

RESEARCH UNDER MARTIAL LAW: THE TASKS AND RISKS OF THE FILIPINO SOCIAL SCIENTIST

LEDIVINA V. CARIÑO

University of the Philippines

The tasks of social scientists include the description and explanation, publication and criticism of social behavior and conditions. Filipino social scientists continue to perform these tasks even under a martial regime although they face possible official sanctions and risks related to the accuracy of their findings, their professional and personal integrity and their roles as citizens.

On September 21, 1972, Ferdinand Marcos, President of the Philippines, promulgated Proc. No. 1081 which placed the country under martial law. Calling the new regime one of "constitutional authoritarianism," the President by that act also suspended the operation of significant provisions of the Bill of Rights, thus allowing for detention without charges and loss of the right to strike, and in various degrees, of the freedom of speech, assembly and the press. At the same time, he declared the New Society as

a revolution that seeks the betterment of the lives of the masses ... (so that they) may have every opportunity to live the good life, including the social order and the stability which guarantee the possibility of the good life.

Equality is the fundamental demand of the rebellion of the poor: it should be the ideological force behind the New Society.¹

In the wake of this, many social (and physical) scientists, along with other intellectuals, peasants and political leaders were imprisoned; others fled to the hills and took up arms, or left the country by various routes. Others identified themselves as fully behind the government. But the big majority stayed to live under the regime in their traditional locations — in the universities and research institutions — to do what they think they do best — to search for the "truth," and to confront the regime with that truth. How they live and work, what they have done,

failed to do and still try to reach — these are the subjects of this paper.

A Typology of Social Scientists

We will adopt here a rather broad definition of "social scientists" to include all persons trained in sociology, economics, political science, psychology and related social disciplines who have spent part or all of their post-baccalaureate career in universities and research academies as technical personnel. This would be inclusive enough to admit most self-definitions and at the same time avoid tests of intellect, philosophy or ideology sometimes attached to the term. In speaking of social scientists in the Philippines under martial law, we may introduce two classificatory factors — institutional affiliation and position vis-a-vis the regime.

The first factor — institutional affiliation — distinguishes between those who remain within traditional academic locations (like universities and research institutions) and those who work outside them. The differentiation is not clearcut. Many professors, for example, combine part-time appointments and consultancies in government and business. On the other extreme, a researcher may also double up as a leader of underground organizations. However, the distinction remains useful, for the tasks and risks each faces differ according to one's organizational location. Academic freedom, for one, is a privilege that can be claimed only

by those who belong to the first category, although it may offer less protection under the current dispensation than used to be available. For another, the degree of commitment for or against martial law may differ according to one's affiliation. Those in the university can maintain some degree of distance from ongoing issues. On the other hand, technocrats and rebel intellectuals can hardly remain neutral. Rather, the nature of their positions compels them to be defenders either of the status quo or the revolution. Gouldner (1963) puts it this way: "those who desert the world and those who sell out both lose the ability to criticize."²

The other category involves one's position and leaning as regards the martial law regime — whether for, against or neutral. These again are points in a continuum rather than strict divisions. "Neutrality," particularly, is a shifting position. A social scientist who strives at an objective appraisal may appear to be a supporter at one occasion and a critic the next. Moreover, self-definitions and perceptions of others may vary widely here. Many sociologists have a romantic attachment to the role of "critic" and may consider themselves as such, although they may be judged by others as neutral or even supportive. On the other hand, technocrats in government may think of themselves as facilitators of means though strictly neutral with regard to ends, but may instead be generally regarded as supporters of the regime.

The types of social scientists located outside the university may be identified as 1) advocate, 2) technocrat, and 3) rebel. The *advocate* is the social scientist who is working in government and solidly for martial law. Advocates have been described as follows:

They all believe in the goals and dreams of the President, for they have shared with him in forging the strategies and tactics of carrying them out. They have no solid political base which was the principal attribute of the well-known oligarchs of the pre-martial law political system, and the

incentives of working devotedly and faithfully with the President do not only involve the fear of losing honor, life and fortune were the martial law administration to fail, but also the joy and pride of fathering the birth of a new society.³

Theirs is the task not only to serve the regime, but also, befitting their career experience as intellectuals, to explain it and to spread its ideology.

The *technocrat* also serves the regime, but his dedication is to "development" and "rationality" rather than to faith in martial law as such. As a social scientist, he has been committed to value neutrality and as an administrator, he is concerned less with goals than with the most efficient means of achieving them. Thus,

it does not really matter, in the long run, who sets those goals. An elective chamber or a "constitutional authoritarian" are the same — they set the course and the technocrats busy themselves with getting there.⁴

In short, "neutral competence" is their outstanding quality.⁵ As mentioned earlier, technocrats tend to be farther along in the scale relative to the advocate, but are definitely at their end of the continuum relative to the entire distribution.

Other social scientists affiliated with business and similar institutions are, strictly speaking, not technocrats but are similar to them in not questioning (even ignoring) the fact of martial law, since their interest is simply in achieving goals.

The *rebel* is one who voted with his feet when martial law was declared, going to the hills, the underground, to the other countries as exiles. Rebels are social scientists who have spurned science, chosen action and the rival ideology of "true revolution." Many of this type have been detained, and for those, the sanctions are strong. Nevertheless, counter-ideologies allegedly enjoy more lenient treatment than ordinary rebels, perhaps owing

as much to the regime's respect for the trained mind as to the possible outcry of the international scientific community to any excesses committed against them.

The social scientists remaining in the university can be classified similarly, as 1) supporter, corresponding to the advocate, 2) "scholar," akin to technocrat, and 3) critic, like the rebel. There is, however, one important difference. Because they are not in government or in its enemy's camp, they can shift positions more freely and range more widely in the scale than the advocate, technocrat or rebel. In so doing, they tend to converge upon the neutral point, usually claiming the academic freedom with which science is supposed to cloak them. Thus supporters and critics alike may cite objectivity — truth wherever it may lead — in praising or damning the New Society.

Since these are types, however, we can set rules for distinguishing among them. Let us start with the man in the middle, since this is the type most social scientists in the universities claim to be. The "scholar" has been described in these terms:

The scientist as such has no ethical, religious, political, literary, philosophical, moral or marital preferences... As a scientist, he is interested not in what is right or wrong or good, but only in what is true or false.⁶

This extreme view has since been recognized as an ethical as well as empirical impossibility. Value-neutral science is itself based on such unquestioned values as the worth of science for the world, the belief that the world is knowable, in the quest for truth however it is identified, and the freedom to seek it, and the professionalism and separation of the roles of the scientist and the citizen. Yet it is the stance to which many social scientists still aspire. The desire for the internal purity of the "scholar" is often accompanied by the demand for autonomy from external forces. Thus academic freedom is defined by a noted

Filipino intellectual as

the freedom of the university teacher or researcher to investigate and discuss the problems of his discipline and to express his conclusions without interference from any political, economic, sectarian or other authority or pressure group, or from the administrative officials or governing body of the institution in which he works.⁷

It may be noted that Weber's demand for a value-free sociology had stemmed from the desire to be free of the domination of the powers-that-be. As such it tended towards the critical end of the continuum. It clearly regarded scientific objectivity as not equivalent to moral indifference.⁸ Moreover science almost demands criticism as a criterion of membership.

Despite the risks under martial law, even because of the adventure and excitement they arouse,⁹ there is no lack of such critics in the universities at present. Rarely, however, does criticism extend to the rejection of the total system. Rather there are nips and bites taken here and there, where the regime is expected to be tolerant, accepting, unaware or uninterested. The stance taken is that of the social scientist reared in the libertarian tradition of the West, upholding the norms of objectivity and fair play, socialized to criticize but not especially to dissent.

Nevertheless, criticism may be absent from the works of many social scientists, some because they stick to "pure description," and others because they are fearful of the possible consequences of criticism. In the latter situation, they may exchange silence or approval for some measure of autonomy and possible survival. The Filipino social scientist lives constantly under this tension, swinging between the approval conferred by the society and that by the scientific community. Nor is this necessarily a case of mental dishonesty: usually trained as a positivist, the social scientist abhors conflict, worships facts and is rarely moved to question rules, policies and

the status quo.

The supporter and the critic are those who have chosen their sides. The *supporter* is one who consistently extols the regime, as much out of pure conviction as from the results of his scholarship. Among his beliefs are 1) that authoritarian government is consistent with Philippine history and culture,¹⁰ 2) that the loss of some freedoms under martial law is a just price to pay for its promise to develop the whole man, i.e., the emphasis on the growth of the political creature must give way to an emphasis on the eradication of economic inequality and poverty.¹¹ Like Durkheim, the supporter may also tend to accept the status quo as normal and any other possibilities as pathological alternatives.¹²

The supporter values the relative tranquility of martial law (as compared to the disruptive activist demonstrations of the early 1970s and the alternative of a full-scale civil war). In addition, he notes and often enjoys the prestige granted to men of the intellect under the regime. Social scientists are in demand at various levels of government and can have consultancies almost for the asking. Some may even enjoy the privilege of traveling abroad to explain and defend the regime. Intellectuals may even be considered "pampered" — for instance, the faculty of the University of the Philippines have been among those receiving the highest salary increments in all of the civil service since 1972.

At the other pole is the *critic* who eschews value-neutrality, at least the non-Weberian variety, and maintains, like the supporter, certain beliefs and attitudes towards society and science that underlie his subsequent behavior. For him, the major role of the social scientist is

to profess (ideas) . . . which imperil the interests and outrage the sensibilities of those in power.¹³

Under this situation, an individual fuses his moralist and scientist selves. A description of a well-known social critic is appropriate:

Marx...thought of himself as a scientist — a savage one to be sure, constantly using hard facts to strip away the veil of hypocrisy and unconscious self-deception that concealed the ugly realities underneath...The whole interpretation of science made sense for him only in terms of moral convictions.¹⁴

Because of his position, the critic is dependent wholly on his university appointment for his living. Any involvements outside the academy would likely relate to action projects with mass organizations and even dissident groups. Although some of these contacts may be distrustful, he may nevertheless be regarded generally as a *karamay*, a Tagalog word referring to someone who shares in one's burdens.

The table below summarizes the types of social scientist we have identified:

<u>Position vis-a-vis</u> <u>Martial Law</u>	<u>Institutional Affiliation</u>	
	<u>Outside Universities</u>	<u>Inside Universities</u>
For	Advocate	Supporter
Neutral	Technocrat	"Scholar"
Against	Rebel	Critic

The rest of this paper will concentrate on the scientists in the second column, those who may be called, collectively, "professional social scientist" because of their continued affiliation with a university or research

institution. This decision is made because social scientists outside the university have freed themselves of the protective mantle of academic freedom and face challenges and opportunities not unlike those faced by the

rest of the society. On the other hand, professional social scientists have certain privileges, tasks and difficulties that seem unique to them. Thus it would be instructive to study how they define their tasks and opportunities and how they face up to the problems accompanying the practice of social science under a martial law regime.

The Tasks

Upon the declaration of martial law, universities were closed; rumors were rife that they would not reopen for the duration of the Emergency. This period provided the social scientists time to consider both their positions — that related to their organizational location, and that apropos their attitudes toward martial law — and what they needed to do. One of the first decisions arrived at by those who decided to stay within university walls is recounted by Salvador P. Lopez, then president of the University of the Philippines (UP) — About two or three weeks before classes were resumed, he was summoned by the President. President Marcos then stated his intention to reopen the UP (and all other schools) provided the teachers would agree to teach “in an objective manner.” Conveying this in turn to his faculty, Dr. Lopez recalled that the condition was greeted with much headshaking, verbalized by one professor as follows:

Sir, there is no such thing as objective teaching. Teaching that is any good at all necessarily involves an act of advocacy. The good teacher must be an advocate of the good, the true, the beautiful.¹⁵

This set the tone for the pursuit of tasks in the UP and in other schools of quality education. Social scientists then set about to do what they had to do, guided by their own judgment of what is the good, the true, the beautiful.

The tasks of description and explanation. As social scientists, however, their inclination was to emphasize the truth, and for this

purpose their first task was the description and explanation of social phenomena, particularly what was occurring in the country at the moment. Since news had been managed and rumors equally unreliable, an accurate depiction of events was hard to come by, and social scientists quickly realized that they had to continue to do research in order to understand and explain the times they were living in. While this was an easy decision considering their training and socialization, it had become more difficult given the context and entailed many risks.

In the fifties and sixties, social science research in the Philippines labored under an unfavorable climate for research, reflected in the: a) heavy emphasis on teaching-only in colleges and universities; b) lack of opportunities and rewards provided for researchers, particularly those in the social sciences; and c) the view of government and industry — ultimate recipients of their output — that research is a waste of time and resources.¹⁶ Added in 1972 onwards were additional requirements for research work. Researchers must get clearance from the Office of Civil Relations (OCR) of the military which sometimes takes months to be received. The clearance letter itself would contain a warning that the research “should not involve anything political.” Field personnel are supposed to have a copy of such clearance and a letter of introduction from the research supervisor with them at all times. In addition, foreign researchers are required to register.

Recently, assistance to research has come from an unexpected though not unbiased source. Government has markedly increased its contributions to social research through three channels. First, its departments increasingly seek researches directed at their programs, sometimes resulting in near-regular commissions to specific research groups.¹⁷ This seems to have come about because of the increase in the number of technocrats in government and the growing recognition, by other sectors, of the role research can play in

policy and program formulation and evaluation.

The second channel is through the government science body, the National Science Development Board (NSDB), which has steadily increased its grants to social scientists. For 1959-65, the NSDB provided less than P500,000 for social science research, representing 3.9 percent of its total appropriations for research and development. From 1966-72, this increased to P1.4 million, with the proportion rising to 6.7 percent. The increase in expenditures for social science is the highest among all areas of research. While no figures are yet available for the martial law period, there is reason to believe that both absolute and relative amounts have again increased substantially. For instance, for 1972-73 alone, the UP College of Education, only one of the units of the university involved in NSDB-funded research, received over P250,000 which is higher than the average annual grant for all social science in the 1966-72 period (P206,858).¹⁸

A third channel is composed of the newly established governmental and semi-governmental institutions which do research themselves or which provide funds for that purpose. Among them are the Development Academy of the Philippines and the Philippine Center for Advanced Studies (now President's Commission of Special Studies) which both perform research and consultancy services for various government agencies as well as undertake significant in-house studies. Semi-governmental institutions which provide research funds would be exemplified by the Population Center Foundation, a private agency which receives USAID and other intergovernmental financing through the governmental Commission on Population. Its founding chairman is the First Lady herself, Imelda R. Marcos.

We have mentioned earlier that the government is not an unbiased source, and,

given martial law, many social scientists have hesitated to accept grants from it. Alternative sources, however, were getting fewer — foreign foundations, for instance, were either concentrating on single big projects or phasing out — even as research was getting more expensive to undertake.

Besides, the influence and prestige of the funding agency has varied considerably. Grants from the NSDB, university-based groups like the Community Development Research Council and the new institutions offer more independence and less probable assaults on one's integrity than direct commissioning by an interested department or government agency. Even in the latter case, however, the "scholar" faces differential capacity for detachment and responsiveness from the administrators in question.

Despite these considerations, social scientists have found that government grants and commissions do offer certain advantages. For instance, they do not require clearance from the military. Even in the provinces, personnel of the commissioning agency would usually be available to introduce a researcher around so that he would not be reported as a suspicious stranger (which might then invite inquiries from the local military officials). In addition, social scientists have found that the entree provided by such links is one of the easiest ways to gain access to the internal workings of government. Thus this opening was pursued by those in search of the truth, in the faith that rhetoric cannot stand under the onslaught of hard facts. Some creditable researches on subjects that touch at the heart of the New Society — on poverty, political and administrative reforms, rural development, stratification¹⁹ — have thus been made with competence and courage.

A related task which social scientists took upon themselves is the analysis of conceptual contradictions between the rhetoric and the policy. For instance, studies have been made about citizen participation and military rule,

nationalism and foreign investments, poverty and development policies. In a somewhat narrower vein, students of bureaucracy have pointed out the problem between the emphasis on performance and the possibility of summary dismissals, the discrepancy between speeches and budgetary allocations, delegation of authority and the needs of centralization.²⁰

Inevitably, perhaps, this has led to a proliferation of research that has been called "development-oriented." De Guzman, focusing on the genre interested in rural development, cites the following components of this kind of research:

Research which indicates and defines development problems and suggests what policies might be needed to solve them;

Research that arises out of problems associated with implementation of policy;

Research that is stimulated by policy consequences;

Action research which includes extensive studies of particular approaches to rural development;

Evaluation studies of rural development programs; and

Studies which integrate results of researches which focus on particular development problem areas.²¹

In turn this has led to a preoccupation with what is meant by development, and what research priorities are required in order to define that concept meaningfully. Social scientists have thus sought the establishment of a national academy of social sciences which can set their research goals independent of, though not necessarily counter to, the research required by political authorities.

The task of publication. Research, however, is not complete until its findings and analyses are written up and circulated. This is a requirement of science which has no better test of objectivity and validity than the

dispassionate appraisal of colleagues, and no better means of building up knowledge than the wide circulation afforded by publication. Indeed the dictum "publish or perish" should apply not so much to any individual researcher as to the scientific community which needs publication for both its continued validation and growth.

The mass media were seized at the start of martial law and many metropolitan dailies were not able to resume publication. For the others, strict censorship was maintained at least until 1974 when the Secretary of National Defense announced the lifting of restrictions in exchange for journalism's self-policing. The earlier situation alarmed the social scientists. Late in 1972 the Philippine Social Science Council, the organization of social science associations, took steps to draft a manifesto-cum-code-of-ethics declaring, among others, the need of social scientists to study and write on what they know to be true. The statement was never formally promulgated because leading members of the Council informally learned that no censorship was expected nor ever imposed on professional journals. The only requirement was registration as a professional publication. That entailed the provision of two copies of the latest issue to the Office of Civil Relations. The speed with which the listing process was accomplished strengthens the belief that the articles were not closely scrutinized. To date there have been no calls for pre-publication "editing" or removal of any article or issue. Even the registration requirement seems to have operated only at the outset of the regime, and subsequent copies have not been required, although journal editors have placed the OCR in their subscription lists. It is assumed, however, that some examination of such journals takes place. Indeed, the registration requirement has been taken as an implicit warning for writers to watch their language.

Still, social scientists continue to publish and speak for the record in public (to the

chagrin of foreign researchers who are often more circumspect). Delays in the circulation of their journals still occur, but these are due to the perennial lack of articles, no full-time editors and the increased cost of printing rather than to censorship — except that made by social scientists on their own.

The task of criticism. The last tasks taken by social scientists is to act as social critic, to ask and pursue the whys, to raise alternative possibilities for action. In this task, they only have to take the President at his word. In the oath-taking of then U.P. President, Dr. O.D. Corpuz, President Marcos stated:

This University has many great traditions...among them are patriotism, freedom from cant and superstition, commitment to the goals of independence. But over and above all these is the love for the life of the mind...

The intellectual integrity of the University of the Philippines is paramount. Whatever we may discuss, whatever conflicts we may have, whatever we may argue about, the intellectual integrity of the University...must be maintained.

If the University is only going to reflect current realities, where will the critical thought — the transforming of criticism of society — come from? There has to be a zone of sanity, of clear uncluttered thought, so that the turmoils can be seen at a distance and hopefully provide an approach to accomodating them or putting them at the service of the society. This the University is ideally suited to do.²²

While there has been no lack of critics, even the mildest criticism is made advisedly, for the social scientist faces many risks under martial law.

The Risks

Research has always been a risk-taking enterprise: every person who claims the label of "scientist" faces always the possibility that his hypothesis is wrong. This is the game of

the researcher who seeks knowledge for knowledge's sake. In the martial law situation, however, there are four additional risks:

1. Risks of facing official sanctions
2. Risks related to accuracy of the findings
3. Risks related to professional and personal integrity
4. Risks to the scientist as citizen.

The risks of facing official sanctions. Lewis Coser, in "Letter to a Young Sociologist," gave the following advice:

All distinguished work in sociology was done by men who followed the lead of their own demon. Once you relinquish the choice of your own problem, that prime prerogative of every scientist and every intellectual, you will become a hired hand.²³

This constitutes the first decision to be made by all practicing social scientists. Under martial law, the difficulty it imposes is symbolized by the clearance requirement. It is almost impossible to pick on any subject of any social value without also touching on a program or policy that is at least of some interest to the regime, and of possibly finding something amiss with its choices. For instance, a well-documented work resulting from six months of participant-observation, focusing on such a staid topic as the "social organization of work" in a government hospital, drew an attack on the researcher's integrity and a blanket denial of her findings after a synopsis was published in a morning paper. Fortunately, the young researcher received no other sanctions. Researchers interested in a government project affecting the cultural homeland of an ethnic minority were not so lucky: there is at least one detainee and one exile in their ranks. Given this situation, some Filipino social scientists have decided to define their areas of study so narrowly that they could not be construed as even remotely going against the regime. Alternatives to this approach have been suggested in another

context by Matson — concentration upon peripheral details that are quantifiable, emphasis on formal theory “carefully insulated from empirical reality,” retiring “to the heights of Pure Method.”²⁴ These alternatives are not unknown to the Filipino researcher. However, while they are relatively safe, they may also be too limiting. For instance, many a scholar has shied away from so-called sensitive issues only to find that such researches are not only permitted but are also given a hearing in high places, with the probability of affecting policy. Thus, despite the regime’s all-out commitment to equality, it has not prevented the publication nor threatened in any way researchers of a study depicting worsening distribution problems in the country.²⁵ Similarly, critics of *Masagana 99* have found responsive ears and modifications following their recommendations among technocrats and administrators in the much touted agricultural production program of the New Society.²⁶ Moreover, researchers on citizen participation, graft and corruption, housing,²⁷ to cite only a few, which show findings negative or critical to the regime’s position and policies have been widely circulated, without any adverse effects on the researchers in question. The query may then be raised: what accounts for the difference?

Four interrelated factors seem to affect the wielding of sanctions: 1) what is the study about?, 2) who conducts it?, 3) how are the findings presented?, and 4) who is interested in the topic?

(1) *What is the study about?* As mentioned earlier, many “scholars” criticize various aspects of the administration, but they generally refrain from challenging the basis of the regime. This may explain why “scholars” are safer than the critic-types. At all times, however, each researcher has to judge how much his work challenges the regime, and to what extent they go to the core of the political problem. Sensitive areas would seem to be those involving national security and those

defined as “issues... within the prerogative of the President.”²⁸ All other topics seem to be allowable.

(2) *Who conducts the study?* As in any regime, constitutional, authoritarian or not, the Philippines seems to have an informal list of persons it trusts, and of those it does not. Acceptance of criticism seems to be affected by this factor. Known critics, particularly those identified with “subversive” organizations, assert that they appear to be constantly watched, and their works closely scrutinized. On the other hand, other social scientists, including those who may be making more negative appraisals, may not be noticed, for various reasons — known allegiance to the regime (i.e., “Deep down, he is with us”), closeness with certain policy makers (whether for personal or professional reasons), the regime’s trust in his capacity for objectivity, or simply, his relative anonymity. The administration shows great interest in knowing what is really going on in the country and uses many instruments — referenda, think tanks, commissioned research — for that purpose. The critical appraisals, when sought for, are commissioned from selected researchers. This may have as much to do with the security consciousness of the regime, as the triumph of the overweening Philippine value of personalism.

(3) *How are the findings presented?* The style also appears to be important. Researches using informal academic language, though biting at some points, may escape sanctions. By contrast, polemical pieces and those tending toward advocacy of radical action tend to be more closely read.

(4) *Who is interested in the topic?* Officials vary in their responsiveness and capacity to accept criticism. In addition, they differ in their desire or ability to read the latest paper from university mills. In fact, one frustration expressed by supporters, “scholars” and critics alike is shared with many social scientists outside martial law regimes: they are not read.

Thus, writers of very critical papers may escape official sanctions simply because they have never come to the attention of those who can impose them.

The risks of official sanctions would be greatest among those critics and "scholars" whose writings tend to stress or be read as emphasizing negative aspects of the regime. They may differ in severity corresponding to the strength of the alleged attack. Supporters would appear to face no problem at all in this regard, though they may expect, as Appalo said, to face the gravest risk of all if they outlive in the regime.²⁹

Despite these considerations, every new topic or paper may test the limits set by the administration since it alone can define subversion, and the definition itself may vary temporally and spatially (Manila being a more permissive environment sometimes). Every Filipino then asks the question: would my critique, truthful and mild though it is from my perspective, or even my simple description be construed as a subversive piece? This is not idle speculation necessarily, for many have met sanctions, some without clearly knowing where the error was made. The sanctions are diverse, including detention, one-day "invitations" to a military camp, loss of clearance to leave the country or simply to meet with strategically important groups (such as military personnel in training). The first risk under martial law then, is, in addition to whether right or wrong, that of whether or not one's work will invite official sanctions.

Risks related to accuracy of the findings. Another risk focuses on whether the findings are right or wrong. In the rare instances where "the facts speak for themselves," this risk may be avoided and become instead a risk in analysis. In every other case, however, the researcher must ponder long over how accurate are the "facts" he gets. Pauline Young's counsel is pertinent:

We should also consider the degree of accuracy or approximation essential for the

demand of science... potential data likely to be strongly colored by emotions may lead to distortions and inaccuracies... (These) should, therefore, be carefully considered both from the standpoint of feasibility of obtaining accurate and reliable facts and methods of approach.³⁰

Respondents have often been assumed to be neutral to the research, ready with information like flowers waiting to be plucked. In the martial law environment, this assumption is sorely tested. The sources of data himself lives in the same society as the sociologist and faces the same possibility of sanctions that he does. The respondents therefore would not participate in the research without some implicit assessment of the risks, just like the social scientist. They ask themselves: Is he really a researcher or only a spy? Will he keep my responses confidential as he promises or will his report show me to be more critical than I have reported? As the researcher self-censors, so do they.

In activist environments, the extent of self-censorship may vary according to people's classification of the researcher into the *kaaway-karamay* dichotomy.³¹ A *Kaaway* (enemy) is one expected to be hostile to the demands of the community and thus supportive of governmental programs currently being implemented therein. Respondents may presume that their risks are great in his presence and thus attempt to present a picture of conformity to minimize those risks. The temptation to the respondent to confirm the expectations of the investigator — a problem warned against by all research textbooks — is likely to occur here very often.

On the other hand, one may be regarded as a *karamay* (friend, literally, one who shares in a person's griefs and troubles), sympathetic to his view-point and willing to take risks to bring them out. The respondents may tend towards greater self-revelation in this case. (The same reactions seem to be elicited if the researcher is seeking data from government, although the *kaaway* here would be the critic,

and the *karamay*, the supporter). If these behaviors always follow the categorization of the researcher, then an assessment of the accuracy of the findings would be relatively easy.

However, appraisal of research in the Philippines is more exacting than this. Attitudes, beliefs, desires are difficult to measure under normal circumstances; the potential for unreliability and invalidity increase under a martial law environment. Some of the following problems may present themselves:

(1) The *kaaway* or *karamay* is not readily identifiable, and the respondent may be left to improvise.

(2) Despite accurate pigeonholing of the researcher, the respondent may take the opposite behavior in hope of better results. For example, he may report the extent of his dissatisfaction to the assumed supporter of the regime because it is *his* recommendation which is likely to be heeded by government. On the other hand, the respondents may refuse to assist a so-called ally for fear of being more closely identified with his critical stance. Besides, since the *karamay* is already known to understand the respondents' situation, he would be apt to publicize the people's non-conforming views, anyway, without need of putting any individual in possible jeopardy as the direct source of data.

The *kaaway-karamay* classification may be important only where the people have set viewpoints. Where, like many researchers, they tend towards neutrality, the classification of the researcher may not be as crucial as how real the problem is to the respondents, their rapport with him, how aware they are of political situations, as well as other factors which would affect research in other settings. For instance, in our own research on graft and corruption, we have not found marked decrease in cooperation from respondents. However, the circumstances under which this

occurs are more narrowly circumscribed. Prior to 1972, we could get information on corrupt practices in an agency (where we are known simply by our professional qualifications) within ten minutes of starting a conversation on "systems improvement" therein.³² Under martial law and in the context of purges and diminished tenure security for civil servants, we can still get comparable information, but

a) Our qualifications have to be confirmed by direct personal links — i.e., we cannot just study an agency where we do not have important friends or relatives — or by a very much longer examination of our credentials.

b) Records are more carefully kept. The "you-may-take-it-home-of-course" permissiveness is generally gone, and even annual reports, supposedly a public resource, have to be signed for, with the purpose for taking it clearly specified. Nonetheless, many researchers who labored to get copies of documents are chagrined to find that some of the "for-you-only" papers are in wider circulation than he supposed.

c) More outright refusals are met, although often laced in the usual friendly tone. Those who do accept seek frequent assurances of anonymity and confidentiality.

d) Interviews take a much longer rapport-building time, and no one offers any information on graft and corruption unless we ask for it directly. Moreover, they tend to confirm or deny what we already know, rather than give new information.

On other sensitive issues, other researchers have found that they may have to discard one-shot interviews in favor of greater involvement in the life of the respondent as a means of getting better data. And they have to develop new techniques that can handle the issue of gaining interviewees' confidence and reactivity more adequately. For certain issues, random sampling is simply not possible.

For researchers working on less controversial topics, or with less politicized respondents, however, whatever difficulties are met are not necessarily much more than those faced during pre-martial law days. In fact, the strongest "Crame effect" encountered in our study of why physicians and other medical personnel remain in the Philippines — despite low incomes and high opportunities elsewhere — was the suspicion that we would reveal their actual incomes to the tax agency.³³ Yet a fear of the tax agency does not seem to be peculiar to the martial law situation, for income is a notoriously difficult item to obtain even in relatively more open societies.

In another research which focused on the performance and satisfaction of civil servants, we found our expectation of self-censorship among respondents to be somewhat overestimated. Employees were less candid in questionnaires (where they were identified by name) but were more eager to brook complaints in the follow-up interviews.³⁴ We still detected some holding back, and insisted on not providing the central personnel agency (which commissioned the research) with a summary of individuals' background and attitudes along with their names. However, many other researchers on the same topic found our hard line on confidentiality unwarranted because *their* respondents had expressed willingness to have such "dossiers" kept. This appears to imply that data sources are not as afraid as many researchers assume them to be. The respondents may not have misplaced that confidence. To the best of our knowledge, no legitimate researcher — supporter, "scholar" or critic — has knowingly violated his implied contract with his respondents. Nevertheless a martial law regime can never completely remove the suspicions. Thus despite all these efforts, we are not certain to what extent the body of research produced under martial law is simply an accurate mirror of what people believe are the boundaries of permissible open communication, but not much else. But Filipino researchers have decided that these

risks must be faced, or no research can be undertaken.

Risks related to professional and personal integrity. The research having been done, the burden of truth shifts again to the scientist. The third set of risks also relates to rightness or wrongness, but this time, of the analysis. In avoiding official sanctions, a social scientist may plunge headlong into choices that would affect his professional and personal integrity. As stated earlier, activities of professional organizations and scientific journals have not been subject to censorship. Yet the fact that many academics have been meeting official sanctions — although these are usually for work in their extra-professional capacities — has spread the fear that an individual may be subject to these for stating results that run counter to the regime's expectations. As a result, resort to self-censorship is popular and there is a tendency to hold back on unpalatable truths. Gouldner's facetious dictum about value-free sociology — that "thou shalt not commit a critical or negative value judgment, especially of one's own society"³⁵ is seriously considered, if not followed.

The need for self-censorship can be exaggerated. Researchers are often unduly limited by their own timidity; often sanctions are not applied, for the reasons cited earlier. Thus the dimming of one's critical eye cannot be blamed on the fact of martial law. Many researchers may in fact profit from a display of what Weber termed "the arrogance of conscience."³⁶

Many social scientists, especially those receiving moral support from their institutions and superiors who encourage courage, regularly test the limits on criticism assumed to be imposed by martial law. These include many within the better known universities with honored research traditions. Professional organizations have also been involved in this regard. For instance, the Philippine Sociological Society, in its first public lecture

series under martial law, sponsored in 1975 sessions on "Strategies for Development" in which technocrats and professional social scientists debated ongoing government approaches and programs regarding squatter housing, regional development, cooperatives and other redhot issues. The next year it zeroed in on poverty and the problems of inequality in the country. In addition, the 1976 convention also urged social researchers to develop a scientific conscience in tackling issues of poverty and other conditions in the society. In both cases, the papers were provocative, the discussions lively and the halls always full.

Nor are these the only attempts at critical candor. Recently, the Philippine Council for Policy Science sponsored a seminar-workshop that focused on the heart of the problem, since its topic was "academic freedom and its relevance to contemporary Philippine reality." Other examples of this kind can readily be cited to show that the assumed curtailment of some of the Filipino social scientist's freedoms has not necessitated the loss of his free spirit.

The risks to integrity are faced by all three types of professional social scientists. The differing commitments of the supporter and the critic may nonetheless lead to the same problem of bias. Both would meet the semanticists' old problem, though from different perspectives, i.e., the former would see the glass half-full, and the latter, as half-empty. Opinionated social scientists may be unable to perceive data contrary to their expectation. Yet since their biases are known, their colleagues may find the works of the partisans easy to interpret and evaluate.

Not so for the "scholar" whose preferences are less known, but the assaults on his integrity cannot be less real. Sometimes the tension between following the dictates of one's conscience and of saving one's skin gets resolved by wearing different masks, as required. Thus, he may be more critical within the groves of academe than when reporting to

the government or funding agency. Or he may degenerate into what Nemenzo calls an "intellectual profiteer,"³⁷ providing analytical and other expertise to whoever can provide the highest fee, following the argument that the scientist is indifferent to the ends anyway.

Even were he to stick to the straight and narrow path, certain dangers to integrity still abound. In an environment not completely cognizant of whatever limited freedom there might be, the social scientists can easily exaggerate the effects of martial law on his findings. In this instance, he may attribute the failure of programs he is examining to the closed-society atmosphere, or credit the reported contentment of his subjects to a delusion brought about by fear. Though many social scientists would not like to admit it, independent studies of the various referenda show that many are not against the continuance of the present regime.³⁸ This is not to the extent shown by the official results (about 90 percent) though not as low as the usual "scholar's" expectation. Moreover, this is a non-negative leaning rather than full satisfaction, a rather distinct difference. Nevertheless, an acceptance of this finding would lead one to other explanatory variables — perhaps local conditions, indifference to government, lack of understanding of the issues, the absence of a class for itself — that could be the object of future efforts. To stick to the wrong conclusion because it seems to preserve one's image of integrity appears to be as much an intellectual sell-out as the other variety.

Or the researcher can be wrong the other way. He may take martial law for granted as affecting everything that he would not recognize its peculiar influence on his subject, thus missing an opportunity to show where an authoritarian regime may indeed delay — or possibly facilitate? — the achievement of results.

The risks of the scientist as citizen. The last risk comprehends all the previous

problems — it is the courage to be. The social scientist takes the first three chances as scientist, still in search of truth. The fourth risk asks: given what he does know, what does he do about it? This bridge is not necessarily crossed by the supporter and the critic, although they know where they stand and of present and future risks. But the fact that they stay in the university links them to the “scholar” who is ambivalent and meets this problem daily.

Professional scientists defend their continued stay within the university as the choice of the most effective venue within their competence. Coser calls this an obligation to use the trained mind, citing Marx's “sit-in” at the British Museum as having an impact far greater than any demonstration in the streets.³⁹ Yet conscience — whether tending for or against martial law — can hardly be contained within university walls and many take seriously the combination of the citizen-scientist role. Gouldner asserts that “sociology pays its way by being involved in the contemporary human predicament.”⁴⁰ This is the way many Filipino social scientists look at their discipline. Some have demonstrated through their policy research where possibilities for greater equality and development may lie. As mentioned earlier, their chances for being heard vary according to the agency and program affected, and how their credentials are viewed by the regime. Agricultural production, health programs, family planning may be among the most action-responsive agencies. Urban development may be an emerging field, if only because the voices of researchers simply join the already strong voices of highly politicized communities. Some have pointed out the choices only in print, while others have shown what they mean by living with the masses. Others have cast their lot with government, reasoning that it is the most capable of bringing about change at this time. Still others have turned even more inward into the university, demanding fuller autonomy from

government, arguing that their contribution would be to develop social innovations, approaches and experiments independent of government's own preferences. These are also the scholars who claim that research priorities — even those relating to national development — must be the prerogative of the social science community. If anything, martial law has sensitized social scientists to the issues of research and has made them more thoughtful of their concerns and impact. Thus researches may be the prelude to longstanding contracts instead of the “love ‘em, leave ‘em” mentality that used to prevail. In order to prove their trustworthiness, less impersonal relationships with the respondents are sought to a greater extent than before. Many scholars have found that it will not do to “use” people without giving them something in return, perhaps a wider forum for their needs, even acting as their spokesman or articulate conscience. Professional organizations and university and research institutions, too, have joined in developing the scientists' conscience. They have taken steps not only to inform and to lay the groundwork for more accurate knowledge, but to help individual social scientists find the courage to continue.

The choices as citizen taken by the scientist informs his other roles and the way he faces the other risks. Most of the sanctions and problems he meets in fact has to do with his behavior as citizen rather than as researcher per se. It is therefore the risk as citizen-scientist that makes it so exciting to be a Filipino social scientist today.

This paper was presented at the Symposium on Action Research and Scientific Analysis of the International Sociological Association, Cartagena, Colombia, April 20, 1977.

Notes

¹The quotations are from the Philippine Army Civil Relations and Information Service (PACRIS), *Guiding Principles of the New Society*, 1976, pp. 35, 53.

²Alvin Gouldner, “Anti-Minotaur,” in Arthur Vidich and Maurice Stein, *Sociology on Trial*, 1963, p. 43.

³Remigio E. Agpalo, "The Organio-Hierarchical Paradigm and Philippine Politics," 1973, p. 59.

⁴Aprodicio A. Laquian, "Martial Law in the Philippines to Date," paper read at the 26th Annual Meeting of the Association of Asian Studies, 1974, p. 26.

⁵The term is Kaufman's, as quoted by Floyd Matson, *The Broken Image*, 1964, p. 81.

⁶R. Bierstedt, *The Social Order*, 1957, p. 20.

⁷Salvador P. Lopez, "Academic Freedom in a Developing Society," paper read at the Seminar-Workshop on Academic Freedom and Contemporary Philippine Reality, reproduced in *The Philippine Collegian*, February 17, 1977, p. 5.

⁸Gouldner, *op cit.*, p. 52.

⁹In a seminar on the Philippines held at the East-West Center, February 1977, a leading Filipino psychologist mentioned this as a factor for remaining in the Philippines only in a half-joking manner.

¹⁰This is a view expressed forcefully for instance by anthropologist Dr. F. Landa Jocano, one of the leading supporters of the regime. A similar view, which, however, looks at recent events as the Philippines' return to Asia is given by Dr. Ruben Santos-Cuyugan, head of the newly-created Philippine Center for Advanced Studies. See *The Fookien Times Yearbook*, 1973.

¹¹The best exposition is made by Onofre D. Corpuz, who has held the posts of president of the University of the Philippines and the Development Academy of the Philippines, and Secretary of Education in the first Marcos term and now Minister of Education and Culture. See "Liberty and Government in the New Society," c. 1973.

¹²See Irving Zeitlin, *Marxism: A Reexamination*, 1967.

¹³Francisco Nemenzo, Jr. "The Continuing Relevance of Academic Freedom," paper read at the Seminar-Workshop on Academic Freedom and Contemporary Philippine Reality, reprinted in *The Philippine Collegian*, February 24, 1977, p. 4.

¹⁴Barrington Moore, in Vidich and Stein, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

¹⁵Recounted in Lopez, *op. cit.*

¹⁶Raul P. de Guzman, "Trends and Directions in Social Science Research in the Philippines," paper

presented to the meeting of the Philippine Studies Council, Association of Asian Studies, March, 1975 pp. 1, 2.

¹⁷Various agency-researcher link-ups are detailed in *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁹Studies on poverty were presented in the 1976 Convention of the Philippine Sociological Society, "Poverty: The Illusion and the Reality," which ran for three days. See also works of the Institute of Philippine Culture on Manila's scavengers, housing the urban poor, etc. See also Leonardo Sta. Romana III, "Indicators of Well-Being," and Ma. Alcestis Abrera, "Philippine Poverty Thresholds," in Mahar Mangahas, *Measuring Philippine Development: Report of the Social Indicators Project*, 1976, pp. 165-222 and 223-274, respectively; Beverly H. Hackenberg, "Planning More Poverty: Costs and Consequences of Squatter Removal in Lanang District, Davao City," and Eleanora M. de Guzman, "The Government Welfare Program and Poverty in the Philippines," *Philippine Planning Journal* Vol. 4-5 (1973 and 1974), pp. 45-64 and 127-136, respectively; and Robert Hackenberg, "The Poverty Explosion: Population Increase and Income Decline in Davao City, 1972," 1973.

Works on rural development strategies have been conducted by the IPC, the Local Government Center, U.P. College of Public Administration, the Development Academy of the Philippines and other institutions. A forthright study on political and administrative reforms was part of a research commissioned by the Department of National Defense and was submitted by the College of Public Administration, U.P.

²⁰These are part of the last study mentioned above: the first by Ledivina V. Cariño, "Personnel Policies and Bureaucratic Behavior under Martial Law," the second from the Integrated Team Report written by Romeo B. Ocampo, and the third by Perla A. Segovia, "Administrative Reorganization: Institutional Development and Management Improvement," (SPAR Series, CPA-UP, September, 1976).

²¹De Guzman, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

²²Quoted from S.P. Lopez, *loc. cit.*

²³*Sociological Inquiry*, 39 (1969), p. 131.

²⁴Matson, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-76.

²⁵Mangahas, *op. cit.*

²⁶See, for example, Gabriel U. Iglesias, "Marcos' Rice Self-Sufficiency Program," in *Implementation*, 1975, pp. 1-34.

²⁷The leading scholar on citizen participation is Raul P. de Guzman, Dean of the College of Public Administration, U.P. Housing studies have been undertaken by Mary Hollnsteiner and her staff at the Institute of Philippine Culture, by Romeo B. Ocampo and his staff on New Towns in the Philippines. See also Sylvia Guerrero's critique of squatter relocation outside the city in the Philippine Sociological Society Lecture Series of 1975. Graft and corruption studies have been conducted since 1972 by Raul P. de Guzman, Ledivina V. Cariño and Ma. Concepcion P. Alfiler. For some data on this kind of bureaucratic behavior during the martial law period, see Ledivina V. Cariño, "Bureaucratic Behavior and Development: Types of Graft and Corruption in a Developing Country," *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, April 1979.

²⁸De Guzman, "Trends and Directions...", p. 13.

²⁹See footnote 3.

³⁰*Scientific Social Surveys and Research*, 1965, p. 123.

³¹As mentioned earlier, this was suggested by the remarks of Emiliana de Leon, former president of the *Samahang Pangnayon* (Community Organization), South Navotas, Rizal, Philippines. Mrs. de Leon's community is composed of fish stevedores who have organized demonstrations against government agencies. The remarks were made at the Philippine Sociological Society 1976 Convention on "Poverty: The Illusion and the Reality," in the session on "Man Against Poverty: Urban," January 25, 1976.

³²The pre-martial law study is "Bureaucratic Norms, Corruption and Development," *Philippine*

Journal of Public Administration, Vol. 19, No. 4 (October 1975) pp. 178-192. The martial law study is reported in "Bureaucratic Behavior...", *op. cit.*

³³See "Why Some Doctors Don't Leave," paper read at the Second Conference on International Migration from the Philippines, Population Institute, East-Wester Center, 1975, and three technical reports submitted to the National Science Development Board.

³⁴We prepared "The Performance Evaluation of Personnel of the Department of Foreign Affairs," report submitted to the President of the Philippines, August 1976. There were thirty other performance evaluation committees submitting reports on as many agencies under the auspices of the Civil Service Commission.

³⁵*Op. cit.*, p. 43.

³⁶Weber is cited by *Ibid.*, p. 51.

³⁷Nemenzo, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

³⁸An analysis of the July 1973 referendum is reported in Romualdo B. Tadena and Ledivina V. Cariño, "The Concerns of the Filipino People," submitted to the Commission on Elections, June 1974. The next referendum was analyzed by a team headed by Gloria Feliciano, dean of the Institute of Mass Communications, U.P. An analysis of the October 1976 referendum is still being written up. In addition, a national survey was made in March 1976 and reported in Ocampo, "Study of Political and Administrative Reforms: Integrated Report," September 1976.

³⁹Coser, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

⁴⁰*Op. cit.*, p. 43.