

EDITOR'S PREFACE

RICARDO G. ABAD

On September 14, 1952, a group of sociologists and teachers from different schools met in Manila to discuss ways to promote sociology in the Philippines. The group decided to organize the Philippine Sociological Society (PSS). About a year later, on August 30, 1953, the group finally approved a constitution and elected its officers. On that same day, some thirty years ago, appeared the first issue of the *Philippine Sociological Review*.

The first issue of the *Review* (insiders call it the *PSR*) came out as a bound mimeographed copy. It featured two articles: a reprinted essay entitled "Suggestions to American Catholic Sociologists for a Scheme of Research," and a piece on the "Welfare Functions of the Filipino Family." The first article invited sociologists to engage in empirical research along the lines of structural-functionalism; the second article accepted the invitation. Much of the issue, however, contained news items on recent books, forthcoming conferences, sociology courses being taught in various schools, and the research activities of sociologists at that time. These researches dealt with social and welfare issues, among them: health, government housing, social unrest, population growth, and the "pathology of town celebrations and fiestas." The reports of many of these projects eventually appeared in later issues of the journal, and along with many papers that followed, made the *PSR* the leading venue for sociological writing in the Philippines.

Thirty years have passed, and the *PSR* continues as a major forum for sociological writing in the country. It has also become, according to the records of the PSSC Central Subscription Service, the best-selling Philippine social science journal. By publishing scientific papers, the *PSR* continues to give recognition to scientific papers and to indicate areas of research which still need to be covered. Its use in classrooms also helps to foster discussion of social science subjects. Through such efforts, the *PSR* helps to fulfill the mandates set forth in the Society's constitution (1953) and its articles of incorporation (1963). These are:

1. To encourage genuine cooperation between sociologists and anthropologists and others in the scientific study of society;
2. 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
3. To stimulate and assist the scientific study of human society and improved instruction in sociology, anthropology, and related fields.

This issue reflects these concerns, and with it the growing acceptance of fresh theoretical approaches to understanding Philippine social conditions. One such approach, derived largely from Marx, is the historical materialist perspective to social relations and social formations. Elizabeth U. Eviota's lead article applies this perspective to interpret the growing immiseration of Third World societies — the accumulation of misery, as the author puts it, that results from accelerated

expansion of international capital and the increased encroachment of the state in the lives of the laboring population. Three other articles share this approach. Ma. Cynthia Banzon-Bautista's literature review points out how peasant social formation, and the resulting dependency status of peasants, can be linked to the external capitalist economy. Temario Rivera's essay provides further evidence of this linkage in his discussion of capitalist penetration in Philippine agriculture. Brian Fegan's work, reprinted from *Canberra Anthropology*, introduces the notion of an "establishment fund" to explain the continued displacement of the Philippine peasantry and rural landless workers.

Equally sensitive to Philippine social conditions, but seen from another perspective, are the essays on the Bukidnon sugar industry, bureaucratic corruption and Philippine values. Francis C. Madigan, S.J. finds a correlation between the huge profits reaped by the Bukidnon sugar industry and the increasing poverty of its sugar workers. He also lists several recommendations which government ministries can take to improve the working conditions of sugar workers. Victoria A. Bautista, in turn, sees the resulting poverty of Filipinos (and the affluence of certain interest groups) as one effect of a public-interest, rather than a public-office, definition of corruption. Along different lines, the underdevelopment of the Philippines has sometimes been blamed, rightly or wrongly, on the sociocultural values of its people. But as Robert P. Hennig argues, the study of Philippine values — a popular topic in the 1960s — never made much headway because the analytical framework was either "too loose or was non-existent, making any conclusion open to rebuttal." He then presents an interdisciplinary framework which may enhance the study of these values.

Two other authors sound the call for more interdisciplinary studies in Philippine sociology. Filomeno V. Aguilar, Jr. weighs the pros and cons of Guthrie's monograph, *The Psychology of Modernization in the Philippines* (1970), and sets the work in the context of contemporary development studies. There is need, he says, to reconcile the various approaches to development studies since the "behavior of individuals is as real as imperialism and neocolonialism." Antonio M. La Viña, in turn, seeks reconciliation of various, sometimes opposing, sociological theories. He praises Iletto's use of phenomenological sociology in *Pasyon and Revolution* (1979), but notes how this perspective can benefit from complementary frameworks which assess the objective conditions of the masses during the revolutionary period.

The calls for interdisciplinary assessments and the acceptance of new perspectives testify to the growing diversity of sociological thinking in the Philippines today. Unfortunately, as our book reviewers observe, this diversity does not surface in recent textbooks on Philippine social problems. Even so, the variety of contemporary sociological thinking promises a brighter outlook for the discipline and the profession — an outlook that future issues of the *PSR* intend to feature on its pages. It is our hope that the women and men who organized the Philippine Sociological Society are pleased with what the PSS and the *PSR* has accomplished in thirty years. To all members (see the 1983 Directory in this issue) and to all our friends, a happy anniversary!