

EDITOR'S PREFACE

Veteran members of the Philippine Sociological Society will recall with what predictable regularity its members used to meet — once a month during the 10 months of the school year, July through April. This enviable record, begun with the founding of the Society in 1953, was maintained with few breaks till the school year 1969–70, when total collapse occurred.

What mystified the Society's members was less what caused the breakdown, than why months went by without any official effort to get back on the old schedule. It was about this time as well that publication of the *Philippine Sociological Review* began to lag. The same general reason was apparently at work in both cases — those in charge of both the Society and its Journal were suffering from serious cases of overcommitment, an infectious disease endemic in the growing social-science communities of developing nations.

It was, in fact, a pleasant surprise when we rallied sufficiently to organize and produce on relatively short notice the Society's 1969 National Convention in the early days of December that year. With the change of officers that occurred in March 1970 (soon after the explosive events of January 1970), it was decided not to revive the monthly meetings as yet, but to replace them in school year 1970–1971 with a public lecture series. Thus was set in motion the series of events that resulted, after the passage of some time, in this double issue of the PSR.

At a meeting held August 8, 1970, at the home of the appointed Program Chairman, Aurora Silayan-Go, the general theme and most topics of the series were decided on by the Society's Board of Directors. Action followed swiftly on these basic decisions — the setting of a tentative schedule, sending invitations to speakers, discussants, and panelists, and making the myriad practical arrangements that necessarily accompany any such public venture.

One of these requirements was the place, the spacious San Miguel Auditorium, Makati, provided free of charge through Jose A. Carpio, assistant vice president and public relations manager of the San Miguel Corporation. Another necessary item was funds for the travel expenses and honoraria of invited speakers. Here William D. Evans, local representative of the Asia Foundation, came to our rescue — as he and his predecessors have so often done. Assistance to help publish the proceedings of the series was also assured by Ramon A. D. Hermano, chief of the division of the social sciences and humanities, National Science Development Board (NSDB). We were in business. "The Philippines Today: second thoughts for citizens concerned" would be a reality.

The first meeting, held September 24, 1970, began with a few words of welcome from the Society's incumbent president, Maria A. Gonzalez. She explained the purpose and scope of the series in these terms:

The eight seminars are intended to be a public forum to discuss — mainly from the social-science viewpoint — a number of national issues, many of which have been a focus of interest for civic and religious groups, activists and

demonstrators, opinion writers, politicians, government officials, and the management sector. Some of the topics to be discussed, such as the Constitutional Convention, the Brain Drain syndrome, environmental problems, and population and family planning, are crucial to the national development of the country.

As Filipinos, we cannot be complacent about the Philippine situation. Aware of the complexity of the problems that face the nation, we must be anxious to understand them and to assist in finding their solutions. For this reason we are bringing together speakers and discussants who are deeply involved in the particular subject to which they address themselves, our purpose being to offer some "second thoughts for citizens concerned."

After thanking the San Miguel Corporation, the Asia Foundation, the NSDB, and the program chairman for their particular contributions, Miss Gonzalez concluded:

The issues to be discussed are many-faceted and often overwhelming, but all of us will be contributing our individual experience, competence, and goodwill to the analysis – which hopefully will yield information, insights, and a certain grasp of the situation. With this premise, we can proceed to participate in this public forum, with the reassurance that any failings on our part will serve as an incentive for the creativity of others.

Although almost all the main speakers and a number of the panelists came to the stage with written papers or well developed outlines, there has been the usual slip twixt lip and print. If we exclude the participants in the fifth meeting (on the Church and development), who were not asked to prepare written statements, and a speaker and a panelist who could not attend their sessions, the overall average is acceptable. The picture is this:

Participants	Total no.	Papers published here	
		Number	Per cent
Speaker	14	12	86
Panelist	19	8	42
Total	33	20	61

As the editor of this volume on the public lecture series I wish to thank all the series participants who, despite their very busy schedules, managed not only to prepare the paper we publish here, but to answer in civil tones all those nitty-gritty questions that editors ask just to convince themselves that they really are what the mast-head says they are.

The first meeting (September 24) was called "Filipinos judge their society." It brought together two speakers, each of whom had been the co-author of a recent national study of social, political, and economic conditions in the Philippines. Jose P. de Jesus had been, with Jose C. Benitez, co-director of a study of the sources of social unrest conducted February 24, to March 10, 1970. Frank Denton was one of the three authors of the much-discussed volume, *A Crisis of Ambiguity: Political and Economic Development in the Philippines* (the "Rand Report," 1970). Presented here are the reflections on their respective studies which de Jesus and Denton shared with us at San Miguel Auditorium. The crisp, orderly comments of Fernando David are added to them, but I never received a written version of the contributions of Manuel Alba and Raymond Altarejos, and hence omit them here.

At the second meeting (October 8), I myself was the main speaker, the topic being the socioeconomic conditions of planters and workers in the sugar industry of Negros Occidental. The talk was based on a study of 256 sugarcane farms conducted in July 1969 and February–March 1970. A lengthy

defense of the sugar industry, presented by Emerito Bagabaldo, follows my paper here; the less favorable, and therefore balancing, judgments of Edgar Jopson and Manuel Regalado were unfortunately not submitted for publication.

The Brain Drain was the subject of two papers at the third meeting (October 22). Josefina Cortes and Florence McCarthy each considered the subject from a distinctive viewpoint, the former emphasizing psychological factors and the latter, the social environment of the Philippine scientific community. The paper of F. Landa Jocano was on another aspect of Filipino outmigration, the fate of laborers and others who have moved to Hawaii, especially in recent years. The comments of Bernardino Perez, read for him in his absence by Mercedes Concepcion, were directed at the paper of Dr. Cortes. Victor Valenzuela, who filled in at the last moment for another panelist, did not submit a written version of his extempore remarks.

At the fourth meeting (November 5) two doctors of law, Joaquin Bernas and Irene Cortes (the sister of Josefina, above) spoke about two reforms that were likely to be considered in the Constitutional Convention: the concept of land ownership, and the system of government. It is our loss that these first-rate contributions are published without the two other papers presented that evening, those of Francisco Nemenzo and Ruben Santos Cuyugan.

Typhoon Yoling struck November 19, the day set for the series' fifth meeting. Some brave souls went to San Miguel Auditorium that afternoon — and had their names read out on a disaster-service radio program, to quiet the fears of the families who were wondering where they had been stranded. But the meeting itself was postponed to December 10, and the meeting place transferred to the Ateneo de Manila Law School Auditorium, Manila, since power had by that date still not been restored to the business district of Makati.

At this meeting a discussion of the role of the church in development was held, with speakers John Carroll and Edicio de la Torre and panelists Armand Fabella and Raul de Guzman. No formal papers were requested, nor is there, I am sorry to say, any further record of the meeting published here.

Meanwhile, on December 3, the sixth meeting had been held as scheduled, but at the Ateneo de Manila Law School. Speakers Mary Hollnsteiner and Aram Yengoyan addressed themselves to environmental problems of Manila and the rural Philippines, respectively. Unhappily, the comments of Felipe Cagampang and Discoro Rabor were not submitted for inclusion here.

Back at San Miguel Auditorium once more, the seventh meeting (January 21, 1971) featured a scholarly view of the pros and cons of graft and corruption, presented by the man who would in another six months or so be chosen Secretary of the Constitutional Convention, political scientist Jose Abueva. His panelists included Senator Benigno Aquino and Assistant Executive Secretary Roberto Reyes and (in the neutral corners of the ring) Randolph David, Meliton Salazar, and Tarzie Vittachi. Mr. Salazar is the only panelist who gave us his comments in writing, though they all had plenty to say from the stage.

The final meeting (January 28) featured demographer Mercedes Concepcion speaking of problems and prospects of Philippine population. All the panelists who joined her in the discussion later turned in carefully composed comments on her presentation. What strange power does this lady have?

So much for the topics discussed in the lecture series and the papers preserved from it. One could add to this an account of the incredibly detailed demands made on the program chairman and her assistants to get such an enterprise underway, publicize it properly, distribute and record the various kinds of tickets for it, see that the site and participants were properly prepared, deliver the honoraria and travel expenses on time, and, in general, make the lecture series go.

But I would rather speak of who were reached by these meetings. We certainly saw present at the lectures any member of the Society who would have come to the usual monthly meetings – and many members we might *not* have otherwise seen. In addition, because tickets were distributed free to faculty members and students in about 50 colleges and universities in Greater Manila and suburbs, we had an estimated 250 students and 300 faculty members who attended one or more of the eight lectures. We know they did not come to *every* lecture (at least at the San Miguel Auditorium) since the hall's seating capacity is 450, and there was always a good number of people from the professions, business, banking, and government in attendance.

The latter paid their way, and so enabled the Society to increase its subscribers for the 1970 volume of PSR and to introduce the journal to a new audience. We trust they will like what they find here, as well as in the first two numbers of this volume, and will join our family of regular subscribers.

My own estimate of the 1970 public lecture series is that it was well done, by any man's standards. More than this, I think that its obvious success contains a message for the members and directors of the Philippine Sociological Society namely, that a series such as this, conducted every school year as part of the Society's regular program, will be far more beneficial to the academic, professional, business, and government communities than the usual monthly meetings to which the PSS was earlier committed. These public lectures and discussions benefit the participants at both ends of the sound system – the speakers, by giving them a chance to air their well-considered views and get some feedback on them from peers and public alike; the listeners, by giving them the opportunity to hear, and ask questions of, some of the nation's better social scientists. These meetings can serve in other words, as a proving ground and market place for ideas, and as a public reward for the hard work the social scientist puts into the paper he presents.

Besides, an annual series such as this one of 1970 will mean the regular appearance of first-rate local material in the pages of the PSR. I am all for that.

FRANK LYNCH. S.J.