

EDITOR'S PREFACE

This issue offers the reader three illustrations of what can happen when two disciplines contribute their particular strengths to the solution of a common problem. The disciplines involved, in various combinations, are anthropology, archeology, education, library science, and sociology, but the pairings are somewhat unexpected. Anthropology, for instance, has joined hands with library science, not archeology. Archeology has gone its own way here, along with sociology. Education, so often accompanied by its helpmate, library science, here leans heavily on the viewpoints and techniques of sociology.

The article by Gubuan and Eshleman examines four hypotheses regarding the way students feel about correction and punishment. Using data provided by questionnaires they administered to 400 students in five Manila high schools—Araullo, Assumption, Manila Science, San Sebastian, and Union—the authors find in the student self-reports ample evidence to support their starting propositions (or, more precisely, to reject the four null hypotheses that organized their research). Their conclusion, clearly implied in the opening and closing words of the article, is that the demonstrating Filipino high school student of the 70s is probably not reacting against authority or direction as such, but against that authority which he or she perceives as delinquent, incredible, or incompetent.

From what I have observed and been told, Philippine librarians (like the high school students of Gubuan and Eshleman) generally show genuine appreciation for informed and positive counseling as to what books to buy with their precious funds. It was to meet this desire of theirs that the Philippine Social Science Council, prompted by Armand Fabella of Jose Rizal College, asked the members of its Executive Board to prepare bibliographies of the 101 best books and periodicals in each of the social sciences. The lists were to be made especially for the use of librarians in Philippine colleges and universities.

My assignment was anthropology. With the help of several colleagues (mentioned in the article), I put together a bibliography which Aurora Noriega Corvera, research librarian of the Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC), then put in meticulously detailed form. As first compiled, the list was a selection from books and periodicals in print as of December 31, 1968. That first edition was mimeographed and made available in 1969. But it has proved so useful to the libraries for which it was intended, and to other institutions and individuals here and abroad, that I thought it might serve the same purpose for a wider public. The Philippine Social Science Council has also made available to the PSR similar listings for sociology and demography. With the help of local scholars in these fields I hope to polish these bibliographies and present them to our readers in the near future.

Let me digress for a moment to say a few words about the Philippine Social Science Council. This Council, to which at the moment (remember, I am writing in 1971) six professional social science organizations belong, was incorporated in December 1968. Its main purpose is to further and improve research, publication, instruction, and faculty development in the social sciences. The current Council

membership is the following: Linguistic Society of the Philippines, Philippine Association of Social Workers, Philippine Economic Society, Philippine National Historical Society, Philippine Sociological Society, Philippine Statistical Association, Psychological Association of the Philippines. And the doors are open for all other organizations that qualify (if you would like further information, write a note to the Executive Secretary, Mr. Blanco, whose address is given below).

The Executive Board, elected by the Presidents of the above societies to represent various social sciences, are presently the following: Eufronio M. Alip (history), John J. Carroll (sociology), Mercedes B. Concepcion (demography), Armand V. Fabella (economics), Abraham I. Felipe (psychology), Frank Lynch (anthropology), Cristina P. Parel (statistics), Emy Pascasio (linguistics), and Teresita L. Silva (social work). Dr. Concepcion is chairman of the Board, and I am the vice-chairman. Dr. Parel is our secretary-treasurer.

Beginning in January 1971, and for a period of 12 months, the Manila Office of the Ford Foundation has made it possible for the Council to have a full-time Executive Secretary. Some of you, who have met or heard from him, know that I refer to Carlo J.M. Blanco, a Ph.D. candidate in educational administration at the University of Toledo (Ohio) whom we persuaded to come back to the Philippines to help us out. His office is at Room 203, Luna Rosa Bldg., 1913 Taft Avenue, Manila (P.O. Box 479, Manila D-406). Hopefully, in one year's time Mr. Blanco will have developed for the Council a series of program proposals which, if implemented, will put social science on a firm footing in this country.

One of the Council programs, already developed in detail, seeks to improve the quality and frequency of social science publications, including the PSR. And this leads me to an important announcement. After lengthy discussion with printers and publishers, and a long look at our own financial records, I requested and received from the PSS Board of Directors their permission to raise the annual subscription rate of the *Review*. For those who from this date forward (May 30, 1971) place orders for the 1969, 1970, or 1971 volumes of the PSR, the rate will be ₱16 per year if the subscriber's address is in the Philippines and US\$4 if it is abroad. But let me add to that this promise: the *Philippine Sociological Review* will be up to date by the end of 1971.

But to return to the contents of this issue. In the third article Scheans examines two hypotheses offered by George Foster, the peasant and Middle-American specialist. One is to the effect that peasant potters generally enjoy (or endure) low status in their communities; the other states that they tend to be markedly conservative people. With data gathered from potters in eight barrios located in five language areas of the Philippines, Scheans questions the validity of Foster's propositions, at least for the Philippines. But he ends up, as do many social scientists, with the frank admission that maybe he and his discussant (Foster) are not talking about the same thing, or from the same viewpoint. The argument is, in other words, inconclusive, but we learn something new about Filipino potters in the course of it. Fair enough.

FRANK LYNCH

May 30, 1971