

PHILIPPINE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Present Mailing Address:
Department of Sociology & Social Welfare
University of the Philippines
Diliman, Quezon City

Socorro C. Espiritu *President*
Ariston Estrada *Vice-President*
George H. Weightman *Secretary*
Ofelia R. Angangco *Treasurer*

PHILIPPINE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

George H. Weightman *Editor*
Socorro Espiritu *Assistant Editor*
Joel V. Berreman *Editorial Consultant*
Pacifico Noroña *Advertising Manager*

The PHILIPPINE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW is the Official Organ of the Philippine Sociological Society. Subscription is three pesos a year or one peso for single copies.

Business correspondence and subscriptions may be sent to the Treasurer or to the Secretary of the Society, c/o Department of Sociology and Social Welfare, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

In this issue, the REVIEW has gathered a series of articles which deal with the general topic of human ecology and its related branches. Human ecology, that social science which treats of reciprocal relations between man and environment, has so far received little direct attention or study in the Philippines. However, there has been a growth of an awareness of its importance. Already courses are being offered at different universities in human ecology itself and related branches such as urban ecology and rural sociology. The articles presented cover several different aspects of this subject, ranging from a theoretical discussion of definition to micro-studies of the spatial patterns and processes involved.

The first article by Richard Collier, former editor of the REVIEW, is related to the specific definition of human ecology and its relationship to human geography. The intent of this report is to arrive at some working definitions in order to permit more fruitful research. Surely little can be done in any field of research until clarity in thought and objective are realized.

Cecilia Cantero-Pastrano in the second article presents an interesting insight into a fishing barrio in the western Visayas. Up to now little, if any, attention has been given to those Philippine barrios whose occupational orientation is not primarily agricultural. Particularly significant in her article is the discussion of the important role played by kin relationship in the sharing of work loads and the settlement of economic difficulties. The role of gossip as an important social control is also stressed.

The Chinese district in Manila has long been a tourist attraction and the subject of much idle speculation, but little serious study has been made of it until recently. George Weightman presents a preliminary ecological description of the community. In this admittedly superficial report, the author endeavors to relate the spatial patterns to the past and the present economic activities of the modern city of Manila. At present the author has undertaken a more detailed study of the interactional ecology and of the spatial-functional areal patterns that have arisen.

In her study of the Diliman community of the University of the Philippines site, Fe Rodriguez Arcinas described the socio-economic interactions of probably the most educated, most Westernized community in the Philippines. Little thought, much less research, prior to this has been given to the role and status of the intellectuals—the modern *ilustrados*—in the contemporary Philippines. The rise of the Diliman com-

munity has created a new social situation in the Philippines—a large residential university area similar to the American patterns. Few still yet realize the full implications of such a development.

As a supplement to this issue the REVIEW presents the timely observations and recommendations of Dr. Isidro about his recent Southeast Asian tour. Naturally, publication of his recommendations is not to be construed as full editorial endorsement of all Dr. Isidro's recommendations. For example, some may not be too alarmed about the possibilities of Communist penetration into schools controlled by the Nationalist Chinese Embassy.

G. H. W.

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN THE THEORIES OF HUMAN GEOGRAPHY AND HUMAN ECOLOGY

Richard Coller

I. Definitions of Human Geography and Human Ecology

Although both of these fields of inquiry are characterized by considerable amounts of written material, few writers have concerned themselves with the relations between human geography and human ecology. So we shall first clarify our perspective by noting the fundamental definitions before considering the more general aspects of theory.

Human ecology is thus defined by A. B. Hollingshead; "Human ecology deals with society in its biological and symbiotic aspects, that is, those aspects brought about by competition and by the struggle of individuals, in any social order to survive and to perpetuate themselves."¹ According to Dawson and Gettys; "The idea of competition is basic in human ecology and the human ecologist proceeds to study the human community in the impersonal manner pursued by the plant ecologist. Human ecology, then, explains how human beings and their institutions assume their characteristic patterns of distribution in space at a given time. It pays particular attention also to the organic relations of the distributed units."² Another definition by one of the "founders" of human ecology, namely R. D. McKenzie, is; "Human ecology deals with the spatial aspects of the symbiotic relations of human beings and human institutions. It aims to discover the principles and factors involved in the changing patterns of spatial arrangement of population and institutions resulting from the interplay of living beings culture."³ In these definitions it will be noted the common elements of competition and/or interaction processes and spatial or symbiotic distribution are prominent.

A greater variety of definitions is available for human geography. First is Pomfret, "Human geography is the study of the relationship between the physical environment and the social environment. The chief interest, therefore, in the study of human geography lies in the manner of man's adjustment to the physical environment, not in the elements of that environment."⁴ Next follows the somewhat narrower but more verbose view of Vallaux, "Human geography is a natural as well as a social science, but treats of man only as far as the substance of the surface of the earth is affected by him or to the extent that physical forces affect his individual or collective life. Human geography may thus be defined as the science which deals with the adaptation, in the widest sense, of human groups to their natural environment; passive adaptation

¹ A. M. Lee, *New Outline of the Principles of Sociology*. Barnes and Noble, 1946, p. 70

² C. A. Dawson and W. E. Gettys, *An Introduction to Sociology*. Ronald Press, 1935, p. 122

³ R. D. McKenzie, "Ecology, Human." *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. 1931, vol. 5, pp. 314-315

⁴ J. E. Pomfret, *The Geographic Pattern of Mankind*. Appleton-Century, 1935, pp. 3-4