

COMMENTS

AGERICO LACANLALE

Nang makita ko pong ang papel na binasa ni kasamang Epistola ay nasa Wikang Pambansa ay medyo kinabahan po tayo dahil medyo mahina po tayo sa Pilipino. With your permission I will try to discuss Dr. Epistola's paper using a foreign language. There are some reasons for this.

Sinabi po ni kasamang Epistola na baka hindi siya maintindihan kung hindi siya magta-tagalog. Baka raw hindi niya mabigyan ng wastong "meaning kung gagamitin niya ang wikang Ingles. Sinabi po niya na kung isasalin niya ang katagang "magpakatao" o "pagpapakatao," ay "Be a man." Sa palagay ko po ay hindi po yata iyon ang tamang translation. Kung atin pong isasalin nang wasto ang magpakatao, ito ay "Be humane."

Ang isa pong dahilan kung bakit gusto kong magsalita sa Ingles, bukod sa sa baka ako'y maubusan ng Pilipino, ay mayroong mga salita sa Ingles na hindi po basta-basta maisasalin sa Pilipino. Kaya ipagpaumanhin po ninyo kung magsasalita po tayo sa Ingles.

The paper of Dr. Epistola deals with the concept of the model of development. He offered two definitions.

First, *gaya-gaya puto maya* which is a Western model. The underlying concept of this is: whether you want to be like an American or Westerner, how much would you like to borrow by way of systems of values, technology, etc., from Western countries?

The second model is the other extreme: you do not borrow from anyone. You develop on the basis of your potentials.

The third concept that he advanced is what I would call in Tagalog as *pili-pili* or *sariling atin*. This is selective adoption of things that are Western as well as those that are indigenous. This concept is in between the two extremes and is often called "development in the middle." If it's going to be selective borrowing or selective application or realization of what we would consider indigenous, the questions that will arise would be: first, what is it what we can use based on indigenous values which would contribute to development? The second question is whether development can be viewed or should be viewed as an end in itself or as a means to an end. When Dr. Epistola discussed the case of the farmer, *pagpapayaman* is viewed as an end in itself, kaya nag-object ang farmer at ang sabi niya "hindi po naman tama ang meaning ng development." But if you look at development simply as a means to an end, you will say: *Magpayaman ka para umunlad ka*, which should not be construed as development per se.

AUTHOR'S RESPONSE

S. V. EPISTOLA

Philippine Center for Advanced Studies

1. The dominant evolution theory, which was discredited sometime ago and which now again shows signs of being revived, says that people evolve

toward particular forms. They become higher and higher. Since the people who formulated this theory were Westerners, it is inescapable that they should define the highest form of development as the development which has been achieved in their society: the industrialized culture.

2. There are a lot of theories on evolution but I have focused on two because these are the extremes. Either you get on the royal road to progress and at the end of this road you'll become a Western society. So when the Western countries say: We are going to give aid for the development of the underdeveloped, they are in effect helping these countries to be like themselves. They are not going to give you money to study the various versions of Lam-ang. The people who study this spend their own money, get no aid from the government or any foundation.

I was surprised at the amount of aid when we were studying technology transfer among farmers only to conclude at the end that it does not take place. One thing that I learned from talking with Filipinos in the rural areas: if you just tell them this is good for you, they will not believe you because they know what is good for them. In the same way, when the physician gives you medicine you will ask: What is it for? What good will it do to me? The farmers have this process going on in their mind; only they are not able to articulate it.

3. When you talk of development as an instrument — instrument for what? For a better life? But what is a better life? My idea of a better life is being able to sit at the Manila Hotel and do nothing there. A friend of mine has a different idea. It is sitting in the casino and lose about ₱10,000 one evening and win another ₱10,000 the next night. Now, where do you find the meaning of this?

If you say development is an instrument, instrument for what? Who will determine this? We? If you come from the U. S. you'll likely forget what you learned there. You have a degree now and obtained academic rank from the community; now you have a platform from which you can talk and you must talk and try to get your students to think for themselves because this is a case of define or be defined. You must define or those Westerners will define who you are.

And unfortunately, our students don't think they will not learn anything if they don't read about it from books. They go to the library to read about Asia when all they have to do is look out from the window and that is Asia. If you go out of the door, the person you'll bump into will most probably be an Asian.

OPEN FORUM

Escobar: Regarding the example given about the farmer, what then should a concerned Filipino citizen do towards national development?

Epistola: The same thing I am doing. Learn from them. You don't tell them what is good. You learn from them what is good.

Sicat: Ibig kong batiin at purihin si G. Epistola sa kanyang paglalahad sa Pilipino. Ako'y tuwang-tuwa na kaya pala nating sabihin ang ating inisip sa ating