philippine studies

**The Social Sciences in the Philippines:
Reflections on Trends and Developments**

Maria Cynthia Rose Banzon Bautista

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

The Social Sciences in the Philippines: Reflections on Trends and Developments

Maria Cynthia Rose Banzon Bautista

This article constitutes preliminary thoughts on the development of the social sciences in the Philippines. Drawing from previous assessments by Filipino social scientists of the history and state of their disciplines,[1] it presents in broad strokes some of the trends and turning points in the growth of anthropology, economics, political science, psychology and sociology, five of the six core social science disciplines in the country.[2]

The article begins with a sweeping historical account of the growth of the social sciences up to their institutionalization in the 1960s, followed by a summative description of developments from the 1970s to the 1990s.[3] Developments are discussed in terms of influences on some of the substantive and methodological concerns of the disciplines. The paper concludes with the contributions of the social sciences to public discourses, policies and practices.

It is important to note that watersheds in the evolution of the disciplines do not correspond neatly to the historical periods set in the paper. Processes associated with particular decades may have begun long before the period under consideration and may have proceeded with significant turns in succeeding years. Mindful of this observation, the periodization in the paper ought to be viewed as a convenient way of contextualizing observed developments in the disciplines and the social sciences taken collectively.

It is also important for the reader to treat this paper as an inchoate and unfinished work, subject to continuing reformulation. Written on

the basis of available documents, views and insights of resource persons and the writer's observations from 1972 to 1999, the paper is circumscribed by the way developments in a few academic institutions in Metro Manila are reconstructed.[4] It does not benefit from a comprehensive review of the practice of the social science profession in other institutions like the Asian Social Institute, the University of Asia and the Pacific, Silliman University and Xavier University. Nor does the paper systematically consider developments in the social sciences in other higher education institutions in the country, government bodies and non-government organizations. Furthermore, the influences and thrusts singled out in the paper do not adequately reflect the diverse theoretical and methodological practices of individual social scientists even in the focal institutions like the University of the Philippines where the trends are most palpable.

Institutionalizing the Social Sciences:
From the American Colonial Period to the 1960s

The literature on the development of the social sciences in the Philippines explicitly traces the genealogy of the disciplines, except psychology, to the works of pioneering thinkers or the teaching of particular subjects during the Spanish colonial period. As ethnographic accounts of settled communities at the time (Abaya, Lucas-Fernan and Noval-Morales 1999, 1) Abaya considered the Eurocentric writings of Spanish chroniclers like Pigafetta, Loarca, Plasencia and Chirino in the sixteenth century as incipient anthropological works. Agpalo argued that the systematic analysis of important aspects of Philippine political theory by the intellectual leaders of the Philippine Revolution notably Jose Rizal and Marcelo H. Del Pilar makes them the pioneers of political science (Agpalo 1999, 199). Similarly, De Dios singled out Gregorio Sanciano y Joson, who wrote a purely economic treatise toward the end of the nineteenth century while taking a doctorate in civil laws from Madrid in 1881 (De Dios 1999, 85) as the first local economist. Abad and Eviota, on the other hand, root the beginnings of sociology in the teaching of social philosophy, social ethics and penology at the University of Santo Tomas toward the end of the century.[5]

Although early thinkers, forerunners of disciplinal works and particular courses may have reflected the state of economic, political and sociological thought at the time, anthropology, economics, political science and sociology as academic disciplines with defined theoretical

and methodological perspectives did not exist in the Philippines before the 1900s. The academic circles in the nineteenth century were oblivious to the need to document and understand the lives and identities of different cultural groups in the country. They were not cognizant of discussions on the scope and appropriate analytical tools for economics. For instance, neither the *Methodenstreit* debate between those who espoused marginalist ideas and the historical school in Europe nor the Marxist critique of *laissez faire* policies figured in local discourses (De Dios 1999, 86–87). As for sociology, the new orientation in social philosophy that passed off as sociological hardly challenged the transcendental moral relationships that underlay a traditional view of the world (Pertierra 1997, 5). Nor did it advance the discipline's secular project of systematically finding explanations for a variety of social phenomena in the real world.

The Philippine social sciences emerged as specialized disciplines with the establishment of academic departments in the early American colonial period.[6] Patterned after American universities, the social science departments in the country were created in different years. Since ethnographic studies of Christian ethnic groups and non-Christian tribes were already well entrenched in the colonial government bureaucracy by the second decade of the 1900s, anthropology was the first discipline to be instituted at the University of the Philippines, the educational flagship of the new colonial order (Abaya 1999, 2). The Departments of Sociology and Economics and of Political Science were established a year after the Department of Anthropology in 1915 while the Department of Psychology was instituted after eleven years (Alfonso 1985, 61–62).[7] The same year saw the establishment of a separate Department of Economics in the College of Liberal Arts although it was taken out of the College three years later to form the nucleus of the School of Business Administration (De Dios 1999, 98–103). Sociology merged with anthropology to become the Department of Sociology and Anthropology in the same period. Both departments split four decades later in 1963, two years before the Department of Economics separated from the College of Business Administration and became the School of Economics.

The return in the 1950s of a substantial core of Filipinos who pursued graduate studies abroad stimulated the establishment of the School of Economics, the split of anthropology and sociology into separate departments and the growth of political science and psychology. While courses in the disciplines covered in this paper had been

177

taught in the first few decades before World War II, the social science curricula attained prominence only in the postwar era (Hollnsteiner 1973, 2). Moreover, the gradual shift in the perspectives and content of the disciplines from legalistic studies of government as the principal organ of the state to studies of political systems and institutions in political science,[8] from descriptive and historical approaches to economic phenomena to the more analytical and quantitative economics that took off in the 1960s (Gonzales 1997), from the view of ethnic communities as other cultures to the linguistic, demographic and ethnographic studies of ethnic groups within one's own culture in anthropology (Bennagen 1990, 2) from counseling psychology to psychological testing and the dominance of experimental methods in psychology (Enriquez 1985, 149–57; Tan 1998, 5; Torres [forthcoming]) and from a social philosophical or normative sociology to one based on empirical research occurred in the three decades following the war.[9]

The presence of a critical mass of trained social scientists did not only lead to substantial revisions of the social science curricula. Bewailing their small number in the face of increasing demands on their professions, the first batches of returning scholars focused on the recruitment of bright students into their respective disciplines. They also organized professional associations that were dedicated to the development of the disciplinal fields. Out of the informal discussion groups in the 1950s and 1960s arose four professional organizations (see table 1).

The formation of professional associations was a defining moment in the history of the social sciences. Their founders and core members were imbued with the commitment to build their respective disciplines and form communities of professionals who eventually set the criteria for membership into their ranks. In the process, they defined the nature of their professions in the country. It is interesting to note, for example, the evolution of the association of economists from the Social Economy Association of the late 1950s that included other social scientists to the Philippine Economic Society (PES) of 1961 that drew its members exclusively from the new breed of economists schooled in the emergent tradition of mathematical models and econometric analysis.[10] Similarly, the membership of the Philippine Political Science Association (PPSA) and the Philippine Association of Psychologists (PAP) was drawn exclusively from academics in the discipline and/or practitioners. But unlike PES with its dominant methodological paradigm, the PPSA and PAP were less definite about the school of thought and methodological position that defined their disciplines. The Philippine

Table 1. Major National Associations of Social Scientists and Professional
Journals

Association	Date of Founding (incorporation)	Journal	Date of First Issue
Phil. Political Science Association	1962	*Phil. Political Science Journal*	1974
Phil. Sociological Association ˙	1952* (1963)	*Phil. Sociological Review*	1953
Phil. Association of Psychologists	1962** (1962)	*Phil. Journal of Psychology*	1968
Phil. Economic Society	1962*** (1972)	*Phil. Economic Journal*	1962***
Ugnayang Pang-Agham Tao (UGAT)	1977****	*Agham-Tao*	1978

Sources: Unless indicated, the source of all entries is Bulatao, et al. 1979, tables 9 and 11
*   Panopio, Isabel (1996, 1)
**   Tan, Allen (1998, 1)
***   Sicat, Gerardo (1982, 18)
****   Bennagen, Ponciano (1990, 13)

Sociological Association was by far even more liberal than the PPSA and PAP in its acceptance of members from the other social sciences. Since its formation in 1952 until the founding of the Ugnayang Pang-Agham Tao (UGAT) in 1977, PSA had included anthropologists, a reflection of the substantive overlap of sociology and social anthropology. Apart from anthropologists, PSA also drew members from other social science disciplines and interdisciplinary fields of study.

The professional associations formed in the 1960s were more than academic clubs sharing common disciplines and passions. They emerged in response to societal and institutional imperatives. As a case in point, a founding member of the Philippine Economic Society recalled in a Forum organized to reconstruct the history of economics in the Philippines, that the need to develop appropriate measures to address the balance-of-payments crisis in the late 1940s triggered the formation of the PES.[11] The debate between those in government who espoused monetary discipline on the one hand and the new industri-

alists and exporters, on the other, underscored the need for professional economists who were not on the payroll of business. As a consequence, members of PES took it upon themselves to facilitate the education of future economists and the training of government personnel in the analytical tools of economics. Thus, when Gerardo Sicat became the first Director General of NEDA, he recruited his staff from the School of Economics and sent them back to the School for graduate studies.

As mark of the commitment of the social scientists to the development of their respective disciplines, the professional associations produced journals as soon as they were established and took pains to keep these publications alive. The journals served as venues for analytical articles and encouraged social scientists to conduct research and disseminate their findings.[12]

The conduct of systematic research and the accumulation of a body of empirical works in the disciplines distinguished the more professional social sciences of the postwar years from their less developed state before the war. Institutions such as the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation facilitated postwar research by providing institution-building grants to Universities and research centers. Newly created research units such as the Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC), the Research Institute for Mindanao Culture (RIMCU), the Institute for Economic Development and Research and Community Development Research Council (CDRC) and the Center for Research and Communications provided additional impetus to social science research.

The fortuitous confluence of charismatic academic leaders with significant following in their respective disciplines and the compatibility of the representatives of new professional associations contributed to the auspicious establishment of the Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC), an umbrella organization of the professional associations (Gonzales 1997). Since its formation in 1963, PSSC has galvanized the social science community to undertake disciplinal and multidisciplinary studies, generate resources for research and systematically build the research capability of young social scientists. In hindsight, one of PSSC's most valuable contributions to building the social sciences in the country is the development of regional institutions. Its regional trainees now constitute the faculty, researchers and administrators of key universities and government agencies outside Metro Manila.

Heeding the Call for Relevance:
The 1970s to the Turn of the Century

The social sciences in the Philippines were colonial implants. Unlike in the West where the disciplines originated, they did not emerge as rational projects to make sense of concrete societal experiences, e.g., the chaos and disorder wrought by the French and Industrial Revolutions (Abad and Eviota 1981, 131–32). Instead, they were shaped by American social science although continental influences that have been integrated by American social scientists into their thinking and practice filtered in. The country's colonial experience, the American training of the first batch of returning social scientists from graduate schools mostly in the United States and the presence of American professors in some of the new academic departments and research institutions account for the dominant hold of American academic traditions. The role of the University of Chicago in shaping the thrusts and approach of Philippine anthropology, through the training of Filipino anthropologists who filled strategic positions in teaching and research, eloquently illustrates the impact of American academia on the social sciences.

The American character of Philippine social science notwithstanding, the first generation of Filipino social scientists returning from their studies abroad in the 1950s and 1960s sought their relevance at the outset to what they perceived to be the needs of Philippine society. Unmindful of the American bias of their training and firmly believing that the social science disciplines they trained for can contribute to the country's development, the pioneers of the disciplines applied their skills to the analysis of Philippine problems and rigorously trained the next generation to follow suit. Economists, for instance, responded to the shift in government's economic strategy towards greater planning and intervention and the need of the business sector to anticipate economic policy through research that went beyond economic history (De Dios 1999, 98). By the 1960s, the predominant studies utilizing mathematical models and empirical testing were efficiency-oriented and concerned with the allocation of resources to various sectors (Mangahas 1982).

Political scientists, psychologists, anthropologists and sociologists were as conscious of making the social sciences useful to the country. Informed by modernization theories, and departing from the emphasis of traditional political science on the state and its organs, political

scientists in the 1960s were preoccupied with understanding and clari-
fying the country's political system and institutions.[13] Psychologists, as
the only social scientists with a recognized professional practice, inevi-
tably grappled with the need to develop appropriate and relevant
psychological tests (Enriquez 1985, 155). Anthropologists, on the other
hand, continued their ethnographic research to further understand
cultural and ethnolinguistic groups in the Philippines while sociolo-
gists with anthropologists developed research expertise and generated
data on topics ranging from ethnic relations, social institutions, com-
munity studies and Filipino values.

The Search for Alternative Paradigms and Methodologies in the 1970s and the 1980s

Prior to the late 1960s and 1970s, social science discourses in the
country avoided areas of intense ideological debate. The thematic foci
of sociologists and political scientists, for instance, eschewed agrarian
unrest and the Huk rebellion. Not until the turbulent years, from the
end of the 1960s to the early 1980s, did this obvious silence receive
scathing remarks from Marxist-inspired scholars. For instance, David
assailed the ideological character of sociology (David 1979, 1–9). By
systematically focusing on the social and cultural aspects of Philippine
life without establishing their links to the wider political economic
structure, sociologists were criticized for masking the structural roots
of social ills and contradictions. Similarly, Nemenzo charged main-
stream political science as an intellectualized expression of bourgeois
ideology.[14] Even the less legalistic and more institutional approach of
political writings in the 1960s was criticized for leaving unexamined
the foundations of the bourgeois social order.

Reflecting the worldwide disenchantment of younger scholars with
traditional social science perspectives, Marxism was one of two move-
ments that influenced the Philippine social science disciplines in the
1970s and the 1980s. The other movement advocated for the
indigenization of knowledge. It was less global, entailing networks of
scholars confined largely to postcolonial societies in the South. The two
movements reflected different intellectual projects that often contra-
dicted each other but in practice drew common adherents and sympa-
thizers. The relationship between Marxism and the indigenization

movement is akin to that between Marxism and the nationalist school, which de Dios discusses cogently in this volume, i.e., close, but complex and ambivalent (De Dios 1999, 94).

Depending on the theoretical position one takes within neo-Marxist thought, i.e. the humanism of the Frankfurt School of Sociology or the structuralism of intellectuals like Louis Althusser and Nicos Poulantzas, Marxist critique of the social sciences consisted either of debunking the ideological character of explanations of social reality or unraveling the economic, political and ideological structures that determine social conditions in a particular historical conjuncture. Unmindful of the differences in the notion of critique implicit in the two strands of Marxism, Marxist intellectuals in the Philippines did not bother about nuances in Marxist theory and applied both notions as they engaged in concrete revolutionary struggles.[15] In the process, they fomented debates that produced a plethora of documents on Philippine political, economic and ideological structures in a postcolonial context.[16]

Marxist focus on Philippine social structures and critique of Western social science as constituting ideological systems of cultural representations imposed on colonial societies may partly explain the affinity of some Marxist-inspired social scientists with the indigenization movement. This movement aims to abstract and articulate a particular society's political, economic and social configuration and more importantly, its cultural roots and identity. The movement's agenda takes on greater significance in colonized societies where peoples' realities have been externally defined and their own interpretations suppressed. Against this backdrop, the movement seeks to contextualize social science knowledge in a particular culture by developing concepts, theories and methods born out of the experiences of the members of that culture. It is at this level of ultimate goals that the indigenization movement, with its culture-bound theorizing and its emphasis on the social construction of cultural and ethnic identities, differs radically from the totalizing framework of Marxism and the privileged conceptual status it gives to social class. Nevertheless, in practice, activists within the social science community, who were once engaged in the political and economic struggles of the movement, have moved quite naturally to advocating for the indigenization of the social sciences.

Marxism and the Philippine Social Sciences

The global rise of Marxism in the 1960s and 1970s, the prolifera-
tion of academic books on the subject, the declaration of Martial Law
in 1972 and the subsequent gains of student activism and the revolu-
tionary movement facilitated the spread of Marxist influence on the
Philippine social sciences. Of the five disciplines covered in this paper,
political science, sociology and anthropology were the most affected.
Given its substantive focus, political science could not ignore the po-
litical theory that inspired the growth of the Philippine left, which in-
cluded some of the discipline's prominent faculty and students among
its ranks.[17] On the other hand, Weberian and Marxist-inspired schools
of thought had slowly eroded functionalist and positivist paradigms in
Western sociology by the 1970s, rendering the Western-oriented disci-
pline in the Philippines more open to Marxist perspectives.

Marxist ideas were widely disseminated in political science and
sociology classes in Manila through publications written by public
intellectuals from these disciplines.[18] The Third World Studies Center
at the University of the Philippines, which provided a venue for dis-
cussing dependency theory, world systems analysis and the mode of
production debate, supplied the materials used in classes on compara-
tive politics, political dynamics, social and political thought, interna-
tional politics, sociology of development, political sociology, ideology
and revolution, rural sociology, the sociology of knowledge and the
theory courses. Despite the usual Western organization of introductory
political science and sociology courses, Marxist perspectives infiltrated
discussions of contemporary issues in these courses. At the University
of the Philippines, the faculty in these disciplines, regardless of ideo-
logical persuasion, dealt with Marxist ideas, if only because political
science and sociology attracted radical students at the height of the
anti-dictatorship movement.[19]

Compared to sociology, anthropology did not seem to have been as
affected by Marxism. Marxist thought formally penetrated only one of
its sub-fields ecological anthropology, while Marxist perspectives were
formally integrated into the courses taught in sociology. Moreover,
anthropology's methodology remained intact whereas Marxism con-
tributed to undermining the strong hold of positivism on Philippine
sociology.

Upon closer analysis, however, Marxism profoundly influenced
Philippine anthropology, albeit indirectly. At the height of the anti-

Marcos movement in the 1970s, Abaya's historical account of the development of the discipline noted how students like Lorena Barros, now a heroine of the underground movement, called for an action-oriented and transformative discipline. Questions regarding the ethical and political involvement of anthropologists in counterinsurgency operations after the famous expose of Project Camelot further reinforced activism among anthropologists.[20] They supported the right of indigenous peoples to resist development programs that tended to erode the cultural and social spheres of their lives. In advocating the self-determination of indigenous peoples, anthropologists allied with the Marxist-inspired movement. For instance, the fight of the people of the Cordilleras against the National Power Corporation's Chico River Basin Project linked anthropologists to the Left. Their experiences in the field contributed to the call for a reinvention of anthropology, the organization of its professional organization in 1977 and the themes that engaged them in the 1980s. The themes included the anthropology of resistance; ethnicity and national unity; culture change and national development; the Tasaday controversy; mass movements; human rights and ancestral land; technology; power; and environment.[21]

In contrast to the influence of Leftist discourse on political science, sociology and anthropology, Marxism hardly made a dent on economics in the Philippines. Although economists participated in shaping the discussions of the Philippine left as well as nationalist discourses, these were not reflected in the *Philippine Economic Journal*. Nor did they figure significantly in the classroom. The closest documented expression of the search for alternatives among adherents of the discipline was Ricardo Ferrer's *An Introduction to Economics as a Social Science* (Ferrer 1970). Criticizing contemporary economics for obliterating the social content of the discipline as a science, Ferrer attempted to return to the classical framework of "political economy where social relations is as much the subject of economics" as all other topics of attention (Ferrer 1970, Preface).

In research, economists did not pursue studies on the structural and political determinants of economic policy particularly on borderline political economic issues and concerns such as foreign investments and multinational corporations.[22] Marxist-inspired sociologists filled the gap by pursuing political economic research in these areas.[23]

The limited effects of debates involving Marxists and neoclassical economists in other parts of the world on Philippine economics are due in part to the nature of the discipline. Of all the social sciences in

the Philippines and with few exceptions, in the world, economics is the only one with an unequivocal paradigm in the Kuhnian sense. It has generated consensus on the fundamental assumptions of methodological individualism and optimizing behavior. More importantly, economics has achieved a methodological unity that is not found in the other social science disciplines. As such, economists do not feel the need to shift to other paradigms in pursuit of topics of interest. Neoclassical economics to them is an eclectic framework, capable of absorbing into its corpus of ideas new insights derived from the use of the discipline's analytical tools. Furthermore, economists in the country tended to be too preoccupied with absorbing and applying the analytical tools to the Philippine situation to spend time on intellectual pursuits like Marxist economics, which the *gurus* of the discipline considered marginal.

Although psychology was not as theoretically and methodologically unified as economics in the 1970s, it too was not affected by Marxism. Except for historicist strains in theory, the essentially atheoretical stance of behaviorism and positivist research on a variety of psychological topics such as prejudice, stereotypes, projective techniques and introspective assessment tools, rendered psychology in the Philippines impervious to the influence of Marxism in the 1970s and 1980s (Bernardo 1999). Despite common threads between Marxist structuralist analysis and Freudian psychoanalysis, the marked differences in levels of analysis between Marxism, with its focus on large social formations, and psychology, with its concentration on the individual, account for the negligible influence of Marxism on the discipline.

By the mid-1980s, Marxist influence on Philippine social science had reached its limits, remaining primarily at the level of discourse. Countless Marxist debates, discussions and publications in the 1970s did not translate into scholarship that could have added rigor to Marxist concepts or revised the theories in light of empirical observations. There were no serious attempts, for instance, on the part of sociologists and political scientists, to determine the convergence of Philippine political economy and society with and divergence from other Third World formations in Latin America, Africa and Asia. They did not incorporate a plethora of findings from various studies into Marxist analysis. Nor did insights from the democratization process of the 1980s feed back into Marxist theory and revise its formulations.

But the impasse in the development of Marxist scholarship in the country is understandable. The dramatic end of the Marcos regime

and the beginning of the Aquino administration in the mid-1980s opened up a challenging arena of struggle, drawing social scientists and Marxist intellectuals into advocacy, policy or action-oriented work. Developing Marxist scholarship was a luxury in light of the demands and imperatives of social transformation. Moreover, funds for research on Marxist topics and theoretical work were unavailable. Within a short time, Marxist discourse gave way to the more domesticated international discourses on civil society and transition to democracy.

In fine, Marxism by the mid-1980s had failed to grow as a field of scholarship. The collapse of the socialist bloc further undermined the influence Marxist ideas enjoyed at the height of the anti-dictatorship movement. Nevertheless, Marxist-inspired social scientists have continued to draw from Marxism, recasting its insights into the more pluralist discourses of the 1990s.

The Indigenization Movement and the Social Sciences

Intersecting with Marxism, the nationalist movement of the 1960s and 1970s intensified the indigenization efforts in the country. But unlike the tacit acceptance of the Western orientation of the social sciences in the 1950s and 1960s when social scientists resolved to apply their analysis to Philippine realities, shedding the colonial legacy of the disciplines was an explicit goal in the 1970s and 1980s. Those who spearheaded the movement participated in anti-West discourses on indigenization in Asia and other parts of the Third World.

How far did the second wind in the indigenization efforts in the Philippines go? To answer this question, it is necessary to unpack the concept of indigenization that has been understood and used differently by members of the social science community. Khrisna Kumar's (1976) aspects of indigenization,[24] which correspond to three levels of the process, is a useful handle for assessing the nature and extent of indigenization in the social sciences. For Kumar, indigenization proceeds in three phases

- structural indigenization or the institutionalized and organized capabilities of a nation for the production and diffusion of social science knowledge;
- substantive indigenization or the focus of a nation's research and teaching activities on its own social institutions, conditions and problems; and

- theoretic indigenization or the construction of distinctive conceptual frameworks and metatheories reflective of the world views, socio-cultural experiences as well as perceived goals of Filipinos.

Assessed in relation to Kumar's aspects, the Philippine social sciences had achieved structural and substantive indigenization by the 1970s. Even economics, which has been claimed to resist indigenization, had a core of competent economists focusing substantively on the study of Philippine problems (see Pertierra 1996, 8). In contrast, theoretic indigenization by the late 1970s and 1980s remained a goal for sociology and political science while anthropology and psychology had begun to move deliberately toward it. Economics, with its unified paradigm, did not even consider setting such a goal.

At the height of the movement to debunk the Western orientation of the social sciences, the community was divided over the strategy for achieving theoretic indigenization. One approach, exemplified by *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, a multidisciplinary movement that started in psychology, viewed theoretic indigenization as a conscious and constant search for indigenous frameworks, concepts, theories and methodologies. A second approach did not see the need to consciously discover Filipino perspectives but saw theoretic indigenization as the outcome of competent social science research in the country. For proponents of the latter approach, the establishment of a research tradition in social inquiry, made alive by critical exchanges among social scientists, will eventually contribute to the development of local paradigms (Gonzales 1990, 119).

Straddling the two approaches, a third view recognized the need to develop social science frameworks, concepts, models and theories that acknowledge historical and cultural specificities but accepted the necessity of organizing inquiries along Western notions of applicable analytical frameworks while historical and culturally-bound frameworks have not supplanted traditional paradigms (Miranda 1984, 78). This approach considered the identification of the limitations of traditional Western paradigms and the unmasking of their outright distortions of social phenomena as critical to the long process of constructing indigenous perspectives.

The most notable developments toward theoretic indigenization in the sense of distinctive concepts, perspectives and metatheories occurred in anthropology and psychology. Nationalist fervor, the shift in the discourse of Western anthropology toward cultural criticism and

the intense soul-searching among Filipino anthropologists speeded up the process of shedding the discipline's colonial legacy.[25] The conscious agenda of decolonizing anthropology in the Philippines led to the creation in 1977 of the UGAT, a network committed to rethinking the discipline's identity, its constructs for understanding the Philippines and its peoples, and the rules of accountability and engagement that should bind anthropologists (Abaya 1999). It also led to a search for alternative theories and methodologies grounded in local cultures.

Covar's work is a case in point. It is an attempt to develop a culture-bound anthropology. *Pagkatao*, translated roughly as personhood, is posited in his writings as the anchor of anthropology and discovering the cultural processes that enhance and shape it is the discipline's primary agenda. Covar reveals the linguistic ramifications of the concept and develops its dimensions metaphorically using the image of the *banga* or earthen jar (Covar 1993, 12). The difficulty of translating the basic concepts and ideas inherent in the metaphor is to be expected. In Covar's framework, a truly culture-bound anthropology is imbedded in the language of the discourse. Outside the language, the essence of the metaphor is bound to be lost.

Drawing inspiration from ethno-science or cognitive anthropology, Enriquez developed *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* (Filipino Psychology), a school of thought that privileged the emic or "native point of view" over the etic or "researcher's viewpoint" (Abaya 1999). *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* (SP) was posited as a "new consciousness reflecting Filipino psychological knowledge that has emerged through the use of local language as a tool for the identification and rediscovery of indigenous concepts and an appropriate medium for the delineation and articulation of Philippine realities" (Enriquez 1990, 124). Ventura describes the features of SP in greater detail. Apart from recognizing language as a basic variable in personality, testing and social psychology, SP is concerned with studying individuals in their natural settings and rediscovering the ties of psychology to other disciplines and branches of knowledge in order to arrive at culturally-appropriate explanations of Filipino behavior (Ventura as cited by Enriquez 1990, 160). But apart from being an attempt to formulate indigenous psychological theories and develop methods, SP was essentially a form of resistance to the hegemony of Western paradigms. Its ultimate agenda was the liberation of psychology from its Western origins (Torres 1998).

Sikolohiyang Pilipino exerted tremendous influence on Philippine psychology in different parts of the country. It produced a plethora of

works that offer an alternative to traditional psychological writings in the Philippines. Torres credited SP with other significant achievements. They include the refocusing of explanations of Filipino personality on indigenous values, of which *kapwa* is the most noteworthy; the importance given to the linguistic specificity of behavioral patterns; the acceptance of explanations of Filipino behavior emanating from other disciplines; the development of new procedures and categories for studying Filipino behavior and the use of the Filipino language in spawning culture-bound concepts and procedures (Torres 1997, 17–37).

Recent literature has noted some problems with the indigenization of psychological knowledge along the approach and methods espoused by SP. In an incisive article, Sta. Maria (1996) criticized Enriquez's method of "plucking indigenous terms that contrast with foreign interpretations" and elevating these to the level of values. She noted that SP formulated local concepts that may be consistent with the idea of a liberating psychology but which were not necessarily drawn from empirical investigations. Methodological issues such as the cultural uniqueness of the methods and their behavioral and attitudinal nuances and the lack of integration between method and content led Sta. Maria to highlight the need to further contextualize SP within Filipino cultural and historical experience. In addition to Sta. Maria's critique, Torres argues that the key concepts of the school of thought are rooted in Tagalog, the language of lowland Christian Filipinos in Central and Southern Luzon (Torres, ibid).

Despite its weaknesses, *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* represents the most advanced attempt at theoretic indigenization among the social sciences covered in this paper. But apart from this movement and Covar's work in anthropology, it is important to note that the initiatives toward theoretic indigenization were not confined to psychology and anthropology. Agpalo's pioneering work in political science is noteworthy (see Agpalo 1972). Taking off from the metaphor of *Pandanggo sa Ilaw*, a folk dance which requires balancing lights, Agpalo elaborated on the subtleties and dexterities of Philippine politics. He eventually linked his insights to the larger paradigm of the *Pangulo* regime. Based on a metaphor of the human body, Agpalo posited a political hierarchy in which the nation's leader is akin to the *ulo* or brain. Since the system is assumed to be organic, he further argued that the leader is consensually chosen.

While Agpalo's metaphor was quite extended, the agenda of developing indigenous concepts did not take off in political science. The

discipline was caught in discourses of political development in which Marxism figured significantly. Moreover, the increasingly more articulate Marxist discourse in political science rendered Agpalo's model of Philippine politics, constructed at the threshold of the highly politicized academic environment of Martial Law, conservative and irrelevant.

By the 1990s, efforts toward theoretic indigenization had resulted in indigenous concepts, recommended methods and procedures for doing field-based social science research in the Philippines and a range of applications.[26] However, there was no apparent attempt in the literature to link concepts and develop indigenized theoretical frameworks and perspectives. Studies in *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, for instance, tended to be descriptive (Bernardo 1998). On the other hand, the plethora of analytical and descriptive research organized along Western-oriented paradigms had not been culled for theoretical insights and integrated into local paradigms.

Although the development of Marxist scholarship and indigenized social science was limited, the two movements that influenced Philippine academia in the 1970s and 1980s left their indelible mark on the orientation of the social sciences in the country. Subsequent activities of most social scientists reflected the value they attached to linking scholarship to the amelioration of Philippine conditions. Since the imperatives of pursuing relevant concerns put premium on policy or action research, significant theoretical work was relegated to an indefinite future, accounting for the atheoretical character of research or the absence of theories developed by Filipino social scientists. Furthermore, their demand for relevance oriented social science writing to a Philippine audience, explaining why competent Filipino social scientists, with the exception of economists, have not been as concerned with publishing in international journals.[27]

From Polarization to Pluralism and Convergence in the 1990s

Intense debates between contending schools of thought and methodological positions preoccupied the social sciences in the 1970s and 1980s with the exception of economics. Questions regarding basic goals and perspectives and the methodological issues posed by *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* divided psychology. In political science, Marxism challenged the structural functionalist and systems approaches to political development with which the modernization theories of Samuel Huntington, Lucien Pye and James Coleman, among others, had affinity. Similarly,

Marxist and phenomenological thinkers contended with structural-functionalism and systems theory in sociology. While anthropology in the Philippines was not divided into contending schools of thought, it was nevertheless engaged in a collective redefinition of its directions against the taken-for-granted colonial standpoint of the 'other' as object of study.

By the 1990s, theoretical attempts to integrate opposing perspectives and levels of analysis blunted the polemical exchanges of the 1970s and early 1980s. For instance, with each encounter, sociology moved closer to achieving some integration of perspectives. The rapprochement of conflicting positions is reflected in Giddens' theory of structuration that combines political economy's focus on structures with the symbolic interactionist and Weberian sociologists' emphasis on human agency. Synthetic theorizing is also manifested in the Marx-Weber model of society and the macro-micro links that connect micro theories emphasizing the contingency of the social order and the centrality of individual negotiations to macro theories of social structures (Banzon-Bautista 1994, 7–49).

The level of theoretical and conceptual convergence that enlightened Philippine sociology in the 1990s had not been achieved in political science, psychology and anthropology. However, there seems to have been greater tolerance in the last two decades for divergent perspectives and modes of doing science in these disciplines. Psychology, for instance, has incorporated insights gained from research in *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* into the discipline's growing body of knowledge. In recent years, it has also been characterized by the coexistence of competing views, i.e., behavioral and experimental positivist approaches, phenomenological perspectives and postmodern feminist discourses (Torres 1997, 17–37).

Opposing perspectives in political science have converged in the areas of international relations, political dynamics and comparative politics. The categories of international discourses and their adoption into the language of Filipino social scientists facilitated their coming together. As a case in point, both Marxist-inspired and functionalist-oriented political scientists have begun to utilize a common vocabulary coming from a discourse on governance that underscores democratization and the significance of civil society. The recent convergence of political scientists working in the area of international security and those working on development further illustrate some degree of rapprochement. In the last decade, the concept of security has begun to

transcend its military connotations, encompassing the domains of po-
litical economists or scholars focusing on development issues (e.g.
environmental issues, peace and conflict resolution). As a consequence,
political science by the 1990s, like psychology and sociology, encour-
aged a plurality of perspectives and concerns that now include the
postmodern deconstruction of the discipline's taken-for-granted core
concepts such as power or the nation-state.

At first blush, it would seem that postmodernism, while influential
in literary circles in the Philippines, has not affected Philippine social
science as significantly as in the West. In a country where relevance to
concrete social conditions has been a significant criterion for concep-
tualizing social science issues and problems, one can logically assume
that understanding the origins, context and elements of social phenom-
ena in order to address policy questions or specify practical solutions
is a major concern. As such, the task of the social sciences is to arbi-
trate between diametrically opposed views on the basis of rules of
evidence. This task requires simplifying complex issues for approxi-
mate and tightly argued answers that are privileged over others.
Against this frame, the postmodernists' affirmation of multiple reali-
ties and acceptance of divergent interpretations as having equal foot-
ing, without distinguishing the interesting and the plausible from the
ridiculous and the absurd, would not seem to have a receptive audi-
ence among Filipino social scientists.[28]

But upon closer examination, postmodern influences are recogniz-
able in Philippine social science, with the exception of economics. In
the first place, strains of postmodernism as a category used to encom-
pass a wide range of perspectives "that reject epistemological assump-
tions, refute methodological conventions, resist knowledge claims,
obscure all versions of truth and dismiss policy recommendations" is
not new to the social sciences (Rosenau 1992, 3). Alternative philoso-
phies and schools of thought that influenced the disciplines as early as
the late 1960s such as existentialism and phenomenology reflect ele-
ments of postmodernism. But granting postmodernism the status of a
'new and different cultural movement that is coalescing in a broad-
gauged reconceptualization' of what is experienced and explained, its
influence on the social sciences is apparent, albeit less prominent than
in the West. Take, for instance, the case of anthropology (5).

Unlike sociology, psychology and political science, which experi-
enced polemical exchanges among opposing schools of thought in the
1970s, anthropology had been more tolerant of the diverse perspectives

of its adherents even in the decade of contention. The collective angst of anthropologists at the time united them in a bigger cause, strengthening their acceptance of plurality within their ranks. After soulsearching for almost a decade, Philippine anthropology emerged with a redefinition of the discipline, from one aimed at writing a master narrative of the distant "other" that has served the interests of social control to a dialogue between the ethnographer and the subject. To put it in Abaya's words, the "other is almost but not our selves and much more besides their othered identities."

Whether anthropologists label their work as postmodern or not, the discipline's determined efforts to shift out of privileging the ethnographer as author have made its practitioners even more sensitive to the voices of indigenous peoples who are now "speaking in their own tongues in tones unheard of before." Abaya articulates the implications of this shift for the discipline.

> It is about time we spoke with them (the "others") as colleagues and fellow makers of culture and gather a rich harvest of mutual learning, of shared but not common speech, of a rhetoric contingent on difference and differential politics (Abaya 1999, 9 parenthesis mine).

The result of dialoguing with the 'others' of anthropology is the democratization of knowledge among indigenous peoples and the larger society. Bennagen expresses this desired outcome succinctly in words resonant of the postmodern spirit.

> It seems to me that all the "Others" of the social sciences are claiming authorship of knowledge production. It is probably more evident in anthropology because of the sharper and multiple differences between academic anthropologists and their traditional subject matter—peasants, workers, urban poor, women, youth and children, etc., which are social sciences' traditional subjects. *Kami ang higit na nakakaalam sa aming kalagayan at problema* is becoming more insistent than ever. If the aim of the social sciences is both to understand and transform the world then the claim of the others for self understanding and self transformation sends to academics a signal for them to rethink their adaptive strategies to help ensure their survival.[29]

Anthropology's redefinition of ethnography makes it easy to understand why anthropologists have problematized the rules of the researchers' engagement in the field or why participatory research has

become more significant to the discipline. The development discourse of the 1980s and postmodern influences opened up anthropology to participatory modes of research.

In hindsight, the discourses of the 1980s facilitated the convergence of methodologies in the other social sciences. The resulting plurality of perspectives and the integrative discourses of the last twenty years have tempered the polemics between positivist social science with its penchant for generalizations and quantification and the interpretive and phenomenological traditions that underscore the significance of language and meaning in social constructions. Thus, the convergence of perspectives was paralleled by an eclecticism of methods. Proof of this is the way sociology and psychology, the most positivistic of the social science disciplines in the Philippines, have allowed for a combination of quantitative and qualitative analytical techniques in formulating arguments. Triangulation of data has been accepted, if not tolerated, by the staunchest positivists in the two disciplines.[30] On the other hand, the more qualitative social sciences have been more open to quantification. Political science has exposed its students more and more to survey research while anthropology has begun to appreciate the usefulness of quantification for summarizing context variables in the sites of ethnographic studies.

Inspired by postmodern perspectives, feminist research methodologies for exploring subjectivities have widened the range of methods available to social scientists. More than the previous decades, the 1990s witnessed the full development and acceptance of qualitative social science methodologies. Unfortunately, this has not been accompanied by significant developments in quantitative social science. Unlike economics, which has kept up with the analytical tools of the discipline, sociology and psychology have not incorporated mathematical developments in their fields with as much commitment as the economists. In fine, the plurality of methods favored the growth of qualitative versus quantitative social science, eroding the significance of positivism in the social sciences as a philosophy of science and methodological orientation.

The convergence of methods and perspectives in the 1990s was enhanced by the increase in opportunities for multidisciplinary research. Such research has been particularly fruitful among political scientists, sociologists, anthropologists and psychologists. Although economists have broadened the scope of their concerns to include issues such as those in governance, the dominance of the neoclassical

paradigm and insignificance of institutional economics in the Philippines constrain the collaboration between economists and other social scientists. With the exception of surveys and opinion polls, potential multidisciplinary research involving economists and political scientists, for instance, would rest on the latter's acceptance and understanding of game theory. The same is true for sociology. Successful collaborations between sociologists and economists in other parts of the world have utilized frameworks consistent with neoclassical formulations and mathematical modeling procedures.

The perceived difficulty of collaborating with economists who have a unified methodology led Bello to advocate the establishment of a department of "critical economics." He conceives the proposed department as less deferential toward the market "less methodologically obsessed" and more attuned to the dirty complexity of reality that "is slipping through the filters" of economists (Bello 1997, 63). The department Bello envisions would convene social scientists engaged in political economic research along an alternative development agenda. In many ways, it is reminiscent of the original motivations behind the establishment of the Third World Studies Center.

Bello's critique of neoclassical economists and implicit judgment of their capacity to collaborate fruitfully with other social scientists in political economic research overlooked an important dimension of multidisciplinary work. Given the diversity of theoretical and methodological positions within and across social science disciplines, multidisciplinary research will thrive when like-minded social scientists are given the chance to work together. The minimum requirement for a multidisciplinary research to succeed is acceptance of negotiated research frameworks, methodologies and ideological positions. It may be difficult to expect neoclassical economists to work with critical social scientists but it is possible to imagine them working along with other social scientists who share their domain assumptions regarding the area and methodology of the study. Similarly, it is easy to imagine individual economists who accept the premises of other social scientists regarding politics and economics, working closely with them on critical research. Crossfertilization of ideas and openness to the perspectives and methods of colleagues from other disciplines are more likely to occur when collegial groups of scholars work together within a common framework.

With an increasing number of social scientists conducting collaborative research, the areas of overlapping concerns will expand and ben-

efit from the synergy of social scientists coming from different disciplines. These areas would include governance and politics; environment and health; culture, language, ethnicity and identity; poverty research; and urban studies, to name a few areas. As new multidisciplinary areas are created, the traditional social science disciplines in the Philippines will reinvent themselves by redefining their problematique and lenses for viewing social phenomena.

Social Science Discourse/Practice and Public Policy

The polarization of perspectives and methodologies in the late 1960s and 1970s and their convergence in the succeeding decades have their parallels in social science practice. The partisan discussions among social scientists on the issue of working with government during Martial Law was eventually replaced by an openness to critically collaborate with policymakers after the restoration of formal institutions of constitutional democracy in 1986. At the height of authoritarian rule, social scientists exchanged polemical barbs. Those who worked with the Marcos administration were accused of legitimizing its dictatorial designs and the crony capitalism it fostered. On the other hand, those critical of colleagues who worked with government were charged with hiding in their ivory tower, unmindful of pressing societal problems.

The regime change in 1986 blurred the great divide. The democratic space created by the change justified the involvement in policy research and advocacy of those who once opposed interfacing with the Marcos government. Since many of the critical social scientists of the 1970s worked closely with sectoral groups and non-government organizations (NGOs) in the movement against the Marcos regime, they pushed for the participation of these groups in governance and linked up with them. The subsequent collaboration of academic social scientists and social science-educated development workers in NGOs augured well for the articulation of development discourses and successful advocacy of particular positions on salient issues.

The social science discourses that filtered into the language of policy and the vocabulary of media after 1986 e.g., neoliberal political economy, democratization, devolution, participatory and sustainable development paradigms, antedated the regime change. They emerged in the international literature in the 1970s and the early 1980s and were refined in the practices and struggles of various movements and

organizations. The Philippine social science community opened up to these discourses after 1983 in the course of addressing the succession of political and economic crises in the aftermath of the assassination of Senator Benigno Aquino. But the vacuum created by the dramatic transition to a new government in 1986 was what facilitated the articulation of some of these discourses in the state's policy framework. For instance, it accounts for the success of the country's economists in integrating and institutionalizing the neoliberal framework of privatization, liberalization and deregulation into the policies of the Aquino administration. The framework has since guided the Ramos and Estrada governments.

While some elements of the social science community celebrated the influence of their colleagues in economic policy, they also cautioned against government obsession with economic growth to the detriment of human development goals. Forming international and national networks, they successfully advocated for the articulation of poverty alleviation and human development targets in the state's Medium-Term Development Plans and the incorporation of theoretically or empirically-based inputs into approaches and action plans in different levels of government such as the Integrated Approach to Local Development Management (IALDM) and the Philippine Plan of Action for Children (PPAC) (see Briones 1998; De Dios 1998).

Social scientists also contributed significantly to the shaping of policy and programs on the environment, health and women. Working closely with non-government organizations and government agencies, they played a part in crafting the current policy thrust and program on social forestry through research inputs on the upland population (see de los Angeles 1998). Social scientists studying the environment also pushed for the reform of the country's resource information system.

In health, significant improvements in program monitoring and implementation are attributed to research and advocacy networks involving academics, NGO workers and medical professionals at the Department of Health. In particular, the success of women's groups in pushing for the institution of specific reproductive health programs attests to the synergy of social scientists, NGO advocates in the women's movement and government agencies. On a broader plane, such synergy accounted for the significant gains of the women sector in the legislation of its concerns and their incorporation into government programs.[31]

The manifestations of the social scientists' influence on policy and program formulation in various areas of national life noted above constitute a small sample of contributions that deserves a separate assessment. Nevertheless, this discussion would be remiss if it does not mention some of the direct and indirect inputs of social scientists to democratic governance and the shaping of public discourse in recent years.

In response to the need for monitoring government efforts to address social concerns like poverty and education, social scientists have developed and refined indicators of human development (HDIs) and minimum basic needs (MBN) through networks of social science advocates in academe, key government institutions, NGOs and the private sector (see de Dios 1998). The indicators have since been used to sensitize local government officials to human development issues. Since 1997, provinces have been ranked along the HDIs. Those with the highest ranks or the greatest change through the years have been properly recognized to encourage local officials to attend to issues beyond economics. Apart from the HDIs, the monitoring of minimum basic needs in selected municipalities has raised the local population's awareness of their conditions along specific indicators and the services they can demand of their officials. All told, the use of both the HDIs and the MBN indices is intended to impact on the expectations of the citizenry at the local level, and hopefully, on the future terms of electoral politics in the country.

While human development indicators are familiar to provincial officials and to officials and citizens of selected municipalities, the public at large remains unaware of them. This is not the case, however, for well-publicized surveys and opinion polls particularly on national political leaders and the public's perception of their performance. Miranda's account of the role of surveys in political debates is particularly instructive.[32]

> On publicly-acknowledged high saliency and/or great urgency issues, some social scientists are currently able to influence the course of public policy by directly communicating survey findings to the highest authorities in briefings regularly provided the President and his Cabinet both chambers of Congress and other major government agencies. Post-Marcos political administrations have become sensitive to public opinion and popular sentiments particularly as these readily reach and are magnified by an exuberant media. By way of an illustration, in October 1995, President Ramos no less responded energetically to the rice

crisis when survey findings indubitably showed that Filipinos were holding him directly responsible for the rice shortage..Other government officials now cite public opinion surveys in many instances, from justifying their proposed agency budgets in Congressional hearings to defending specific agency programs and even, at times, taking media to task for the latter's alleged disinformation and sensationalism..Arguably the greatest impact of survey research or more specifically public opinion surveys is registered in the choice of public officials through the electoral process. Less than 15 years ago, it was possible to assess electoral contests and their probable results without once using the word "survey." Since 1992, "public opinion polls," and "surveys" have become part of the standard vocabulary of anyone who would presume to analyze national elections in this country (Miranda 1998, 1–5).

The controversies generated by the results of electoral surveys further heightened public awareness of social issues and social science methodologies, e.g., the survey methodology. Social scientists, who write columns in daily newspapers or host television shows, have contributed to this awareness by clarifying the issues involved. The occasional differences in views and perspectives of social scientists-cum-columnists or television commentators highlight the heterogeneous character of the social science community.

The fundamental differences and divisions within this community make it difficult to generalize about the impact of the social sciences on public policy and discourses. For the gains from one theoretical and ideological perspective constitute negative effects for contending positions. Social scientists critical of globalization, for instance, have assailed government policies that derive from the neoliberal paradigm the economists in the country worked hard to integrate into existing policy frameworks. While proponents of these opposing perspectives have not clashed within academic circles in the years of convergence and pluralism, recent public statements printed or aired in media have been quite intense. Whether they will translate into vigorous social science debates on development discourses reminiscent of the decades of polarization remains to be seen. The outcome would depend upon the economic and political struggles among contending forces that embody divergent global, national and local interests. After all, the practices of social scientists in the last three decades that have defined the development of Philippine social science as a whole have been shaped by the contingent affinity of historical forces and intellectual influences.

Notes

1. For an overview of the history and state of the social sciences in the early 1980s see Caoili (1984). For assessments of teaching, research, extension, research dissemination and use until the 1980s see pages 86-215 of Samson and Jimenez (1983). For an assessment of the social sciences in the University of the Philippines, see Castillo (1994). For the most recent reflections by different social scientists on their respective disciplines, see the papers in this volume.

2. History is the sixth discipline. Since its discourse merits a separate discussion, it is excluded from the coverage of this paper. At its establishment in 1963, the Philippine Social Science Council recognized 13 social science disciplines namely, history, anthropology, economics, political science, psychology, sociology, demography, linguistics, statistics, geography, mass communication, public administration and social work.

The disciplines break naturally into three groups: the first six are the traditional core disciplines; the next four are to some extent peripheral disciplines that may have grown out of the core disciplines or that straddle the boundaries between the social and physical sciences; the last three are largely applied areas (Bulatao et al. 1979, 62).

3. The summative description glosses over important developments with less visible but probably more profound impact on each of the disciplines. This is one of the major limitations of the paper.

4. Ateneo de Manila University, de la Salle University and the University of the Philippines.

5. Abad (1981, 132) citing Macaraeg who in turn was cited in Hunt and others. *Sociology in the Philippine Setting*. Manila: Alemars Publishing House and Catapusan, Benicio. Development of sociology in the Philippines,' *Philippine Sociological Review*, 3-4 (July-October) 53–57.

6. Anthropology was introduced in the Philippines even before the creation of an academic department at the University of the Philippines. By 1901, the colonial government had already established the Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes to explore the origins and characteristics of the people of the Philippines for purposes of colonial control.

7. See Tan (this volume) for a chronology of the development of psychology in other schools; Agpalo (1996 and 1998) for political science; Panopio, Isabel. 1996 for an indication of the development of sociology in schools outside UP and Metro Manila; Abaya (this volume) for anthropology and de Dios (this volume) for economics.

8. In his discussion of the history of political science, Agpalo (1996) noted the prevalence of the view established by George Malcolm and Maximo Kalaw that the discipline's central concern is the state and its principal organ. Agpalo counterpoised an alternative view in 1965, one that adopted a sociological approach.

9. Panopio (1996) noted that in the mid-1950s, the topics of the Philippine Sociological Society centered on the nature and scope of sociology. Some of the

professors of sociology at the time clearly possessed a more social philosophical orientation.

10. See Sicat, 1982 and de Dios, 1999 for a discussion of the evolution of the Philippine Economic Society from the Philippine Economic Association initially composed of Amado Castro, Benito Legarda Jr., Quirico Camus Jr., Jose Fernandez Jr., Armand Fabella. Later the group expanded to include Joachim Ahrensdorf, Thomas McHale, Sixto Roxas, Fr. Michael Mc Phelin, Oscar Lopez, Felix de la Costa, Onofre Corpus and Juan Ponce Enrile.

11. From the transcripts of the Forum held on January 30 at the Philippine Social Science Center. The forum was part of the Fourth National Social Science Congress (pre-Congress 1).

12. Other journals that emerged in the next decade served as additional outlets for social scientists. For instance, economics is served by the *Philippine Review of Economics and Business* and the *Journal of Philippine Development* (formerly *NEDA Journal of Development*). It should be noted that the regularity of the issues became a problem in later decades.

13. Machado, Kit. 'Philippine politics: research 1960–1980: areas for future exploration.' In Hart, Donn (ed). Philippine Studies, Political Science, Economics and Linguistics'. Occasional paper No. 8 (de Kalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University center for Southeast Asian Studies, 1981) as cited in Caoili (1984, 70).

14. Nemenzo's remarks in the third national conference of the Philippine Political Science Association in 1977 as cited by Agpalo (1996) p. 396.

15. The humanist notion of critique called for a negation of existing structures and forms of consciousness that prevent the full development of the human potential. Asserting an epistemological break between the young Marx who espoused a humanist project and the older Marx who developed a science of history, structuralist Marxists advocated a notion of critique as unraveling the system of determination that accounts for what exists.

16. See, for instance, the Third World Studies Center's *Marxism in the Philippines* (1984).

17. The influence of Marxism on political science may not have been as strong in other parts of the country. Considering the lag and background of political science teachers in the region (many are lawyers) Machado's observation that textbooks on Philippine government and politics prior to 1972 remained basically descriptive, utilizing a historical and legal approach, may have applied even in the post-1972 period. op cit. as cited in Caoili (1984, 70).

18. The public intellectuals included Francisco Nemenzo, Randolf David, Alexander Magno and Temario Rivera. Note that the influence of Marxism in sociology was less apparent in the publications of the period. Marxist articles did not figure significantly in the issues of the *Philippine Sociological Review*. Nevertheless, David's Marxist-inspired critique of sociology and advocacy of the dependency model of development fomented discussions and drew a following among younger sociologists.

19. It is important to note that while the public intellectuals from among the University of the Philippines' Faculty of Political Science and Sociology were quite influential in mainstreaming Marxism into their disciplines, Marxists did not dominate either the Departments of Political Science or Sociology. Majority of the faculty was non-Marxists.

20. Funded by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the US Army, Project Camelot was designed to develop a general social science model that would make it possible to politically influence social change in developing nations. Some of the researchers involved in the Project did not fully appreciate the political implications of their efforts to study the potential sources of political dissidence in particular countries. It is alleged that information from Project Camelot was utilized to bolster the military dictatorship in Chile, generating strong reactions from the social science communities of Latin America and other regions. The controversy led to the premature termination of the Project. See Horowitz, Irving Louis. *The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot. Studies in the Relationship Between Social Science and Practical Politics* (1967).

21. The Tasaday controversy revolved around the authenticity of a tribe of primeval cave dwellers supposedly discovered by Manuel Elizalde. The 'ecological find' turned out to be a hoax.

22. Alonzo and Canlas (1981, 55). The authors, however, noted Jurado's paper on the political economy of labor-capital relations as an exception.

23. See for instance, the research in the Third World Studies Center on foreign investments and multinational corporations in the export crop sector.

24. Kumar, Khrishna, 'Indigenization and transnational cooperation in the social sciences'. Paper presented at the conference on Emerging Issues in Cultural Relations. Honolulu 9-10 December 1976 pp. 1-26 as cited in Bennagen (1990, 8).

25. Bennagen (1990, 4) cites Taylor's *Primitive Cultures* (1881) and Diamond's 'A revolutionary discipline' *Current Anthropology*. 5(5):432-37 as the seminal works for the soul-searching among Western anthropologists.

26. The applications of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* have been in clinical work and business.

27. This situation is beginning to change. With globalization and the University's bid for competitiveness, there is increasing pressure on the social science community to communicate with colleagues abroad and meet international standards.

28. For an enlightening discussion of the issues of postmodernism in the social sciences, see Rosenau (1992).

29. Bennagen, Ponciano as expressed in a personal communication to Abaya in Abaya (1999, 10).

30. In the triangulation approach, everything is material for constructing the ultimate reality from various perspectives and arrangements of time (Lagmay 1985, 189).

31. The gains of women's research and advocacy networks in public policy are chronicled in the documents of the University of the Philippines Center for Women Studies.

32. The Social Weather Stations Inc. pioneered in opinion polling and has been able to sustain a survey research capability for quarterly surveys (Miranda 1998).

References

Abad, Ricardo and Elizabeth Eviota. 1981. Philippine sociology in the 1970s: Spinning out of the colonial cocoon. In *Social science research activities in the Philippines,* edited by L. Sicat et al. Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies.

Abaya, Eufracio, Maria Luisa Lucas-Fernan and Daisy Noval-Morales. 1999. Changing terms of engagement: A review of the history of anthropology in the Philippines. In *The social sciences in the life of the nation*, vol. 1, edited by J. Miralao. Quezon City: National Academy of the Philippines and the Philippine Social Science Council.

Agpalo, Remigio. 1999. Political science in the Philippines, 1880 to 1998: A history of the discipline for the centenary of the First Philippine Republic. In *The social sciences in the life of the nation*, vol. 1, edited by J. Miralao. Quezon City: National Academy of the Philippines and the Philippine Social Science Council.

———. 1996. *Adventures in political science*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Alonzo, Ruperto and Dante Canlas. 1981. A survey of economic research in the Philippines: 1970–1979. In *Social science research activities in the Philippines*, edited by L. Sicat et al. Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies.

Banzon Bautista, Maria Cynthia Rose. 1996. Lessons from history. In *Empowerment and accountability for sustainable development: Toward theory building in the social sciences*. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

_____. 1995. The Philippines: Reflections on the development of social science." In *Social science in Southeast Asia: From particularism to universalism*, edited by N. S. Nordholt and L. Visser. Comparative Asian Studies 17. Amsterdam: VU University Press.

_____. 1994 . Reflections on Philippine sociology in the 1990s. *Journal of Philippine Development* 38 (1–2).

Bautista, Victoria. 1998. Pag-uugnay ng adbokasya ng palisi sa gawain ng siyentipikong panlipunan: Isang pagninilay. Paper presented at the National Social Science Congress IV's Pre-Congress III on Philippine Social Sciences and Public Policy and Practice, 22–23 May, Philippine Social Science Center.

Bello, Walden. 1997. Thoughts on the response of Philippine education to globalization. In *Globalisasyon, nasyonalismo at edukasyon*. Proceedings of the 1997 Faculty Conference, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy. Puerto Azul, Cavite, 14–15 November.

Bauzon, Leslie. 1982. Perspectives in contemporary Philippine Social Science research: History, political science, public administration and geography. In *PSSC Social Science Information* (October-December).

Bennagen, Ponciano. 1990. The indigenization and Asianization of anthropology. In *Indigenous psychology*, edited by V. Enriquez. Quezon City: Akademya ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino.

Bernardo, Allan. 1998. Reflective practitioners, scholarly teachers and socially responsible researchers: On mindful growth and becoming in Philippine psychology. Paper presented at National Social Science Congress IV's Pre-Congress I on The History and Development of Social Science Disciplines in the Philippines, 29–30 January, Philippine Social Science Center.

————. 1997. Psychology Research in the Philippines: Observations and Prospects. *Philippine Journal of Psychology* 30: 38–57.

————. Brillantes, Alex. 1998. Local governance and social science discourses in Philippine politics and governance. Paper presented at the National Social Science Congress IV's pre-Congress III on Philippine Social Sciences and Public Policy and Practice, 22–23 May, Philippine Social Science Center.

Briones, Leonor. 1998. Human development policy and the social sciences. Paper presented at the National Social Science Congress IV's Pre-Congress III on Philippine Social Sciences and Public Policy and Practice, May 22–23, Philippine Social Science Center.

Bulatao, Rodolfo, Abraham Felipe, Andrew Gonzales, FSC, Consuelo Gutierrez, Mariano Obias, Bonifacio Salamanca and Zelda Zablan. 1979. A Profile of Philippine social scientists. First Southeast Asian Workshop of Social Scientists. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

Caoili, Olivia. 1983. The social sciences in the Philippines: A retrospective view. In *First national social science congress: Toward excellence in social science in the Philippines*, edited by L. Samson and C. Jimenez. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Cariño, Ledivina. 1980. Research under martial law: The tasks and responsibilities of Filipino social scientists. *Philippine Sociological Review* 28.

Castillo, Gelia. 1994. The social sciences in the UP System: A commentary on mission, vision, goals and objectives. In *UP in search of academic excellence*, by Gemino Abad et al. Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies, College of Public Administration and the University of the Philippines Press.

————. 1974. The dialogue between social science research, policy and action. In *PSSC Social Science Information*. August.

Covar, Prospero. 1993. Kaalamang bayang dalumat ng pagkataong Pilipino (lekturang propesoryal). Dr. Jose Cuyegkeng Memorial Library and Information Center, Manila.

David, Randolf. 1984. Philippine sociology in search of an alternative paradigm: Trends in Philippine sociology. Diamond Jubilee Lecture Series. Department of Sociology, University of the Philippines.

————. 1979. The social sciences in the Philippines: A critique. Paper presented at the seminar on the Philippines and the Third World, University of the Philippines.

De Dios, Emmanuel. 1998. From Sanciano to Encarnacion: Footnotes to a genealogy of economics in the Philippines. In *The social sciences in the life of the nation*, vol. 1, edited by J. Miralao. Quezon City: National Academy of the Philippines and the Philippine Social Science Council.

————. 1998. The human development network: Policy research and advocacy in a lateral mode. Paper presented at the National Social Science Congress

IV's Pre-Congress III on Philippine Social Sciences and Public Policy and Practice, 22–23 May, Philippine Social Science Center.

De los Angeles, Marian. 1998. Philippine environment and natural resources management: Perspectives from environmental economics. Paper presented at the National Social Science Congress IV's Pre-Congress III on Philippine Social Sciences and Public Policy and Practice, 22–23 May, Philippine Social Science Center.

Enriquez, Virgilio. 1990. Toward a liberation psychology. In *Indigenous psychology*, edited by V. Enriquez. Quezon City: Akademya ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino.

————. 1985. The development of psychological thought in the Philippines. In *Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Isyu, pananaw at kaalaman*. Manila: National Bookstore.

Ferrer, Ricardo. 1970. *An introduction to economics as a social science*. Quezon City: Malaya Books.

Gonzales, Andrew, FSC. 1996. The future of the social sciences in the Philippines. In *PSSC Social Science Information*. July-December.

————. 1990. Indigenization of the social sciences: A red herring? In *Indigenous psychology*. Quezon City: Akademya ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino.

Hollnsteiner, Mary Racelis. 1973. The state of the social sciences. *Philippine Social Science Information* 1 (1).

Javier, Emil. 1998. Science and technology policy and the social sciences. Paper presented at the National Social Science Congress IV's Pre-Congress III on Philippine Social Sciences and Public Policy and Practice, 22–23 May, Philippine Social Science Center.

Lagmay, Alfredo. 1985. Western psychology in the Philippines: Impact and response. In *Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Isyu, pananaw at kaalaman*, by A. Aganon at A. David, RVM. Manila: National Bookstore.

Lamberte, Exaltacion. 1998. Issues in monitoring life beyond economics: Implications for the practice of social science in Public Policy. Paper presented at the National Social Science Congress IV's Pre-Congress III on Philippine Social Sciences and Public Policy and Practice, 22–23 May, Philippine Social Science Center.

Lamug, Corazon. 1999. Toward a Filipino sociological imagination. In *The social sciences in the life of the nation*, vol. 1, edited by J. Miralao. Quezon City: National Academy of the Philippines and the Philippine Social Science Council.

Makil, Perla and Chester Hunt. 1981. The impact of martial law on sociologists in the Philippines. *PSSC Social Science Information*. January-March.

Mangahas, Mahar. 1982. Perspectives in contemporary Philippine Social Science Research: Economics, demography, social work and statistics. *PSSC Social Science Information* (October-December).

Mercado, Cesar. 1982. Perspectives in contemporary Philippine Social Science research: Anthropology, linguistics, mass communications, psychology and sociology. *PSSC Social Science Information* (October-December).

Miranda, Felipe. 1998. Democratizing methodologies in the social sciences: Survey research in the contemporary Philippine context. Paper presented at the National Social Science Congress IV's Pre-Congress III on Philippine Social Sciences and Public Policy and Practice, 22–23 May, Philippine Social Science Center.

_____. 1998. Summary thoughts on social science discourse and public policy. Paper presented at the National Social Science Congress IV's Pre-Congress III on Philippine Social Sciences and Public Policy and Practice, 22–23 May, Philippine Social Science Center.

Panopio, Isabel. 1996. The history of the Philippine sociological society. Unpublished.

Pertierra, Raul. 1997. *Explorations in social theory and Philippine ethnography*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Porio, Emma. 1998. Participatory/people-centered development: A social science discourse in Philippine politics and governance. Paper presented at the National Social Science Congress IV's Pre-Congress III on Philippine Social Sciences and Public Policy and Practice, 22–23 May, Philippine Social Science Center.

Racelis, Mary. 1989. Lessons from history. *Empowerment and accountability for sustainable development: Toward theory building in the social sciences*. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

Rocamora, Jose Eliseo. 1998. Political Discourse in post-Marcos Philippines. Paper presented at the National Social Science Congress IV's pre-Congress III on Philippine Social Sciences and Public Policy and Practice, 22–23 May, Philippine Social Science Center.

Rosenau, Pauline Marie. 1992. *Post-modernism and the social sciences*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Samson, Laura and Carmen Jimenez, eds. 1983. *First national social science congress: Toward excellence in social science in the Philippines*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Sicat, Gerardo. 1982. The early years of the Philippine economic society. *Philippine Economic Journal* no. 51 21(5).

Sicat, Loretta. 1981. An overview of the social science research activities in the Philippines. In *Social science research activities in the Philippines*, edited by L. Sicat et al., Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economics.

Sta. Maria, Madelene. 1996. Is the indigenization crisis in the social sciences resolved in sikolohiyang Pilipino? *Layag* 1(1).

Tan, Allen. 1999. Philippine psychology: Growth and becoming. In *The social sciences in the life of the nation*, vol. 1., edited by J. Miralao. Quezon City: National Academy of the Philippines and the Philippine Social Science Council.

_____, Ruperto Alonzo and Alex Brillantes. 1989. *Social science and economic recovery*: Papers and proceedings of the national social congress II, 24–26, November 1988. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

Torres, Amaryllis. 1997. Methods, mind or meaning: Shifting paradigms in Philippine psychology. *Philippine Journal of Psychology* 30: 17–37.

Torres, Amaryllis. 1989. Environment, society and development: Philippine report on social science perspectives and sustainable development. In *Empowerment and accountability for sustainable development: Toward theory building in the social sciences.* Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

Third World Studies Center. 1983. *Marxism in the Philippines.* Quezon City: Third World Studies Center, University of the Philippines.

Villacorta, Wilfrido. 1990. Western influences on social science in the Philippines. In *Indigenous psychology*, by V. Enriquez. Quezon City: Akademya ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino.

————. 1981. Survey of studies on Philippine politics: 1970-1980. In *Social science research activities in the Philippines,* edited by L. Sicat et al. Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies.