

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Philippine Studies: Geography, Archaeology, Psychology, and Literature

Review Author: John N. Schumacher

Philippine Studies vol. 24, no. 2 (1976) 247–248

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

Spes, the Church in the Modern World. Each separate chapter in that document draws a picture of the situation of man in the world of today but ends with a section showing how Christ is the super-human solution of all human problems" (pp. 135-142).

Charles J. McCarthy

PHILIPPINE STUDIES: GEOGRAPHY, ARCHAEOLOGY, PSYCHOLOGY AND LITERATURE: Present Knowledge and Research Trends. By Frederick L. Wernstedt, Wilhelm Solheim II, Lee Sechrest and George H. Guthrie, Leonard Casper. (Special Report no. 10). De Kalb, Illinois: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University, 1974. viii, 104 pages.

As Donn Hart, who edited these papers, explains in his preface, they are revised and augmented versions of papers originally presented at the 1973 meeting of the Association for Asian Studies. They are, therefore, the work of well-known American experts in selected areas of Philippine studies, written primarily for other American scholars. Nonetheless, they all have, in varying degrees, value to Filipino scholars as well. Each paper follows a general format: a survey of the general state of knowledge of their discipline as regards the Philippines, the authors' recommendations for future research projects to fill the existing gaps noted in their surveys, and an annotated basic bibliography for their discipline. Fred Eggan, Director of the Philippine Studies Program at the University of Chicago, contributes an introductory essay providing perspective for the papers that follow.

Wernstedt's paper, the briefest, as might be expected from the relatively undeveloped state of geographical studies in the Philippines, is thorough in its coverage of the existing studies. It emphasizes the need of geographic input into government planning, lamenting the lack of professionally-trained Filipino geographers, especially for those areas of public policy which are too sensitive for other than Filipino geographers. Solheim's survey is a detailed and informative history of Philippine archaeology from H. Otley Beyer to the present, emphasizing the work being done by Filipino institutions and scholars. His view of the future in archaeology is optimistic, and he sees an increasing trend towards paleoanthropology, the study not only of prehistory, but of the culture of prehistoric man.

The other two papers, by the fact they express their personal views on the directions future research should take in their respective disciplines, open themselves more to controversy, though they too follow the basic format outlined above. The Guthrie-Sechrest article is strong in its advocacy of the experimental methodology in the study of Filipino psychology, which it asserts to be "value free except for its commitment to the ultimate value of

truth," an assertion which in its obvious sense many social scientists and other people may question. Nonetheless the paper does not intend to exclude the value of observational and interview methodologies, only to complement them. Casper's survey criticizes severely the "self-styled 'committed writers'," who by their proscription of all who do not write in accord with their abstract preconceptions, are as destructive of Philippine literature as is censorship. Nonetheless, he acknowledges that "the apparent polarization spins out into a broad spectrum." What Philippine literary criticism especially needs is to be "permissive of rich diversity," and not let polemics between schools of criticism stifle the still meager production of Philippine critics. The paper concludes with a number of suggestions for a reconstruction of the "whole history of the search for a free-responsible, flexible relationship among Philippine society, its literature, and that literature's criticism, since the Propaganda Movement."

If all the papers contain much that is known to specialists in the field, all provide compact surveys and suggestions useful to the specialists and informative in many respects to nonspecialists.

John N. Schumacher

PHILIPPINE-CHINESE PROFILE: Essays and Studies. Edited by Charles J. McCarthy, S.J. (Pagkakaisa Monograph, no. 3). Manila: Pagkakaisa sa Pag-unlad, Inc., 1974. xi, 247 pages. P19.50.

This book is a collection of papers concerned with the integration of the Philippine-born Chinese into the larger Filipino community. Most of the articles here have been published before in a wide variety of journals here and abroad. Their authors range from foreign social scientists writing in scholarly journals, to Filipinos concerned about the moral and national implications of the legally and/or socially enforced separation of a substantial minority in the Philippines from a greater contribution to national development, to Philippine-born Chinese who consider themselves to have no other homeland than the Philippines and desire to participate more fully in the development of the nation.

As is to be expected in such an anthology, not all of the articles are of equal value from a scholarly point of view, but even most of those written for more popular periodicals are the work of competent scholars and give evidence of being based on sound research. Due to the delay in reviewing the book, some of the points raised, e.g., in connection with the difficulties in the naturalization process or the status of Chinese schools, have been rendered at least partially moot by subsequent developments, such as the Presidential decrees facilitating naturalization and various government dispositions on the Filipinization of schools, as well as by the recognition of the People's