

Editor's Note

Environment, sex, rural development, and food are authentic concerns of Filipinos, although not necessarily in their order of preference but as topics of the articles in this issue. Degradation of and abuse in the use of the environment escape our notice until the problem strikes us personally or dramatically, such as the unbearable pollution from jeepneys, cars, and trucks; a sinking town in Palawan; the catastrophic landslide in Davao del Norte, or the vanishing coral reefs.

The first article in this issue by Edwin W. Lee points out the dominant Philippine policy to achieve more growth, but at the expense of the environment. The author also underscores the apparent weakness of traditional public administration in developing and aiding environmental administration. As an evolving field, environmental administration requires an interdisciplinary and comprehensive approach to deal with a more dynamic and complex problem. Lee offers an intervention process model following a systems approach to overcome the fragmented strategy and to establish the linkage with several interacting systems.

A different type of intervention is analyzed in the article by Amelia P. Varela who evaluated the Philippine family planning program operational since 1969. This program implements the Philippine policy to reduce population growth and thereby improve the Filipinos' quality of life. The aim of Varela's study was to raise the issue of viability of the program, to measure performance, and to identify the critical variables contributing to successful performance. Parallel to Lee's strategem of a systems approach, Varela suggests an input-conversion-output model and stresses the need to link the population program with other development efforts of the government. However, her findings indicate that the level of integration in the program is limited. In fact, Varela found that program activities were amenable to less rather than more integration. The results of the Varela study should give us an opportunity to re-examine our premises in either the traditional or new public administration which recommends integration as a solution to policy or program dilemmas.

Gabriel U. Iglesias calls for an improved management of rural development (RD) because of the need for a "faster growth" in the rural sector. The author explicitly points out that the rural poor should be the target of RD programs. There is also the search for an integrated approach whether process or program level type. Perhaps, we should begin with a redefinition of the RD concept so as to achieve integration, Iglesias urges. He recommends that we adopt a "comprehensive but discriminative strategy." Does this mean in effect that we be more cautious and selective in recommending an integrated approach?

Food for the people and agriculture as a base for national development are analyzed by Festus C. Nze in the final article. The author unequivocally indicts the unsatisfactory performance of the agricultural development policy in Nigeria for the period 1975-1980. Several shortfalls were described, such as money being poured on huge bureaucracies, contradictory policies, low priority given to the agricultural sector, inaccessibility to credit, and so on. Food for the 80 million Nigerians came mainly from imports as domestic farm productivity declined and food prices rose. Again, Nze is enamored with a comprehensive policy in agriculture to encompass manpower development, education, credit, technology, and rural development. Our attention then turns full circle to the systems model suggested by Lee, but mindful of its constraints and limits.