

EDITOR'S PREFACE

FRANK LYNCH

November 15, 1971

If you looked carefully at this issue's Table of Contents, you will have noticed how it differs from those found in earlier numbers of the PSR. The main difference is that we have introduced subheadings to distinguish several sections, or departments, among which the contents are now distributed. In the order of appearance, the divisions are the following: Articles, Brief Communications and Research Notes, News and Recent Developments, The Sampler, and Book Reviews. The Editor's Preface is in its usual introductory position. Since this partitioning of the PSR's contents is something new, I owe the readers of the Review an explanation.

What the PSR is for. The best place to start is with the goals of the Philippine Sociological Society, which owns and publishes the PSR. In general terms, as expressed in the Society's articles of incorporation (1963), the PSS aims:

1. To promote human knowledge and welfare by encouraging the study and discussion of matters in sociology, anthropology and related fields, and by disseminating significant information — especially the results of recent research and study in sociology, anthropology and related subjects; and
2. To stimulate and assist the scientific study of human society and improve instruction in sociology, anthropology and related fields.

Greater detail is found in the Society's constitution, of which the incorporating articles are only a partial reflection. Moreover, in Article II of that constitution (approved August 30, 1953) there is one purpose which is only vaguely present in the articles of incorporation. It reads as follows: "To encourage generous cooperation between sociologists and anthropologists and others interested in the scientific study of society" (Article II [e]). Joining this latter purpose to those already mentioned, we derive the following self-appointed mission of the PSS; namely: (a) the encouragement and assistance of research, discussion, dissemination of information, and improved instruction in sociology, anthropology, and related fields; and (b) the fostering of a vigorous and articulate social-science community.

The PSR's role in the accomplishment of these ends is manifold. To speak first of one of the less obvious ways in which the Review does its part, consider for a moment how social-science research is aided and encouraged by the continual issuing of reports on what has been done: these articles reward those who did the work reported, and give all others up-to-date position markers to serve as indicators of topics already covered and as starting-points for work still to be done. Discussion of social-science subjects is fostered (hopefully) by the very fact of publishing these studies, but one could go one step further by inviting written comment on articles that appear in the PSR. And this we now do.

Improved instruction can be promoted in various ways, but the place of the Review in this part of the PSS program would seem to be through the publication of worthwhile, Philippine-relevant materials and by the offering of bibliographies, course outlines, and practical hints for social-science teachers, especially those at the high-school and college levels.

The generation of a vibrant, vigorous social-science community is a huge task, one to which the newly created Philippine Social Science Council addresses itself directly. Here the PSR can do its part by becoming a forum for the discussion, not only of those articles and other items that appear in its pages, but of any issue or topic that appears appropriate for the consideration of today's social scientist in the modern Philippines.

New features of the PSR. Now let us return to the departments or divisions which are found in this issue of PSR. I shall relate each in turn to the goals which the Review seeks to achieve as an instrument of PSS policy.

The *Articles* section is least in need of explanation, for it has been a part of the PSR since Vol. 1, No. 1 in 1953. But it might be a good idea to state briefly the norms which guide the editor in accepting an article for publication. They are given elsewhere in this issue in greater detail, but in simple terms the major considerations are these: (a) *significance* – for social science in general and for our understanding of the Philippines in particular; (b) *intelligibility* – the target audience being as young as students at the third-year-college level and including, therefore, non-specialists; (c) *responsibility* – by which the author expresses himself in a manner that distinguishes opinions from observations, conclusions from findings; and (d) *courtesy and respect* toward those about whom the author writes.

Articles are distinguished in two ways from those reports found in the section called *Brief Communications and Research Notes*; namely, completeness (or degree of finish) and complexity. It is expected that an extremely simple (but significant) observation, analysis, suggestion, or conclusion will find its way into the second section, rather than to a place among the articles. Further, interim reports and preliminary statements will go with them. The reason for separating the two departments is to encourage social scientists to send in brief, simple statements about what they are doing, even though they are far from finished with the program or project they report. Further, we hope in this manner to hear from those who literally have no time to write an article, but do have something to say about a teaching technique, a potentially significant but undeveloped observation, an article or comment they read in the PSR (or elsewhere), problems they face in terms of teaching load or salary, needs they feel in the area of professional training, teaching materials, or fellowships and other assistance for themselves or their students. All of these comments, no matter how brief, have a place in the section called "Brief Communications and Research Notes."

News and Recent Developments is about happenings. Meetings held or to be held, fellowships available or awarded, courses offered or to be offered, arrivals and departures, new appointments – all these items and more will be recorded here. When there is an especially large number of announcements or other material about the PSS, a special section will be marked off (as in this issue) for a *Report from the PSS Board*.

Another division is that for *Book Reviews*. At the end of this issue of PSR, distinctions are made between a book listing, a book notice, a book review, and a review article. The section entitled *Book Reviews* is generally to be reserved for contributions answering just that description, though *book listings* may later have a place in it, among books received – when we have so developed this section that it attracts more publishers' attention. The review article is really an *article* and will be placed among its fellows in that department, but *book notices* will be referred to *Select*, which is a new librarian's tool published by Xavier University (Cagayan de Oro).

The Sampler. The PSR has had special niches for news and book reviews at other points in its history, but there is one genuine innovation in this issue. We call it *The Sampler* for now. What it is is a reprint of a generous portion of some worthwhile but expensive publication about the Philippines. The strategy behind this section, the reasoning used to gain the acquiescence of publishers and authors of potential entries, is this: (a) given the price of this book (generally published in a country where printing costs are much higher than in the Philippines), the publisher can hope to sell almost no copies

in the Philippines; (b) yet the book would never have been written without the cooperation of the author's Filipino colleagues, assistants, informants, and hosts; (c) why then not share with us as much of this book as we can afford to reprint in the PSR? It could even happen that, (d) if public interest is great enough, it may be reasonable (hardly profitable) to allow the making of an inexpensive Philippine or Asian edition. At any event, (e) you cannot fail to win the good will of many Filipino social scientists and make yourself better known in this country.

The first reply to a letter of this kind was from Philip Lilienthal, Director of the University of California Press at Berkeley. He was delighted to give us full permission to publish what we wished from Stuart Schlegel's *Tiruray Justice* (1970). We give you Chapter Two, "Tiruray Morality," in this issue.

Dr. Schlegel's book currently sells at US\$5.50 in the United States, and about RPP40.00 in Manila — hardly a price to attract the average Filipino student, faculty member, or librarian. How to get the book, then? Thanks to the kindness of the publishers, you already have in hand a good sixth of it (30 out of its 190 pages). What about the whole book? At the moment, I see two possibilities: (a) if there are enough orders to justify it, we could arrange for a local offset edition, which could sell for about ₱12.00; (b) if the response is not that strong, then until it develops sufficiently libraries might ask for a microfilm or microfiche copy. Fr. Suchan informs me that a microfiche copy, for instance, could be prepared on order for about ₱8.00. The Ateneo de Manila has the facilities to do so, and he is willing to be of service. Moreover, he will assist interested librarians in the acquisition of a microfilm-microfiche reader if their institution does not yet have one. As the initial note to his article below will tell you, this is one of his major interests.

In this issue. We have spoken at length about the new framework of the PSR, and slipped unconsciously into a few words about this issue's contents. We should do this more systematically now.

We begin with the seven articles. Since we now give an abstract of each article at its beginning, there is less need to tell you about its content here. But I do have a few observations to make. The seven articles have no single theme — unless it be Philippine society, which is a little too broad for a theme *within* PSR. Rather, several ideas predominate. *Role expectations* is one, which is central to the articles of Pahilanga-de los Reyes and Hottle, and a side issue in Suchan's discussion of librarian's problems. Another is *religion and society*, a concern of Hottle, Defever, and Carroll. Still another is *family and kinship*, for which Eder and Pagayona furnish illustrative material from the Batak of Palawan and Dizon, a bibliography.

One might detect another kind of unity in the articles — three of them result from theses recently completed at the Ateneo de Manila. It is my hope that *every* worthwhile thesis written in the general area of Philippine sociology and anthropology will find its way in some form into the pages of PSR. For this reason I will appreciate the assistance of colleagues here and abroad in locating those theses (and similar unpublished materials) which should be brought to public attention through an article, a research note, or even just a citation. When the Philippine Social Science Council is functioning more effectively, I am sure the Executive Secretary will tackle this perpetual problem, perhaps tying it in with several of the PSSC's imaginative programs. Meanwhile, please write directly to me if you know of some worthwhile unpublished material that should be printed in the PSR.

The lead article is a condensation of the author's lengthier study of role expectations among sugarcane workers and planters. Romana Pahilanga, who became Mrs. de los Reyes in October 1971, uses her considerable field experience and knowledge of social-anthropological inquiry techniques to answer the question that is frequently heard where sugarcane is grown; namely, who are more paternalistic, the planters or the workers? In the next article, Fr. Max Hottle uses a similar technique to find out what the people in four parishes of Negros Oriental expect their priests to do for them. Here the main concern is to locate the kind of people who are most willing to accept the changes that are in progress within the Catholic Church at this time.

Tondo is a long way from Negros Oriental, but the article of Fr. Defever has certain similarities with that of Fr. Hottle. Also dealing with the general area of religious expectations, the author is less concerned with what his respondents expect of priests than with what they expect from God or some other supernatural or preternatural force. In fact, the whole point of immanent justice and magical prayer seems to be to cut out the middleman in the business of retribution.

Fr. Carroll, who is well-known to all social scientists interested in the Philippines, presents for our consideration what is definitely a thought piece. It is kept in its original outline form to make it as clear as possible that it is not meant to be taken as a finished statement of objectives and priorities, but as a starting point for thinking about such goals. I am hopeful that groups concerned with the better direction of their resources will use Fr. Carroll's provocative outline as a means of reordering their strategies and tactics.

Especially for social anthropologists, the article of Jim Eder and Ben Pagayona has an important message. Not infrequently those doing community studies, particularly where the communities are small and remote from large centers, make the understandable mistake of speaking of the people living in those barrios and sitios as if they were all pretty much the same in their values, opinions, and behavior. This is the fallacy that I have referred to elsewhere as "bar-graph ethnography," a tendency to ignore the distinction between the ideal and the actual, and to describe only a single way of life as if there were no variations within the community. In contrast to this, one may have what I call "normal-curve ethnography," in which allowance is made for individual and subgroup variation within even small settlements, an approach which often reveals the fact that there are greater differences *within* any one community than *between* the modes of behavior recorded in two different communities. Eder and Pagayona not only advocate normal-curve ethnography, but give us one technique for doing it.

Jesse Dizon recently completed a thesis on kinship patterns among a sample of middle-managers in manufacturing firms of the Greater Manila area. In the course of looking over what had been done to date on Filipino kinship, he put together a working bibliography on the subject. Since I knew about it, I asked him to put it in a form that would make it compatible with the Lynch-Corvera bibliography published earlier in PSR. The result of his efforts is given here, along with the expressed hope that others who make up bibliographies of this kind will share them with our readers in the same way. Librarians will find the bibliography useful, not only to answer questions raised by students who wish to write about family and kinship, but also to guide their purchasing of new books. This brings us to the final article, the findings of a survey conducted by Fr. Suchan, Director of Libraries at the Ateneo de Manila. He tells me that the article in mimeographed form has already become required reading for library students in one of India's universities, not to acquaint young librarians with the problems faced by Filipino librarians, but to teach them how to gather data about their own difficulties. This is perhaps the most important contribution of Suchan's article for the average reader of PSR. He takes us through the process, step by step, of formulating, administering, and analyzing a fact-finding questionnaire. Explanations of this kind are hard to come by in the local literature.

There are just two items in the Brief Communications section. One is a mini-report done by Teodoro Llamzon and myself after a very brief visit to the Tasaday in July of this year. Fr. Llamzon has a much more comprehensive study of the Tasaday and related languages in the forthcoming issue of the *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* (Vol. 2, No. 2 [December 1971]), and Robert B. Fox can be contacted through Panamin (Elizalde Building, Makati, Rizal) for further cultural data. The second piece in the Brief Communications section is the policy statement prepared for, and presented to, the Constitutional Convention by the Linguistic Society of the Philippines and the Philippine Association of Language Teachers. It will be of more than historical interest.

After the News and Recent Developments section comes the Sampler, about which we spoke at some length earlier. Following it we have three book reviews. The first and longest is by Mary

Hollnsteiner, who rhapsodizes about Schlegel's *Tiruray Justice*, calling his Chapter Two, reprinted in the Sampler, a "gem of a chapter." To put that chapter in proper perspective, I recommend that you read Hollnsteiner's review before you read Schlegel's brilliant and insightful exposition of Tiruray morality. The second book review, written by myself, takes a very favorable view of Hank Lewis' study of Ilocano rice farmers in two barrios, one in Isabela and the other in Ilocos Norte. Using the technique of controlled comparison advocated by Philippine-specialist Fred Eggan, Lewis accounts in plausible fashion for the differences existing between the farmers of Ilocos Norte and their children and grandchildren of the Magat River Valley in Isabela. I am hopeful that publishers of this book will allow us to quote portions of it in a future Sampler. The third book review was contributed by Richard Poethig, who is, like Mary Hollnsteiner, among the growing number of local social scientists whose interest is in urban problems. Poethig describes a recently published new edition of Aprodicio Laquian's *Slums are for People*. I print the review here to make sure that those who have not heard of this masterful study of Barrio Magsaysay, Tondo, will look for it and read it. Fortunately, as Poethig mentions, the book is still available locally in a slightly different version but at about one-tenth the cost of the edition which he reviews in these pages.

Because so many items were submitted by the officers of the Philippine Sociological Society for inclusion in PSR, we made special sections for them in this issue. The reader will find aside from the Report from the PSS Board a complete copy of the PSS By-laws as amended at the special meeting of October 23, 1971 as well as the list of norms drafted by the Board for manuscripts to be published in the PSR. I have added a few practical suggestions for those sending materials to us for this purpose.

Contributors to this issue

Other than authors of articles, each of whom is identified in the initial note to his contribution, the following wrote one or more items for this issue: MERCEDES B. CONCEPCION (Ph.D. in sociology, University of Chicago 1963; dean, U.P. Population Institute; secretary of the Board of directors, PSS, and chairman of the executive Board, Philippine Social Science Council); MARY RACELIS-HOLLNSTEINER (M.A. in sociology, University of the Philippines 1960; professor of sociology and anthropology, department of sociology and anthropology, and research associate, Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila); TEODORO A. LLAMZON, S.J. (Ph.D. in linguistics, Georgetown University 1968; associate professor of linguistics, department of language and linguistics, and project director, Ateneo Language Center, Ateneo de Manila; president (1971), Linguistic Society of the Philippines, and editor, *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*); RICHARD P. POETHIG (B.D. in Christian ethics, Union Theological Seminary, New York 1952; director, interseminary Urban-Industrial Institute).

Error in PSR 18(3-4):178

In the quotation from Frank Lynch's "Notes on the alliance model of social organization," an omission was made which changed the meaning of a sentence and must have confused the thoughtful reader. The italicized words should be supplied: "On the other hand, the successful introduction of productive industry and efficient government, to name only two institutional requirements of a modern state, seems to require the adoption of *universalistic criteria quite opposed to the operation of kin-bias*, at least in the choice of many kinds of voluntary action partners." The error, I am happy to say (*consuelo de bobo*), was not that of Frank Lynch, editor, but of Frank Lynch, author.

A final word

As this issue goes to press, we have almost reached the goal of bringing PSR up to date by the end

of December 1971. There is one more double issue to go, and I am grateful indeed for the cooperation of Mercedes B. Concepcion and Wilhelm Flieger, who are bending their energies and expertise to the task of putting together a special issue on demography. With that issue (Vol. 19, Nos. 3-4) we shall be up to date. There may be some delay in getting that final issue *through* press by December 31, but it will certainly be *in* press by that time. Meanwhile, let me invite you to study the Report from the PSS Board and decide what manuscript or manuscripts you can send me for possible publication in one of our 1972 issues. Don't be bashful: share the wealth.