



Going back to that fateful November at UP, I listened with disbelief as the Department Chair pointed out that my interest in anthropology was misguided. "There is no future in anthropology in this country!" he snapped. Later I realized he was reacting to my expressed interest in cultural anthropology in a department heavily committed to physical anthropology, archaeology, and folklore. 'Go to sociology', he added.

MARY RACELIS

DIVERGING AND INTERSECTING, 1956-1986: A SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Reminiscing on one's early years at UP offers fond memories of the many enjoyable parts of that journey while conveniently ignoring the stresses and strains of graduate student life. This invitation asks me to recall the late 1950s, '60s, and '70s as the years of my participation in the evolution of anthropology and sociology at UP.

My story begins with an eager visit to the Department of Anthropology in November 1956 to register for Masters Studies. As an under-graduate major in sociology and anthropology in Cornell University, New York, I had been immediately captured by anthropology. Its focus on people at grassroots levels and its fascinating accounts of diverse cultures spanning the world convinced me that this

was my field. While sociology was interesting, Cornell's sociologists understandably focused on industrial societies, the United States in particular. For me, that was a turn-off because I planned to return to the Philippines, which was hardly an industrialized society then or now. Cornell, then, initially nurtured my love for anthropology as my professional future while developing my early resistance to sociology.

Going back to that fateful November at UP, I listened with disbelief as the Department Chair pointed out that my interest in anthropology was misguided. "There is no future in anthropology in this country!" he snapped. Later I realized he was reacting to my expressed interest in cultural anthropology in a department heavily committed to physical anthropology, archaeology, and folklore. "Go to sociology", he added.

"No!" I thought to myself, "not sociology!" and promptly enrolled for a Masters in political Science.

Alas, political science in 1956 proved disappointing. People seemed nowhere to be found in its emphasis on policy manipulations and high-level governance at national and international levels. At best, people were visualized as an indistinguishable blur of "citizens" somewhere in the distant periphery. The only saving grace was Professor Rex Drilon's stimulating course in Political Philosophy.

Toward the end of the first semester, I realized that the best choice after all was sociology. By then, I also knew more about the courses taught there, had met some of the faculty and realized that the Department of Sociology and Social Welfare was indeed grounded in Philippine realities. Although one studied industrial society, it appeared mainly in a global framework affecting non-industrial societies like the Philippines. So, shift!

In the first semester of the following academic year, my two sociology classes were balanced off by a six-unit cultural anthropology course offered by visiting Fulbright Professor Dr. Donn V. Hart. Every Sunday, our class of seven, among them Paula Carolina Malay from Geography, Prospero Covar and Mario D. Zamora from Anthropology, and I journeyed to Tawiran, a fishing village in Obando, Bulacan. Paula had grown up in Obando, so convinced Dr. Hart that it had the characteristics he was seeking for our field site.

There we learned how to do fieldwork—participant observation, interviewing, recording, classifying and analyzing data utilizing the Human Relations Area Files, and getting secondary information. Hart, himself, had done rural research in Caticugan, Samar, moving away from the traditional focus of anthropologists in indigenous people.

From the beginning, therefore, I straddled both sociology and anthropology with a close link to political science. When it came time for my thesis, I continued to do fieldwork in Obando supported by a grant from the recently established UP Community Development Research Council (CDRC). The CDRC grants were a boon to young UP social scientists serious about doing research. The resulting thesis entitled "The Dynamics of Power in a Philippine Municipality," adopted the still unfamiliar and suspect approach of applied anthropology in a community development framework. Graduation and the MA in Sociology came in March 1960.

Among those sitting with me awaiting the grant decisions of the CDRC were young political scientists and public administration students Jose P. Abueva and Buenaventura Villanueva. They represented the new breed of young Filipino academics in the 1960s and 1970s returning to the Philippines with a PhD or MA from abroad. In anthro there was E. Arsenio Manuel and F. Landa Jocano back from the University of Chicago. Sociologist Ruben Santos Cuyugan, my thesis adviser, returned from Harvard University along with Randolph David and Karina Constantino David from England. They joined sociology department stalwarts

Belen Tan Gatue Medina and Ofelia Regala Angangco.

Scattered across the UP landscape were sociologists Leodivina V. Cariño in Public Administration, Gelia T. Castillo at UP Los Baños, Mercedes B. Concepcion at the Population Institute, and Sylvia H. Guerrero in Social Work and Community Development. Gloria D. Feliciano, who started the College of Mass Communications, was close kin. So too in the College of Music was ethnomusicologist Jose M. Maceda recording the songs and music of indigenous people. American visiting professors continued to bolster course offerings—in sociology Richard W. Coller, Elsie Hargreaves, Chester L. Hunt, and Paul Oren; in applied anthropology, was Milton L. Barnett, among others.

Let us now focus on the 1960s and the 1970s as significant decades in the development of our two disciplines. Since I had kept one foot in sociology and the other in anthropology throughout my UP studies, my story can bring out pivotal points about divergences and intersections.

THE YEARS OF EXPANSION: FROM UP DOMINANCE TO INCLUSIVITY

In the 1960s several colleges and universities were teaching sociology but less often anthropology. Their collective research efforts, however, were limited compared to UP's record. Up to 1960, UP dominated as *the* research university. Pivotal turning points were emerging, however, as more and more colleges and universities over the next two decades were setting up research institutes and majors in sociology.

A clear research challenger from 1960 onward was the Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC), Ateneo de Manila, not yet University then. Fr. Frank Lynch, S.J., having just returned with a PhD in anthropology from the University of Chicago founded both the Ateneo's Department of Sociology and Anthropology and the IPC. The latter would seek: "a better understanding of

culture and society in the Philippines and other Asian countries, an improved quality of life for disadvantaged groups, and a more peaceful, just, and equitable national and global society." IPC was to carry out grounded, basic-applicable research bolstered by the strong social justice orientation of the Jesuits.

Thus, while IPC researchers gathered and analyzed data appropriate for academic publications, they were to write their research reports for public dissemination in non-technical, non-jargon form. This meant presenting practical, easily understood, evidence-based content and sound recommendations for improving people's lives. The eight major ethno-linguistic groups representing 85 percent of the Filipino population, were to be the central figures – the Bicolano, Cebuano, Ilocano, Ilonggo, Kapampangan, Pangasinan, Samar-Leyte and Tagalog. Indigenous people would not be left out though, as seen in IPC's early partnership with Notre Dame of Jolo College's Coordinated Investigation of Sulu Culture and its studies of the Tausug, Samal and Bajau initiated by anthropologist Gerard Rixhon.

Fr. Lynch and I met for the first time in the summer of 1960 at the monthly session of the Philippine Sociological Society at Padre Faura. At the time, the PSS still covered both sociologists and anthropologists as their professional association. Since I lived in Quezon City, I gave Fr. Lynch a ride back to Loyola Heights.

In the ensuing half hour trip, Fr. Lynch glowingly described his aims for anthropology and sociology in the Philippines. All that would happen through a research institute and a teaching department soon to be established. His vision proved so inspiring that at the end of the ride, I stated quite firmly, 'You should hire me!' And he did.

The rest is history. Joined also by then anthropology student Wilfredo F. Arce, the three of us soon began issuing research reports on Philippine values. Gradually young research associates and assistants joined us, eager to get a variety of studies underway. Several of today's professionals testify to being introduced to organized research through the IPC. The late Katrina Constantino David recalled with a smile that as an IPC research assistant, her first job entailed sorting survey data by inserting long needles through hundreds of punch-cards to separate them into clustered variables. Mahar Mangahas reminisces that as a young instructor at the UP Department of Economics, he did rural research for an IPC Project, *View from the Paddy: Empirical Studies of Philippine Farming and Tenancy*. When he explained his Diliman absences to his macro-economics supervisor as linked to fieldwork, the latter is reported to have exclaimed, "Fieldwork? Economists don't do fieldwork!"

IPC thus became a center for anthropologists and sociologists coming to Manila from different parts of the country and abroad. Visiting American anthropologists congregated there for many a *kwentuhan*, describing their new preference for studying peasant society. In many cases, upon their return to their universities, they identified MA or PhD scholarships for their talented IPC research assistants and interpreters to obtain degrees in sociology or anthropology in the United States.

Ateneo became famous for its Public Lecture Series in anthropology, sociology, and related social sciences at a well-attended Makati venue. The course "Understanding the Philippines" was popular as a learning opportunity for everyone from business managers and educators to missionaries and budding social scientists. Reaching out to colleges and universities all over the country to help them establish their own research institutes also formed part of Fr. Lynch's agenda. IPC organized popular summer training institutes in social science. The results often spurred their college or university presidents

to give greater attention to sociology and anthropology and allocate more funds for research.

So successful was this latter program that as the demand increased, Fr. Lynch encouraged the Philippine Social Science Council to take it over as a major program—which it did. An interdisciplinary umbrella organization founded in 1968, the PSSC contributed immensely to unifying the social science community and minimizing potential inter-academic rivalry. Its five founders illustrated this new level of integration—Eufonio Alip in history, Mercedes B. Concepcion in sociology, Armand Fabella in economics, Cristina Parel in statistics and Frank Lynch in anthropology. His contributions to the social sciences were recognized upon his death in 1978 by naming the PSSC library the Frank X. Lynch, S.J. Library.

The 1960-70s, therefore, moved anthropology and sociology into nationwide prominence. Nudged out of their comfort zones from having always been "the best," UP faculty upped their stakes in teaching, research, and outreach. The times called for sharing the limelight, however. This UP did so, usually graciously but not always when it saw itself competing against Ateneo's anthropologists and sociologists. With IPC viewed from the other end of Katipunan Road as UP's upstart competitor, periodic barbs shot from Diliman to Loyola Heights affirmed that underlying competitive stance. Yet the personal ties of friendship and collegiality largely created through common PSSC involvement, spanned the kilometer distance between UP and Ateneo. Civility welcomed by all but a few. Let me disclose that this account is told largely from the Ateneo end of Katipunan Road because that is where I was located. A UP counterpart from the Balara end might describe the situation differently.

By the late '60s, more significant tensions were arising. Looming on the horizon were the dark clouds of the Fourth Quarter Storm. On September

21, 1972, President Ferdinand Marcos signed Proclamation 1081. We were now under Martial Law.

THE YEARS OF TURMOIL AND RESISTANCE: ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY UNDER MARTIAL LAW

The Martial Law years unearth terrible memories for many of us. I need not dwell here on the colleagues, students, friends, family, and many others detained, tortured, and salvaged from 1972 to 1986. That history is well known—if repressed by those in power. Since universities were a major source of resistance, the authoritarian juggernaut crushed recalcitrant faculty, students and administration alike. Those identified as Far left, being automatically regarded as Marxist by the authorities, were subject to arrest and detention at any time. Fleeing to the mountains to join the New People's Army became their only acceptable choice. Others chose to stay, given family obligations, while struggling to remain honorably employed. Many Catholic school protests stemmed from their own activist framework, the Theology of Liberation. While its advocates verged to the Left ideologically, their political orientation fell into the framework of non-violent activist Christianity. Overall, a cloud of fear descended upon the nation.

RESIST-MANEUVER-PLACATE-RESIST!

Faculty still pursued their teaching duties but had to develop a self-protecting dual-voice system in light of the oppressive setting. Even as you were lecturing, a second voice in your head murmured, "Careful! Think about what you're saying; there might be military officers or pro-Marcos students in the class who will report you as subversive."

Sociologists and anthropologists encountered particular dilemmas. We

regularly speak or lecture on and discuss social class, social movements, patron-client relationships, community organizing as non-violent conflict-confrontation, or marginalized groups and the kinds of discrimination and injustice they experience. Would statements about rights violations, landlord exploitation or oppressive police or military officers, evidence-based though they might be, risk the label of "Communist" thrown at you?

That kind of identification in military intelligence circles brought the recurring specter of the Metrocom vehicle stopping in front of your house at 2:00 a.m. followed by a heavy-handed invasion of your bedroom before they hauled you off to detention and beyond.

That was the *tokhang* of our era. Given this oppressive atmosphere for academics, research and writing also had to be self-monitored as imperative for one's safety. Nonetheless, evidence remained our foundation stone, even as the authorities breezily dismissed it or used it against us.

Early on, social scientists in Manila faced an uncomfortable, even nerve-racking, situation. Soon after Martial Law was declared, a colleague appointed to a high position in government called together academics to lavish brunch meetings at a five-star hotel in Makati. His aim was to discuss and get agreement on how we could advance the New Society aspirations for poor Filipinos through research for social change. Not only were the bulk of us unwilling to contribute to that vision. His version of research was social engineering plain and simple—top-down planning by technocrats who claimed sole expertise in making "uneducated people" to do what they should. A former student of mine, the official urged me to: "Choose a community, Mary, any community and do whatever social experiments you want to do. We will fund that research and program." Without openly articulating our discomfort, we continued talking to pass the time.

Every two weeks or so for perhaps three months, our coterie of key social scientists dutifully but with some guilt selected our preferred goodies at the five-star breakfast buffet. That aimed at sustaining our participation while discussing how to bring about social change. Despite our distaste, we attended the meetings, unsure what the consequences might be if we didn't. At the same time, we implicitly adopted "the foot-dragging strategies of the peasant," saying just enough to get by without really producing any significant results for the convener."

Over the next two to three months, participants dropped out for one reason or another, giving explanations they hoped were credible as to why we could no longer attend. The included chronic illness, a needy parent, overwhelming academic duties, local or foreign travel—anything that looked like a valid excuse. Our New Society colleague finally gave up on us.

Our dilemma centered on how one could refuse a request which bordered on a summons from the administration but which implied serious consequences if you refused to comply.

UP professors would automatically be chosen to promote the Administration's cause, academic freedom or not. Thus, for example, they could be pressured to become Marcos' ghostwriters for his self-serving alleged authorship of *Tadhana; The History of Filipino People*. Could one refuse an order from a dictatorial government, a refusal that could cost you your job or even your life? These were the kinds of horrendous choices that many of us were forced to confront.

INSTITUTIONAL RIVALRIES IN POLITICALLY CONTENTIOUS TIMES

Stresses came from other directions as well. The Tasaday "discovery" pitted one set of anthropologists against the other. The controversy entailed an intricate weaving of anti-Marcos / Manda Elizalde orientations with what some believed was a certain degree of envy on the part of a few UP scholars. That was attributed to Elizalde's inviting only Ateneo researchers and respected foreign specialists to go to the Mindanao site and carry out research on the Tasaday. Included in the early years were Frank Lynch, Robert Fox of the National Museum, young anthropologists Carlos A. Fernandez IV, David Baradas and linguist Teodoro Llamzon. Brought in from US universities for their expertise were ethnobotanist Douglas Yen and linguist Carol Malony.

Their research results appeared in Philippine Science Social Council (PSSC) and other academic publications based on the evidence at hand. They dismissed the early sensationalized reports of a "Stone Age" people isolated from the rest of society for centuries. Because of Elizalde's drive for publicity, those Stone Age claims and his penchant for helicoptering in famous people, like actress Gina Lollobrigida and Charles Lindbergh to see the Tasaday for themselves, generated a huge controversy in the anthropology world. The unfortunate spinoff on the academic side, which roundly discredited Elizalde as a Marcos sycophant, implied if not outright accused the anthropologists and other scientists who did the early onsite studies as having either hoodwinked the world about "the Stone Age" or letting Elizalde use the Tasaday in order to boost his status worldwide.

Eventually, Elizalde's depredations led Frank Lynch, Robert Fox and the entire Ateneo team to resign from the Tasaday research program. Elizalde had violated once too often their terms for research, that were sensitive to the reactions of the Tasaday themselves.

Those were dark days for anthropology reflected in what became a serious U.P. - Ateneo clash. From the Ateneo side, it appeared blatantly unethical for fellow UP anthropologists to impugn them unjustifiably, apparently in order to hit their real targets, Manda Elizalde and Ferdinand Marcos. It took decades for the anger to return to the level of friendly competition, even collaboration.

A MOMENT OF TRUTH

It was the Trinidad Herrera case though that brought the evils of martial law right to my door-step. I knew Trining well, having been a board member of the Philippine Ecumenical Council on Community Organization (PECCO). Trining emerged early on as the leader of the Zone One Tondo Organization (ZOTO) whose creation had been supported by PECCO community organizers.

Catholic and Protestant clergy and laity including myself, were equally represented on PECCO's working Board. As martial law progressed and organizing successes proliferated, ZOTO's office was targeted for raids. Trining was arrested several times, but usually released quickly. On April 23, 1977, however, the tide turned. This time, Trining suspected, would be different—and she was right. Intelligence officers arrested, jailed, and tortured her.

This is where anthropology and social work entered in. Teresita Palacios at the UP Institute of Social Work and Community Development and I received an urgent call soon after Trining's arrest and detention from three human rights lawyers, Jose Diokno, Francisco Soc Rodrigo and Lorenzo Tañada. It was imperative that we rush to their office. Puzzled by the sudden summons, we complied and they explained. Trining Herrera, still in detention, was going to stand trial at a military tribunal for her alleged Communist activities as ZOTO leader; the three were her defense lawyers. Would each of us, they asked, be willing to write a statement showing that community organizing was not a Communist Leftist activity but a legitimate process of people's development?

We were stunned. The serious consequences for us and our families sprang immediately to mind if we were to write those pieces. Think it over, they counseled, perhaps discuss it with your families; but let us know as soon as possible. We are preparing for her trial. Tessie and I left to discuss the situation. Why us, we asked ourselves? On reflection, the answers to our question became clear. Being on the PECCO Board, we knew Trining and understood events in the Foreshore. Moreover, we were the only two academic Board members and thus had some credibility as fact-oriented social scientists professionally informed about communities. We had also previously published articles about the value of community organizing for poor people's self-help and development.

Tessie and I were terrified. Into how much danger would that put us and our families? Neither of our husbands really knew how involved we were in Tondo Foreshore organizing; we decided that this was not the time to tell them. The key issue confronting us, however, was that Trining needed us and we were the only two persons who could actually write the kinds of testimonies the lawyers wanted. The moment of truth had come. If we declined the request out of fear and thus failed to come to Trining's defense, we would never again be able to show our faces in the Tondo Foreshore. The die was cast.

We wrote our separate papers and submitted them to the human rights team. To this day I consider that statement on the validity of community organizing and mobilizing for peoples' demands and empowerment as the most important paper I have ever written. Unfortunately, the carbon copy of the document has been lost.

That very night we each hid under the bed our bags packed with a change of clothes, a towel, toothbrush and toothpaste, ready for that truck stopping outside at 2:00 a.m. Fortunately, it never came. The lawyers submitted our papers and used them in Trining's defense. A badly written

rebuttal came from an ally of the tribunal, but we were not asked to respond to it.

Tessie and I never found out whether our papers had any influence on the tribunal judges. Trining was released sometime later and that was enough for us.

The lesson for anthropologists and sociologists who try to be both researchers and friends of the people in "our" communities is that at some point, our mettle as engaged social scientists may be tested. When we are asked to defend a community being charged with subversion by outside authorities, does one flee the area when threatened? Or do we stand with it in some way, sharing the dangers they face? In reality, in such cases the people themselves will usually warn you it's time to leave because they care about your safety.

LEADERSHIP OR LIABILITY?

Martial law was harsh in other less obvious ways for social scientists. One was never sure whether you were being watched until something bad happened. Then you knew you were in fact being watched. Events abroad and in the country illustrate this.

At the 1976 International Habitat Conference in Vancouver, Canada, I gave a public presentation on informal settlers in Metro Manila and their struggles to carve out a better life or their families in the cities. Yet, they were systematically threatened by eviction and relocation to distant sites far outside the city with no employ-

ment and limited services. The talk was evidence-based and I had given many talks like it in Manila even under martial law. At the end of the session, a political scientist friend cautioned me about saying unfavorable things about government policies when abroad. There had been several staff in the audience from the National Housing Agency (NHA). I had criticized NHA policies even though I had also praised the government efforts in upgrading and nearby relocation for Zone One dwellers. The apt phrase, my colleague reminded me, was "Do not wash our dirty linen in public."

Sure enough, a month after I returned to Manila, I heard that meetings of the Tondo Foreshore Development project, on which I was a consultant, had taken place but I had not received an invitation. I then went to see General Gaudencio Tobias, the project manager. We had always gotten along well. He had even once confided to me that although he had led the Philcag non-combatant group during the Vietnam War, he was sometimes even more afraid of facing the ZOTO leaders with their latest well-articulated demands. As an engineer, he valued my social science insights in trying to comprehend the human and social situations he was facing on the Foreshore.

When I explained that I had been absent from the two previous Foreshore meetings because I had not received the notice, his reply indicated that he had heard about my Vancouver talk. I had been critical of the government housing program. When I explained that I had also said good things about the Tondo Foreshore Development Project, he warmed up a bit and said he would be sure I got the notice for the next meeting. Yet, it was clear that a friendly bond of trust had been broken. Critiquing government policies abroad when the Marcos Administration was already being heavily criticized there was not welcome and could have consequences.

Another such example emerged when the International Labour Organization (ILO) representative in the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) Bangkok visited the IPC, asking me as its Director to submit a project proposal to study agricultural wage labor. A good deal of attention had gone to land reform and farmers rights to ownership, but very little to agricultural laborers and other informal sector landless workers. We wrote up in the proposal and she submitted it pro forma to the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) for approval. To her surprise the Director-General, who was actually a friend of mine, explained to her that his office was apprehensive about IPC's doing the project. He did not explain but she wondered whether we had an unfavorable reputation in the Marcos Administration. I guessed that the IPC's strong outspoken stance on social justice and the rights of poor people to development benefits might have had a bearing on NEDA's reaction. Moreover, my outspoken commentaries on the government's eviction and relocation programs must have played a part. The research on agricultural labor never materialized.

It was then I realized I might have become a liability to the IPC, even though Fr. Lynch and the Ateneo President would surely defend my stance. As a research institute we were critical not of government per se but of government policies.

Our research was aimed at enabling government to rectify certain shortcomings for the benefit of affected marginalized people. However, some people in the Marcos Administration apparently did not see it that way but rather as criticism of the government which was not tolerated. This example dramatizes the social environment in which anthropologists and sociologists had to maneuver gingerly, trying to identify and avoid the danger signs so as to maintain one's safety and that of the institution. Whoever thinks of this as "a Golden era" was not there.

Ironically, it was another kind of fear that ultimately made me decide to leave the Philippines with my family in 1979. One day, Secretary of Social Welfare Fanny Aldaba Lim, a good friend, dropped by the IPC to tell me she was leaving for a UN post abroad. Accordingly, her staff had compiled a short list of people who could take her place—and I was one of three nominees. I was stunned, first, upon realizing that someone in the national stratosphere even knew of my existence, and second, thinking, there is no way I can possibly agree to become a member of the Marcos Cabinet!

The now familiar situation reemerged. How would one diplomatically refuse such an invitation from the Marcos government if it were to come? Plead illness? A family problem? That didn't seem possible. That very night we held a family consultation. The decision: write to the UNICEF, which a couple of months earlier had invited me to apply for a position in New York as Senior Adviser in Family and Child Welfare. I had refused the offer at the time. Now it was important to find out whether the job was still open. It was. I got it and moved to New York in 1979. What better excuse to refuse a dictator than to join a UN organization?

Thus, while one part of the Marcos Administration regarded me with suspicion as an "activist" social anthropologist, another part apparently saw some benefit in my potential contributions. This kind of ambivalence and unpredictability worried many social scientists trying to find a safe niche in a discordant world.

LOOKING BACK: LESSONS LEARNED

Diverging and interconnecting strands between anthropology and sociology reached increasingly substantial levels of integration in the 1960s. IPC and research institutes in colleges and universities all over the country came alive as they sought to upgrade their research skills.

Instrumental were the number of young faculty returning from graduate studies locally or abroad. UP had to come to terms with this expanding research expertise, sometime in a competitive posture but more often in the style of an older sibling nurturing the fast-growing infant institutes. IPC's burgeoning influence seemed to spur UP forces determined to retain their leadership through these outreach efforts.

The Philippine Sociological Society continued to bring sociologists and anthropologists together as it had since the 1950s until the Ugnayang Pang-Aghamtao, or UGAT—the Anthropological Association of the Philippines created in 1977—set them on divergent paths. Under the umbrella of the PSSC, however, both disciplines periodically came together over common projects and issues while retaining their separate identities. They attended each other's annual conferences and stayed in touch. Personal friendships across disparate campuses helped.

Overlapping also came in the field in that anthropologists studied communities under the rubric of peasant society and culture while sociologists investigated rural society.

Martial Law and the Marcos Dictatorship in 1972 transformed the social science landscape into a never-ending nightmare for many. We saw colleagues and students hauled away. One had to be careful of what we said or wrote, always apprehensive that we might unknowingly be dubbed "Communist" by a listener or reader with the consequent arrest, detention, or salvaging.

The two-voice self-censoring syndrome and whispering about martial law events became so natural that when attending conferences outside the country, we would suddenly realize that we had forgotten to speak in normal voices about political events. Fear of the 2:00a.m. vehicle stopping outside hovered over us.

Teaching and field research became problematic, given the turmoil on campuses as Martial Law wore on. UP faculty, especially, had to come to grips with how far they could go when mandated as state academics to render support to the dictatorship without jeopardizing their own sense of resistance or raising ethical dilemmas. Fleeing to the mountains served for some, but for others with significant family responsibilities, finding an honorable way to stay proved to be a never-ending struggle. Ideological trends brought out the strengths of the students and faculty veering toward or in the Left as they clashed with the Metrocom. At another level, the rivalry between the two schools at either end of Katipunan continued with accusations between Natdems vs Socdems, or "Leftists" vs "Clerico-Fascists." Only in the early 1980s as the economic situation deteriorated and mass protests included even the business community did the political epithets get drowned out in favor of the common cry, *Tama na, sobra na!*

People Power 1986 freed us from the endemic fear, suspicion and danger of the martial law regime. We all breathed a enormous sighs of relief. Trying to build another kind of society—fairer and more inclusive—loomed as an exciting new challenge for anthropologists and sociologists. ≠