asia*, ed. Tony Day and Maya Hian Ting Liem. Ithaca: Southeast Asia Program Publication, Cornell University, 2010.
- Ermitaño, Tad. “José Maceda and the Semiotics of Noise”. *WSK Festival: Feedback Forum*. Quezon City, 24 October 2019.

- Flores, Patrick D. “‘Total Community Response’: Performing the Avant-Garde as a Democratic Gesture in Manila”. *Southeast of Now: Directions in Contemporary and Modern Art in Asia* 1, no. 1 (2017): 13–38.
- Hack, Karl and Geoff Wade. “The Origins of the Southeast Asian Cold War”. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 40, no. 3 (1 September 2009): 441–448. <http://oro.open.ac.uk/18829/>.
- Maceda, José. “What Is Ugnayan”. *Philippines Quarterly*, no. 45 (1974).
- Matherne, Neal. “Naming the Artist, Composing the Philippines: Listening for the Nation in the National Artist Award”. University of California Riverside, 2014.
- Nicolas, Arsenio. “From Ugnayan to Udlot-Udlot—The Music of José Maceda”. In *The 1st International Conference on Ethnics in Asia Life, Power and Ethnics on the Occasion of the 25th Anniversary of Naresuan University*. Mahasarakham, 2015.
- Orosa, Rosalinda L. “A World Happening in Music: Ugnayan”. *Philippines Quarterly* 40 (1974).
- Tenzer, Michael. “José Maceda and the Paradoxes of Modern Composition in Southeast Asia”. *Ethnomusicology* 47, no. 1 (2003): 93–120.
- yamomo, meLê and Basilio E. Villaruz. “Manila and the World Dance Space: Nationalism and Globalization in Cold War Philippines and South East Asia”. In *Theatre, Globalization and the Cold War*, ed. Christopher B. Balme and Berenika Szymanski-Düll, pp. 307–23. Transnational Theatre Histories. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Archive:

The University of the Philippines Center for Ethnomusicology (formerly the José Maceda Archive). References from this archive are indicated with the accession number JM followed by the file’s accession number.