BUILDING NEXUSES AND NETWORKS

Dr. Michael L. Tan

Delivering a keynote at the end of a symposium or conference is always more difficult than doing it at the start, because of expectations that a grand synthesis be presented around the conference theme and the presentations. This is especially difficult because we deal with two great sciences in a great university, developing in several historical contexts.

I therefore chose to have a more reflective piece on sociology and anthropology, which I hope will help us to better appreciate what these sciences have to offer. We do this as part of a celebration of a coming together of minds, culminating months of activities for a reunion of sociology and anthropology in UP, one which I hope will mean more dialogues and cooperation.

Let me give a broad outline of my paper— much of it will be retrospective, to trace our common roots and appreciate the richness of that past; limiting ourselves to sociology and anthropology in the west, we find the two sciences developing with the imprint of centuries of western colonialism which included convergences and divergences, brought about by common social causes and challenges. I will talk about the need to incorporate discourses around these divergences and convergences in our curricula, in our development of paradigms and research methodologies and in the crafting of agendas for the future.

COMMON ROOTS

If that sounds like a rather ambitious outline, it is because we are dealing with at least 500 years of doing social science. The formal emergence, the naming of social sciences in the west, dates to the 18th and 19th centuries. But if we probe more deeply, we see the social sciences date further back, products of paradoxical forces: on one hand, the Renaissance, Enlightenment, and humanism that transformed societies and an age of revolution; and on the other, western explorations, colonialism, and imperialism with its unprecedented oppression of humanity.

That paradoxical backdrop should better inform our revisiting the products of social science in the west, going back at least 500 years to include, for the Philippines, the work of Spanish friars in the Philippines, in particular their *relaciones* or historical accounts. We would deal too with the founda-tions of western linguistics, again with the friars' vocabularies or word lists/dictionaries, products of the friars' interest in the languages of the "natives" as tools for evangelization, and subjugation.

Today, there is much more translated literature available from non-western social discourse, notably Ibn Khaldun's (1332-1406) *Muqadimmah*. A translation published by Princeton in 2015[1]

describes the work as establishing "the foundations of several fields of knowledge, including the philosophy of history, sociology. ethnography, and economics." Yet Khaldun is, as far as I know, not mentioned in any local social science text-book.

Our panoramic scans of the social sciences should consider, too, *counterflows,* away from the Euroamerican-centric materials, to include "popular" social science. Anthropology, borrowing from linguistics, introduced the powerful "ethno-" prefix to highlight the importance of the emic, the "native point-of-view", and indeed, our social sciences today would be grossly deficient if we do not mine folklore and popular narratives. The translation of folklore into *kuwentong bayan* must be matched by its inclusion in our education agenda, in and out of classrooms and conferences.

All this complicates the task assigned to me of a closing keynote, but I accepted this challenge with an important personal filter: my age.

At 70, there is much to share, even as I grapple at times with senior moments; but these are 70 years of a very exciting life, one which could be described too as that of a refugee because I have had to cross so many disciplinary boundaries. My first degree was in veterinary medicine, followed by anthropology because right after graduation I worked with NGO (non-government organization) community-based health programs in public health, which has continued these past 50 years, well into the Covid pandemic. I have been fortunate to have been allowed to combine work with civil society with that of the academe, in particular our national university. In the last two years, I have taken on a new responsibility of running a college which is mainly the performing arts and sport science, with which I have been peripherally involved over the last two decades but which is now a main focus, allowing me to savor life as a *jubilado* (to be in jubilee), the Spanish term used for retirement. (To be clear, I am far from being retired.)

Of late I've talked about these transdisciplinary forays as excursions (maybe even expeditions), with all the connotations of discovery, as well as adventure (but without adventurism). Especially in the times we live in, these excursions require us to be willing to take risks, to confront adversity, if we are to be true to our common roots, where doing the social sciences, even before those social sciences had names, necessarily meant questioning of the norms of the times.

"Our panoramic scans of the social sciences should consider, too, counter-flows, away from the Euro-American-centric materials, to include "popular" social science.

It is particularly appropriate that we have this symposium in 2022, marking the 150th anniversary of the Gomburza martyrdom, one which is often reduced, for popular consumption, to the grisly representation of Fathers Gomez, Burgos, and Zamora and the barbaric *garrote*, when we should be talking more about the three priests' execution as a violent reaction of the powerful Spanish friars against liberalism and secularism. It was that liberalism, that secularism, that became the midwives for the very concept of "Filipino" and, eventually, of Filipino nationalism.

We forget that liberalism was a foundation, too, for social sciences, and not just in the west. In our own universities in the Philippines, liberalism fired the imagination of young students and their mentors for better societies, a better world, and it is our duty to carry on this legacy.

Teaching anthropology, in particular theory and research, means we need a constant reading of the signs of the times, against the backdrop of the past. We start by remembering the division between anthropology and sociology, which were based on colonial agendas. Sociology and the urban, which could be the Europeans, versus the rural, which is everyone else in the world. The civilized – themselves of course, and therefore

sociological – versus the uncivilized, again the rest of the world, for the anthropologist. The Western, sociology, versus the non-Western, anthropology. These binaries continue to be present.

I did my graduate studies in the US and the Netherlands, where, ironically, the colonial insistence on departmental silos was being challenged. My master's work was guided by an anthropologist and geographer. In the Netherlands, where I did my PhD, I was with the medical anthropology group, under the Faculty of Sociology and Political Science. But when we — faculty and students — were together we never really thought about who was a political scientist or who was a sociologist. Under that faculty was a sub-department called "Anthropology and Non-Western Sociology" and again we did not put up barriers with each other.

In our university, in the "late" Faculty Center, anthropology and sociology were spatial neighbors, but the divergences of the two disciplines, set off by the traditions of American traditions where our disciplinal forefathers and foremothers trained, kept us distant from each other.

There were historical reasons for this. Anthropology has sometimes been referred to as a child of imperialism[2] but when you think about it, all the sciences are children of imperialism, anthropology perhaps the most favored among the siblings because we were useful not just for providing information for colonial social engineering but also the very ideological (ir)rationalization for imperial-ism with its theories of social evolution — the primitive, the barbaric and the civilized — going hand in hand with the invented category of race and a hierarchy of races.

Note that in the Ateneo system, the departments have been of anthropology and sociology. In UP Baguio, it is anthropology, sociology and psychology. Departmental mergers are un-thinkable in UP Diliman but we can at least do more interdisciplinary studies. This should start with a focused re-reading of the discourses in theory books and in the journal articles as we recognize our histories and their mix, even the clash, of colonialism and humanism. We should read even the canonical works from both anthropology and sociology with new eyes. I still emphasize with my students reading if possible, the original works, which of course limits us because we use mainly English and I feel strongly that if there are students who want to pursue reading in German or in Spanish that would be much better. For example, Rizal read, and was influenced by the German Enlightenment philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803), so a fuller understanding of Rizal, the first Filipino ethnologist we often forget, comes from a reading of Herder, but his works are not readily available in English.

It is important, in this re-reading and recalibration, to remind students that the early social sciences were porous and that in our contemporary world of territorial academe (described to me once by an American archaeologist as similar to male silver-backed gorilla territoriality), we end up excluding the works of writers who do not carry the labels we have today. For example, I include the fathers of (western) sociology — Compte, Spencer, Marx, Durkheim, and Weber — in my anthropology theory classes, pointing out how key concepts we use today flowed from one "discipline" to another. Spencer, for instance, was the one who coined the term "survival of the fittest", which Darwin borrowed. Marx is described as an economist and sociologist, but preferred to be called a philosopher.

DIVERGENCES

The study of theory allows us to look at the divergences between and among the sciences, our interest in this symposium being sociology and anthropology. Paradoxically, we find the divergence in anthropology taking place through an a-theoretical turn in the 20th century, especially in the US tradition of Boas, who rightly called for more ethnological research before attempting theoretical propositions.

Ironically, the emphasis on ethnology allowed anthropology to be co-opted for social engineering and colonial agendas. The first director of the Bureau of Education in the

Philippines was an anthropologist, David Barrows. His appointment to that position reflects the US colonial administrators' recognition of the importance of anthropology for social engineering. Our own anthropology department in UP was established in part because of the need to train civil servants for the Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes, read the unconquered indigenous communities.

But even as mainly American anthropologists took up the older anthropological theories and propagated the notions of the primitive native. I imagine our grandparents picking up those notions from their textbooks, which were being used in college. The full horror of this mis-education hit me when, several years ago, a friend about my age told me he was elated to read about UP's inviting indigenous peoples to "camp out" at the university and to educate our faculty and students on their situation. This friend reminded me of our growing up in a different era, where our elders saw the indigenous peoples, thanks to miseducation, as less than human, and that we "civilized" Christian lowlanders encroached into their territories, land-grabbing and... "shooting them down like rabbits."

If anthropology was being molded in the Philippines to (mis)represent the primitive native, sociology had taken up the western agenda of functionalism, turning us into apologists for the status quo, painting societies in equilibrium, maintained by structures and neatly defined statuses and roles.

The power of this functionalism became all too real as I read, recently, an undergraduate's reaction paper to a class we had on the caste system. One line stood out in her paper: "The caste system, even if defective, allowed an orderly functioning of society through a division of occupations."

Yet I feel this functionalism needs to be discussed in our anthropology theory classes; including British structural functionalism, the very heart of social anthropology, dating back to the early 20th century, as well as functionalism in sociology, from Durkheim in the 19th century to the mid-20th century Chicago school of sociology. There is an interesting nexus here: we

Rizal read, and was influenced by the German Enlightenment philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803), so a fuller understanding of Rizal, the first Filipino ethnologist we often forget, comes from a reading of Herder, but his works are not readily available in English."

often acknowledge the sociologist Robert Merton for the concepts of latent and manifest functions which are so useful for explaining cultural "riddles" but these key constructs were first formulated by Bronislaw Malinowski (1884-1942) in British social anthro-pology. As a medical anthropologist, I refer to Talcott Parsons' "sick role" as well, which entitles people to certain privileges, subject to socially defined rules. Studying that sick role is so relevant today when we look at our politicians and the way they excuse themselves from their respon-sibilities... as well as to evade prosecution for their derelictions of duty.

It is important to address the weaknesses of functionalism, especially in the way sociology and psychology created the divisions of the normal and the abnormal, between the normative and the deviant behavior. Sociology in fact overlapped in many countries with criminology. This should not mean an outright rejection of the work around "deviance". I think of the work of Stanley Cohen on moral panics in the 1950s, when people suddenly discovered a new human species called the *teenager* who may

kjkj

as well have been aliens, given societies' fears of this new creature. We know Cohen's formulations about moral panics are still important and that these panics continue today and are not just about teenagers. In the Philippine context, besides the demonization of the teenager and "juvenile delinquency" producing the massacres of our young in the war on drugs, we live today with red-tagging, which is virulent and deadly moral panic as well. Moral panic is scapegoating; a search for people to blame for the problems of society, sometimes by the very people who create those problems.

When I first started teaching in UP, I would ask students to describe their ethnicity and many of them actually protested, "Sir, hindi kami ethnic!" and it took a while to explain to them that we are all ethnic; we all have our ethnicities.

In the 60s, anthropology and sociology, independently of each other, began to participate in the discourse around development. Sadly, the discourse, in trying to explain underdevelopment, often involved victim-blaming. If the Philippines were under-developed, it was because we were resistant to change, which is a precursor for the pasaway narrative that you hear so often today. The discourse generated here, which is pervasive in the country — from schools to work places — is that values are the source of problems in the country, even as modern-day moralists invoke the need to "bring back" or to "preserve" values. An example of the contradictions comes with the way *utang na loob* is mangled, on one hand blamed for nepotism and corruption and, on the other, invoked as a value that has to be preserved, usually in a feudal context: one must have *utang na loob* for our parents, for our employers, our landlords, by not questioning the status quo.

The research in Ateneo in the 1960s, which identified the "Philippine values", infuriated UP academics during a time of social ferment. For UP's academics, the problem was not values, the problem was imperialism and its structures, and therefore the solution was not value change but revolution. The discourse is of course much more complicated and deserves a revisiting, especially the countercurrents that emerged amid the tumult of the 1960s, the 1970s and martial law.

The countercurrents were in sociology as well, as seen in the work of Randy David. I remember reading his work on the urban poor as an undergraduate. The urban poor were all around us, accepted as a given, or even, in a slightly more progressive perspective, as the product of exploitation. But Randy David wrote about how capitalism required an army of urban poor, wages kept intentionally low because there would always be someone poorer and in greater need, willing to take the barest minimums of wages (including below the legally mandated legal wages).

In anthropology in the 1970s, we had Ponciano Bennagen, the first to write his anthropology thesis in Filipino and who was later appointed to the post-1986 Constitutional Convention. Anthropolo-gists of this era found kindred spirits in Virgilio Enriquez, who was developing *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* and drawing some of his materials from anthropology to question Western psychology. The intersections with *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* extended into the way we developed our research methods in Philippine anthropo-logy and a divergence away from the more positivist methods of sociology.

There is much more of these intersections, convergences, and divergences that can be brought into our courses. In particular, I want to mention 'practice anthropology', which we associate with Pierre Bourdieu, even if he is actually a sociologist. I take particular delight in bringing his discussions of habitus, and pointing out that its origins go back to Aristotle... and that in the Philippines, one Filipino word we've used for culture is *"kaugalian"*, if we go into practice anthropology, we do talk as well about culture-making as *"kasanayan"*.

As we talk about convergences, I would like to make a special appeal to give more attention to issues of gender, starting again with looking at the histories of our disciplines and correcting the omission of "mothers" of our disciplines. In anthropology— we have Ruth Benedict with culture and personality, and Margaret Mead who went beyond culture and personality to handle... just about everything else. Many anthropologists are not aware she actually visited the Philippines, and was one of those who pushed for the establishment of what is, today, the Philippines Social Science Council.

"Cohen's formulations about moral panics are still important, and that these panics continue today and are not just about teenagers. In the Philippine context, besides the demonization of the teenager and "juvenile delinquency" producing the massacres of our young in the war on drugs, we live today with red-tagging, which is virulent and deadly moral panic as well.

Our popular Sex and Culture (Anthro 187) course has exoticized this area of anthropology, in part through the writings of male colonial anthropologists. The anthropology department reoriented that Sex and Culture course, and has established a GE subject, Exploring Gender and Sexuality (its difficult birth a possible subject for another symposium), which gives more prominence to the many feminist anthropo-logists and a strong female presence in critical gender studies. I was fortunate to have been drawn into the international networks in these critical gender studies. But even then I do find myself falling behind with the work being done here by women. Sociology has been strong in these areas. I need to cite Arlie Russel Hochschild on emotional labor (which I hope more Filipinos will work on), and many of us probably do not realize that the term "reproductive labor" actually came from a Filipino-American sociologist, Rhacel Parreñas in her book *Servants of Globalization: Migrants and Domestic Work*.[3] The concept of reproductive labor is often missing in the way we discuss overseas work – this stark fact that families in Singapore, Hong Kong and the Middle East are able to reproduce, at great cost to our own families and our children.

In the Philippines, sociology has also been more feminine and influential in the academe. Ofelia Angangco, the first woman Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Cynthia Bautista as the CSSP Dean did a lot of work on agrarian communities and something that's often forgotten — the mobility of the middle class, the middle class being another area of research that needs to be given more attention. I also want to mention sociologist Ester de la Cruz who fought so hard for World Religion as a GE course in the Philippines but faced so much opposition because it was seen as inappropriate for a secular university. The result? Our students are left on their own, sometimes falling prey to fanatical religious groups in UP, including cults. Religion is so important in Philippine life, and yet UP pretends it does not exist.

CRAFTING RESEARCH

Research needs to be paradigm-driven, and the paradigms that create research methods should be studied now in their historical context. I wanted to add, in the context of the 20th century of neo-liberalism and authoritarian populism. There are so many contributions in terms of methodologies — our old-fashioned ethnographies are still useful and we should be proud of anthropology for pushing for participant observation, which ran counter to mainstream positivist science, whose ghosts continue to haunt us in sociological and demographic research. I ask our sociologists to be careful, because you are used very often for statistical reductionism. You say people who smoke are more likely to engage in premarital sex, but the way it is described is a slippery slope— that because you smoke, you'll be more likely to engage in premarital sex. I sometimes add, mischievously: and just what is it about premarital sex that so upsets our academics? Is it the "immorality" of it all, or is it the risk of pregnancies, which can be prevented if you had access to contraception? But that opens up into more slippery slope fears.

Anthropology offered the alternatives, especially from Clifford Geertz and interpretive anthropology: get people's stories, get people's daily lives as contexts. In fairness, sociology, and its long lost cousins in social work and community development, have softened positivism with

grounded theory, where field work is used to build theories. In many great sociological works, whether it's Durkheim or more recent American works you can see the brush strokes of ethnography and you can see how anthropology probably influenced the reports in them.

There are important convergences as we craft more rigorous and vigorous research methodologies. My favorite is symbolic interactionism, which comes from sociology but has been adopted into anthropology, bringing out the full potentials for exploring meaning-making and phenomenology.

Symbolic interactionism "authorizes" more collection of narratives, and of research as story-telling. A concrete example from my own work: as Covid-19's rampage slows down, we might be neglecting people still grappling with 'long Covid' months after "recovering" from the acute form of the disease. Anthropologists need to collect the stories of Filipinos with long Covid and advocate more attention, and advocate more attention, and care, including PhilHealth coverage. But then PhilHealth relies on the International Classification of Diseases (ICD), which has a very quantitative foundation, and which is slow in recognizing emerging problems such as long Covid.

Another area for anthropological-sociological exchange is the crafting of research utilizing social interactionism, again originally from sociology with all its metaphors of theater: settings and actors and scripts. Anthropology has benefited from social interactionism, as we find in the work of James Spradley.

Let me give an example of how vital social interactionism is for our research agenda. Ateneo has done research around sexual scripts: for example, what do young people say to each other when they go out on dates? That should be done as well in UP if we are to improve our responses to the problems of sexual harassment, which are no longer limited to those between teacher and student but also among students in relationships. We need to understand the nuances in relationships, and how they are expressed in conversations, in *diskarte*.

Anthropology enriches the paradigms of social interactionism with our emphasis on participant observation. We have subverted positivism, erasing the binaries between researchers and the researched on and created more space for voices of the marginalized. Photovoice is an important example, where communities are encouraged to take photographs to capture what they think, what they feel, about certain issues. The photographs also capture the nuances of space and time, and allow communities themselves to share their reflections not just about what is in the photo, but what is "behind" these visual narratives.

Where did Photovoice come from? This was actually developed by anthropologists who were working with The Ford Foundation on development and environmental projects initially in China in the 1990s. Over the years, photovoice has spread to different countries and is used for all kinds of projects. With the rise of digital technologies and platforms, this participatory research method has found new lives for anthropologists, sociologists and social scientists in general.

RECALIBRATION

We need to re-appropriate our humanist origins and humanism, and non-western sociologies and anthropologies.

We must better appreciate the boundaries of that humanism in terms of knowledge production and in applying the knowledge to the lives of people and communities and nations. Very relevant to our times is the problem of historical amnesia and historical revisionism, which is not limited to the Philippines. But much of the local critiques of historical amnesia come from historians and political scientists. Sociologists and anthropologists would do well to bring in additional perspectives, a history of ideas using sociological and anthropological lenses. We might want to start with Rizal, who we often forget was a member of the Berlin Society of Ethnology. We need to bring back his works, not as required readings alone in PI 100 but as almost timeless social commentaries. I use his work on so-called Filipino indolence in my theory classes, asking students to identify glimpses of

20th century anthropology theory in a 19th century work. I also mention that Rizal's work inspired the Malaysian sociologist Syed Hussein Alatas to write a book, *The Myth of the Lazy Native*.[4] The "lazy native" is so iconic, used by many colonial powers for victim-blaming, and we need more counter-narratives like that done by Rizal and Alatas.

Counter-narratives are so important today to fight what Hannah Arendt called totalitarian temptations. We are convinced we need more discipline, we need the death penalty, we need tokhang, we need extrajudicial executions. We were "predisposed" (using Bourdieu) to the imposition of martial law by Ferdinand Marcos in 1972 and today, we are predisposed to electing Ferdinand Marcos Jr. to the presidency. All he needed to do was to use social media to build up those totalitarian temptations. I will assert that the totalitarian temptations were generated by the main-stream, in the distorted values education of our schools in particular. Even worse, social sciences are co-opted for this distortion.

> **"It seems *Sikolohiyang Pilipino,* which started as a progressive, if not radical, social science, has been co-opted, even integrated into the discourse on Filipino values, which was, ironically, heavily criticized by *Sikolohiyang Pilipino.***

For example in the school which I now direct, I was shocked to find in the syllabus for *Sikolohiyang Filipino*, which is now a required GE course in all our tertiary institutions, objectives that included "an appreciation of the 'true' Filipino identity and "to conduct case studies of unique behaviors among Filipinos". I had to bring in Elizabeth Protacio, retired professor from the Psychology department to clarify *Sikolo-hiyang Pilipino*. It seems *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, which started as a progressive, if not radical, social science, has been co-opted, even integrated into the discourse on Filipino values, which was, ironically, heavily criticized by *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*. We know that the Senate and the Department of Education keep coming up with values education; we know corpo-rations use values training in HR and it can be used to obscure the very exploitative relationships that exist within schools and companies.

Nexuses are connections that we often do not recognize, connections which, instead of becoming strengths, become weakest links. Both anthropology and sociology offer us theoretical moorings and research tools through which we can deconstruct ideological packages that have made life so much easier for despots, including converting the war on drugs, the war on Covid, into wars on people.

A variation on the discourse of "values preservation" has been the creation of myths of resilience. To give you an example I've been looking at photographs from old and new media in many of my classroom discussions and webinar lectures. Two photo-graphs were striking: these are people drinking in the flood, there's a table and they're drinking. Bottles of beer are displayed with the brand name strategically positioned. The photographs are supposed to be sources of pride around the theme "How resilient the Philippines!" In a class just a few weeks ago weeks ago, I used up several minutes of processing, repeatedly asking, "what else do you see?" and no one ever noticed something very important: both pictures only show males. In other words, so-called resilience, depicted in the photos, is a matter of the very privileged male. In times of crisis, the men can play basket-ball, they can drink in the floodwaters. Where were the women? They were probably in the house, worrying about where they're going, how they're going to pay for the drinks that their men are drinking, worried about their sons playing basketball and not trying to find ways to help out the family.

Alexis de Tocqueville was a Frenchman who first used the term "habits of the heart" in a book about democracy in America, first published in 1835.[5] He was very excited about the United States, a young country, but that early (the US was not even 100 years old), he already warned about the dangers of individualism in American Society. In 1985, sociologist Robert Beulah headed a team that published the book *Habits of the Heart*[6] which was very ethnographic; numerous interviews and their chapters written by the team on love or the individualism, and again individualism comes up and receives much praise. But it's so interesting that only a few years after that, Robert Putnam, a political scientist, wrote a book called *Bowling Alone*.[7] He was raising alarm signals — bowling alone is literal, he noticed that many Americans bowl alone. He said that was such a disturbing sign of the deterioration of social capital. This was late 1980s, worth re-reading today given what has happened to America, to the point where you had 80 million people voting for Trump, a president who nearly destroyed the United States and could still destroy the United States and the world. The totalitarian temptation is there. We have to look at it in the Philippine context and we have to look at the work of sociologists and anthropologists and see how we might want to connect our dots.

Nexuses are connections that we often do not recognize, connections which, instead of becoming strengths, become weakest links."

"A variation on the discourse of "values preservation" has been the creation of myths of resilience.

I want to end on a happy note. I think the convergence and intersections are taking off, with or without symposia. I'm proud of Gideon Lasco, a fellow medical anthropologist who just came out with a book, *Drugs and Philippine Society*.[8] It brings together work from anthropologists, sociologists and other social scientists exposing the war on drugs using various lenses from anthropology and sociology, social constructivism and political economy. This is an example of the kind of work we need to do together — expose the rhetoric, the lies behind terms like "war on drugs", deconstruct what an *addict* is and why everything was all wrong from the very start, because the term "addict" (which is biomedical) was actually flawed.

The challenges are very urgent with the onslaught of authoritarianism. I would like to see more work on Latin *caudillismo*, which is the brand of authoritarianism that we have with Duterte, the Spanish macho ideal. I worry that we will have a two-headed monster of a dynasty for the next six years with many repercussions. All of this is going to happen amid the specters of pandemics and climate emergency. We have to be prepared, we anthropologists and sociologists and social scientists. These are the networks of epistemic communities, not just multidisciplinary but transdisciplinary across universities and not just in Katipunan Ave. but across the country. We will need more research and publications and multimedia productions.

Let us heed the sociologist C. Wright Mills who talked about the need for a *sociological imagination*,[9] which is, simply, linking histories

and the study of society with individual lives. Let's use that sociological imagination as we write about social mobilizations like the community pantries which built on food as socialization. Look at the signs used to accompany the free food with calls for *respeto*, *disiplina*. I remember a photo of eggs, accompanied by a sign that read: *"kumuha lang ng pang-umagahan, hindi pang leche flan"* ('Get only enough for breakfast, not for leche flan.') The humor must be documented for posterity as an example of the dynamics involved that need to be brought out to counter all this nonsense about the *pasaway* Filipino and all.

I end giving special thanks again to the next generation of social scientists, whose energy, imagination, and humor, will bring intersections, nexuses and networks to a new level. *Maraming salamat sa inyong lahat*.

Notes

[1] Ibn Khaldûn. (2015). *The Muqaddimah*. Abridged edition. Franz Rosenthal, trans. Princeton University Press.

[2] Kathleen Gough. (1968). *Anthropology: Child of Imperialism.* Monthly Review.

[3] Rhacel Salazar Parreñas. (2015). *Servants of Globalization: Migrants and Domestic Work.* 2nd Edition. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

[4] Syed Hussein Alatas. (1977). *The Myth of the Lazy Native.* London: Frank Cass Publisher.

[5] Alexis de Tocqueville. (2000). *Democracy in America.* Jacob Peter Mayer, editor. New York: Harper Collins.

[6] Robert N. Bellah, et al. (1985). *Habits of the Heart*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

[7] Robert Putnam. (2000). Bowling Alone. New York: Simon and Schuster.

[8] Gideon Lasco (ed.). (2021). *Drugs and Philippine Society*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

[9] C. Wright Mills. (1959). *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.