speech and sociology would tend to agree that although it is not impossible, it is at least extremely difficult to "teach an old dog new tricks."

A problem in field research which is seldom or never mentioned in classroom discussions is presented by Richard Coller. The basis of this problem lies in the fact that the researcher and his assistants are just as human as their subjects of study. Therefore, the common tie of social interaction that rises out of the study frequently affects the research work itself. Since the Philippines is entering an era of field studies, (we hope), this article may serve as a timely warning to future field research projects.

The article by Pilar Gonzalez represents an excursion into the realm of social philosophy. Areas of family life which apparently require change are first indicated. Then the point is brought forward that sociology, along with other social sciences, should be used to accomplish the desired changes. A considerable amount of effort along these lines has already been exerted in other countries. There have been established such institutions as pre-marital counseling clinics, family adpustment institutes, and clinics to re-organize families that have already collapsed. In all cases the sociological contribution has been significant. Whether or not such work can be begun in the Philippines in the near future is quite uncertain, but, as the article indicates, there seems to be a definite need for some such work to be done.

The articles in this issue only touch upon a few of the many possible applications of sociology. As society grows ever more complex it appears likely that the sociologist will be more called-upon to engage in applied sociology. Whether or not we will be able to meet future calls depends largely upon the type of sociological training that is given to Philippine students in the present.

—R. W. C.

FREEDOM AND ECONOMIC PLANNING *

Philip M. Hauser

The literature on freedom and economic planning is polemical and often doctrinnaire. The concepts involved are complex and the divergencies in basic ideological assumptions and approach to them are great. Thus "freedom" and "economic planning" are, on the one hand, regarded as antithetical; and, on the other, as complementary or even mutually dependent.

To begin with, although the concept "economic planning" is relatively unambiguous, "freedom" may have many connotations. These include political, personal, religious, and economic freedom. These categories are neither mutually exclusive nor exhaustive. But they may be used to help to illuminate an analysis of the interrelations of freedom and economic planning.

To assure a common universe of discourse, these essential freedoms may be defined as consisting of the ability to make individual choices with a minimum of restrictions or interferences by agencies of Government other than those imposed by broad considerations of health, safety, or morals. That is to say, the freedoms do not exist *in vacuo* but, always, within a framework of constraints imposed by a social order, whether informal or formal. Freedom is necessarily a degree of personal choice within an accepted social framework with varying orders of constraints.

Economic planning may be considered as consisting of a general effort to direct and control a national economy from a central source, the central government; and a set of instrumentalities to effect such direction and control. Here, also, degree is involved in the sense that economic planning may embrace very general and broad direction, or minute and detailed controls; and the economic planning instrumentalities may embrace the whole or given sectors of an economy.

If an empirical approach is taken in exploring the interrelations of freedom and economic planning, as defined, then certain generalizations may be made for the contemporary world. Where economic planning is practiced the most comprehensively and intensively, there is the least political, personal, religious, and economic freedom. The situation in the communist part of the world, containing about a third of the world's peoples, documents this generalization. In contrast, where there is the least economic planning there is the greatest amount of freedom in each of the senses specified. The free

* Prepared by invitation for the Asian Conference for Cultural Freedom sponsored by the Congress for Cultural Freedom and the Society for the Extension of Democratic Ideals, Rangoon, Burma, 19th February, 1955.

western world, which also contains about a third of the world's people, seems to provide ample documentation of this generalization.

More specifically, it is in the communist part of the world that economic planning is both the most extensive and intensive where direction and control of the economy tends to be maximized. It is also in this part of the world that the ability of the individual to make his own choices or decisions in respect of the political, personal, religious or economic facets of existence are close to a minimum.

In contrast, it is in the free western world that economic planning is much more limited; and individual choice is relatively great in each of the fundamental phases of existence to which reference has been made.

These empirical observations have the utmost significance to newly independent nations of free Asia. It is hardly necessary to elaborate the vast difference between the free western world and the communist world in the ability of individual to enjoy political, personal, religious and economic freedom. Moreover, there is also a vast gulf between the free western world and the communist world in levels of living in the ability to enjoy economic freedom in the sense of access to adequate material goods and services, as well as to participation in all phases of a given culture.

The association between economic planning and restrictions upon freedom, as observable in the contemporary world, does not necessarily mean that these concepts are completely incompatible. To begin with, within the free western world itself there are varying degrees of economic planning evident among, for example such nations as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Sweden. Moreover, within the communist countries there are undoubtedly variations in the degree of freedom permitted. The observed negative correlation between degree of economic planning and degree of freedom may, in large part, be a stage in history that is subject to further historical change.

In fact, it is clear that a number of the free countries of Asia are setting their courses of national economic and social development on the assumption of the compatibility of economic planning and freedom. Certainly Burma, the host nation to this Conference, which I happen to know best among the countries of Asia, is committed to a programme of economic and social planning with a minimum of interference with political, personal, religious, and economic freedom, and with a view towards increasing economic freedom in the sense of raising levels of living. In adopting a programme of national planning, Burma, to be sure, has socialized a number of the important sectors of her economy. But she has nevertheless left a substantial portion of her economy open to private enterprise.

A number of the leaders of nations in free Asia are convinced that economic planning is not only compatible with freedom in their countries, but is a prerequisite to it. And there is much to support their position.

In the first place, the newly independent countries of free Asia have achieved both national consciousness and aspirations for higher levels of living at a juncture of human history when the contrast between the most advanced nations and the least developed is, from an economic development point of view, fantastically great. In contrast with the initial stages of development of contemporary more advanced nations, the less developed countries today, in the world as a whole as well as Asia, face a quite different situation. Compared with the advanced countries in their early stages of development, the less developed nations today are relatively poorer in level of living and in capital resources, experience much greater pressure of population upon resources, have no access to a "new world," and have relatively little experience with commercial and technological development.

Moreover, as a byproduct of long periods of colonialism and hard earned political independence, a number of the countries of free Asia are characterized by pluralistic, politically divided, and truncated, societies. That is, these countries have yet to achieve integration of their diverse racial and ethnic stocks, political unity, and effective leadership in non-governmental as well as governmental activities. Years of colonial subjugation wre not conducive to the assimilation of the many diverse populations nor to the development of a sense of national unity; and revolutionary movements which preceeded political independence were understandably impatient with preindependence leaders, not only in government but, also, in other walks of life—business, education, administration, the professions, etc.

In consequence, the free countries of Asia find economic planning a must in their efforts to achieve independence and to raise the levels of living of their peoples. Only through central economic planning can the limited available human and material resources be most effectively mobilized and employed. Only the central government can begin to cope with the tremendous problems of economic rehabilitation with which they are confronted as an aftermath of war and revolution; with the back-breaking task of increasing capital outlays for both productive and social capital; with the task of imbuing the masses of their peoples with the same aspirations and incentives which motivate and activate the leaders.

It is difficult to conceive of any successful argument against economic planning by central governments in most of Asia. Moreover, economic planning is incorporated into the political and eco-

nomic fabric. In consequence, the free countries of Asia may be the proving ground in which the compatibility or incompatibility of economic planning and freedom will be tested.

For it seems to be the desire of the leaders and of the people in the free countries of Asia to preserve the essential freedoms. The problem is whether the free nations of Asia have the will, the forebearance, and the knowhow to achieve their goals of "socialism" without infringment of the essential freedoms. Moreover, once the initial phases of induced economic development are well under way through central national planning, it may be that the free Asian nations will find it feasible and desirable increasingly to depend on the free market mechanism to increase productivity and raise levels of living. The contrast between the free western and communist nations of Europe in the post war development of the consumer sectors of their economies and increased levels of living will undoubtedly be noted by the free nations of Asia.

There may be some temptation to adopt what may seem to be the more efficient methods of totalitarian dictatorship to hasten economic planning and its implementation. The preservation of the freedoms and the pursuance of democratic methods entail discussion, disagreement, and often compromise. Democratic and free methods are often slower, more tortuous, and may seem less efficient than totalitarian methods. But succumbing to the lure of the supposed efficiency of dictatorship would mean the adoption of the communist type of economic planning—planning at the expense of the freedoms, planning at the price of the enslavement of the individual.

The challenge which confronts the free nations of Asia is that of demonstrating whether the freedoms can indeed be preserved, while economic planning is pursued in the interest of the welfare state. This may be perhaps the most important experiment of our time. It may lead to a fusion of the desirable elements of both economic planning and the pursuit and possession of the freedom.

It has been indicated that the free western and communist worlds respectively, each embrace about a third of the world's population. The remaining third comprises mainly the less developed nations of the world, a considerable portion of which is in Asia. Asia may have it in its power to demonstrate to the other two-thirds of mankind that economic planning can be compatible with freedom. If this can be done, then Asia may contribute a way of life that will take its place among the great cultural achievements of human history.

THE "MOTHER TONGUE" AND SOCIALIZATION

Lillian O'Connor, Ph. D.

In this article is discussed one aspect of socialization in family life. The biological abilities of the child in regard to speech are channeled by social training in the group. Language is a prime example of a group characteristic rather than an individual trait. As indicated, cultural differences in this socialization process extend to language training, so that the sound patterns of one language differ from those of others. Learning a new language in later life is therefore a matter of re-socialization in that particular aspect of life, so that the previous cultural training in language is utilized with important modifications in the learning of another language or languages. Hence the former channeling of the physical apparatus for speech will be re-directed into the sound patterns of another culturally-established language system.

The gift of speech comes from God. Language is "man-made." We perhaps should add that the "language problem" may be "woman made" since it is the mothers of the world who teach us our first language, our "mother tongue." The characteristic patterns learned in babyhood influence all other languages we learn later in life.

The ability to speak is possessed by all normal human babies, and each one of us has what it takes to produce sound with our vocal cords and to hear with our ears. We are born with a physical apparatus consisting of lungs, nose, teeth, lips, tongue, bronchial tubes, with which to modify the sounds infinitely. Moreover, as human beings, we have an intellectual capacity which governs these attributes and makes us different from other animals who have a similar physical make-up. Because the physical attributes mentioned above are primarily intended by God as life maintaining agents (breathing, chewing, swallowing) speech is often referred to an "overlaid" function. We must *learn* to talk.

Very early in life the baby learns the value of this "overlaid" function; moreover, he uses it quite efficiently to make his parents and others around hm attend to his wants. At times, he whimpers, or cries, or yells, or screams, or sobs, until someone is disturbed enough to pick him up, or cuddle him, or feed him, or remove the pin that's hurting him, or change his clothing, or do something else to make him comfortable. At other times, he smiles, or coos, or gurgles, or babbles, or grunts, or vocalizes up and down the musical scale using innumerable vowels diphthongs and consonants. These activities get atten-