

# RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL THEORY BUILDING IN THE THIRD WORLD

PRISCILLA WEEKS

*Department of Anthropology  
Rice University*

*This paper explores the current discourse on the need to indigenize social science in Third World countries. It suggests that while couching pro-indigenization arguments in terms of nation building and dependency theory is legitimate such a framework does not address the specific ways Western theory fails to describe Third World 'reality.' After looking at this problem of 'theoretical slippage' in the context of a Philippine rural development program, it reformulates the indigenization debate in terms of the need for a 'critical' anthropology.*

In many Third World countries, there is a growing debate about the need to indigenize the social sciences. Those advocating indigenization often couch their arguments in nationalistic terms. They rightly consider the imposition of Western theoretical systems to be related to past colonial efforts and point to the special role of social scientists as providers of valuable information to colonial administrators. In this context, independence from the academic hegemony of the West is viewed as part of the process of nation-building. Often, only passing reference is made by those advocating indigenization to the lack of fit between Western theory and the reality of Third World society and culture. Arguments about the possible inappropriateness of wholesale appropriation of foreign-constructed theory could be strengthened by citing specific ways in which it has failed to adequately describe the Third World.

Problems of lack of fit between theory and "reality" are specially salient to development efforts. After more than twenty years of programs aimed at 'modernizing' the 'undeveloped' nations, we find that the gap between Third World and First World and the differences between rich and poor within Third World countries is still large. Indeed, development efforts have sometimes exacerbated pre-existing structural inequalities. The call for a re-evaluation of social science paradigms in general, and development models in particular is timely.

The role of the anthropologist vis-a-vis development has been dialectical. The anthropologist has been both advocate and critic of spe-

cific projects. But even more profoundly, anthropological theory, along with that of other social sciences, has been incorporated into development practice. Spin-off disciplines such as development communication, rural development, and extension education have been the result of the synthesis of anthropological, sociological, psychological and economic models.

As theory builders, academic social scientists divorce themselves from their counterparts actively engaged in development (agency personnel, social planners, extension workers). The distance between the university and the field allows them to critique a process to which they have contributed without assuming responsibility for its failures. But practice is theory a few steps removed and it is possible to tease out some of the seminal theoretical origins of the development models on which programs are based. Such an exercise is important if we are to devise new strategies which are not simply revisions of past unsuccessful ones.

This essay will trace some of the connections between anthropological theory and development models by focusing on an integrated rural development project which was designed according to a Rogerian communication model.

## Anthropological Theory and Development

Anthropology has struggled with the question of the rationality (à la Weber)<sup>1</sup> of 'primitive' and later (and more germane to this paper) of peasant peoples. How were their societies eco-

conomic? The first question to be answered was what constitutes an economy and the field became increasingly reductionist as it searched for definitions and built paradigms around systems of production and distribution based on formal economic theory (formalism). A formalist approach allows anthropologists to construct models of economy-less societies. Exchange in such societies is linked more to prestige and maintenance of social relations than to the accumulation of wealth (here I refer to the capitalist conception of wealth rather than 'prestige' wealth).

Polanyi's redefinition of economy opened up the debate to include cultural forms and led to the substantivist position in which all cultural forms could be viewed as ultimately economic, negating the concept that economy constituted a separate social sphere.

Intrinsic to an economic system are its players. The discourse on what constituted an economy was mirrored by one on the economic rationality (essential to a formal economy) of the actors within a given social system (usually peasants). A dialectical relationship was constructed between an individually maximizing peasants and a cooperative, corporate one whose actions were guided by notions of group solidarity.

This early literature has been invoked in several recent studies on peasant rebellion and subsistence strategies in Southeast Asia.<sup>2</sup> Two in particular are salient to the field work I conducted in 1985.

### *The Moral Economy versus the Rational Peasant*

A moral economy, as defined by Scott (1976), consists of the nexus of social relationships which ensure the peasant's subsistence. Scott focuses on the landlord-tenant dyad within the framework of agrarian unrest in Vietnam. He asserts that the decline of patronage destabilized peasant subsistence patterns which relied heavily on the landlord's acting with regard for peasant welfare. Viewing this decline as a moral breach, the peasants rebelled, Scott maintains, not to free themselves from the landlords, but to reinstate old relationships. Central to Scott's argument is the idea that peasant eco-

conomic behavior is guided by the need to minimize risk as opposed to the aim to maximize economic gain. The crucial issue to peasant cultivators is not what is taken away (from their harvests) but how much is left. If subsistence needs are met and basic landlord duties fulfilled, peasants are satisfied. There are two corollaries to this "subsistence ethic": first, the "safety first" principle which underlies peasant efforts to minimize risk and second, a certain amount of distribution and sharing integral to everyone's "right to survive" (Szanton 1972).

Peasant behavior as formulated in a moral economy (and the earlier formulations of the corporate peasant on which Scott draws) informs values-oriented research which, in turn, has been incorporated into rural development strategies. Specifically, it provides developers with a framework in which to think about the moral impetus for sharing resources (the right to survive) and it describes peasant resistance to change (in terms of risk minimization). Though couched in Marxist terms of exploitation and hierarchical conflict, Scott's moral economy approach stresses peasant values when discussing social change and it supports developer notions that peasant values are the major factor contributing to project success or failure.

Personal variables such as degree of education and access to media are correlated with personality traits such as resistance to change or innovativeness. After the identification of how certain personal traits (which are related to other cultural forms) affect development, the extension agent's job becomes to foster those traits conducive to change and discourage those which inhibit social change. In Scott's model, peasants change in response to capitalist intrusion; to processes initiated by others (i.e. landlords). This view of peasant behavior dovetails nicely with development models in which the extension agent is the initiator of change-introducing new technology and information into traditional agricultural methods. Inequality resulting from social structural conditions are thus elided.

Popkin (1979) reconstructs the literature on economic man to counter Scott's moral eco-

onomy approach, as defined by Popkin, presents peasants as maximizing individuals engaged in a series of investments and gambles. The term "investment" is interpreted broadly to include children who will act as farm workers and insurance in old age, village reciprocity and farm machinery. Peasants, in his construction of them, actively choose the best strategy to meet their goals. These goals are not necessarily subsistence-related as peasants are "opportunity maximizing," not just "risk minimizing," and therefore seek economic advantage. The search for opportunity leaves them open to change. For Popkin, peasant revolt does not represent the wish to return to old structures, but is an attempt to explore new possibilities.

Like Scott, Popkin focuses on peasant values. The view of the self-maximizing peasant supports developers in their reliance on small profit-making ventures (such as cottage industry and commodity associations) and in their appeal to such form of "rational" (here the term elicits both Weber's use of the term as well as rational as a corollary of logical) behavior as being on time, planning ahead, saving money and letting go of superstition.

### The National Nutrition Program

From February to December 1985, I studied an "integrated" rural development program in Nueva Ecija called the National Nutrition Project (NNP).<sup>3</sup> "Integrated" rural development is an ambiguous phrase which encompasses a wide range of development strategies. This particular program was fashioned on the Rogerian model of Development Communication and relied heavily on management and communication techniques to direct barangay level "modernization."

Barangay leaders were encouraged to participate in the administration of the program and everyone was encouraged to contribute to the planning process. Training in the techniques of community organization was given as much, if not more, emphasis as the transfer of technology. Eventually, a few of the barangay leaders were able to discuss the project in the same technical terms as NNP staff, having be-

come familiar with the sociological jargon used in Development Communication.

One recurring theme found in the field experiences cited below is the ambiguity the developers had toward their farmer clients. It is my contention that the act of appraising peasant behavior through the lens of imported paradigms restricted the developers' ability to perceive the complexity of peasant behavior. This led to behavioral vascillation on part of the developers causing them to appeal alternately to the corporate, moral peasant (à la Scott) and to the self-maximizing, rational peasant (à la Popkin) depending on the particular requirements of the project engaged in. They were therefore frustrated when villagers did not act within the "appropriate" behavioral model invoked. A more coherent image of peasant behavior and motivations, articulated with recognition of structural constraints on the project, would have better accommodated the range of behaviors found.

NNP hoped to effect change in two ways: through the introduction of small commodity projects (capital build-up cooperative animal dispersal programs, etc.) and through seminars on planning, "modern" values, development communication, leadership, and the like.

The development staff generally felt that farmer/peasants are not able to plan for their future needs because they do not delay gratification and lack the planning skills. One staff member commented that because of their cold winters, temperate countries have only one harvest and because of their mild climates, tropical countries have two. People living in temperate climates are therefore used to working harder and having to save, like Aesop's ant, for the winter while tropical peoples are used to depleting all of their resources immediately and do not know how to save and plan for the future. There were other comments about Filipino indolence which were usually said in jest. But enough seminars were given by project staff (and later, by local leaders) about the need to act rationally, use time and resources wisely and drop those traditions which hinder development that I suspect the developers' jests had serious undertones. On one level, the joke was

directed at all Filipinos and therefore the developers were laughing at themselves, too. But it was really aimed at the farmers and was exhorting them to overcome such faults.

#### *Farmers and Dole-Outs*

A commonly-cited example of irrational farmer behavior was the widespread default on low-interest loans provided by the government and rural banks. Default is variously referred to, both in the literature and in the field, as the "dole-out mentality" and "unwillingness to pay." (Both terms stress farmer values over structural inequalities.) It has presented problems for the individual farmers involved who are then restricted from further borrowing and forced to seek credit from usurers at high interest rates. It has also hurt rural banks. Because of the high rate of arrearages, many such banks lost their credit with the Central Bank and are now disqualified from participation in those programs. According to rural bankers, this leads to even more defaults as farmers are unwilling to repay loans when not assured they will be available next planting season (Concepcion 1985). A cycle is created in which farmer default leads to rural bank default, which leads to the closing of banks, which leads to more default. Low interest loans become harder for everyone to obtain.

Farmer and NNP accounts of default differed. Some farmers cited lost crops owing to disease or storm as reasons for non-repayment. Others explained that the new loans put them even further in debt, coming on top of debts already contracted to cover subsistence needs or that other expenses arose. They always used the wording "unable" or "unlucky" to pay instead of "unwilling" to pay. On the other hand, the staff felt that those farmers who did not repay their loans were relying on the government too much. Some staff members couched this in the stronger terms of relying on government handout. And though they sincerely sympathized with the farmers' poverty, they felt farmers were hurting themselves and others by not paying back the loans. Many lectures were devoted to the evils of the "dole-out mentality."

There is another possible aspect of the "dole-out mentality" which was expressed through farmer complaints about political and organization leaders. It was a generally accepted "fact" that politicians, government employees and even businessmen contracting with the government skimmed off the top for personal use. Farmers had access to newspaper and radio reports about corruption on the national level and suspected the same locally. In such matters, it was definitely "every man for himself." To add insult to injury, barangay services were poor and if a politician had the road repaired or provided sports equipment or school supplies, it was couched in terms of a personal favor to the people rather than as part of routine government services. If loans were repaid under these conditions, where would the money go? Into the pockets of the already rich who would then periodically dispense "gifts" back to the barangay, keeping the lion's share for themselves.

In turn, the granting of "free" inputs (through default of the loan) for one planting season freed up funds which could be used by the farmer in other ways: to send a child to high school, to purchase needed household items, to pay for agricultural tools, and the like. The repayment of the loan placed them back into the debt-repayment cycle with nothing concrete to show for the extra money. But what about the sanctions against using what was meant to be recurring credit as a one-time disbursement? Farmers viewed the inability to get low interest loans again as the negative consequence of their "inability to pay." They were aware, however, that this was the only consequence of default. The bank would send reminders about the loan, but would not appropriate part of the harvest in return for repayment (as the usurer would). Viewed in these terms, default could, in some cases, constitute economically rational behavior.

#### *Cooperative Schemes*

The NNP had no financial resources for the introduction of new technology. Its budget was used for staffing, training and travel. Part of

the staff's responsibility therefore was to find seed money from other sources to be used in cooperative "commodity" (e.g. goats, pigs, vegetables) projects. Two types of schemes were employed — commodity associations and dispersal projects. For example, a group of people interested in raising goats would form an association. A loan would be secured by NNP through an outside source. Each member would then receive either a female goat or the money for one and each would contribute a certain amount of personal money towards the purchase of a communal male goat to be cared for by one of the members. After the members' animals gave birth to several litters, the individual farmer would repay his part of the loan, presumably using the money gotten from selling the baby goats. A portion of these profits would be put into a communal fund from which money could be borrowed by members. The goal was two-fold: the establishment of individual breeding programs and capital buildup. If for some reason other than negligence, a farmer would lose his brood goat or another calamity prevented the repaying of his portion of the debt, the other members would make up his part or the money would be taken out of the community fund.

On one occasion, the NNP borrowed money from a non-profit organization to begin a goat-raising venture. The price of a female goat was distributed to six farmers who were to pitch in to buy the male goat. The six were all barangay officials and were chosen by the mayor. Several of these men already owned goats. One had seven and not wanting another, used the loan for other purposes, as suggested to him by the mayor. When agency personnel would come to check his goat, he would point to one at random claiming it was the NNP goat.

When the recipients received the money for their goats, they were told that it would be good to disperse some of the offspring to their *kababayan*. This would be done on a voluntary basis. The possibility of dispersal to others was the justification for giving the first loan to officials who were relatively well-off rather than to the more needy in the barangay. Barangay officials were considered to be lay community

developers (also called indigenous leaders) and as such, NNP staff relied on their sense of community which would predispose them to sharing the fruits of this project with others.

The project, however, did not disperse any goats. Not only were no kids dispersed, no male was ever bought because no money was collected to do so. The members either did not have the cash to contribute, were unwilling to put in towards a communally-shared goat, or viewed the female goats as a reward for political loyalty rather than as part of the development program. Tension was created in such cooperative ventures by competing values. The agency relied on the self-maximizing, economically rational peasant (in the form of barangay elites who were considered to be more educated and less traditional) to carry out the technical part of the scheme successfully. At the same time though, the scheme relied on the corporate peasant who would agree to participate with the project as planned even though he might not need any goats, share the risk of project failure with the others in the cooperative, and finally, to dispense the fruits of his labor to those less fortunate when the time came. What the agency got was the individually-maximizing peasant who used the project to further his own interests.

Similar problems occurred in almost all of the cooperative/dispersal schemes tried by NNP.

### *The Ethics of Sharing*

Though the ethics of sharing is necessary to the success of a cooperative, farmers sharing behavior was viewed by NPP staff as being sometimes rational and sometimes not. The animals bred are meant to be sold for individual profit and sharing of those resources is considered to be appropriate only if done within the guidelines of the program (i.e., planned dispersal). The process of gaining self-sufficiency is shared; the gains are individual. Agency personnel are upset (and projects fail) when farmers slaughter the goat or pig dispensed for breeding purposes on occasions such as fiestas, birthdays or weddings. They are sharing the resources given to them by the program, but not in the manner intended. One can understand the developers'

viewpoint. First, there is only so much money available for these projects and second, project goals are long-term.

Other forms of sharing in which the right to survive ethic took precedence over individual maximization were evident. Recipients of government loans would often share these with others. If one is able to avail himself/herself of production inputs and a friend or relative is not, he/she might share these with the less fortunate one. Because the inputs are enough for the hectareage of one farm and it is stretched to cover two, optimal yield is not achieved on either one. People also shared land (houselots and fields) with poor relations as well as shared food. This represents redistribution to a specific group of people chosen by the one with the resources to be shared. When designing the commodity-oriented cooperatives, the developers ignored the reality of pre-existing social alliances and its inverse, the factions which hamper cooperation.

These non-cooperative sentiments were most often displayed through mistrust of members of the other faction and ironically, are based on the ethics of sharing. A good example is the situation surrounding the aid given after Typhoon Saling. The first donation received was P1,000 from a private source to be distributed to the most needy i.e. those who lost their homes. The barangay captain argued that to distribute the donation in such a manner would cause jealousy among the people not receiving aid and invite comments that he gives community resources only to his friends. Consequently, the donation was used to buy nails and each household received about half a kilo whether or not the house was damaged. When the second donation arrived, this time from the government, to be used in the same manner (i.e., given to the most needy) the captain was out of town. The officer-in-charge decided to disperse the donation as directed. The criticism was so loud and prolonged that every subsequent donation, whether in cash or in-kind, was distributed equally. One cash donation gave each household 12 pesos. The farmers distinguished between general and particular patterns of distribution of goods and services.<sup>4</sup> Those goods

considered as belonging in the sphere of what was to be shared were not to be distributed to individuals and especially not along kin or friendship lines. The official who dispersed large sums to those he considered to be the most needy was labelled corrupt as he was viewed as misappropriating goods meant for the entire barangay. The moral basis of this attitude was the feeling that each family in the barangay was poor and though levels of desperation were recognized, each considered himself to be deserving of public aid. One farmer repeatedly expressed the sentiment that the poorest members of the community should be helped. He did what he could to help them. But though his house was barely damaged, he also applied for the aid. While expressing a communal "right to survive" sentiment, he sought to maximize his situation because he, too, was poor. His maximizing behavior was informed by the communal moral stance regarding the redistribution of public goods. In this regard, the "rational peasant" was informed by the "moral peasant."

There are other signs of tension between stated ideals and actual behavior which the developers did not consider. The term *bayanihan* originally referred to the practice of community members helping a barangay mate move his house. It was extended to refer to unpaid labor either on a community-wide project such as a road or help in a neighbor's field. The term then evolved to encompass paid field labor when the laborers are from one's barangay. All three usages are current among farmers and it can be confusing when one talks about the *bayanihan* method. In the interviews I conducted, some would use the term to describe paid labor; others, family labor. Yet if one asks for a definition of *bayanihan*, invariably the "pure definition," removed from a specific situation, always referred to unpaid help. The term was used rhetorically by both developers and farmers to describe the Filipino ethic of helping out and implicit in its meaning was the notion of self-help. NNP staff kept trying to invoke the spirit of *bayanihan* through the cooperatives. While the mood invoked by the term remains unchanged, the community spirit on which it is based is not always present but depends on

the particular situation and the individuals involved.

### A Dependent Social Science

As I have tried to illustrate through the above examples, the developers' pre-conceived ideas vis-a-vis peasant behavior inhibited rather than facilitated their interactions with farmers within the framework of the NNP project. This stemmed in part to their reliance on reductionist theories. In this essay, I have focused on peasant behavior as constructed in recent values-oriented literature, only occasionally alluding to the developers' neglect of the relationship between social structure and project outcome. Such a critique of development is implicit in the Marxist literature on social change which states that meaningful development of the Third World cannot be realized unless current relations of power are altered. While Marxist analysis offers a good criticism of current development efforts, it does not offer an agenda developers feel they can use and instead of a dialogue, there is debate with each side facing the other across theoretical boundaries. The controversy about development strategies is paralleled by the discourse vis-a-vis the need to construct a body of social theory unique to the Third World.

Dependency theory, a Marxist-based model of world structures, has been adapted to explain the continuing institutional and theoretical dependence of Third World (peripheral) academics upon their counterparts in the First World (the core). Like economic dependence, academic dependence entails the export of raw materials (in the form of data collected by foreign researchers) from peripheral countries to core countries. The raw data is fashioned into theories and exported back into the peripheral countries.

Those worried about this international division of academic labor agree that the first step would entail a revision of the current institutional structures which perpetuate intellectual dependency. They point to the need to "decolonize" Third World universities which are modeled after European institutions and which

by teaching European style courses, largely ignore "native" concerns.

These "new dependistas" would also correct the information imbalance between the core and the periphery, providing Third World scholars access to journals and situating more headquarters of international scholarly organizations in Third World countries.

A more radical strategy would be a call for a moratorium on international cooperation in the social sciences in order to give Third World academics time to work out their own theoretical stances without input from the core. Such a moratorium would preclude western academic research in Third World countries and would curtail other forms of cooperative ventures between metropolitan and peripheral academics.

That core countries have not paid much attention to such concerns is evidenced by the relative lack of attention their arguments receive in major "international" (core) journals. The principle vehicles for this dialogue among peripheral academics have been national and regional conferences and the *International Social Science Journal* which is funded by UNESCO. In the eyes of some peripheral scholars, Western social scientists and those Third World social scientists who are not in favor of indigenous theory debate the applicability of pet theories rather than explore some of the fundamental problems in international social science as it is currently practiced.

This lack of attention by core social scientists to the Third World academic community's accusations of First World hegemony can be explained in several ways. They believe the call for indigenization is nationalistic posturing, or they feel it is a boring (i.e., not theoretically engaging) debate, or the "new dependistas" are right — the First World does practice academic hegemony over the Third World under the guise of internationalism.

It is true that Third World social science has openly dedicated itself to the task of nation-building. The most oft-cited difference between First and Third World academics is the latter's over-political stance. Their call to indigenize social science can be seen as part of the nation-

building effort but it should not be viewed only as a symbolic nationalist gesture. The disenchantment with Western models is a product of the very real failures of such models to guide Third World development efforts.

The "new dependista" approach, however, has problems of its own. By appealing to dependency theory, it frames its arguments only in political/structural terms. The western social science community is treated as a fully integrated, if somewhat amorphous, body which serves a definite function in the support of the present global structure. The failure of western paradigms to adequately deal with Third World culture is associated with those structures that perpetuate the "colonized mind" (Alatas 1974), i.e. the peripheral academic's inability to "think for himself." We are left with the Marxian adage that infrastructure determines superstructure.

Is there another way to conceive of this 'legitimation crisis' of the social sciences?

### The Rise of Critical Anthropology

A parallel discourse exploring the credibility of anthropological paradigms has arisen from the interplay of ideas found in Critical Theory (à la Frankfurt School) and techniques of textual and discourse analysis as practiced by linguists. Various called interpretive, reflexive or hermeneutic anthropology, this critical endeavor focuses on the problems of anthropological authority and representation i.e., how and what one knows and how that is represented in anthropological writing. Two questions arise: first, what is the basis of the privileged position of the anthropologist vis-a-vis his "subject" and second, how can he/she maintain this position in ethnographic writing without falling back on positivistic statements which promote the anthropologist's interpretation of culture (e.g., social processes) over that of his subjects. The "new dependistas" have answered the first question politically. The privileged position of the anthropologist is in reference to his place in colonial history. They have not addressed the second issue — a task I will do now.

Anthropology is an empirical discipline. "Armchair" anthropologists such as Frazer who

constructed theories by ordering large amounts of data taken from other sources into a logical, coherent whole gave way to Malinowskian anthropologists who favored field experiences. As anyone who has done field work knows, the researcher is presented with fragmentary bits and pieces of culture. His task upon returning to the university is to translate such observations into coherent paradigms seemingly capable of elucidating the puzzle he was confronted with in the field. In the process of disposing of contradictions, possible alternative interpretations are pushed aside. It is in this way that the process of ethnographic writing reinforces the anthropologist's privileged position in the defining of culture. It also leads to the crystalization of theory and instead of a range of possible ways to view a certain issue, one is forced to pick and choose among available paradigms.

Gonzales (1982) has suggested that social scientists become "bricoleurs," patching together relevant points found in different theories. A more radical and critical approach would be to incorporate into ethnography the multiple discourses that arise from field experience. Such a presentation of alternative formulations would allow the subjects (the anthropological others) to participate in the definition of the issues.

In order to elucidate the ideas above, let us return to the problem of the dole-out mentality. The fact that the phenomena has been perjoratively labelled the dole-out mentality privileges the bankers' and government's definition of the problem. Farmer formulations of default experience are given brief attention through surveys constructed by social scientists who, while sympathetic to the farmers, work within the framework outlined by lenders, not borrowers. The exercise serves as an attempt to raise the critical consciousness of the borrowers to effect a change in their behavior, but refuses to serve the same function for the lenders. A critical approach would not elide farmer formulations in favor of lender formulations, but would juxtapose both realities; "not only to gain their feedback but to engage in a mutual raising of critical consciousness (Fischer, 1982)."



### Conclusion

Debate and theoretical diversity are crucial to the construction of new knowledge. The call for indigenization of social theory will aid this process. But the dangers now facing theory (especially in development) are compartmentalization and stagnation, as competing theoretical stances are becoming separate academic disciplines. Sometimes specialization tends to inhibit rather than promote diversity of thought and creative approaches as the representatives of the different disciplines become firmly entrenched in their theoretical outlooks. Such rigidity can be critical in Third World countries where theory becomes practice through development projects and where resources are scarce. As one developer so aptly put it, "every saint has his miracles." The problem is that the saints do not always talk to each other, in part because of a theoretical rigidity based in the confidence that one's own speciality "has the answers," and in part because of the difficulty of keeping up

with research findings when journals and books are not always available and when one's administrative and teaching duties are excessively demanding — which is the case in many Philippine universities.

Because development practice is based on sociological, economic and anthropological theory, it is crucial that theory building be a ground up exercise. There is neither the time nor the resources to experiment with development models based on abstract or ideal types. Scholars interested in social change face the task first of deconstructing and then of reconstructing current models, not only taking salient points of different models and patching them together, but reconfirming and adding to them through field work and juxtaposing the alternative formulations found there. The debate vis-a-vis the need for an indigenous body of theory underlines this need. Paradigms based in the Philippine experience (through field work) would automatically result in an indigenous development model.

### Notes

The field work from which these examples are drawn was funded by the Ora N. Arnold Fund. The author was a Research Associate at the Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, while engaged in field work.

<sup>1</sup>Unless otherwise stated, the word "rational" will refer to economic behavior as described by Weber.

<sup>2</sup>For other research stressing peasant ethics in economic behavior, see Szanton's study of a market town (1972) and Kerkvliet's (1979) study of the Hukbalahap.

<sup>3</sup>It is not the intent of this essay to critique a particular development project, but to address larger issues concerning theory. For this reason, the name of the program has been changed.

<sup>4</sup>General distribution includes shared benefits such as hospitals and roads. See Hollnsteiner 1963.

### References

- Abad, Ricardo and Elizabeth Eviota  
1981 Philippine Sociology in the Seventies: Spinning Out of the Colonial Cocoon. In *Social Science Research Activities in the Philippines*; Joint Research Program Series, no. 25. Loretta M. Sicat (Ed.) Tokyo, Japan: Institute of Developing Economies.
- Alatas, Syed Hussein  
1974 The Captive Mind and Creative Development. *International Social Science Journal* 26:691-703.
- Alger, Chadwick F. and Gene M. Lyons  
1974 Social Science as a Transnational System. *International Social Science Journal* 26:137-150.
- Banzon-Bautista, Cynthia.  
1984 *Marxism and the Peasantry: The Philippine Case*. Quezon City: Third World Studies Center 1984.
- Bleicher, Josef  
1982 *The Hermeneutic Imagination*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Barnett, George A. et al  
1981 Communication and Cultural Development: A Multidimensional Analysis. *Human Organization* 40:330-336.
- Beltran S., Luis Ramiro  
1976 Alien Premises, Objects and Methods in

- Latin American Communication Research. In *Communication and Development: Critical Perspectives*. E.M. Rogers (Ed.) London: Sage Publications.
- Bose, Santi Priya  
1962 Peasant Values and Innovation in India. *American Journal of Sociology* 67:552-560.
- Clemente, Wilfredo Al. II and Constanza Fernandez.  
1972 Philippine Corruption at the Local Level, *Solidarity*, vol. VII, no. 6.
- Concepcion, J.C.  
1985 Rural Banks Seek More Government Incentives, *Bulletin Today*, March 18, p. 32, sect. 1.
- Fegan, Brian  
1972 Between the Landlord and the Law, *Philippine Sociological Review*, vol. 20, nos. 1 & 2, January-April 1972.
- Ferrer, Artemia L.  
1985 Rice Technology, Rent Capitalism and Agrarian Changes in a Rice Farming Village of Central Luzon. Presentation at PCCARD Program Review, Central Luzon State University, Munoz, N.E. Dec. 1985.
- Fischer, M.M.J.  
1982 From Interpretive to Critical Anthropologies, Serie Anthropologia Social no. 34, Departamento de Ciencias Sociais, Brasilia.
- Forster, Peter  
1973 A Review of the New Left Critique of Social Anthropology. In *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. T. Asad (Ed.) New York: Humanities Press.
- Gerholm, Tomas and Ulf Hannerz (Eds.)  
1982 The Shaping of National Anthropologies. *Ethnos*, Special Edition.
- Held, David  
1980 Introduction to Critical Theory. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gonzales, Andrew  
1982 Filipinization of the Social Sciences: A Red Herring. Reprint of presentation to National Development and the Social Sciences symposium, Manila, 1982.
- Hollnsteiner, Mary Racelis  
1963 The Dynamics of Power in a Philippine Municipality. Quezon City: Community Development Research Council.
- Kerkvliet, Benedict J.  
1979 The Huk Rebellion: A Study of Peasant Revolt in the Philippines. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- Marcus, George E. and M.M.J. Fischer.  
1986 Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mattelart, A.  
1970 Criticas a la "Communication Research," In *Cuadernos de la Realidad Nacional* (Chile), Edicion Especial 3:11-22.
- Mazrui, Ali  
1975 The African University as a Multi-National Corporation: Problems of Penetration and Dependency. *Harvard Educational Review* 45:191-210.
- Nagano, Yoshiko  
1984 Share Tenancy and Landless Rural Workers: Reflections on the Feudalism and Capitalism Debate. The Philippines in the Third World Papers, Series No. 40, July.
- Po, Blondie.  
1978 Rural Organizations and Rural Development in the Philippines: A Documentary Study in Rural Organizations and Rural Development; Some Asian Experiences. Inayatullah (Ed.), Malaysia: Asian and Pacific Development Administration Centre.
- Polanyi, Karl  
1944 The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Redfield, Robert  
1956 Peasant Society and Culture. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ruby, Jay and Barbara Meyerhoff  
1982 Introduction. In a Crack in the Mirror. J. Ruby (ed.) Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Szanton, Maria Cristina Blanc  
1972 A Right to Survive: Subsistence Marketing in a Lowland Philippine Town. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Vidyarthi, L.P.  
1980 Cultural Factors in Development Process: Case Studies from Tribal Bihar. *Man in India* 60:153-167.