EDITOR'S PREFACE

FRANK LYNCH, S.J.
August 24, 1974

With one exception (the article by Murray), the papers in this issue were first presented at the 1973 National Convention of the Philippine Sociological Society. The meetings were held January 20—21, 1973, at Bocobo Hall, site of the Law Center of the University of the Philippines at Diliman, Quezon City.

At the opening session Salvador P. Lopez, president of the University of the Philippines, welcomed the Society's members to the Diliman campus. In doing so he recalled for them U.P.'s long-term interest in sociology. Had he remembered that the Philippine Sociological Society was an association for both sociologists and anthropologists, he might also have mentioned the equally long history of the University's department of anthropology. But the president's purpose was not to reminisce, but to encourage; in particular, to urge the assembled scientists to stick fearlessly to their scholarly commitments regardless of how society might change.

The first four articles in the current issue concern the people of Metro Manila, with emphasis on selected slum and squatter neighborhoods. To one not familiar with the modern urban mix (in the Philippines and elsewhere), this may seem like undue attention to a small segment of the city's residents. But the fact is that these "marginal" people account for at least one-third the metropolitan population. A student of urban housing problems and solutions, Mary Hollnsteiner finds that the squatters of Manila's Tondo district are (as of 1971) generally disinclined to accept transfer to a suburban relocation site. They prefer (and who can fault them for it?) to be where their only present source of income is — the Big City. Alternatives for reasonable action are two: either relocate squatters elsewhere *within* the city, or move them out only *after* they have been employed at or near a suburban housing site.

Sylvia Guerrero reports on three low-income neighborhoods of Metro Manila, one in Caloocan City and the others in Manila itself. The data she collected indicate that, despite the depressed conditions in which they live, and notwithstanding the grave misgivings they have about the (pre-martial-law) state of the nation, the residents of these areas nurse sanguine hopes for the future. In particular, they expect that higher education will be their children's salvation and, indirectly, their own.

Reflecting on his activities in a slum section of Santa Ana, Manila, F. Landa Jocano tells us what he thinks he did right, and what wrong, in the course of his studies there. For the improvement of urban research he sees a special potential in the anthropologist's traditional technique of participant observation. He apparently accepts in turn the sociologist's position that, especially where the society is complex, the investigator does well to multiply the number of his informants.

Unlike the three preceding authors, Rodolfo Bulatao has an interest in the general population of Metro Manila, with no special emphasis on low-income residents. His highly quantitative study of what makes people happy is part of his broader concern for the development of valid social indicators. Studies along this line are currently being conducted by the Development Academy of the Philippines, the Cooperative Regional Development Project of the U.P. Institute of Planning, and the Social Survey Research Unit of the Bicol River Basin Development Program.

The next three articles concern the planning and implementing of development. Walter Coward leads off by distinguishing two models appropriate for different kinds of innovation. The diffusion

model has proved successful for technological change, he says, but the social-learning model is preferable where new social arrangements are being developed. In the first approach, the innovation is designed by outsiders to fit the situation as they understand it. In the second, the end-users themselves design and adapt their own changed ways.

Pedro Acierto challenges notions commonly held about the positive association between certain personal and social traits of community development (CD) workers, on the one hand, and, on the other, the level of their work performance. Showing that these traditional expectations are largely without foundation in fact, Dr. Acierto strongly advocates an experimental approach to worker selection and to CD strategies in general. In his advocating that CD innovators try to "satisfy the end-users' tastes and beliefs," he seems to take a position somewhere between the social-learning and diffusion models described earlier by Coward.

Not so Delbert Rice. In his report on the Negritos of Santa Fe, San Marcelino, in the province of Zambales, the Reverend Rice takes a four-square stand on what the goals of Negrito development should be. His approach in this respect is clearly close to Coward's diffusion model, which is especially well adapted to the introduction of technological innovations. Most interesting and defensible is Rice's suggestion that the formal education of Negrito children be postponed till their 11th year, by which time they will presumably be well grounded in the ethical and value systems of the group.

David Baradas and Eric Casiño enlighten us about selected aspects of two Filipino Muslim societies, the Maranao and the Jama Mapun. It is no coincidence that in addressing themselves to social organization they should both end up describing systems of social inequality. Baradas tries to explain why it is that the Maranao of Lake Lanao, Mindanao, seem to be forever jockeying for positions of higher status among their fellows. He sees their continual contests as the inevitable consequence of a system of rank differentiation based on controvertible claims. Casiño, like Baradas, looks to history for an explanation of the present social-class system found among the Jama Mapun of Cagayan de Sulu, Sulu Province. He shows how the colonial powers of the past undermined the traditional highly stratified system and created what is now a mitigated hierarchical arrangement not unlike that found in the Christian Philippines.

One such group is the take-off point for the last article in the issue. Completing a series a three PSR papers on lowland social organization (see his bibliography), Francis J. Murray, Jr., here relates his Tagalog findings to information about groups elsewhere in the Philippines, especially the Mountain Province.

Prospero Covar has spent years in the study of Philippine revitalization movements, the *Watawat ng Lahi* of Laguna in particular. In his research note he proposes a synthesis of the existing nomenclatures for phenomena of this kind. In the role of overall rapporteur, Randolph David records what questions were asked, what conclusions reached in the course of the small-group discussions held one afternoon at the National Convention. In registering the doubts and anxieties of social scientists still wary of the new dispensation, this report comes full circle to the opening address of S. P. Lopez.

Of the 22 papers presented at the Convention, 13 have now been published. The first to see print was that of Juan Flavier and his associates (see the previous issue of PSR), while the remaining 12 are in the pages that follow. The answer to the Biblical question, "Where are the other nine?" is that five papers on population or family planning have been reserved for a future issue of PSR, to be co-published by the U.P. Population Institute; the other four (by Abueva, Benitez, Fabella, and — would you believe — Lynch) are not likely to see the light of day, since to my knowledge they were not prepared for publication. Add these four papers to a long list of slips twixt lip and print.

Speaking of slips, allow me to apologize, shamefacedly, for a serious error in *Social Issues '72* (PSR 20[4]). Not only did I fail to credit Francis Yap of *Impact* magazine for the distinctive head-within-a-head poster and PSR cover he kindly produced for the Sociological Society. I added insult to injury by overlooking the fact that a printer's error had credited the cover to someone else! *Patawad po.*