

Political Science in the Philippines 1880-1998

A history of the discipline

*for the centenary of the
first Philippine Republic*

REMIGIO E. AGPALO

Tinatalakay sa sanaysay na ito ang pagdedebelop ng disiplinang agham pampulitika ng Pilipinas, na ang diin ay nasa mga pangyayari sa Unibersidad ng Pilipinas. Tinukoy ng sanaysay na ang ama ng agham ay ang intelektwal ng Kilusang Propaganda, lalong-lalo na sina Marcelo H. del Pilar at Jose Rizal, at ng Himagsikang Pilipino na sina Emilio Jacinto at Apolinario Mabini.

Ang pagdedebelop ng agham pampulitika sa Unibersidad ng Pilipinas ay nagsimula noong 1915 nang ang departamento ng Agham Pampulitika ay itinayo. Sina George Malcolm (Amerikano) at si Maximo M. Kalaw (Pilipino) ang mga naging unang pinuno ng Departamento. Ang pokus sa pagtuturo at pag-aaral ng agham pampulitika sa pamumuno ng mga pinunong ito ay ang estado o *state*; at ang *approach* nila ay *historical* at *legalistic*. Ang Kapisanan ng Agham Pampulitika ng Pilipinas ay itinayo noong 1962 sa pamumuno ni Remigio E. Agpalo. Simula sa dekada ng 1960s hanggang sa ngayon ang pokus ay ang *political system* at *political process*.

Ang mga *trends* ng agham, pampulitika ay tungo sa *systematic*, *empirical* at *comprehensive* na agham, na ngayon ay binubuo ng limang *fields* —(1) Pamahalaan at Pulitika ng Pilipinas; (2) Kumparatibong Pamahalaan at Pulitika; (3) Dinamikong Pulitika (“Political Dynamics”); (4) Relasyong Internasyonal, Pangmundong Gobyerno, at Batas Internasyonal; at (5) Teyoriya at Metodohiyang Pulitikal.

Tinatalakay rin ng sanaysay na ito ang pagdedebelop ng kurikulum ng agham pampulitika, ang mga nailimbag na mga aklat na pampulitika na may kaugnayan sa Pilipinas, ang pagdedebelop ng Kapisanan ng Agham Pampulitika ng Pilipinas, at ang mga problema ng agham.

THE HISTORY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE in the country can be traced back to a significant period of Philippine history—the Propaganda Movement (1880-1895) and the Philippine Revolution (1896-1901)—and it could be characterized as a movement of the discipline in terms of focus as a subject matter and approaches to the study. In terms of focus, the discipline is moving away from the *state* and towards the *political system*; in terms of approaches, from the legalistic, institutional, historical, and normative approaches towards the systemic, sociological, processual, and behavioral approaches. The major trends indicate a development towards a more comprehensive political science and greater professionalization. The major problems arise from the inevitable difficulties and tribulations of a very young discipline with few professional practitioners in a modernizing polity beset by numerous problems. The agenda for the future naturally and logically are shaped by the *discipline's* major problems and trends.

1

Although the major *ilustrados* or intellectuals of the Propaganda Movement and the Philippine Revolution during the period 1880-1901 of Philippine history did not regard themselves as practitioners of political science, they are actually the fathers of Philippine political science. These *ilustrados* are five: the triumvirate of the Propaganda Movement Jose P. Rizal (1861-1896), Graciano Lopez Jaena (1856-1896), and Marcelo H. del Pilar (1850-1896); and the duumvirate of the Philippine Revolution Emilio Jacinto (1875-1899) and Apolinario Mabini (1864-1903).

That these five intellectuals are indeed the fathers of Philippine political science is shown clearly in the major works of leading practitioners of political science in the country before and after World War II. Before World War II, Teodoro Kalaw, the author of *Manual de Ciencia Política*,¹ highlighted the importance of the works of these *ilustrados*.² After World War II, Cesar A. Majul likewise recognized the significance of the political and constitutional ideas of these intellectuals.³

Of the triumvirate of the Propaganda movement, Rizal was the most prolific, original, and comprehensive—definitely the greatest. An advocate of liberal democracy and modernization, Rizal expounded and analyzed his political ideas in several works, especially in his two essays “The Indolence of the Filipinos” and “The Philippines a Century Hence”⁴, his two novels *The Social Cancer*⁵ and *The Reign of Greed*⁶ and his constitution for *La Liga Filipina*.⁷ Based on the propositions on man, whose attributes

are dignity, rationality, perfectibility, and freedom, Rizal's political philosophy posits the progressive development of human society. The culmination of this progressive development is a new socio-political order, whose constituent elements are new men, who are nationally participant, oriented towards scientific and universalistic values, and truly self-confident and free. In such polity, agriculture, commerce, and industry would flourish, the arts and sciences would develop, and the laws would be wise and just. Education of the people is the means which brings about this new socio-political order, and, hence, Rizal's prescribed mode of social and political change is evolutionary instead of revolutionary.⁸

Jaena and del Pilar are likewise exponents of liberal democracy like Rizal. Jaena's political ideas have been compiled and published in a book *Speeches, Articles and Letters*⁹ and del Pilar's in appendices to a book *Marcelo H. del Pilar*.¹⁰ A book on the latter's political ideas has also been published.¹¹

Of the political thought of the duumvirate of the Philippine Revolution, Mabini's has been written about and analyzed more extensively and fully than Jacinto's.¹² Mabini's political thought is more extensive, comprehensive and more systematic than Jacinto's.¹³ Like Rizal, these two political thinkers are likewise exponents of liberal democracy, for they were influenced significantly by Rizal. Jacinto's political writings have been compiled and published in *Buhay at mga Sinula ni Emilio Jacinto*, and Mabini's in *La Revolution Filipina*.¹⁴

The approach to politics by the fathers of Philippine political science is philosophical and normative. This was a major orientation of the tradition of Europe, which was the principal source of their political ideas.

The cession of the Philippines by Spain to the United States in 1898 and the defeat of the Filipinos in the Filipino-American War in 1901 paved the way for a new direction in the development of Philippine political science. The shift was from the philosophical or normative approach to the legalistic-institutional and pragmatic approaches, with a view to developing a science of government. This shift was inevitable because the Americans by the turn of the century had already established an American Political Science Association and developed a political science based on the legalistic and institutional approaches. The new direction in political science was effected by the Americans through the University of the Philippines, which was chartered in 1908. In the law establishing the

University of the Philippines, one section provided that the Board of Regents shall have the power "to provide," among others, "a College of Social and Political Science."¹⁵

This College of Social and Political Science has never been established, although the provision has never been repealed, in the University of the Philippines. However, a Department of Political Science was established in the College of Liberal Arts in 1915. Its first "Chief of the Department," as the designation of the head of the Department was called in the first few years of the Department, was George A. Malcolm, who had been appointed as Acting Dean of the College of Law for the academic year 1912-1913. In 1916, Malcolm published a book *The Government of the Philippine Islands*. He declared:

In modern political science, there is understood by "state," in its widest sense, an independent society, acknowledging no superior. The United States Supreme Court in an early case defined "state" as "a complete body of free persons united together for the common benefit, to enjoy peaceably what is their own and to do justice to others." A more comprehensive definition containing the essential constituent elements is that a state is "a community of persons more or less numerous, permanently occupying a definite territory, independent of external control and possessing an organized government to which the great body of inhabitants render habitual obedience."¹⁶

The above quotation was deliberately chosen in order to indicate Malcolm's focus on the study of political science—the state, which is a juridical concept. His approach to the study of government is also obvious in the above quotation; it is legalistic, as indicated by citations of a definition of state from *Chisholm v. Georgia* (1793), 2 Dall. (U.S.), 455, 1 L. Ed. 456; and Garner's *Introduction to Political Science*.¹⁷

The first Filipino student of politics to define political science adopting the Malcolm position was Teodoro M. Kalaw. In his *Manual de Ciencia Politica* in 1918, T.M. Kalaw said that the object of the study of his book was "the nature and organization of the State, the structure and functions of the great branches of government, and the theory of political and civil liberties."¹⁸

The first Filipino political scientist with very profound influence in the development of Philippine political science is Maximo M. Kalaw, the younger brother of Teodoro M. Kalaw. Maximo M. Kalaw's great influence in the development of the discipline is based on the following facts: (1) He was the second of two staff members of the Department—the first was the Chief of the Department, Dean Malcolm—who originally manned the Department in the academic year of 1915-1916¹⁹; (2) He was the first Filipino appointed as head of the Department; (3) During the formative years of the Department at the University of the Philippines, from 1920 to 1934, he was not only head of the department but also the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts; (4) He was eminently qualified academically, for aside from his studies in the University of the Philippines, he had gone also to the United States, getting an LL.B. degree at Georgetown University in 1915 and an A.B. degree at Georgetown University in 1916, studying special courses at the University of Wisconsin, and being honored by the University of Michigan in 1924 with a Ph.D. degree; (5) He was the first Filipino exchange professor to an American university; (6) He was co-author, with Dean George A. Malcolm, of *Philippine Government*,²⁰ which was formerly an approved textbook in the public schools; (7) He was also the author of other books, such as *Self-Government in the Philippines*²¹; *The Case for Filipinos*²²; *The Development of Philippine Politics, 1872-1920*²³; and *Philippine Government*²⁴; (8) Finally, he was also very active and prominent in journalism and the public service; he was associate editor of the *Manila Times* in 1918; technical adviser to independence missions to the United States in the early 1930s, member of the National Assembly, and Secretary of the Department of Instruction and Information during the Osmeña administration.²⁵

Like Malcolm and his older brother, the younger Kalaw also defined political science as a study focused on the state. He was also convinced of the practical value of political science. He said:

The study of the state, and principally of its organ, the government—its development, organization, and function—is . . . of vital importance especially to a people of a young republic that have assumed for themselves the supreme sovereign powers of a state.²⁶

The state-focused political science articulated by Malcolm and the Kalaws in the University of the Philippines was continued by subsequent students of

government and politics, especially textbook authors of introduction to political science and Philippine government.

One of the earliest authors of such textbooks, Jose M. Aruego, who was also one of the most prominent Filipino political scientists after Maximo M. Kalaw before World War II and the post-war period until the 1940s and early 1950s, published *Principles of Political Science* in 1932 and *Philippine Government in Action* in 1954. The preface of the former stated: "The aim has been to present within a single volume a general survey of the study of political science. The study begins and ends with the state."²⁷ The latter likewise revolves around the juridical concept of state. Both books had been revised at least three times to accommodate new data and developments, but in the revised editions the state focus of the textbooks had never been changed.

Other textbooks on Philippine government written by authors prominent either in academe or the government are *The Government of the Philippines*²⁸, *The Constitutional Government of the Philippines*²⁹, *The Government of the Republic of the Philippines*³⁰, *Philippine Government and Politics*,³¹ and *Philippine Government*³². The Tolentino textbook was published in 1950 and the one by Espina came off the press in 1981. The others were published between 1950 and 1981. All of them were analyzed in terms of the state, using the legalistic and institutional approaches.

Owing to the influence of Malcolm and the Kalaws and the impact of the textbooks on Philippine government, the state-focused political science has become firmly established in the Philippines, both in the private and public colleges and universities. However, this kind of political science has been challenged by political scientists with orientations in political sociology and political economy.

An example of critiques of the state-focused kind of political science by political scientists with orientations in political sociology is a paper delivered during the golden jubilee of the Department of Political Science of the University of the Philippines in 1965. The author of this paper argued that the focus on the state should be supplanted by new foci—the concepts of political system and political process. The reason given for this contention was:

In our post-independence era, the state-focused kind of political science is no longer appropriate. Our problem now is no longer how to gain independence (to which

problem the state-focused political science was appropriate, for it revolved around the concepts of sovereignty and rights), but how to modernize as a nation—economically, socially, and politically. It is not the rights and powers of government agencies and the people legally defined that ought to interest us primarily now, but the ways and means to develop and mobilize the resources of the nation and integrate the various sectors and groups which constitute the Philippine social and political system.³³

The author of the paper compared and contrasted the political science focused on the state, which was labeled the old political science, and the political science focused on the political system and political process, which was termed the new political science. He said:

The old kind is essentially legalistic in approach. It is legalistic because it studies the juridical concept of state, the various forms of government, the branches and agencies of a government, their legal powers and limitations, the people as citizens or aliens, or as voters or non-voters, their legal rights and limitations, the idea and nature of sovereignty, the legal relationships between sovereign states, and the prerogatives and legal limitations of them. It is essentially static because it emphasizes legal structures and functions.... When it studies the dynamics of government, it studies procedures. Thus its analysis of legislation, administration, adjudication, and elections is mechanical. Legislation, for instance, is analyzed in terms of first reading, second reading, the rules of procedure or debate, third reading, the kinds of voting during third reading, and so forth. In elections, the same mechanical approach is adopted—registration of voters, who are and are not voters, qualifications and disqualifications of voters, voting, rules to be applied in counting the votes, and so forth. The interplay of social, economic, political and other forces in the political system is not stressed and may even be ignored. Thus, all the life, complexity, grimness,

grace, confusion, and dynamism of politics are underplayed or disregarded.

The new political science, on the other hand, is essentially sociological and dynamic. It studies the political system and the political process instead of the state. It stresses, instead of legal rights and authority, actual political behavior and the social, economic, ideological, geographical and other dynamic factors which affect it. It emphasizes political interaction and actual participation instead of legal relationships. But it does not ignore or disregard the authority and rights of government agencies, citizens, and other political units or persons. They are also studied, except that they no longer constitute the main bulk of the analysis. Because of the divergent emphases and approaches of the old and the new political science, their methods and techniques of studying and understanding government and politics also differ. The old political science lays much emphasis on library study, analyzing legal documents, such as written constitutions, statutes, administrative rulings, and the like. The new political science frequently makes use of field survey, observation, and interviews.³⁴

The critiques of the state-focused political science by political scientists with orientations in political economy started appearing in the later 1960s and during the 1970s. Dr. Francisco Nemenzo, Jr. is one of the articulate and vigorous exponents of political science with orientations in political economy. During the third national conference of the Philippine Political Science Association in 1977, Nemenzo remarked

The mainstream of political science in the United States, as in the Philippines, has been an intellectualized expression of bourgeois ideology. As its formative stage, political science was hardly more than bourgeois jurisprudence reduced into liberal rhetorics, and there was a tendency to explain political realities in terms of the legal system. The so-called "traditional approach" gave rise to the impression that lawyers make the best teachers in political science.

Over the last two decades, political science has, of course, become more sophisticated. The legalistic conception of

reality has given way to more dynamic approaches. All this has made political science, alas, no less conservative. Our areas of concern have shifted from the study of formal rights to actual citizens' participation; from structures and legally prescribed functions of governmental agencies to patterns of political behavior; etc.

But studies along this line still leave unexamined and, therefore, uncriticized the foundations of bourgeois social order.³⁵

Accordingly, Nemenzo proposes that a political economy orientation should be followed by students of politics. The political economy preferred by Nemenzo is of Marxist variety; and the new foci of political science he prescribes are "*dependency and liberation* the key concepts in current radical literature."³⁶

Of the two alternatives to political science focused on the State—political sociology (focused on political system and political process) and political economy (focused on dependency and liberation)—the former, partly owing to the fact that it was advocated earlier, is gradually growing in strength in the Philippines. Another reason why it has been gradually becoming stronger is that the professional practitioners of the discipline—Ph.D. degree holders, most of whom are graduates from American universities—are also increasing in number gradually. It must be noted that American universities were responsible for the behavioral revolution in political science in the 1950s and early 1960s. Most of these Ph.D. practitioners of Philippine political science were products of American universities during the behavioral revolution of political science. The two indicators of its gradual growth of strength are the increasing number of courses and increasing number of books published about political sociology in comparison to the number of courses and books published related to political economy. These will not be taken up here, for they are included in Section II.

To complete the brief history of political science in the Philippines, data on students enrolled and graduated with degrees in political science, as well as the number of colleges and universities providing courses in political science, are required. Unfortunately, complete data on these matters are not readily available, for these have not been collected, collated,

and summarized in systematic studies as needed for a comprehensive understanding of the state of political science in the country. What are presented below are necessarily those selected data which are available

In 1976, Bulatao, *et al.* reported that there were "40 state colleges and universities throughout the islands (i.e., the Philippines), as well as over 600 private colleges and universities, enrolling, as of 1972-1973 a total of 720,000 students."³⁷ It is difficult, however, to estimate the number of students taking political science as courses or as a course of study in these private and public institutions of higher learning, although in most schools a course on Philippine government and politics is a required subject for all students.

It is a well-known fact, however, that there are only few universities in the Philippines with autonomous departments of political science. The oldest university in the Philippines, the University of Santo Tomas (which was founded in 1611), until now does not have an autonomous department of political science. Courses in political science in the University, however, are taught in a Department of Social Sciences. The most prestigious Catholic university with an autonomous Department of Political Science—the Ateneo de Manila University—has a very small department, with a staff of only three faculty members. Among the Protestant-operated universities, Silliman University is certainly one of the best, but like the University of Santo Tomas, it still does not have an autonomous department of political science, although it does have a Department of Social Sciences. Among the non-sectarian universities, the University of the East and Far Eastern University perhaps have the largest autonomous departments of political science, but data on their students and graduates in political science are not readily available. The University of the Philippines has the oldest Department of Political Science in the country, established in 1915.

Data on college graduates in private schools with a bachelor's degree in Foreign Service and in Public Administration (which are actually political science degrees)—the table where these data were drawn does not include political science—are provided by Bulatao, *et al.* for academic year 1969-1970. Out of a grand total of 13,825 students who graduated in the private schools with degrees in various fields, there were 225 students with majors in the social sciences. Of these students, there were 45 graduates

in political science, fifteen (15) of whom graduating with an A.B. Foreign Service and thirty (30) with a B.S. Public Administration.³⁸

The data presented above indicate that the private colleges and universities are not producers of graduates in political science. If some universities, like the University of the East and Far Eastern University, have a large staff of faculty members who belong to departments of political science, these departments appear to be primarily servicing only students who take up required introductory courses in political science (e.g., Philippine Government and Politics) but not taking care of students who are majors in political science. It is possible, of course, that Bulatao, *et al.* have incomplete data in their table of graduates in the private schools in the liberal arts and sciences by major in 1969-1970. However, their source—Division of Evaluation, Research and Statistics, Bureau of Public Schools, Statistical Bulletin, 1969-1970—appears to be reliable. And Bulatao, *et al.*, are professional social scientists.

This means that if one talks of political science in the Philippines, he must refer to political science in the University of the Philippines. We must now look into selected statistical data on political science students in the state university.

The first student to graduate with a bachelor's degree in political science from the U.P. Department of Political Science graduated in 1920.³⁹ The first student to graduate with a master's degree in political science in the University of the Philippines graduated apparently in 1925.⁴⁰ The first student to graduate with a Ph.D. in political science graduated in 1970.⁴¹

In 1961-1962, the Department of Political Science graduated the following number of students with the following degrees: Bachelor of Arts in Political Science—46; Bachelor of Science in Foreign Service—48; and Master of Arts in Political Science—2.⁴²

For the academic years 1969-1970 and 1970-1971, Arcellana provides the following statistical data:

Our Department has been busy In 1969-1970 it services 1,013 A.B. majors and 523 Foreign Service students for a total of 1,536 undergraduates plus 72 graduate students for a grand total of 1,608 students. These figures dipped somewhat in 1970-1971 to 710 A.B. majors and 358 Foreign

Service students; for a total of 1,068 undergraduates, and 84 graduates (increase of 12) for a grand total of 1,152 political science upperclassmen. . . . In 1969-1970, there were 86 graduates of A.B. Political Science and 59 graduates of B.S. Foreign Service, degree courses administered by our Department. In 1970-1971 there were 81 graduates of A.B. Political Science and 34 graduates of B.S. Foreign Service.⁴³

In 1981, there were 357 undergraduate majors in A.B. Political Science and 36 in B.S. Foreign Service, as well as 75 graduate students, enrolled in the Department. The graduates in A.B. Political Science were 41 students; in B.S. Foreign Service, 9; in M.A. Political Science, 4; and Ph.D. Political Science, 1.⁴⁴

II

Since the discipline of political science is not well-developed in the private colleges and universities, and since among state universities it is only the University of the Philippines that has a developed discipline of political science, the discussion of trends in the teaching of political science will be focused primarily on the trends in teaching at the state university.

As already pointed out in the first section of this paper, the Department of Political Science was established in 1915, and that its first "Chief of the Department" was Dean George A. Malcolm. In the first year of the Department in academic year 1915-1916, there were only five political science courses offered—Political Science 1-5.⁴⁵ By the next academic year, 1916-1917, these courses had doubled, Political Science 6-10 having been added. As listed in the *Catalogue, 1916-1917, Announcements 1917-1918* of the University, these ten political science courses were: Political Science 1, *Principles of Political Science*; Political Science 2, *Constitutional History*; Political Science 3, *American Government*; Political Science 4, *Philippine Government*; Political Science 5, *Oriental Governments*; Political Science 6, *European Governments*; Political Science 7, *Political Parties*; Political Science 8, *Municipal Government*; Political Science 9, *Theory and Practice of Legislation*; Political Science 10, *Teachers' Course in Government*. These courses were taught by only two staff members, Dean Malcolm of the College of Law and Maximo M. Kalaw.⁴⁶

During the early 1920s, the courses of the Department doubled once more, Political Science 11-22 having been added. By this time, Maximo Kalaw was

already the Head of the Department, as well as Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. The additional courses, as listed in *the General Catalogue 1922-1923, Announcements 1923-1924*, were Political Science 11, *Diplomacy*; Political Science 12, *Constitutional Development in China*; Political Science 13, *Chinese Diplomacy*; Political Science 14, *Far Eastern Relations and Politics*; Political Science 15, *History of Political Thought*; Political Science 16, *Problems of Municipal Government*; Political Science 17, *International Law*; Political Science 18, *Current Political Problems*; Political Science 19, *Colonial Government*; Political Science 20, *History of Diplomacy*; Political Science 21, *American-Philippine Relations*; and Political Science 22, *Seminar in Political Science*.⁴⁷

By this period, the staff members of the Department had more than trebled in number, for the *General Catalogue 1922-1923* listed seven instead of only two members. Also, the scope of political science as taught had become comprehensive, for all the major fields of political science were already to be found in the political science curriculum of the Department—Political Institutions and Comparative Governments Political Dynamics, International Relations, and Political Philosophy and Theory. However, it must be noted that there were only two courses in Political Dynamics—Political Science 7, *Political Parties* and Political Science 9, *Theory and Practice of Legislation*—and only one Political Philosophy and Theory—Political Science 15, *Political Thought*. Practically, all of the twenty-two courses in political science of the Department dealt with Political Institutions and Comparative Governments and International Relations.

The general pattern of the courses in political science in the University of the Philippines as instituted by Malcolm and Kalaw during the formative years of the discipline between 1915 and 1925 remained essentially the same even after Kalaw's retirement as Head of the Department of Political Science and Dean of the College of Liberal Arts in 1935 until the outbreak of World War II in Asia in 1941 and even after the end of World War II in 1945 until the early 1950s. Some courses were abolished, others renamed, several renumbered, and a few were instituted, but by and large, the pattern remained essentially the same.

One of the few courses instituted after World War II that is noteworthy is Political Science 107, *Geopolitics*. The description of the course in the *Catalogue 1947-1948* of the University reads: "A study of political institutions as affected by geographical environments; brief review of forces and politics behind colonial expansion; trends towards international groupings which affect international relations and politics."⁴⁸

We take note of this course, which was introduced by Pedro L. Baldoria, a Ph.D. holder from the University of Southern California who joined the Department in 1947, for two important reasons. First, it was the most popular and influential course of the Department after World War II until the 1950s as indicated by the number of students who studied under Dr. Baldoria and several master's theses written based on geopolitics. Second, it was an interdisciplinary approach (i.e., in terms of political geography) challenging the traditional interdisciplinary approach based on political law. However, after Dr. Baldoria's death in 1966 the course on geopolitics became dormant, and eventually it was abolished for lack of a faculty member sufficiently interested in teaching the course.

The decade of the 1950s is a significant period in the history of the Department of Political Science for two principal reasons. First, during the first half of the decade, the Department lost a major area—public administration. It was made an autonomous unit, becoming the Institute of Public Administration in 1952 and later as the College of Public Administration. And second, there was a new development in the staff of the Department.

Until the first half of the decade of the 1950s, only Dr. Baldoria was the Ph.D. holder in the Department after the early Ph.D. holders of the Department were taken by the national government to serve the new Republic after its independence in 1946, or had retired or died in the late 1940s. However, by the second half of the decade, Dr. Baldoria ceased to be the only Ph.D. holder of the Department. Three faculty members of the Department taking up Ph.D. courses in the United States finished their doctoral studies one after the other in the later 1950s—Onofre D. Corpuz in 1956, Cesar A. Majul in 1957, and Remigio E. Agpalc in 1958.

Corpuz's major academic interests were political institutions and political theory. In the graduate program, he introduced some courses on Philippine political institutions. In the undergraduate program, his contributions were notable. He instituted a course on "Policy, Politics, and Government," described as "Meaning of politics as the process by which the community makes public decisions."⁴⁹ He transformed Political Science 2, *Constitutional History*, into Political Science 108, *Constitutional Systems*. And he instituted a new course, Political Science 121, *The Philippine Administrative System*.⁵⁰ Thus, Corpuz put more vigor to the theoretical, systemic, and systematic study of government and politics. Unfortunately, for the discipline of political science, he did not serve the Department of Political Science long enough to give it

profound influence, for he was taken by the University Administration as Vice-President for Administration in the early 1960s and eventually by the national government as national official, first as Undersecretary of the Department of Education in 1966 and later as Secretary of the Department of Education and then Minister of the Ministry of Education and Culture, as well as top official of other national bodies (e.g., President of the University of the Philippines and President of the Development Academy of the Philippines).

Majul's main academic interest was political philosophy. However, owing to the fact that he was originally connected with the Department of Philosophy, he could not give the Department of Political Science his full time. In fact, more of his time was given to the Department of Philosophy than to the Department of Political Science. Nevertheless Majul introduced a new course in the graduate program of the Department—a course on the political and constitutional ideas of the Philippine Revolution.

Agpalo became Academic Officer-in-Charge of the Discipline of Political Science⁵¹ in 1961-1963, and Chairman of the Department of Political Science⁵² in 1963-1966. Transforming Corpuz's "Policy, Politics, and Government" into a course on political sociology, now entitled "Society, Politics, and Government," and adding "Interest Groups" to the old course on political parties, as well as renaming the old course on research in political science as "Systematic Politics," Agpalo continued the Corpuz orientation in theoretical, systemic and systematic study of politics and government; and at the same time, he started the emphasis on the political sociology orientation of political science. In the graduate program, he introduced several courses on political dynamics, political theory, and comparative government. Among the new courses which he introduced are: Political Movements, the Elite in Politics, Politics of Revolution, Politics of Modernization, Contemporary Problems in Political Dynamics, The Developing States, Totalitarian Governments, The Theory of Democracy, The Theory of Totalitarianism and Authoritarianism, the Roman Catholic Theory of Politics, Political Obligation, and Seminar on Plato and Aristotle. In 1965, he likewise led the Department in the celebration of the Golden Jubilee of the Department by holding an international conference on the twin themes of "Trends and Problems of Asian Governments and Politics" and "Political Science in Asia." This golden jubilee conference was attended by delegates not only from representative colleges and universities all over the Philippines but also by selected delegates from Japan, China, India, Thailand, Vietnam,

Malaysia, Australia, and the United States. He also started the adoption of a quintuple classification of areas of the courses in political science offered by the Department in both the undergraduate and graduate programs. Based primarily on the International Political Science Association classification of the areas on political science in the 1950s,⁵³ the fields or areas of political science as adopted by the Department were: I. Political Dynamics; II. Comparative Governments; III. Philippine Government and Politics; IV. World Politics and international Law; and V. Political Theory and Methodology.⁵⁴

Since the 1960s, the curricular program of the Department of Political Science, by and large, stabilized, although some revisions of descriptions, occasional renumbering, a few institution, and some abolition of courses have been effected.

The most recent available publication of the courses, classified by areas, taught by the Department of Political Science appears in the *General Catalogue II 77/78* of the University of the Philippines system.⁵⁵ As listed in this catalogue, the courses of the Department, grouped by fields or areas, are as follows:

1. Undergraduate

Introductory Courses and Philippine Government

1. Social and Political Thought
2. Political Science 11. Introduction to Political Science
3. Political Science 14. Philippine Government and Politics
4. Political Science 150 Philippine National and Local Administration
5. Political Science 151 The Philippine Executive
6. Political Science 152. Philippine Legislative System
7. Political Science 153 The Philippine Judicial System

Political Dynamics

8. Political Science 160. Society, Politics and Government
9. Political Science 161. Political Parties and Interest Groups
10. Political Science 163. Political Behavior: Processes and Movements

Foreign and Comparative Government and Politics

11. Political Science 171. American Government and Politics
12. Political Science 172. Government and Politics of Selected European States
13. Political Science 173. Government and Politics of the Commonwealth of Nations

14. Political Science 177. Government and Politics of Asia I
15. Political Science 178. Government and Politics of Asia II
16. Political Science 179. Government and Politics of Asia III

International Law, Organization and Relations

17. Political Science 180. Philippine Foreign Policy
18. Political Science 181. American Foreign Policy
19. Political Science 182. International Politics
20. Political Science 183. International Organization
21. Political Science 184. Diplomatic and Consular Practice
22. Political Science 185. Public International Law
23. Political Science 186. Private International Law

Political Theory and Methodology

24. Political Science 190. Practicum
25. Political Science 192. Ancient and Medieval Political Theory
26. Political Science 193. Modern Political Theory
27. Political Science 194. American Political Theory
28. Political Science 195. Asian Political Thought
29. Political Science 196. Philippine Political Thought
30. Political Science 199. Research in Political Science

2. Graduate

Philippine Government, Politics and Administration

31. Political Science 250. Seminar in Philippine Administrative Problems
32. Political Science 251. Seminar in Philippine Political Institutions
33. Political Science 252. Seminar in Contemporary Philippine Legislation.
34. Political Science 254. Problems in Philippine Local Government
35. Political Science 255. Problems in Philippine Constitutional Law
36. Political Science 301. Seminar in Contemporary Philippine Governmental Problems

Political Dynamics

37. Political Science 260. Seminar in Political Dynamics
38. Political Science 261. Seminar in Political Parties, Elections, and Interest Groups
39. Political Science 262. The Elite in Politics
40. Political Science 263. Politics of Modernization
41. Political Science 313. Seminar in the Politics of Revolution

Foreign and Comparative Government and Politics

42. Political Science 271. Government and Politics of Latin America
43. Political Science 272. Government and Politics of West Asia
44. Political Science 273. Government and Politics of Sub-Saharan Africa
45. Political Science 277. Government and Politics of Asia

46. Political Science 279. Seminar in Local Government and Administration in Asia
47. Political Science 320. Problems in Comparative Government and Politics
48. Political Science 323. Constitutional Governments
49. Political Science 324. Communist Political Systems
50. Political Science 325. The Developing States

International Law, Organization and Relations

51. Political Science 280. Problems in Philippine Foreign Relations
52. Political Science 282. Comparative Foreign Policy
53. Political Science 285. Problems in International Law
54. Political Science 330. Seminar in the Foreign Policy of the Major Powers
55. Political Science 331. Seminar in International Relations
56. Political Science 332. Regional Organizations and World Security
57. Political Science 333. Seminar in International Organizations

Political Theory and Methodology

58. Political Science 290. Seminar on Plato and Aristotle
59. Political Science 291. Seminar in Medieval Political Thought
60. Political Science 293. Political Obligation
61. Political Science 294. The Theory of Democracy
62. Political Science 295. Socialist and Communist Political Theory
63. Political Science 296. The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution
64. Political Science 299. Seminar in Political Science
65. Political Science 300. Thesis.
66. Political Science 343. Seminar in Political Theory
67. Political Science 400. Dissertation

With regard to the present staff members of the Department, these have grown from two faculty members in 1915-1916 to twenty-four in 1982-1983. Of these present staff members, eight have Ph.D. degrees, fourteen have master's degrees, and two have bachelor's degrees. Of the two with bachelor's degrees, one is about to finish his masteral studies.

As regards the courses in political science taught in other colleges and universities, there is no need to go into detailed discussion, for either they have very few courses in political science, or if they have several courses, these are generally modeled after the course offerings of the University of the Philippines. At least two reasons may account for the University of the Philippines courses being used as models. First, the University of the Philippines has been the leading institution in the country in various

academic fields, including the social sciences in general, and political science in particular. And second, several members teaching political science in the universities which have autonomous Departments of Political Science have graduated from the University of the Philippines.

We shall present a general profile of political science courses taught in various universities of the country as a conclusion to the discussion of the trends in teaching political science. The data we shall present are those gathered by Vigilia in a survey in 1968-1969 and 1971-1972 of seven colleges and universities in all important regions of the country: Northern Luzon—St. Louis University; Metropolitan Manila—University of the Philippines, Ateneo de Manila University, University of the East, and Philippine Christian College; Visayas—Silliman University; and Mindanao—Mindanao State University. In Vigilia's study, the quintuple-field classification of main areas of political science of the Department of Political Science of the University of the Philippines was adopted, adding a sixth field—public administration—“because it was considered by some of the institutions covered as another area although in UP it is a separate and more specialized field.”⁵⁶

Vigilia's findings on the courses in political science taught in the above-mentioned seven colleges and universities are:

- 1) International Relations and Comparative Government were the most emphasized areas. International Relations subjects constituted 32.36 percent of the total course offerings in 1968-1969 and 31.79 percent in 1971-1972. For the same years, Comparative Government had 18.5 percent.
- 2) Political Theory and Political Dynamics were stressed next with Political Theory accounting for 15.6 percent of total offerings for both academic years and Political Dynamics for 13.3 percent in 1968-1969 and 13.87 percent in 1971-1972.
- 3) Philippine Government and Politics and Public Administration were emphasized last with unvarying 15 and 20 subjects, respectively, in both academic years.
- 4) State-owned schools appeared to be more conscious of an equal emphasis on areas excepting Public Administration which is virtually nonexistent.

- 5) Private institutions have given a relatively heavier weight to only three areas, namely, Comparative Government, International Relations, and Public Administration.
- 6) Curricular changes during the two academic years were insignificant.³⁷

With regard to trends in research on Philippine political science, these could be surveyed by dividing the time span from 1915, when the Department of Political Science of the University of the Philippines was established, to 1981, into three periods: 1915-1945, the pre-war to World War II period; 1946-1965, the independence period up to the golden jubilee year of the Department of Political Science; and 1966-1981, the post-golden jubilee period until 1981, the year when martial law was lifted in the Philippines. These periods may also be called Period I, Period II, and Period III, respectively. For manageability, only the significant books and/or monographs on Philippine political science will be examined.

During the period of 1915-1945, eight political scientists (four foreigners and four Filipinos) could be identified as having produced significant or at least creditable works in political science. The four foreigners were George A. Malcolm, Dapen Liang, Grayson Kirk, and Joseph Ralston Hayden. The four Filipinos were Teodoro M. Kalaw, Maximo M. Kalaw, Jose P. Laurel, Sr., and Jose M. Aruego.

Of the books written by the four Filipinos, only the major works of Maximo M. Kalaw were presented in full. We shall now identify the principal works in Philippine political science of the remaining three, with a brief statement of their academic and/or governmental career.

Teodoro M. Kalaw, who was earlier mentioned as the author of *Manual de Ciencia Política* in 1913, was editor of *El Renacimiento*, 1907-1909; member, Philippine Assembly, 1910-1913; Secretary, Philippine Assembly, 1913-1916; Director, National Library, 1916-1917 and 1929-1939, and Secretary of the Department of Interior, 1920-1922. He was also the author of *La Masonería Filipina* (1920) and *La Revolución Filipina* (1924), as well as the editor of *Epistolario Rizalino* (1930-1938) and Apolinario Mabini's *La Revolución Filipina* (1931).

Jose P. Laurel, Sr. taught in the Department of Political Science, as well as the College of Law, of the University of the Philippines. He also taught in the National Teacher's College, and he founded the Lyceum of the

Philippines. Having served as member of the Cabinet and of the Philippine Legislature during the American regime and during the Commonwealth era as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, as well as Secretary of Justice, Laurel likewise served the country as President of the Republic during the Japanese occupation and Senator in the Congress of the Philippines after World War II.

Laurel's principal works in political science are in the areas of political philosophy or ideas and public law. His works in public law are: *The Election Law*⁵⁸; *Local Government in the Philippine Islands*⁵⁹; *Cases on Constitutional Law, Vol. I*⁶⁰; *Cases on Constitutional Law, Vol. II*⁶¹; *Administrative Law and Practice*⁶²; *The Three Powers of Government Under the Philippine Constitution*⁶³; *Philippine Constitutional Law*⁶⁴; and *Philippine Law on Elections*⁶⁵. Laurel's studies involving political ideas or philosophy are *Forces that Make a Nation Great*⁶⁶; *Political and Moral Orientation*⁶⁷; *Bread and Freedom*⁶⁸; *Our Economy—What Can Be Done*⁶⁹; *Thinking for Ourselves*⁷⁰; and *Moral and Educational Orientation for Filipinos*.⁷¹

Jose M. Aruego was Dean and Professor of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts, and Professor of Political Law and International Law, National Law College of the University of Manila. He also served as delegate to the 1934-1935 Constitutional Convention. His principal works in political science, besides the two mentioned in the first section of this paper, are *The Framing of the Philippine Constitution*⁷², Vols I and II; *International Documents for the Philippines*⁷³; and *Philippine Government in Action and the Philippine Constitution*.⁷⁴

In the case of Dean Malcolm, besides his books already mentioned in the first section, he also authored *The Commonwealth of the Philippines*⁷⁵ and *First Malayan Republic*⁷⁶. With regard to Liang, a Chinese political scientist who was a Visiting Professor of Political Science in the Department of Political Science in the 1950s, he was the author of *The Development of Philippine Political Parties*.⁷⁷

Kirk and Hayden are both American academics, the former not only a professor of political science but also at a later date, President of Columbia University; and the latter, a professor of political science at the University of Michigan. He also served as an Exchange Professor in the University of the Philippines and later a Vice Governor of the Philippines. Kirk's major work is *Philippine Independence*⁷⁸; and that of Hayden, *The Philippines: A Study in National Development*.⁷⁹

The approaches to the studies in political science in Period I were either in terms of political or public law, or political philosophy, or historical development. The focus was the state, either emerging or fully developed, or its agencies, leaders, and similar entities, or movements or transformations taking place within it. Whatever the approach or the focus of the study, in every case there was no attempt at systemic analysis. Even the movements or transformations within the state or the emerging state, which can lend themselves easily to systemic analysis, were studies in terms of historical development.

During the second period, from 1946 to 1965, there were twelve books on Philippine political science which are significant or at least creditable. Listed in chronological order, these books are: *The Philippine Presidential Election of 1953*⁸⁰; *The Philippine Presidency*⁸¹; *The Bureaucracy in the Philippines*⁸²; *Focus on the Barrio*⁸³; *Magsaysay and the Philippine Peasantry*⁸⁴; *The Congress of the Philippines*⁸⁵; *The Political Process and the Nationalization of the Retail Trade in the Philippines*⁸⁶; *Patterns in Decision-Making: Case Studies in Philippine Administration*⁸⁷; *The Philippines and the United States*⁸⁸; *Politics in the Philippines*⁸⁹; *Leaders, Factions, and Parties: The Structure of Philippine Politics*⁹⁰; and *The Philippines*.⁹¹

If the political science outputs of Period I are compared with those of Period II, it is quite obvious that the outputs of the first period are either quite limited in scope, i.e., they cover specific subjects, such as Philippine Commonwealth or Philippine Independence or about norms, either descriptive (such as the election law) or prescriptive (such as values, ethical orientations, and the like). Moreover, they are either approached legalistically or historically. In the case of the outputs of the second period, however, while studies on specific subjects are still made, there is more variety of subjects examined and the approaches used are also more varied, not confined to legalistic and historical approaches. Decision-making and policy-making approaches are used, as well as functional, structural, interest-group analysis, institutional, inter-state, historical, and legalistic approaches.

During the third period, from 1966 to 1981, which is five years shorter than Period II, there are thirty books on political science published that could be assessed as significant or creditable. These books are likewise listed below in the chronological order of their publication.

The first fifteen of these books were published between 1966 and 1974. They include the following: *The City in Nation-Building*⁹²; *The Development*

*of an Interest Group*⁹³; *The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution*⁹⁴; *U.S. Military Bases and Philippine American Relations*⁹⁵; *Foundations and Dynamics of Filipino Government and Politics*⁹⁶; *American Neo-Colonialism: Its Emergence in the Philippines and Asia*⁹⁷; *Philippine Parties and Politics*⁹⁸; *Ramon Magsaysay: A Political Biography*⁹⁹; *The Matrix of Policy in the Philippines*¹⁰⁰; *International Law in Philippine Relations*¹⁰¹; *The Political Elite and the People: A Study of Politics in Occidental Mindoro*¹⁰²; *Philippine Local Government: Issues, Problems, and Prospect*¹⁰³; *Muslims in the Philippine*¹⁰⁴; *United States-Philippine Cooperation and Cross-Purposes*¹⁰⁵; and *Towards a Southeast Asian Community*¹⁰⁶

The last fifteen of these books, published between 1975 and 1981, are the following: *Chinese-Philippine Diplomatic Relations, 1946-1975*¹⁰⁷; *The Philippine Congress: Causes of Structural Change*¹⁰⁸; *Parliamentary Government*¹⁰⁹; *The Huk Rebellion*¹¹⁰; *The Philippines and the United States: Forging of New Relations*¹¹¹; *The United States and the Philippines*¹¹²; *The Philippines and Southeast Asia*¹¹³; *Of Citizens and Leaders: Reform and Government in a Suburban Setting*¹¹⁴; *Marcos and Martial Law in the Philippines*¹¹⁵; *Central Planning and the Expansion of Public Enterprise*¹¹⁶; *Roots of Dependency: Political and Economic Revolution in 19th Century Philippines*¹¹⁷; *Islam and Development: A Collection of Essays*¹¹⁸; *The Social and Political Thought of Claro M. Recto*¹¹⁹; *The United States and the Philippines: A Study in Neo-Colonialism*¹²⁰; and *Church-State Relations*¹²¹

It is obvious that in spite of the fact that period III is five years shorter than Period II, the outputs of the third period are very much greater than those of the second period. In fact, books published in Period III increased by more than double of those published in Period II. It is also important to note that there was tremendous increase in research work on international relations. The study of local government units or their politics, which was introduced in Period II, also substantially increased in Period III. Studies on political instability (rebellion or revolution) and dynamic ideologies (nationalism, neocolonialism, and imperialism) had also emerged in the third period. Finally, political philosophy or political thought, which was prominent in Period I and virtually absent in Period II, had reappeared with vigor in Period III.

In general, the main trends indicated by the research outputs of Philippine political science from 1915 to 1981 as shown in the data of the three periods as presented above are: (1) development towards comprehensiveness, i.e., more and more areas/fields of political science are researched; (2) movement away from legalistic and institutional approaches and towards systemic and

behavioral approaches; (3) adoption of new interdisciplinary areas of study, such as political sociology and political anthropology, besides the more traditional fields of political history, political law, and political philosophy; (4) development towards more explanatory, theoretical, or systemic studies; and (5) development, in more general terms, towards greater scientific rigor.

Before concluding this section, an observation on political economy as a new interdisciplinary field must also be noted. This new area is already emerging, for it has been advocated as an area to be researched since the 1970s by students of politics with interest in or appreciation of Marxist analysis.

As noted in the first section, Nemenzo had called attention to the significance of this kind of research. There are full-length studies on this new area already published but full-length books of Filipino political scientists have not yet appeared. However, some articles have been published and several mimeographed papers have been circulated and discussed during conferences, symposia, and the like. Samples of these works are as follows: "Dependency and Liberation: Focus on the Third World"¹²²; "Rethinking the Philippine Social Formation: Some Problematic Concepts and Issues"¹²³; and "Authoritarianism and Underdevelopment: Notes on the Political Order of a Dependent-Capitalist Filipino Mode."¹²⁴

III

The major problems of Philippine political science are concerned with or related to the educational background of the faculty members teaching political science, the status and effectiveness of the professional association of Philippine political science, funding for the professional association and political science research, the role of political scientists in the society or the polity, and the linkage of Filipino political scientists with colleagues in foreign countries with a view to undertaking international research projects or effecting international understanding in the common enterprise of political science.

With regard to the educational background of the faculty members teaching political science in the Philippines, Vigilia's findings of a study of political science faculty members from seven Philippine universities and colleges in 1968-1969 and 1970-1971 are indicative of the educational

profile of political scientists in the country. The faculty respondents in Vigilia's study in 1968-1969 and 1970-1971 were seventy-five (75) and sixty-eight (68), respectively.

Vigilia's findings are quoted below:

- (1) In the school year 1968-1969, Master of Arts degree holders had the biggest share of the teaching staff with 38.67 percent or, numerically, 29 teachers. This was also true in 1971-1972.
- (2) Coming second were the Bachelor of Arts holders registering 26.47 percent or numerically 18 teachers in both academic years.
- (3) Instructors with a law degree come third with 20.0 percent and 19.13 percent in the two academic years, respectively.
- (4) There was a relative scarcity of Doctoral degree holders and numerically they comprised the smallest group in the overall faculty set up with 17.33 percent and 13.23 percent in the two academic years, respectively.¹²⁵

Vigilia's findings, insofar as general profile of educational background of the faculty is concerned, are quite similar to the findings of another study by Rodolfo A. Bulatao, Abraham I. Felipe, Andrew B. Gonzales, F.S.C. Consuelo I. Gutierrez, Mariano D. Obias, Bonifacio S. Salamanca, and Zelda C. Zablan (hereafter Bulatao, *et al.*) in 1976. The political scientists studied by Bulatao *et al.* are not the same or similar to those studied by Vigilia, for the former's population was composed of political scientists as listed in the secretariat of the Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC) in 1976. Nevertheless, the findings on their educational profile are useful, for they are corroborative of Vigilia's findings.

The findings of Bulatao, *et al.* on the educational background of the seventy-nine (79) political scientists listed in the secretariat of PSSC in 1976, by highest degree obtained, are: Bachelor's degree, 40; Master's degree, 23; and Doctorate, 16.¹²⁶

If we define professional political scientist as a practitioner of political science with a Ph.D. in political science or some other similar doctoral degree, which stipulative definition is justified by the fact that such a practitioner had the longest formal training on the substantive courses, methodology and canons of ethics of political science and had already proven his competence in systematic research on politics and government by means of his doctoral dissertation, then the above two studies by Vigilia and Bulatao *et al.* reveal that there are few professional political scientists in the Philippines, for there

are only a few political scientists in the country with Ph.D. degrees in political science or some other similar doctoral degree. The main bulk—an overwhelming majority—is composed of faculty members with bachelor's, master's, and law degrees.

Considering that these faculty members with bachelor's, master's, and law degrees constitute the main bulk of the instructors of political science in the country, they cannot be expected, other things being equal, to provide the students with excellent training in political science. Considering further that the available textbooks are legalistic in orientation and content, political science as political law is perpetuated from decade to decade. Such political science, therefore, is superficial, for law in modernizing or Third World countries is normally the manifestation of ideal relations—not the reality—of the society and its polity. In any case, if law reflects reality in such countries, in most cases, it reflects only a small part of reality.

The findings of *Vigilia* and *Bulatao et al.* on the educational background of the practitioners of political science should be read in conjunction with the findings of *Vigilia* to a question asked why students enrolled in political science courses took up those courses in order to appreciate the status of political science. The students' regard for political science, as revealed by the *Vigilia* study, is dismally low, perhaps owing to the fact that the students did not see a bright future in political science. In any case, political science was perceived by the students only as a means to an end, which indicates that political science has a lower status than other careers, such as law or even politics. Of the 465 students who participated in *Vigilia's* survey, the numbers and percentages of those giving answers to the question stated above were: 242 or 52.25 percent answered, "as a preparation for a law degree"; 146 or 31.40 percent answered, "as training for would-be politicians." Responses of "to have knowledge of the subject"; "as preparation for teaching profession", and "to acquire research skills" had 28, 27, and 21 respondents, respectively.¹²⁷

Why are the professional practitioners of political science in the Philippines few? Part of the answer to this question is that of the forty (40) state universities and colleges and about six hundred (600) private colleges and universities throughout the country, there are only three universities offering courses leading to the doctorate degree in political science and/or public administration as late as 1976—the University of the Philippines, University of Santo Tomas, and Centro Escolar University. Even those higher institutions of learning offering a masteral degree in political science and/or public

administration were only eleven—the University of the Philippines, Ateneo de Manila University, University of Santo Tomas, Far Eastern University, Manuel L. Quezon University, Philippine Women's University, University of Manila, Philippine College of Commerce, Arellano University, and Lyceum of the Philippines.¹²⁸ More significantly, the students graduating with doctoral degrees from these institutions of higher learning are extremely limited. For instance, in academic year 1969-1970, there were only five (5) doctoral graduates. Those graduates with masteral degrees in the same academic year were only four (4).¹²⁹

Another reason why there are few graduates with doctoral degrees in political science and/or public administration is that the recruiting ground for doctoral students in political science and/or public administration—the students who have majored in and graduated with a bachelor degree in political science or similar discipline—are not numerous. In the private colleges and universities, the graduates with a bachelor's degree in political science or related discipline were only forty-five (45) for academic year 1969-1970; and at the University of the Philippines in the same academic year there were only eighty-six (86) in A.B. Political Science and fifty-nine (59) in B.S. Foreign Service.

The second problem of Philippine political science, which is concerned with the status and effectiveness of the professional organization of Filipino practitioners of political science, is intimately related to the first. Owing to the fact that the educational backgrounds of those teaching and researching in political science are heterogeneous—very many are lawyers, more numerous than the lawyers are those with a bachelor's degree, and few Ph.D. holders—these practitioners of political science had been burdened by great difficulties in organizing themselves; and after they succeeded in organizing themselves, they have been saddled with great problems of maintaining an effective organization. The lawyers in the political science association naturally insist and persist in construing political science as political law; the few professional political scientists, advocating their magnificent obsessions—paradigms, ideologies, or conceptual frameworks—engage in sporadic academic conflicts among themselves, and the main bulk of the practitioners of political science—the bachelor's degree holders—carry on by teaching the students the introductory subjects in political science courses only because these are needed as preparatory courses for law or politics, or because they are required for graduation in education, business, and other career fields or professions. As a result, these bachelor degree holders, who constitute the main bulk of the practitioners of political science, have been condemned to

carry on, year in and year out, teaching introductory courses. Consequently, they have been condemned to remain as instructors, getting very low salaries, and, therefore, also condemned to improving their incomes by taking so-called "over-load" courses or doing "sidelines" (i.e., engaging in some odd jobs during off-hours, such as selling insurance policies and the like).

The overall consequences of all these facts are: (1) general apathy to the activities of the professional political science association in particular and the advancement of political science in general on the part of the main bulk of the practitioners of political science; (2) sporadic conflicts over academic or political issues among the professional political scientists; (3) a general feeling of frustration on the part of the leadership of the professional association; and (4) consequently, the low status of the association or of its general membership in the estimation of government policymakers or by society in general. However, a few political scientists as individual academics are highly regarded by the academe, the national government, and by civic organizations.

Thus, it took a long time for the practitioners of Philippine political science to organize a formal professional association. Although a Department of Political Science had been established in the University of the Philippines as early as 1915 and other departments were established in other universities thereafter, it was not until December 5, 1962 that the Philippine Political Science Association was established and incorporated.¹³⁰

The Philippine Political Science Association (PPSA) was organized as a "non-stock, non-profit, non-partisan, and non-sectarian" association [By-Laws of the PPSA, Art. II (2)]. Its purpose, according to the original By-Laws, was "to promote, encourage, and support the objective and disinterested study of Political Science which according to Aristotle is 'the most sovereign of the arts and sciences' [By-Laws of the PPSA, Art. II (1)]. Besides, the Association "shall publish a journal" and "shall establish and maintain contact with similar professional national and international organizations in the interest of mutual enlightenment" [By-Laws of the PPSA, Art. II (3) and (4)].

The charter officers of the Association were: President—Remigio E. Agpalo; Vice-President—Pedro L. Baldoria; Executive Secretary—Emerenciana Y. Arcellana; Treasurer—Avelina S. Salacup; Auditor—

Alejandro M. Fernandez; Legal Officer—Quirino D. Carpio; and Chairman, Board of Editors (of the *Philippine Political Science Journal*)—Rex Drilon.¹³¹

The inaugural conference of the PPSA was held at the University of the Philippines on March 16, 1963, when the charter officers were also inducted to office. At the conference were all the members of the Department of Political Science and some faculty members of two other universities—Ateneo de Manila and the University of the East, who were the initial members of the Association. After the inaugural speech of the President of the Association, a keynote speech was delivered by an American Visiting Professor of Political Science to the University of the Philippines, Dr. Charles E. Martin. His speech was entitled “The Orbit of Political Science.”¹³² After the PPSA was launched in orbit during the morning session, the afternoon was devoted to the holding of a symposium. The papers read were: “Democracy and Philippine Culture,” by Fr. Pacifico Ortiz, from the Ateneo de Manila University; “Democracy and Philippine Politics,” by Dr. Onofre D. Corpuz; and “Democracy and Philippine Foreign Policy,” by Salvador P. Lopez, from the Department of Foreign Affairs.¹³³

By the third year of the PPSA and the golden jubilee of the Department of Political Science in 1965, the PPSA still did not have a journal. One year later, when the Charter President was on his way to take the post of Visiting Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Hawaii and as Senior Specialist at the East-West Center and when the incumbent President Dr. Pedro L. Baldoria passed away, the PPSA gradually became so inactive that for all practical purposes it could be regarded as moribund.

It was not until 1973 that the PPSA was reactivated. The publication of a maiden issue of the *Philippine Political Science Journal* (PPSJ) in June, 1974, its contents being made up of the papers delivered at the inaugural conference of the PPSA eleven years before, made the reactivation more or less “official,” thanks to the quiet but dedicated “yeoman’s job” performed by younger concerned discipline practitioners working behind the scenes and the much appreciated encouragement and moral support of colleagues from other social sciences in the Philippine Political Science Council (PSSC). A journal was a requirement for membership in the PSSC.

This maiden issue was devoted to “Political Science in the Philippines.”¹³⁴ Its editor and chairman of the Board of Editors then was Dr. Loretta Makasiar Sicat. The members of the Board of Editors were: Roman Dubsky, Gabriel V. Iglesias, Estrella D. Solidum, Eva M.D. Ventura, and Wilfrido V. Villacorta.

Still, it took some time before the Association could be fully reactivated; and in 1976, *fourteen years* after it was established and *thirteen years* after its first conference was held, the PPSA held its *second* national conference.

Since 1976, the PPSA has become quite active. Since the principal activity of the PPSA is the holding of conferences, national and regional, basic data on these conferences, such as dates held, venues, and themes, are tabulated below. (See Table I: PPSA Conferences below.)

Table 1: PPSA Conference

| Conference | Theme |
|--|---|
| Second National Conference | Political Science, Philippine Politics and National Development |
| Third National Conference, 1977, Quezon City | Power and Social Responsibility |
| First Southern Philippine Regional Conference, 1978: Cotabato City | Political Integration and Nation Building Focus on Southern Philippines |
| First Western Visayas Regional Conference, 1978, Iloilo City | Development Politics: Philippine Perspective |
| First Eastern Visaya Regional Conference, 1978, Baguio City | Agenda for Regional Planning |
| First Northern and Central Luzon Regional Conference | National Development and Regional Priorities |
| Fourth National Conference, 1978, Quezon City | Politics of Development: Processes and Strategies |
| Second Eastern Visayas Regional Conference, 1980, Palo, Leyte | Dimensions of Regional Autonomy |
| Fifth National Conference, 1981, Zamboanga City | Politics and Socio-Economic Changes and National Development |
| Sixth National Conference, 1982, Marawi City | Development Politics: Focus on Mindanao |

Source: Various issues of the **Philippine Political Science Journal** and *Annual Reports of the Philippine Political Science Association*.

This account of the professional association is incomplete if the sporadic conflicts within the PPSA are not brought out. For instance, in the No. 8, December 1978 issue of the *Philippine Political Science Journal* (PPSJ), Art. II (1) of the By-Laws of the Association still provides: "It shall be the purpose of the association to promote, encourage, and support the objective and disinterested study of Political Science, which, according to Aristotle, is 'the most sovereign of the arts and sciences.'" However, this provision was amended drastically. The amendment, as put in the No. 9, June 1979 issue of the PPSJ, states: "The association shall promote, encourage, and support the study of Political Science." The significant words "objective and disinterested study" were removed, and the phrase, "which, according to Aristotle, is 'the most sovereign of the arts and sciences'" was deleted. During the meeting when the amendment was proposed and approved, the interested charter members were not present. However, the original provision of the By-Laws—"This Association shall be non-stock, non-profit, non-partisan, and non-sectarian"—was not touched. But this provision was scuttled by an amendment in 1981. The interested charter members this time were present in the meeting, and they made a vigorous attempt to save the provision. Their efforts were in vain, for the contested provision in the By-Laws was deleted after a heated debate and the counting of the votes.¹³⁵ To assuage the feelings of the concerned charter members, the word "disinterested" was readopted to modify "Political Science" in Art. II (1), such that this part of the By-Laws now reads: "The Association shall promote, encourage, and support the disinterested study of Political Science."¹³⁶

The third major problem of Philippine political science is funding for the activities of the PPSA and the research projects of political scientists.

With regard to the first aspect—funding for the activities of the PPSA—the problem arises partly on account of the limited membership of the Association. Owing to this fact, members' dues, therefore, are insufficient to fund the national and regional operations of the organization. Funds could come from the government but these would make the Association beholden to the government. Money could also be tapped from private corporations, but it would also undermine the academic integrity of the PPSA. Even funds from educational foundations—Ford, Rockefeller, and the like—could have the same effect on the Association.

In the end, the PPSA had to make compromises to cope with the perennial problem of funding. The Association would not accept funds

from “political” agencies of the government, but it would accept from such agencies as the National Science Development Board, now reorganized and called the National Science and Technology Authority. It would also accept funds from the Philippine Social Science Council, a private, non-stock, non-profit, non-sectarian organization composed of representatives of eleven social science organizations¹³⁷ in the country, which was incorporated in 1968. The PPSA would also accept subsidiary supports from government officials, especially from the University of the Philippines (for instance, hosting a dinner for conference delegates)

As regards the second aspect—funding for research projects of political scientists—the same instability as it obtains in the first characterizes this matter. The chief reason for this is that the main sources of funding for the first—the National Science and Technology Authority and the Philippine Social Science Council—are also the main sources for the second.

The source of funding of the National Science and Technology Authority (NSTA) is government appropriation in the national budget. The major sources of funding of the Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC) are the NSTA, Fund for Assistance to Private Education (FAPE), Ford Foundation, International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS), and the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA).

However, since the PSSC provides funding for several social science disciplines and their practitioners, and its funds after distribution to the member associations are not really ample—since its incorporation in 1968 the PSSC has raised over P7 million for its programs and projects¹³⁸—the PSSC actually is the source of funding for only a small number of political scientists doing their research projects. The same is true with the NSTA. For example, of the total funds of P3,126,574 allocated for various areas, the social sciences were allotted only P105,743 or 3.25 percent, with most of the funds going to agriculture (55.55 percent) and medicine (26.58 percent).¹³⁹ Since there are several social science disciplines competing for the P105,743 allotted to the social sciences, it follows that the practitioners of political science would get only a few thousand pesos.

The fourth major problem of Philippine political science is concerned with the roles of political scientists. Should they confine their activities to “objective” and “disinterested” studies of government and politics? Are there

such things as objective and disinterested studies of political science? Is not every activity or study a manifestation of interest *per se*?

Should political scientists accept consultancy jobs with the government or private corporations? Should they go on special detail, taking a leave of absence from their regular teaching assignments and accepting temporary jobs in the government? Should they serve as “resource persons” for various agencies and groups?

On the issue of “objective” and “disinterested” studies of government and politics, this has been a subject of debate of the members of the PPSA since the later 1960s. Instigated by Marxist and Aristotelian orientations of some members of the Association, it was aggravated by the declaration of martial law on September 21, 1972 and the regime of martial law itself—from September 21, 1972 to January 17, 1981. The amendments of the By-Laws of the PPSA in 1978 and 1981 are some of the clear indications of vigorous debating on and partial resolutions of this ongoing question.

The issue of “objective” and “disinterested” studies of political science has also been debated in terms of whether to adopt activist positions either for or against the government. In the early 1970s just before the declaration of martial law, those in favor of activist roles opted for joining political rallies and even manning the barricades in the campus. Those in favor of objective and disinterested approaches to the study of politics shunned such activities, although they were not against adopting a critical view of the government and its policies and getting involved and committed in the major political and social issues of the times, provided that these are studied, analyzed, and assessed systematically and theoretically.

With regard to the roles of consultants, resource persons, commentators, and the like, Filipino political scientists cannot avoid them. The government needs the expertise of political scientists in various aspects of government and politics. The mass media—radio, TV, and the press—also need political scientists for the systematic analysis of major issues that emerge in public discourse. Interest groups, political parties, and other entities also seek the expert views of political scientists on various political problems which they encounter in the political process. In a developing country such as the Philippines, where various crises are rampant—crisis of identity, crisis of legitimacy, crisis of participation, crisis of distribution, and the like—the need for the expertise of political scientists by the government and non-governmental agencies or groups becomes even more necessary and urgent.

Arcellana provides specific illustrations of the various activities of political scientists as they play their roles of consultants, resource persons, advisers, and the like. She said:

For our part, the Department of Political Science has tried to make itself useful nationally. Members of our Department have participated in various national undertakings and community projects. We serve as lecturers at the National Defense College of our Republic at Fort Bonifacio, the Air Force Command, as well as with the UP Extension at Clark Air Force Base. We have served as consultants and resource persons in various committees of the Constitutional Convention. We worked as consultants in the recent audit of our House of Representatives. We have taken part in committee hearings and written position papers and reports for the Council on Higher Education. We helped the Department of Foreign Affairs set up an in-service training program, and have for years assisted in the preparation of foreign service examinations; we are in the process of revising the foreign service curriculum drastically to meet the national needs. We have accepted numerous invitations to speak before various professional and civic groups. We participated in radio and TV programs like Sandigan, Pulong Bayan, and Elections 69 and 70 We have counseled students and helped them get jobs and/or scholarships.¹⁻⁴

There is no doubt that all these services had been useful to the governmental agencies, professional organizations, the mass media, the general public, the students, and other groups. They had also boosted the morale and reputation of the political scientists, for their expertise in certain areas was recognized, their being needed by different groups or sectors of society and the agencies of government proven, and their participation in public affairs demonstrated. However, a serious question has to be asked: Do these activities or roles consume so much precious time of the political scientists that they have very little time and even energy left for serious research in political science?

Finally, the last major problem of Philippine political science has to do with international cooperation in the enterprise of political science. After

all, political science is an international affair, and it develops through the contributions of political scientists from all nations.

The problem is that Filipino political scientists, including the few practitioners of the discipline who have produced significant works in Philippine political science, hardly have opportunities to participate in regular conferences of the International Political Science Association (IPSA) and similar international professional organizations, or to engage in an international effort to undertake research on political science topics which concern two or more countries, a region of the world, or even the whole mankind. The principal reason for the first problem is lack of funding to attend such conferences; and the main cause of the second is lack of linkage with colleagues abroad who are interested in the same topics.

Since the 1960s, more and more Filipino political scientists have been invited to and have participated in international conferences or symposia on some specific political science subject. Still, the participation of Filipino political scientists in international conferences remains intermittent, irregular, and even insignificant.

However, the Philippine Political Science Association has been paving the way for more and more cooperative efforts with foreign political scientists and with the International Political Science Association ever since the PPSA became a member of the IPSA in 1978.¹⁴ In 1982, for example, the PPSA hosted a Round Table for the Asian Research Committee of the IPSA in Manila. The PPSA also participated in the First National Social Science Congress, which took place in November, 1983.

IV

Political Science as a discipline is concerned, when viewed from the empirical perspective, with the structures and processes of the government, which is the central and regulative agency of either the political system or the state, as affected by its environment (immediate or distant, national or international, and whether social, economic, cultural or otherwise), and as affecting what individuals, groups, and agencies in the polity perceive to be the good life or justice. Normatively, it is concerned with justice itself as Aristotle, the father of political science, had posited. However viewed from the empirical or normative

perspective, it is a discipline whose contributions to human survival, welfare, and civilization are of critical importance.

If political science is not yet fully developed in the Philippines, as indicated by the data on its historical development, trends in teaching and research, and major problems, then it cannot contribute significantly to the understanding of one of the most important and strategic forces of society—the government which is responsible for the basic needs of man; peace and order, economic well-being, freedom, and justice. It also cannot contribute significantly to the international enterprise of advancing the frontiers of knowledge and civilization.

Thus, the agenda for the future of political science in the Philippines must be on the strategies to be adopted to strengthen and develop political science more significantly. These strategies must be specified so that they can be acted upon and the objectives are realized.

The first item in the agenda of Philippine political science is the training of large numbers of professionals of political science in the country to strengthen the discipline of political science. This item is the most important because the main cause of the underdeveloped state of political science in the Philippines is the small number of Ph.D. holders. Since the professional political scientists are few, there are only a few who could be expected to produce significant and creditable works in political science. Also owing to this fact, the task of teaching of political science courses in the forty state universities and colleges and about six hundred private colleges and universities inevitably has been taken over only by the bachelor-degree holders and those with masteral degrees.

What we are espousing for political science, in fact, is what the Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC) has advocated for the social sciences when the PSSC decided that the “training of large numbers of social scientists” and ensuring high academic standards shall receive “foremost consideration” in the PSSC agenda for the 1980s.¹² The coincidence of the priorities of political science and the social sciences in the Philippines is natural and logical, for political science is representative of the social sciences of the country, especially when the development of the discipline and its major problems are concerned.

The next item in the agenda of Philippine political science is research. This is also obvious from the discussion of trends in research in Philippine political science. Although research in the discipline is becoming more

and more comprehensive, systematic, and numerous, still it is a dismal fact that only eight political scientists, only four of whom are Filipinos, produced either significant or creditable political science literature in Period I (1915-1945); only twelve significant or creditable books in political science were published in Period II (1946-1965); and only thirty in Period III (1966-1981). This item of the agenda is directly and intimately related to the first, for only the training of large numbers of Ph.D. degree holders in political science will assure increased significant research in the discipline.

In the case of Philippine political science, the major research area that should be given priority should be that of foreign governments and comparative political systems and politics, for this area has hardly been cultivated. The area of political theory and methodology should also be given emphasis. Needless to say, the areas of Philippine government and politics, political dynamics, and international relations, which are already well-tended, should be cultivated more extensively and intensively.

In the area of Philippine government and politics, there are specific research fields that should be given top priority. In view of the fact that a new form of regime has been established in the Philippines since the declaration of martial law in 1972—a societal *pangulo* regime¹⁴³—this regime and its politics should be fully researched with a view to producing a full-length book on the subject. Philippine political parties, interest groups, and public opinion should be given more time, funds, and projects for research. Domestic policies, the administration of justice, and elections should also be put in the agenda for research. The subject of human rights must likewise be given high priority in the research agenda.

Former U.P. President Salvador P. Lopez, however, believes that “the subject of human rights”—human rights in their universal context as well as in the specific “Philippine setting”—should be given “the first item in the agenda of the social sciences in the 1980s.”¹⁴⁴

Lopez asks and answers:

What are my reasons for proposing that human rights be the first item on the agenda of the social sciences in the '80s? First, the question assaults the mind every day and hour of our conscious lives. We cannot ignore it and we cannot make it go away. We open the morning paper and going through the numbing habit of reading it has not dulled the questions

that leap to the mind: How would a free, balanced and responsible newspaper write up the stories on terrorist bombing? Why are persons under arrest virtually condemned in the press in advance of any trial? Or you read that certain members of the *Batasang Pambansa* want to give emergency powers to President Marcos by statute, as if the amended Constitution which already gives him such powers weren't enough. Or that the Ministry of Education and Culture wants to place the University of the Philippines directly under its authority.¹⁴⁵

The approach to research should not be confined to any particular approach, such as the sociological or philosophical (if in terms of discipline), or group or decision-making approach (if in terms of specific focus), or micro-political or macro-political (if scope is concerned). At the present development of Philippine political science, it will be undesirable and unwise to close the doors to different approaches. Explorations and applications of different approaches will be useful and fruitful in attempting to develop the appropriate approach to Philippine political science, especially if the area being studied and researched is that of Philippine government and politics. In any of these approaches, conceptual frameworks, paradigms, or models should be constructed, reformulated, and reassessed to fit the data being studied.

The third item of the agenda for Philippine political science is funding the activities of the PPSA and research projects of Filipino political scientists. At present, the PPSA is primarily funded by subsidies or contributions from NSTA and PSSC, and a significant portion of the funding for the research projects of Filipino political scientists also comes from these two agencies.

The NSTA, however, appropriates only a small percentage of the total allotment of its budget for the social sciences, for the main bulk is given to agriculture and medicine. The grants for the social sciences, therefore, must be increased significantly by persuading governmental policymakers to increase the allotments for research in the social sciences, especially political science. This could be done best by the PPSA and the Department of Political Science of the University of the Philippines, for these two agencies have the organization and presence of some prestigious political scientists to advocate such policy.

The PSSC has adopted the policy of subsidizing the publication of the professional journals of its regular members and giving financial support for

the holding of national and regional conferences of its regular members, especially the least financially endowed. This PSSC policy has enabled the PPSA to hold most of its national and regional conferences, as well as to publish, more or less regularly, its journal, the Philippine Political Science Journal. This policy, therefore, should be continued. And since the PSSC is the regular source of funding of the Philippine Political Science Association, the funds of the PSSC should be greatly increased by tapping more funds from foundations, the national government, international educational organizations, and wealthy individuals and private corporations identified with one or more disciplines represented in the PSSC, either as a member of the discipline or disciplines or by activity. The latter two can be persuaded to give endowment funds to the PSSC by appealing to their sense of social responsibility and philanthropic spirit.

Last but not the least in the agenda of Philippine political science is the promotion and encouragement of internationally collaborative research work in political science. The IPSA should be persuaded to allocate a special fund to help young political science associations like the PPSA. Such funds could be used in taking care of the funding for transportation, room, board, and other miscellaneous expenses of political scientists representing the national political science associations who are reading papers before or attending regular or special conferences of the IPSA or some foreign political science association. The IPSA could also help the young national political science associations by providing fellowships for doctoral studies or post-doctoral research in foreign countries, or by making arrangements with well-established and financially well-off national political science associations to grant such fellowships to deserving members of young national political science associations.

There are other items that could be placed in the agenda of Philippine political science in the 1980s and beyond, but the above four are sufficient. As a common but valid saying goes: "First things first."

V

This postscript updates important aspects of Philippine political science in the 1980s and 1990s, namely the curricular offerings in political science; the published books significant or relevant to Philippine political science, politics, and government of the same period; and the role of the Philippine Political Science Association in the 1980s and 1990s. It ends with a conclusion which returns to the beginning of this consolidated essay—that Philippine political

science was founded by the intellectual leaders of the Philippine Propaganda Movement and the Philippine Revolution of 1880-1901.

The pattern of curricular offerings of Philippine political science in the 1980s-1990s¹⁴⁶ did not change in comparison to the pattern of curricular offerings in the 1970s¹⁴⁷. The curricular offerings of the Department of Political Science in the University of the Philippines were used in this generalization, for the UP Department of Political Science can be assumed to be the most modernized in the country. The reason for this assumption is that the strongest and the most progressive Department of Political Science in the entire country is the UP Department of Political Science. The generalization based on the curricular offerings of the Department of Political Science could apply to the best curricular offerings and the most progressive private or other university Department of Political Science if there is one; and if there is none, then the UP political science curricular offerings in the 1990s could be a model for the other Department of Political Science in other universities.

The curricular offerings in political science in the fields of Philippine Government, Political Dynamics, Foreign and Comparative Government and Politics, International Relations, and Political Theory and Methodology at the U.P. Department of Political Science in 1996-1998¹⁴⁸ were practically the same as those offered in the 1970s, except that they were more numerous and the fact that some of the courses were revised in definition or focus, or the courses were renumbered, and a few were added. For instance, "Human Rights and Humanitarian Law," "Ideology and Politics," "Political Economy," and "Women in Politics" were added in the curricular courses in 1996-1998. Honors courses for selected Juniors and Seniors were also added, but the courses offered were readings in the classics of Philippine government, comparative politics, international relations, and political theory, courses which were already provided at the senior level of the undergraduate program or in the graduate program.

The U.P. Department of Political Science curricular offerings in the Undergraduate Program and in the Graduate Program as listed in the University of the Philippines Diliman, General Catalogue 1996-1998, are listed in full in Appendix A.

With regard to the significant books of Philippine government and politics relevant to Philippine political science, for the period after the

Golden Jubilee of the Department of Political Science in 1965, i.e., from 1966 to 1981, the period which I adopted for my cut-off point in the UNESCO project, I identified thirty books significant or relevant to Philippine political science. The period covered was sixteen years. If we compare the number of published books significant or relevant to political science in the 1980s and 1990s, a period of nineteen years (which is quite comparable in length to the period 1966-1981), we find that the number of books published in the earlier period increased tremendously or very significantly. The increase was not only 100% or even 300%. The increase was actually more than 560%, for 170 books significant or relevant to Philippine political science were published in the 1980s and 1990s. My criterion in the inclusion of books significant or relevant to Philippine political science is not confined only to books written by Filipino political scientists but also by non-Filipino political scientists (e.g. Americans) and non-political scientists (i.e., historians, anthropologists, or journalists).

Why was there a tremendous or very significant increase in the published books significant to Philippine political science? While the increase in the number of Filipino political scientists and social scientists, non-Filipino political scientists and social scientists and authors of Philippine political and social affairs, could account for the tremendous increase in the published books significant or relevant to Philippine government and politics or Philippine political science, I don't believe this is the more important factor, for although there was an increase in the number of Filipino political and social scientists, non-Filipino political and social scientists and public affairs authors, the increase was only incremental. More important as a factor accounting for the very significant number of books published significant or relevant to Philippine political science is the nature of the period 1980s and 1990s. This period is a time of critical revolutionary changes in Philippine government and politics and in the world; and of centennial celebrations of national events or national heroes or significant anniversaries of national institutions or leaders. These revolutionary or critical events and significant anniversaries or centennial celebrations motivated or prodded authors on Philippine political or social science or public affairs to write books. Among the revolutionary or critical events in 1980-1998 in the Philippines and the world are the following: the lengthening of the period of martial law and its impact on Philippine society and the polity; the assassination of Senator Benigno "Ninoy" Aquino, Jr., the "Snap" Elections in 1986; the so-called People

Power Revolution of February 1986; the coup attempts of the Reform the Armed Forces Movement (RAM) in 1937 and 1989; the liberalization and privatization movements, as well as the globalization trend, in both the Philippines and the world; the revolution against communism in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the democratization trend in Eastern Europe; the depletion of natural resources and tremendous increase of the population, in both the Philippines and the world; the drug menace and domestic and international violence; and the longing for peace and prosperity, in both the Philippines and the world.

The seventy books published in the 1930s and the one hundred volumes published in the 1990s which are significant or relevant to Philippine political science are listed in Appendix B.¹⁴

As regards the role of the Philippine Political Science Association (PPSA) in the promotion of the discipline's academic interest, this role is best discussed by relating it to the president of the PPSA. The presidents of the PPSA from the early 1980's to the latter part of the 1990's were/are: Dr. Loretta Makasiar Sicat, Dr. Carolina Hernandez, Professor Carmencita T. Aguilar, and Professor Felipe Miranda. The periods of terms in the presidency of the Association of these four officials were/are as follows: Makasiar Sicat, 1981-1985; Hernandez, 1985-1989; Aguilar, 1989-1995; and Miranda, 1995-1998.

At the beginning of her presidency, Dr. L. Makasiar Sicat expressed her apprehension that, owing to lack of funds, the PPSA might not be able to hold national political science conferences.¹⁵ Instead, the PPSA might only either join other social science organizations in their conferences or serve as the local host of round-table conferences for some international organizations of which it is a member. Despite these initial misgivings, however, the PPSA did hold national conferences in 1981, 1982, and 1983 (Table 1 PPSA Conferences, p.30 above).

This time, the national conferences were held outside Metro Manila. The 1981 conference was held in Zamboanga City in Western Mindanao, with Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Enrique M. Fernando, an eminent constitutionalist, as keynote speaker, in view of the fact that the conference was held in February, the anniversary month of the Philippine (1935) Constitution. The conference theme was "Political and Socio-Economic Changes and National Development."

The 1982 conference was held in Marawi City (Central Mindanao) with the theme "Development Politics: Focus on Mindanao." Also in 1982, the PPSA was the host of the Round-Table of the Asian Research Committee of the International Political Science Association that was held in Manila. Dr. John Trent, Secretary-General of the International Political Science Association met with the PPSA officers.

A third national conference was held in 1983 at Silliman University in Dumaguete City, Negros Oriental (Visayas) with the noted political scientist Dr. Onofre D. Corpuz as keynote speaker. Thereafter, the PPSA co-hosted with the Department of Political Science of the University of the Philippines some academic activities in the celebration of the U.P. Diamond Jubilee in 1983 and was an active participant in the First National Social Science Congress in November 1983.

That year, the various social science disciplines—anthropology, demography, economics, geography, history, linguistics, mass communications, psychology, social work, sociology, statistics, public administration, and political science—held the First National Social Science Congress. This was given institutional support by the Philippine Social Science Council, to which all thirteen disciplines have affiliated their respective national associations as regular members, the National Research Council of the Philippines, and the Pi Gamma Mu International Honor Society.

The theme of the First National Social Science Congress was "Towards Excellence in Social Science in the Philippines." The PPSA under the presidency of Makasiar Sicat joined the First National Social Science Congress through the participation of four members of the PPSA, who read papers in the Congress. The PPSA members, including their papers read in the Congress were: Jose V. Abueva, "The Filipino in Crisis and Implications for Social Scientists of the Critical State of the Filipino Nation;" Olivia C. Caoili, "The Social Sciences in the Philippines: A Retrospective View;" Loretta Makasiar Sicat, in a joint authorship with Andrew Gonzalez, a member of the National Linguistic Society, "Human Resources and Institution-Building in the Social Sciences;" Wilfrido V. Villacorta, a political scientist from De La Salle University, in joint authorship with a researcher from De La Salle University; and Leslie Bauzon, a historian from the U.P. Department of History, "An Assessment of Two Social Science Structures: The National Research Council of the Philippines and the Philippine Social Science Council, Inc."

The term of the officers holding office with Makasiar Sicat as President of the PPSA was to terminate in 1983, but it was extended to 1985, for when she called for nominations from the members of the PPSA for candidates for the officers of the Association in early 1983, no nominations arrived at the Office of the President of the PPSA, so the incumbents had to continue serving in a hold-over capacity.

In addition, by dint of a doggedly persistent quest for funding---for membership fees alone were not enough to defray the printing costs---the *PPSJ* continued to be published during those years, even though publication was sometimes delayed. The 1982 issue, which was actually printed in 1984, came out under the editorship of Dr. Temario Rivera.

A national conference was planned for 1984, but because this writer failed to get a copy of the 1985 annual report of the President of the PPSA and the fact that he failed to attend the meetings or affairs of the PPSA in 1985-1988, this writer cannot report on the activities of the PPSA during 1985-1988. In 1985-1988, this writer was a faculty member of the Department of Political Science at the De La Salle University, where he served as full-time faculty member after retiring from the U.P. Department of Political Science, effective on December 31, 1984.

In 1984, the PPSA under Makasiar Sicat also collaborated with the Philippine Society for Public Administration (PSPA) and the Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration (EROPA) on a regional research project on "Power and Responsibility," with focus on "Participative Process in Politics." The Filipino participants in the regional project gave special attention to the national Batasan elections held in May, 1984. The PPSA handled the sub-topic of "Political Parties."

In 1988, the President of the PPSA was Hernandez. Although this writer likewise failed to get a copy of the 1988 and 1989 annual reports of the PPSA president, Hernandez' activity in 1988 could be discussed, for the proceedings of the Second National Social Science Congress are published.¹⁵¹

In this quinquennial congress- the congresses of the national social sciences are quinquennial - in 1988, the PPSA under Hernandez joined the conference through the participation of seven political scientists who read papers on "Sovereignty and Economic Recovery: Question for Filipino Social Scientists;" "Decentralization and Social Autonomy; the Source of

Frustration of Local Officials;" "Indigenous Communities and Regionalization;" "Bureacracy and Public Accountability;" "Civil-Military Relations;" "Church-State Relations;" and "Economic Recovery and Human Rights."

On May 26, 1989, there was held a national conference of the PPSA under the presidency of Hernandez. Only a one-day meeting, the PPSA conference listened to and afterwards discussed the four papers read before the group by Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Republic of the Philippines Marcelo H. Fernan, "The Judiciary and the Challenges of the Times;" Congressman Michael G. Masura of the House of Representatives, "Executive-Legislative Relations;" Chancellor of U.P. Los Baños and former dean of the College of Public Administration, U.P., Dr. Raul P. de Guzman, "Decentralization, Democracy, and Development"; and Dr. Wilfrido Villacorta of De La Salle University, "The 1987 Constitution and Foreign Policy: Challenges and Responses."

Aguilar began her presidency of the PPSA by sponsoring a lecture series of the PPSA on Filipino Political Ideas" in September, 1989. The first set of lectures was held at the Polytechnic University of the Philippines on September 14, with two speakers who lectured on "The Political Ideas of Manuel L. Quezon" and "The Socialist Tradition in the Philippines." On September 30, another set of lectures was held at the University of Santo Tomas, whose theme was "The Radical Tradition of Filipino Political Ideas." Three speakers were invited to give lectures on the political ideas of Jose Abad Santos, the radical socialist ideas of the People's Movement in the Philippines, and the radical contemporary views in the Philippines.

Aguilar also linked the Philippine Political Science Association with the Philippine Congressional Fellows Program of the Asia Foundation and the Philippine House of Representatives for three consecutive years (1989-1992). The PPSA representatives in the different regions chaired the screening committees together with the representatives of the Philippine Rotary Club and the Kapisanan ng mga Broadcasters sa Pilipinas as members. The program provided congressional training to 50 potential young leaders from the regions.

In 1990, Aguilar continued the sponsorship of lectures as co-sponsor, with the Department of Political Science of the University of the Philippines as principal sponsor, on the occasion of the Diamond Jubilee

of the UP Department of Political Science and of Dr. Maximo M. Kalaw, the first Filipino head of the Department of Political Science. On August 10, Dr. Emerenciana Y. Arcellana delivered a lecture on "The Development of Political Science in the Philippines." On August 18, this writer delivered a lecture on "The Political Science of Dr. Maximo M. Kalaw;" and on September 20, Chancellor Raul P. de Guzman delivered a lecture on "Public Administration as a Branch of Political Science."

The Arcellana and Appalo lectures were held at the Faculty Center Conference Hall; and the De Guzman lecture was held at Malcolm Hall in the College of Law.

Earlier in 1990, on May 3-4, the PPSA through the leadership of Aguilar sponsored a round table discussion on "Government and Politics: Structures and Processes" at the Philippine Social Science Center. Filipino political scientists who are members of the PPSA and foreign political scientists who are members of the International Political Science Association Study Group on Executive Structures and Processes, participated in this round table discussion. Dr. Dag Anckar, a member of the Executive Board of the International Political Science Association participated in the roundtable discussion.

The year 1993 was another busy and productive year for the PPSA. On May 7-8, Aguilar as president of the PPSA led in the holding of a national conference on the theme "Political Science: Productivity, National and Global Issues." A foreign political scientist, Dr. Arthur Martinez, from the Department of Political Science of the University of Mexico, read a paper on "The Political Movements in the Yucatan Peninsula, Republic of Mexico." The other participants in this national conference are Filipinos, most of whom came from the Department of Political Science of the University of the Philippines. However, a few came from other universities or private academic research agencies, such as Dr. Socorro Leyco-Reyes, formerly from De La Salle University, who presented a paper on "Dictatorship To Democracy in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and the Philippines;" Dr. Pablo Tangco, from the University of Santo Tomas, who discussed a paper in defense of a parliamentary system of government; Ms. Aileen S.P. Baviera, from the Philippine-China Development Center, who read a paper on "China and the Issue of Trade;" and Professor Shirley Advincula, the Secretary of the Philippine Political Association, who delivered welcome remarks.

Among the Filipino political scientists (with papers) who participated in the national conference were Reynaldo R. Ty, "The Globalization of Human

Rights;" Jaime Faustino, "Domestic Politics in Regional Negotiations: The Philippines and AFTA;" Jorge Tigno, "The NGOs and the Empowerment Process;" Clarita R. Carlos, "Issues and Problems in Political Psychology;" Felipe B. Miranda, "How Can Political Science Research Contribute to Productivity;" Eva M.D. Ventura, "The Nature of Social Science (Political Science) Research;" and R.E. Agpalo, "The Need for Concept-Formation and Model-Construction by Filipino Political Scientists." Besides the above papers and their presentors there was also a panel on "The Problems of the Discipline." The panelists were Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., Olivia C. Caoili, Estrella D. Solidum, Malaya C. Ronas, and R.E. Agpalo.

At the end of the year on December 9-10 the Third National Social Science Congress was held; and the PPSA contributed papers in that congress. The papers presented to the Congress were "The Local Government Code of 1991: Priming Local Governments To Take the Lead in Sustainable Development," by Alex B. Brillantes, Jr; and "Democratization for Sustainable Development," by Temario C. Rivera.

1994 was an equally busy and productive year of the PPSA. On May 2, 3, and 4, the PPSA held an annual conference on "Issues and Problems in Governments and Politics Today;" and on July 15-17, the PPSA, together with other organizations, co-sponsored with the Philippine Constitution Association (PHILCONSA) as principal sponsor, the first National Conference on the Constitution.

The May 1994 national conference was similar to the 1993 national conference in that both foreign and Filipino political scientists participated in the conference, with most of the participants from the U.P. Department of Political Science but a few of them came from other universities or research agencies. But it was quite different from the 1993 conference because a local government official from a well-known municipality also participated in the conference. That well-known municipality is Makati, now a city, and the top local government official who was to participate was Mayor Jejomar Binay. Although Mayor Binay failed to join the conference, he was actually substituted by his municipal administrator, who discussed "Some Problems in Local Government Administration."

The last year of Aguilar's presidency of the PPSA -1995- was even more busy and productive than either 1993 or 1994. In the beginning of the year, on January 27-28, the PPSA sponsored a lecture series, designed "to contribute to teachers' efforts to update the course contents, to develop

the teaching incentives and upgrade the quality of political and social science education in the Philippines” in the Visayas, co-sponsored by La Consolacion College in Bacolod City, Negros Occidental, focused on the twin topics of “The Study of Philippine Politics” and “The Study of Comparative Government and Politics.” About the middle of the year, on July 26-27, a national conference was held at the Bulwagang Rizal (Faculty Center) Conference Hall, in the University of the Philippines in Quezon City. The theme of the national conference was “Political Science as a Discipline.” Towards the end of the year, on October 3-5, the International Federation of Social Science Organizations (IFSSO) for the first time held its biennial conference in the Philippines, at the Philippine Social Science Center (PSSC), in Quezon City. Although the PSSC, an affiliate of IFSSO, organized the Philippine Conference, together with the Division of Social Sciences of the National Research Council of the Philippines (NRCP), it was Aguilar, a Vice-President of IFSSO and President of PPSA, who worked as the moving spirit behind the Philippine Conference of IFSSO. The principal papers of the IFSSO Philippine Conference were already published in a paperback book, entitled *Cooperation and Conflict in Global Society*.¹⁵³ The IFSSO has international members from different social science organizations or units from Europe, Latin America, Asia, and Africa. As described by the book’s editor: “A hundred representatives from foreign universities and research councils as well as social science organizations affiliated with the PSSC participated in the Conference.”¹⁵³

Returning to the national conference in July, we note that Onofre D. Corpuz, former head of the UP Department of Political Science, former President of the University of the Philippines and former President of the Development Academy of the Philippines, and at the time of the PPSA national conference was already given the 1995 National Social Scientist (Political Science) Award by the PSSC, served as the keynote speaker of the conference. His keynote speech was “The State of Political Science in the Philippines.”

The last two national conferences of the PPSA were organized by the incumbent President of the PPSA, Felipe B. Miranda. The first national conference under his leadership of the PPSA was held outside of Metro Manila, in Lingayen, Pangasinan, on May 9-11, 1996, at the Pangasinan State University. Its theme was “Assessing National and Global Processes of Democratization: Challenges to Political Science.” The second national

conference was held in Quezon City, at the PSSC, on May 8-9, 1997. Its theme was "Furthering Democratization and Development Through Elections."

These national conferences were both traditional and innovative. They were traditional, because the papers read were academic political science papers discussed in the traditional ways of academics, using academic critiques and adopting occasional mischievous but academic asides or "adlibs." They were also innovative, for they featured the "presidentiables" of the forthcoming May, 1998 elections.

In the 1996 national conference, the "presidentiables" who discussed their respective political programs or visions for the nation were Vice President Joseph Estrada, Speaker of the House of Representatives Jose de Venecia, Senator Edgardo Angara, Senator Raul Roco, and the Chairman of the Subic Bay Metropolitan Authority (SBMA) Richard Gordon. The governor of Pangasinan, Oscar Orbos, also spoke in the national conference as keynote speaker. These government officials and "presidentiables" were also subjected to academic critiques by the participants.

In the 1997 national conference, three prominent "presidentiables" also came and discussed their programs of government and assessment of the Philippine political situation. These three were Vice President Joseph Estrada, Speaker of the House of Representatives Jose de Venecia, and Senator Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo. Another prominent senator, Senator Blas F. Ople, came to the conference, giving his views and remarks on the current Philippine political situation. All of them were engaged in academic debate or discussion by the participants of the conference.

The more important papers of the 1996 national conference had been published under the title of *Democratization: Philippine Perspectives*.¹⁵⁴ The papers and proceedings of the national conference in 1997 remain unpublished.

One other role of the PPSA is the publication of the *Philippine Political Science Journal* (PPSJ), the official organ of the PPSA. The maiden issue of the PPSJ, No. 1, came out in June 1974. The last issues of the journal for the 1980s were Nos. 15 and 16, for June and December 1982.

The updating of the publication of the PPSJ, therefore, should start on No. 17, for June 1983.

The aspects of the *Philippine Political Science Journal* are similar to the faces of the moon—there is a bright or cheerful face, but it has also a dark or dismal aspect. The set including Nos. 1 to 16 is the bright and cheerful face, for it was published; but the set including Nos. 17 to 28 is the dark and dismal aspect, for these issues of the PPSJ remain benighted, not seeing the light of day. The set including Nos. 29 to 30 also saw the light of day; and, therefore it is also a bright and cheerful face. But, starting with No. 39 (1995), the PPSJ once more remains in darkness.

Having updated the curricular offerings of Philippine political science and the books relevant to it, as well as the role of the PPSA, in the 1980s and 1990s, I now end this postscript as I began this consolidated article on the role of the founding fathers of Philippine political science—the intellectual leaders of the Propaganda Movement and the Philippine Revolution (Graciano Lopez Jaena, Marcelo H. del Pilar, Jose Rizal, Emilio Jacinto, and Apolinario Mabini).

There is an important reason why I return to the intellectual leaders of the Propaganda Movement and the Philippine Revolution. In 1998, we celebrate the centennial anniversary of the First Philippine Republic on June 12. Without Graciano Lopez Jaena, Jose Rizal, Marcelo H. del Pilar, Emilio Jacinto, and Apolinario Mabini, who provided the principal ideas and ideals of the First Philippine Republic, the First Philippine Republic would have had no strong and powerful political formula to legitimize and justify its existence. I would like also to clinch the point made in the beginning of this essay why those intellectual leaders of the Philippine Propaganda Movement and the Philippine Revolution were truly the fathers of Philippine political science, especially del Pilar, Rizal, Jacinto, and Mabini. These four authors were the pioneers of Philippine political science, for they had published between 1839 and 1898 works of systematic exposition and analysis of a very important aspect of Philippine political science. This aspect is what I, following Friedrich, categorize as political morphology, a systematic or theoretical study of political forms or bodies — ‘morphé’, form or body; and ‘logý’, systematic study.¹⁵⁵ In 1889, del Pilar published his work *La Soberanía Monacal en Filipinas*,¹⁵⁶ a study of the Philippine body politic or form of government. It was about friarchy or *frailocracia*. As a study, it was a systematic study, for del Pilar described the nature of friarchy in the Philippines in the late nineteenth century, analyzing its economic, political, and religious aspects systematically. Rizal, in 1889 and 1890 published in *La Solidaridad*, his great essays, “Filipinas

Dentro de Cien Años” and “Sobre La Indolencia de los Filipinos.”¹⁵⁷ In these essays he discussed the nature of a new social order or a new society, based on libertarian and democratic ideas, which new society was provided with a political constitution in “La Liga Filipina.”¹⁵⁸ published in 1892. Put together, the ideas and concepts in the two essays and the “Liga Filipina” constitute a new political regime or body politic,¹⁵⁹ a pangulo-regime model, a systematic work on political morphology.

Lopez Jaena, although not systematic and theoretical like del Pilar and Rizal, supported all the political ideas of del Pilar and Rizal. Jacinto, in his “Kartilla ng Katibunan”,¹⁶⁰ “*Limang at Dilog*,”¹⁶¹ and “*Pagkatatag ng Pamahalaan sa Hukuman ng Silangan*”¹⁶² of 1896 and 1898 also reinforced the ideas in the works of Rizal. In fact, Jacinto’s political philosophy embodied in his works, advocated a pangulo-regime model like Rizal’s. And Apolinario Mabini’s “True Decalogue,”¹⁶³ “Ordinances of the Revolution,”¹⁶⁴ and “Constitutional Program of the Philippine Republic”¹⁶⁵ of 1898 embodied a theory of a democratic and libertarian regime, operating in accordance with the Filipino cultural values of the supremacy of the executive in the government and of *pagdamay* (caring for and sharing with fellow persons) in the society, a work on political morphology.

I shall not elaborate further, for if I do, I shall be writing a full-length treatise.

APPENDIX A
CURRICULAR OFFERINGS
OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

1996-1998

UNDERGRADUATE

Social Science

- 103 **Statistics for the Social Sciences.** Statistical techniques for social research (cross-listed with Sociology 190). {Prereq: Math 1, 11, 3 u.
104 **Human Rights and Humanitarian Law.** Seminar on the evolution and development of the theory, principles and practice of international human rights and humanitarian law. 3 u.

Political Science

- 11 **Introduction to Political Science.** Concepts, theories, and principles of political science; types of political systems; development of political institutions and processes. 3 u.
14 **Philippine Government and Politics.** Development, organization and operation of the Philippine political system, with emphasis on the present. 3 u.
110 **Political Analysis** An examination of the methodological issues in the study of politics – the scientific method and the logic of social inquiry. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14. 3 u.
141 **Readings in Philippine Government and Politics.** Directed readings in the classics of Philippine government and politics. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 150/JS. 3 u.
143 **Readings in Comparative Politics.** Directed readings in the classics and contemporary theories of comparative politics and government. Prereq: SS. 3 u.
144 **Readings in International Relations.** Directed readings in the classics of international relations. Prereq: SS. 3 u.
145 **Readings in Political Theory.** Directed readings in the classics of political theory. Prereq: SS. 3 u.
150 **Philippine National and Local Administration.** Principles, Practices and problems of public administration; historical, behavioral and institutional analysis and evaluation of the national and local bureaucracy and administration in the Philippines. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14. 3 u.
151 **The Philippine Executive.** National Executive in the Philippines; its nature and development. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14. 3 u.
152 **Philippine Legislative System.** Structure and function of the legislative system in the Philippines; legislative behavior and legislative process; statute and bill drafting; executive and judicial lawmaking. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14. 3 u.
153 **The Philippine Judicial System.** Role of courts and other law enforcement agencies in the administration of justice. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14. 3 u.
157 **Special Topics in Philippine Government, Politics and Administration.** Prereq: Pol. Sci. 150. 3 u.
160 **Society, Politics, and Government.** Society as the matrix of politics; political

- power and leadership; patterns of decision-making; political modernization and development. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11/COI. 3 u.
- 161 **Political Parties and Interest Groups.** The types and structures of political parties and interest groups; their function in the political system; their strategy and tactics, particularly in aggravating and articulating interest and controlling governmental power and public policy. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14. 3 u.
- 162 **Politics of Change.** Problems of social, economic and political change in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14. 3 u.
- 163 **Political Behavior: Processes and Movements.** Belief Systems; nature and development of political processes and movements. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 160/COI. 3 u.
- 164 **Ideology and Politics.** Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14. 3 u.
- 167 **Special Topics in Political Dynamics.** Prereq: Pol. Sci. 160. 3 u.
- 170 **Introduction to Comparative Government and Politics.** Comparative political processes in the developed and developing states. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14, 3 u.
- 171 **American Government and Politics.** Theory and dynamics of the government and politics of the United States. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11. 3 u.
- 172 **Government and Politics of Selected European States.** Political systems of the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Germany, and Russia. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14/COI. 3 u.
- 176 **Government and Politics of East Asia.** Political systems of Japan, the People's Republic of China, North Korea, Nationalist China and Republic of South Korea. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 170.
- 177 **Special Topics in Comparative Government and Politics.** Prereq: Pol. Sci. 170. 3 u.
- 178 **Government and Politics of Southeast Asia.** Political Systems of Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14/COI. 3 u.
- 179 **Government and Politics of South Asia.** Political systems of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan and Nepal. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14/COI. 3 u.
- 180 **Introduction to International Relations.** International cooperation and conflict; and regional, functional and universal regimes and institutions sustaining those processes. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14. 3 u.
- 181 **Philippine Foreign Policy.** The nature and development of Philippine foreign policy and the foreign policy process. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 11, 14. 3 u.
- 182 **Foreign Policy of Major Powers.** Development of the foreign policy of major powers, e.g., the United States, Russia, China, Japan, and others. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 180. 3 u.
- 183 **International Organization.** Development, structures, functions, and problems of international organizations. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 180. 3 u.
- 184 **Diplomatic and Consular Practice.** Development, organizations, functions, and problems of diplomatic and consular practice with emphasis on the Philippines. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 180. 3 u.
- 185 **Public International Law.** Nature, development, sources, principles and problems of international law and its role in the development of a world community; selected cases. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 180. 3 u.
- 186 **Private International Law.** Selected cases involving citizens or juridical entities of different states. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 180. 3 u.
- 187 **Special Topics in International Law.** Organization and Relations. Prereq:

- Pol. Sci. 180. 3 u.
- 190 **Practicum.** Prereq: JS. 3 u.
- 192 **Ancient and Medieval Political Thought.** Political Thought from Plato to the medieval thinkers. Prereq: SS. 3 u.
- 193 **Modern Political Thought.** Political Thought from Machiavelli to the contemporary political thinkers. Prereq: SS. 3 u.
- 194 **American Political Theory.** Political and social ideas of leading American statesmen, publicists, and other thinkers from the colonial period to the present and their influence upon American democracy. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 171/COI. 3 u.
- 195 **Asian Political Thought.** Main currents of Asian political thought. Prereq: SS/COI. 3 u.
- 196 **Philippine Political Thought.** Main current of Philippine political thought. Prereq: SS/COI. 3 u.
- 197 **Special Topics in Political Thought and Methodology.** Prereq: SS. 3 u.
- 197.1 **Junior Honors 1.** Supervised readings in the classics of political theory. A paper based on or related to the readings is required. Prereq: Qualifications as stated in Honors Program. 3 u.
- 197.2 **Junior Honors II.** Supervised readings in the classics on Philippine government and politics and public administration and/or political dynamics. A paper based on or related to the readings is required. Prereq: Junior Honors I. 3 u.
- 198.1 **Senior Honors I.** Supervised readings in the classics on comparative politics and/or international relations. A paper based on or related to the readings is required. Prereq: Junior Honors II. 3 u.
- 198.2 **Senior Honors II.** Honors thesis. Prereq: Senior Honors I. 3 u.
- 199 **Research in Political Science.** Approaches and methods of research in systematic politics. Prereq: Math. 1, 11; Pol. Sci.
- 110; **Soc. Sci. 103.** 3 u.
- 200 **Undergraduate Thesis.** Prereq: Pol. Sci. 199. 3 u.

GRADUATE

International Studies

- 201 **Introduction to International Studies.** 3 u.
- 202 **Development of International System.** 3 u.
- 203 **The Geographical Context of International Affairs.** 3 u.
- 209 **Readings in International Relations.** 3 u.
- 251 **The Organization Management of International relations.** 3 u.
- 261 **Contemporary International Issues and Trends.** 3 u.
- 270 **Comparative International Systems.** 3 u.
- 280 **International Law and World Order.** 3 u.
- 290 **The Theory of International Relations.** 3 u.
- 298 **Practicum.** 3 u.
- 299 **Research Methods.** 3 u.
- 300 **MA Thesis.** 6 u.

Political Science

- 210 **Advanced Political Analysis.** Critical analysis of epistemological and methodological issues in the study of politics. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 110. 3 u.
- 250 **Seminar in Philippine Administrative Problems.** Selected problems in

- the governmental processes in the Philippine bureaucracy. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 150/COI. 3 u.
- 251 **Seminar in Philippine Political Institutions.** Types of political institutions which evolved in the Philippines from pre-Spanish period to the establishment of the Philippine Commonwealth in 1935. 3 u.
- 252 **Seminar in Contemporary Philippine Legislation.** Problems in Philippine Legislation legislative-executive relations. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 152/COI. 3 u.
- 254 **Problems in Philippine Local Government and Administration.** Selected problems in the government and administration of local units and their relationships to the national government, role of local units in socio-economic development Prereq: Pol. Sci. 150/COI. 3 u.
- 255 **Problems in Philippine Constitutional Law.** Selected problems in Philippine constitutional law, with emphasis on current developments; theory and cases. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 153. 3 u.
- 258 **Special Problems in Philippine National and Local Politics and Administration.** Directed readings on the issues, trends and problems in national administration and central-local government relations. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 150. 3 u.
- 260 **Seminar in Political Dynamics.** Interaction of individuals, groups, belief systems, political movements and government in the policy formation; techniques of influence and pressure and their impact on political systems; theory of political analysis. Field research may be required. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 160/COI. 3 u.
- 261 **Seminar in Political Parties, Elections, and Interest Groups.** Problems in Philippine political parties, elections, and interest groups, and their impact on the government. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 160/COI. 3 u.
- 262 **The Elite in Politics.** The political elite and their role in the political system. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 160/161. 3 u.
- 264 **Women and Politics.** Changing political roles, status, attitudes and behavior of women in contemporary society and political implications of changing female/male relationships. 3 u.
- 268 **Political Economy.** Directed readings in theories of political economy and their empirical implication. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 160. 3 u.
- 270 **Theories of Comparative Politics.** 3 u.
- 271 **Government and Politics of Latin America.** The political systems of selected states in Central America, the Caribbean, and South America. 3 u.
- 272 **Government and Politics of West Asia.** Government and Politics of Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, UAR, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, etc. 3 u.
- 273 **Government and Politics of African States.** Government and politics of selected African states. 3 u.
- 279 **Seminar in Government and Politics of Asia.** Selected problems in the governments and politics of Japan, Taiwan, India, Pakistan, and any other selected Asian countries. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 177/COI. 3 u.
- 280 **Problems in Philippine Relations.** Selected problems in Philippine foreign relations, with emphasis on current developments. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 180/COI. 3 u.
- 282 **Comparative Foreign Policy.** The determinants, goals, techniques, problems and machinery in the formulation and conduct of the foreign policy of the United Kingdom, France, Germany, the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, and Any other selected countries. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 172/182/COI. 3 u.

- 283 **International Political Economy.** International political and economic system, particularly the capitalist world system, as the framework and determinant of public policy and economic performance. 3 u.
- 284 **Government and Politics of European States.** Political processes and institutions of selected European states, including the interplay of local processes and institutions with supranational political formations. 3 u.
- 285 **Problems In International Law.** Selected Problems in international law, with emphasis on current developments. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 185. 3 u.
- 290 **Seminar on Plato and Aristotle.** The political theories of Plato and Aristotle; their influence on political science. Prereq: Pol. Sc. 192. 3u.
- 291 **Seminar in Medieval Political Thought.** The political philosophy of Western and Eastern thinkers. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 192/Col. 3 u.
- 293 **Political Obligation.** Analysis of classic theories of political obligation-Hobbes' Leviathan, Lockes Two treatises of Civil Government, and Rousseau's Social Contract; critique of modern theories of political obligation. Prereq: Col. 3 u.
- 294 **The Theory of Democracy.** The theory of constitutionalism, republicanism, and democratic socialism. Prereq: Pol. Sc. 193/193/194. 3 u.
- 295 **Socialist and Communist Political Theory.** The development of socialist and communist political theories from Babeuf to the present. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 192/193, 3 u
- 296 **The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution.** Filipino political ideas from the propaganda period to the 1st Philippine Republic. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 196/Col. 3 u.
- 297 **Contemporary Political Thought.** Political thought in the 20th century including aspects of critical theory, post-behaviorism, post-structuralism and post-modernism. 3 u.
- 299.1 **Advanced Researched Methods.** Prereq: Pol. Sci. 199. 3 u.
- 300 **Master's Thesis.**
- 301 **Special Problems in Philippine Government and Politics.** Selected contemporary political, economic, social, and other issues and problems of Philippine government. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 150/Col. 3 u.
- 313 **Seminar In the Politics of Revolution.** Nature of, and conditions bringing about, revolutions; leadership and ideology, stages of development and impact of revolutions on political development. 3 u.
- 320 **Special Problems in Comparative Governments and Politics.** Selected problems on the governments and politics of major countries. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 172/Col. 3 u.
- 323 **Constitutional Government.** Constitutional governments in theory and practice; selected cases. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 171/172/Col. 3 u.
- 324 **Socialist Political Systems.** Theory and Practice of major socialist political systems. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 172/Col. 3 u.
- 325 **The Developing States.** The theory and practice of the government and politics of selected developing states. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 178/Col. 3 u.
- 326 **The Politics of the Developed States.** Comparative political processes and institutions in selected developed states such as the United States, Japan and Western Europe, particularly as these relate to political change. 3 u.
- 330 **Seminar in the Foreign Policy of the Major Powers** 3 u.
- 331 **Special Problems in International Relations.** 3 u.
- 332 **Regional Organizations and World Security.** Development and trends

- towards regional organization and integration; regional blocs and organization within the framework of world order and security. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 182/183/Col. 3 u.
- 333 **Seminar In International Organizations.** Selected problems of the United Nations and specialized agencies. Prereq: Pol. Sci. 183/Col. 3 u.
- 343 **Special Problems in Political Theory and Methodology.** 3 u.
- 400 **Dissertation.**

APPENDIX B
BOOKS RELEVANT TO POLITICAL SCIENCE PUBLISHED
IN THE 1980s and 1990s.

A. Books Published in the 1980s

1. Reuben R. Cancy. *The Counterfeit Revolution: Martial Law in the Philippines* (Manila: 1980).
2. Jose M. Crisol. *The Armed Forces and Martial Law* (Makati: Agro Printing House, 1980).
3. _____, *Men and Arms* (Makati: Agro Printing and Publishing House, 1980).
4. Jose P. Leveriza. *Personnel Administration* (Metro Manila: National Bookstore, 1980).
5. Lorenzo Sumulong. *My Years in Public Service* (Manila: 1981).
6. Ferdinand E. Marcos. *The New Republic* (Manila: 1982).
7. Vivencio R. Jose, ed., *Mortgaging the Future: The World Bank and the IMF in the Philippines* (Quezon City: foundations for Nationalist Studies, 1982).
8. Carlos Quirino. *Arrang: The Life and Times of Elogio Rodriguez, Sr.* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1983).
9. Froilan M. Bacingan, ed., *The Powers of the Philippine President* (Quezon City: UP Law Center, 1983).
10. Irene Cortes. *Emerging Trends in Law* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1983).
11. Pacifico A. Castro. *The Philippines and Law of the Sea* (Manila: Foreign Service Institute, 1983).
12. Caridad Aldecoa-Rodriguez. *Negros Oriental and the Philippine Revolution* (Dumaguete City: The Provincial Government of Negros Oriental, 1983).
13. Nick Joaquin. *The Aquinos of Tarlac: An Essay on History as Three Generations* (Mandaluyong: Cacho Hermanos, inc., 1983).
14. Joaquin G. Bernas. *Philippine Constitutional Law* (Manila: Rex Bookstore, 1984).
15. Glenn Anthony May. *Social Engineering in the Philippines: The Aims, Execution, and Impact of American Colonial Policy, 1900-1913* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1984).
16. Teodoro A. Agoncillo. *The Burden of Proof: The Vargas-Laurel Collaboration Case* (Mandaluyong: UP- Jorge B. Vargas Filipiniana Research Center, 1984).
17. Third World Studies Center, ed., *Marxism in the Philippines: Marx Centennial Lectures* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines 1984).
18. Alexander R Magno. ed., *Nation in Crisis: A University Inquires into the Present* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1984).

19. Fred Poole and Max Janzi. *Revolution in the Philippines* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1984).
20. Benigno S. Aquino, Jr. *Testament from a Prison Cell* (Makati: Benigno S. Aquino, Jr. Foundation: 1984).
21. _____. *The Garrison State and Other Speeches* (Makati: Benigno S. Aquino, Jr. Foundation, 1985).
22. R. J. May and Francisco Nemenzo, Jr. *The Philippines After Marcos* (Sydney, Australia: Croom Helm, Ltd., 1985).
23. Ma. Aurora A. Carbonell-Catilo, Josie de Leon, and Eleanor E. Nicolas. *Manipulated Elections* (Manila: College of Public Administration, University of the Philippines), 1985).
24. Nick Joaquin, Translator. *The Recto Valedictory* (Manila: Claro M Recto Memorial Foundation, Inc., 1985).
25. Ramon C. Aquino. *Chief Justice Jose Abad Santos, 1886-1942: A Biography* (Quezon City: Phenix Publishing House, Inc., 1935).
26. Lourdes Paredes-San Diego. *Don Quentin of Abra* (Quezon City: 1985).
27. Ferdinand E. Marcos. *The Democratic Revolution* Edited by and with an Introduction by Ileana Maramag (Metropolitan Manila: Office of Media Affairs, 1985).
28. _____. *The Filipino Ideology* (Manila: Marcos Foundation, Inc., 1985).
29. Patricia Ann Paez. *The Bases Factor: Realpolitik of FP-US Relations* (Manila: Center for Strategic and International Studies of the Philippines, 1985).
30. Alfredo B. Saulo. *Emilio Aguinaldo: Generalissimo and President of the First Philippine Republic* (Quezon City: Phenix Publishing House, Inc., 1985).
31. Filemon C. Rodriguez. *The Marcos Regime* (Quezon City: MOED Press, 1986).
32. Visitacion R. de la Torre. *History of the Philippine Civil Service* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1986).
33. Renato Constantino, ed. *Vintage Recto: Memorable Speeches and Writings* (Quezon City: Foundation for Nationalist Studies, Inc. 1986).
34. Resil B. Mojares. *The Men Who Would Be President: Sergio Osmeña and Philippine Politics* (Cebu: Maria Cacao Publishers, 1986).
35. Manuel F. Martinez. *Aquino vs. Marcos: The Grand Collision* (Quezon City, 1986).
36. Cecilio T. Arillo. *Breakaway: The Inside Story of the Four-Day Revolution in the Philippines, February 22-25, 1986* (Manila: Kyodo Printing Company, 1986).
37. Isabelo T. Crisostomo. *Story: Profile of a President* (Quezon City: J. Kriz Publishing Enterprises, 1986).
38. Carolina G. Hernandez et al., eds. *Issues in Socio-Political Transformation in Asia and the Pacific: The Recent Philippine Political Experience* (Quezon City: Center For Integrative and Development Studies, No date). Appended Program, however, s dated 1986.
39. John Bresnan, ed., *The Marcos Era and Beyond* (Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press, 1986).
40. Belinda A. Aquino. *Politics of Plunder: The Philippines Under Marcos* (Quezon City: Great Books Trading, 1987).
41. Harry Sichrovsky. *Ferdinand Blumentritt* (Manila 1987).
42. Aruna Gopinath. *Manuel L. Quezon: The Tutelary Democrat* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1987).
43. Priscila S. Manalang, ed. *A Nation for our Children: Selected Writings of Jose V.*

- Diokno (Quezon City: Claretian Publications, 1987).
44. Carlos Quirino. *Apokakay: The Biography of Elpidio Quirino* (Makati: Total Book World, 1987).
 45. Charles C. McDougald. *The Marcos File* (San Francisco: San Francisco Publishers, 1987).
 46. Claude A. Buss. *Cory Aquino and the People of the Philippines* (Stanford: Stanford Alumni Association, 1987).
 47. Walden Bello. *Creating the Third Force: U.S. Sponsored Low Intensity Conflict in the Philippines* (San Francisco: Institute for Food and Development Policy, 1987). Philippine Edition.
 48. Michael T. Klare and Peter Kornbluh, eds. *Low-Intensity Warfare: Counter-Insurgency, Pro-Insurgency and Anti-Terrorism in the Philippines* (Quezon City: KEN Inc., 1987).
 49. Alexander P. Aguirre. *Readings on Counter-Insurgency* (Quezon City: Pan Service Masters Consultants Inc., 1987).
 50. William Chapman. *Inside the Philippine Revolution: The New People's Army and its Struggle for Power* (Quezon City: KEN, Inc., 1987).
 51. Reuben R. Canoy. *The Quest for Mindanao Independence* (Cagayan de Oro City: Mindanao Post Publishing Company, 1987).
 52. Felix B. Bautista. *Cardinal Sin and the Miracle of Asia* (Manila: Vera-Reyes, Inc., 1987).
 53. Patricio R. Mamo. *The Aquino Administration's Baptism in Fire* (Manila: National Bookstore, 1987).
 54. Carmen Navarro Pedrosa. *The Rise and Fall of Imelda Marcos* (Manila: 1987).
 55. Raul P. de Guzman and Mila A. Refirma, eds., *Government and Politics of the Philippines* (Singapore: Oxford University Press and College of Public Administration, U.P., 1988).
 56. Martin J. Noone. *The Life and Times of Michael O'Doherty* (Quezon City: E.P. Garcia Publishing Company, 1988).
 57. F. Landa Jocano. *Philippines-USSF Relations* (Metro Manila: NDCP Foundation, 1983).
 58. Sterling Seagrave. *The Marcos Dynasty* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988).
 59. David Wurfel. *Filipino Politics: Development and Decay* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1988).
 60. Robin Broad. *Unequal Alliance, 1979-1986: The World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the Philippines* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1988).
 61. Aurora Javate-De Dios, Petronilo Bn. Daroy, and Lorna Kalaw-Tirol, eds., *Dictatorship and Revolution: Roots of the People's Power* (Metro Manila: Conspectus Foundation, Inc., 1988).
 62. Antonio B. Quizon and Rhoda V. Reyes, eds., *A Strategic Assessment of Non Governmental Organizations in the Philippines* (Metro Manila: Asian Non-Government Organization Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development, 1989).
 63. Jose P. Ablatez. *Foundations of Freedom: A History of Philippine Congresses* (Manila: Merriam and Webster, Inc., 1989).
 64. Renato Velasco and Sylvano Mahiwad, eds., *The Philippine Legislative Reader* (Quezon City: Great Books Publishers, 1989).
 65. Renato Constantino, ed. *The Essential Tañada* (Quezon City: Kkarrel, Inc., 1989).
 66. Victor N. Corpus. *Silent War* (Quezon City: VNC Enterprises, 1989).
 67. Samuel. Tan. *Decolonization and Muslim Identity* (Quezon City: Department of History, University of the Philippines, 1989).

68. Orlyno A. Ochosa. *The Tinio Brigade* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1989).
69. Jose Maria Sison, with Rainer Werning. *The Philippine Revolution: The Leaders View* (New York: Crane Russak, 1989).
70. O.D. Corpuz. *The Roots of the Filipino Nation* (Quezon City: AKLAHI Foundation, Inc., 1989). Vols. I and II.

B. Books Published in the 1990s

1. Salvador P. Lopez. *Elpidio Quirino: The Judgement of History* (President Elpidio Quirino foundation, 1990).
2. Elpidio Quirino. *The Memoirs* (Manila: National Historical Institute, 1990).
3. Arturo M. Tolentino. *Voice of Dissent* (Quezon City: Phoenix Publishing House, 1990).
4. Alfredo B. Saulo. *Communism in the Philippines: An Introduction* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1990). Enlarged Edition.
5. Joaquin G. Bernas. *Dismantling the Dictatorship: From MIA Tarmac 1983 to EDSA 1990*.
6. Belinda A. Aquino, ed. *The Failed December Coup* (Quezon City: Office of the Vice-President for Public Affairs, University of the Philippines, 1990).
7. The Fact-Finding Commission [Re Investigation and Study of the Attempted Coup d'Etat in the Philippines in 1989]. *The Final Report* (Manila: Bookmark, 1990).
8. Carmelo V. Sison, ed. *Constitutional and Legal Systems of ASEAN Countries* (Quezon City: Academy of ASEAN Law and Jurisprudence, University of the Philippines Law Complex, 1990).
9. Rosario Mendoza Cortes. *Pangasinan, 1801-1900. The Beginnings of Modernization* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1990).
10. _____. *Pangasinan, 1901-1986: A Social Political Socio-Economic and Cultural History* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1990).
11. _____. *Pangasinan, 1572-1800* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers 1991).
12. Violeta B. Lopez-Gonzaga. *The Negrense: A Social History of An Elite Class* (Bacolod: Institute for Social Research and Development, University of St. La Salle, 1991).
13. Volker Schult. *Mindoro: A Social History of a Philippine Island in the 20th Century* (Manila: Divine Word Publications, 1991).
14. Carolina G. Hernandez and Werner Pfening, eds. *Media and Politics in Asia: Trends, Problems, and Prospects* (Quezon City: UP Center for Integrative and Development Studies and Friedrich Naumann Foundation 1991).
15. Carmencita T. Aguilar, ed. *Government and Politics: Structures and Processes* (Quezon City: Philippine Political Science Association, 1991).
16. Rodney J. Sullivan. *Exemplar of Americanism: The Philippine Career of Dean C. Worcester* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1992). Philippine Edition of same book, published by Center for South and Southeast Asia, University of Michigan, 1991).
17. David G. Timberman. *A Changeless Land: Continuity and Change in Philippine Politics* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies and Manila: Bookmark,

- 1991).
18. Arturo C. Aruiza. *Ferdinand E. Marcos: Malacatang to Makiki* (Quezon City: Aruiza Enterprises, 1991).
 19. Rod B. Gutang. *Pulisya: The Inside Study of the Demilitarization of Law Enforcement in the Philippines* (Quezon City: Daraga Press, 1991).
 20. Estrella D. Solidum. *The Small State: Security and World Peace* (Manila: Kalikasan Press, 1991).
 21. Alexander R. Maño. *Politics Without Form* (Quezon City: Kalikasan Press, 1991).
 22. Natalia M.L.M. Morales, ed. *Politics, Science and Democracy* (Quezon City: Department of Political Science, University of the Philippines, U.P. Diliman, 1992).
 23. Santiago V. Alvarez. *The Katipunan and the Revolution*, tr. By Carolina S. Malay (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1992).
 24. Rafaelita Hilario Soriano. *A Shaft of Light* (Quezon City: Kayumanggi Press, 1991).
 25. Luzviminda T. Tangcangco. *The Anatomy of Electoral Fraud: Concrete Bases for Electoral Reform* (Manila: 1992).
 26. James Putzel. *Captive Land: The Politics of Agrarian Reform in the Philippines* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1992).
 27. Amando Doronila. *The State, Economic Transformation and Political Change in the Philippines, 1946-1972* (Manila: Oxford University Press and Transition Publications, Inc., 1992).
 28. Remigio E. Agpalo. *Jose P. Laurel: National Leader and Political Philosopher* (Manila: Jose P. Laurel Memorial Corporation, 1992).
 29. Jose D. Ingles. *Filipino Advocate and Spokesman* (Manila: Philippine Branch of the International Law Association, 1992).
 30. Jose V. Abueva and Emerlinda R. Roman, eds. *The Aquino Administration: The Record and Legacy, 1986-1992* (Quezon City: UP Press, 1992).
 31. Alberto T. Muyot. *Human Rights in the Philippines, 1986-1991* (Quezon City: Institute of International Legal Studies, Law Center, University of the Philippines, 1992).
 32. Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr. *President Aquino: SeinhooD Postponed* (Manila: 1992).
 33. Salvador P. Laurel. *Neither Trumpets Nor Drums: Summing Up the Cory Government* (Quezon City: PDM Press, 1992).
 34. Ledevina V. Cariño. *Bureaucracy for Democracy: The Dynamics of Executive-Bureaucracy Interaction During Governmental Transitions* (Quezon City: College of Public Administration, U.P. and International Center for Economic Growth and Philippine Institute for Development Studies, 1992).
 35. Victoria A. Bautista, Ma. Concepcion C. Alfiler, Danilo Reyes, and Proserpina D. Tapales, eds. *Introduction to Public Administration in the Philippines* (Quezon City: college of Public Administration, UP, 1993).
 36. Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr. *The Third Philippine Republic, 1946-1972* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1993).
 37. Alejandro Lichauco. *The Philippine Crisis* (Makati: St. Paul's Press, 1993).

38. Roman Dubsy. *Technocracy and Development in the Philippines* (Quezon City: UP Press, 1993).
39. Sukarno D. Tanggol. *Muslim Autonomy in the Philippines: Rhetoric and Reality* (Marawi City: Mindanao State University Press, 1993).
40. Samuel K. Tan. *Internationalization and the Bangsa: Moro Struggle* (Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies and UP Press, 1993).
41. Diosdado Macapagal. *Constitutional Democracy in the World* (Manila: Santo Tomas University Press, 1993).
42. Jose V. Abueva and Emerlinda R. Roman, eds. *Corazon C. Aquino* (Quezon City: UP Press, 1993).
43. Bobby M. Tuazon, ed. *Torment and Struggle After Marcos: A Report on Human Rights Trends in the Philippines Under Aquino, March 1986-June 1992* (Quezon City: Task Force Detainees of the Philippines, 1993).
44. Robert L. Youngblood. *Marcos Against the Church: Economic Development and Political Repression in the Philippines* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1993).
45. Alexander R. Magno, ed. *Papers on Democratization and Empowerment* (Quezon City: Third World Studies Center, *Kasarinlan*, Vol. 8, No. 3, First Quarter 1993).
46. Ronald E. Dolan, ed. *Philippines: A Country Study*, Fourth Edition (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, DA Pam 550-72, 1993).
47. Glenn Anthony May. *Battle for Batangas* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1993).
48. Isagani R. Medina. *Cavite Before the Revolution* (Quezon City: CSSP Publications, University of the Philippines, 1994).
49. Zeus A. Salazar. *Agosto 29-30 1896: Ang Paglalakay ni Bonifacio sa Maynila* (Lunsod Quezon: Miranda Bookstore, 1994).
50. Raul J. Bonoan. *The Rizal-Pastells Correspondence* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1994).
51. Ferdinand C. Llanes, ed. *Katipunan: Isang Panbansang Kiusan* ([Quezon City]: Trinitas Publishing, Inc., 1994).
52. William Henry Scott. *Barangay: Sixteenth Century Philippine Society and Culture* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1994).
53. Rondo M. Gripaldo. *The Quezon-Winslow Correspondence and Other Essays* (Manila: De La Salle University Press, 1994).
54. Alex B. Brillantes, Jr. and Bienvenida M. Amaries-Illago. *1898-1992: The Philippine Presidency* (Quezon City: College of Public Administration, UP, 1994).
55. Eric Gutierrez. *The Ties That Bind: A Guide to Family, Business and Other Interests in the Ninth House of Representatives* (Pasig: Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism, 1994).
56. Violeta Lopez-Gonzaga. *Land of Hope, Land of Want: A Socio-Economic History of Negros, 1571-1985* (Quezon City: Philippine National Historical Society, 1994).
57. Alfred W. McCoy. *An Anarchy of Families: State and Family in the Philippines* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila Press, 1994).
58. Jaime B. Veneracion, Patnugot. *Ang Kilusang Masa sa Kasaysayang Pilipino* (Quezon City: College of Social Sciences and Philosophy, December 1994, Special

Issue.)

59. Cesar P. Cala and Jose Z. Grageda, eds. *Studies on Coalition Experiences in the Philippines* (Makati: Bookmark, Inc., 1994).
60. Temario C. Rivera. *Landlords and Capitalists, Class, Family, and State in Philippine Manufacturing* (Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies, 1994).
61. Miriam Defensor Santiago. *Cutting Edge: The Politics of Reform in the Philippines* (Metro Manila: Womans Publications Today 1994).
62. Mita Q. Sison-Duque. *In the Beginning ... A Nation, A President [Life and Times of Fidel V. Ramos.]* (Dagupan City: Lyceum-Northwestern College Press, 1994).
63. Jovito R. Salonga. *The Senate Said No* (Quezon City: UP University Press, 1995).
64. Juan Ponce Enrile. *Where There's A Will* (Pasig City: Anvil Publishing Inc., 1995).
65. Francisco S. Tatac. *Making the System Work: Beyond the Year 2000* (Quezon City: Reyes Publishing, Inc., 1995).
66. Jose F. Lacaba, ed. *Boss: 5 Case Studies of Local Politics in the Philippines* (Pasig: Institute for Popular Democracy Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism, 1995).
67. Ledivina V. Cariño, ed. *Conquering Politico-Administrative Frontiers: Essays in Honor of Raul P. de Guzman* (Quezon City and Manila: JP University Press and UP College of Public Administration, 1995).
68. Proserpina D. Tapaies and Nestor N. Pilar, eds. *Public Administration by the Year 2000* (Quezon City: College of Public Administration UP, 1995).
69. Vivian De Lima and Carmencita Karagdag, eds. *Peace, Disarmament, and Symbiosis* (Quezon City: Conference on Peace, Disarmament and Symbiosis, 1995).
70. Luis Camora Dery. *The Army of the First Philippine Republic* (Manila: DLSU Press, 1995).
71. Bonifacio S. Salamanca. *Toward a Diplomatic History of the Philippines* (Quezon City: UP Press, 1995).
72. Carmencita T. Aguilar, ed. *Cooperation and Conflict in Global Society* (Manila: International Federation of Social Science Organizations, 1995).
73. Remigio E. Agpalo. *Adventures in Political Science* (Quezon City: UP Press, 1996).
74. Mark R. Thompson. *The Anti-Marcos Struggle: Personalistic Rule and Democratic Transition in the Philippines* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1996).
75. Carl H. Lande. *Post-Marcos Politics: A Geographical and Statistical Analysis of the 1992 Philippine Presidential Election* (Manila: De La Salle University Press, 1996).
76. Arnold Molina Azurin. *Beyond the Cult of Dissidence in Southern Philippines and War-torn Zones in the Global Village* (Quezon City: UP Center for Integrative and Development Studies and UP Press, 1996).
77. Historical Commission. *Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas. Communism in the Philippines: the PKP, Book 1* (Metro Manila: Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas, 1996).
78. Richard Pierre Claude. *Educating for Human Rights: The Philippines and Beyond* (Quezon City: UP Press, 1996).

79. Pacifico Agabin. *Unconstitutional Essays* (Quezon City: UP Press, 1996).
80. Genielle B. Romano. *Philippine Public Enterprises and Privatization* (Mandaluyong: Fiscal Administration Foundation, 1996).
81. M. Rajaretnam, ed. *Jose Rizal and the Asian Renaissance* (Kuala Lumpur and Manila: Institut Kajian Dasar and Solidaridad Publishing House, 1996).
82. Silvino V. Epistola. *Hong Kong Junta* (Quezon City: UP Press, 1996).
83. Carlos Ronquillo y Valdez. *Ilang Talata Tungkol sa Paghihimagsik Nang 1896-97*. Isagani R. Medina. Patnugot (Quezon City: UP Press, 1996).
84. Merlin M. Magallona. *The Dismantling of the Philippine State and the Impact on Civil Society* (Quezon City: Institute for Legal Studies, UP Law Center, 1996).
85. Leandro I. Verceles. *In the Mainstream of Development: Diplomacy* (Makati City: Verbuenco Press, 1996).
86. Emerenciana Y. Arcellana. *The Relevance of Plecto Today* (Quezon City: Office of Research Coordination, University of the Philippines, 1996).
87. Cayetano W. Paderanga, Jr., ed. *The Philippines in the Emerging World Environment: Globalization at a Glance* (Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies, UP Press, 1996).
88. Conrado de Quiros. *Dead Aim: How Marcos Annihilated Philippine Democracy* (Pasig City: Foundation for World Wide People's Power, Inc., 1997).
89. Adriel Obar Meimban. *La Union: The Making of a Province, 1850-1921* (Quezon City: Rex Printing Company, 1997).
90. Glenn Anthony May. *Inventing a Hero: The Posthumous Re-Creation of Andres Bcnifacio* (Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1997).
91. Bernardita Reyes-Churchill, ed. *Determining the Truth: The Story of Andres Bcnifacio* (Manila: Manila Studies Association and Philippine National Historical Society, Inc., 1997).
92. Ma. Luisa T. Camagay, Translator. *French Consular Dispatches on the Philippine Revolution* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1997).
93. O.D. Corpuz. *An Economic History of the Philippines* (Quezon City: UP Press, 1997).
94. Frank H. Golay. *Face of Empire: United States-Philippine Relations, 1896-1946* (Quezon City: Atenec de Manila University Press, 1997).
95. Miriam Coronel-Ferrer, ed. *Peace Matters: A Philippine Peace Compendium* (Quezon City: Center for Integrative and Development Studies and UP Press, 1997).
96. Felipe B. Miranda, ed. *Democratization, Philippine Perspectives* (Quezon City: UP Press, 1997).
97. Blas F. Ople. *The Philippines and the World* (Quezon City: Institute for Public Policy, 1997).
98. Isabelo T. Crisostomo. *Fidel Valdez Ramos: Builder, Reformer, Peacemaker* (Quezon City: J. Kriz Publishing Enterprises, 1998).
99. Adrian Cristobal Cruz. *The Tragedy of the Revolution* (Manila: studio Five Publishing, Inc., 1998).
100. Carmencita T. Aguilar, ed. *Regimes in Transition. Socio-Economic and Political Transformations* (Manila: International Federation of Social Science Organizations, 1998).

NOTES:

* The first paragraph and Sections I, II, III, and IV of this essay are reprinted from T. Uchida, ed., *Political Science in Asia and the Pacific* (Bangkok: UNESCO, 1983), pp. 145-82; also reprinted in Remigio E. Agpalo, *Adventures in Political Science* (Quezon City: UP Press, 1996), pp. 391-429. The last section, V (the postscript), was a paper presented to the Pre-Congress I "The History and Development of Social Science Disciplines in the Philippines," 31 January 1998, at the Philippine Social Science Center, Diliman, Quezon City.

¹ Manila: Esfuerzo Obrero, Inc., 1918).

² See *La Masoneria Filipina* (Manila: Bureau of Printing 1920); *La Revolucion Filipina* (Manila: Manila Book Company, 1924); *Epistolario Rizalino* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1930-1938), 5 vols. and *La Revolucion Filipina*, I and II by Apolinario Mabini (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1931), which Teodoro Kalaw edited.

³ See *Mabini and the Philippine Revolution* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1960); and *The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1967).

Jose Rizal, *Political and Historical Writings* (Manila: National Heroes Commission, 1964), pp. 130-63 and pp. 227-65.

⁵ (Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1912). This book is a translation by Charles E. Derbyshire of Rizal's *Noli Me Tangere*.

⁶ (Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1918). This book is a translation by Charles E. Derbyshire of Rizal's *El Filibusterismo*.

⁷ Rizal, *Political and Historical Writings*, pp. 309-16.

⁸ Remigio E. Agpalo, "Jose Rizal: Filipino National Hero and His Ideas of Political Modernization," *Solidarity*, 4 (December): pp. 1-14.

⁹ Graciano Lopez Jaena, *Speeches, Articles and Letters* (Manila: National Historical Commission, 1974).

¹⁰ Magno S. Gatmaitan, *Marcelo H. del Pilar* (Quezon City: Muñoz Press, 1965).

¹¹ Lea S. Zapanta, *The Political Ideas of Marcelo H. del Pilar* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1967).

¹² Cesar A. Majul, *Mabini and the Philippine Revolution* and *The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution*; and Remigio E. Agpalo, "Liwanag at Dilim: The Political Philosophy of Emilio Jacinto," in *Adventures in Political Science* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1976), pp. 63-75.

¹³ Apolinario Mabini, *La Revolucion Filipina*, I and II, ed by Teodoro M. Kalaw (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1931); Jose P. Santos, *Buhay at mga Sinulat ni Emilio Jacinto* (Manila: 1935).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

- ¹⁵ [UP] Catalogue 1914-1915. *Announcements 1915-1916* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1915), p. 26. The full text of the law is on pp. 25-29.
- ¹⁶ George A. Malcolm, *The Government of the Philippine Islands* (Manila: The Lawyers Co-operative Publishing Company, 1916), p. 9.
- ¹⁷ These citations are Malcolm's. James W. Garner, *Introduction to Political Science* (New York: American Book Company, 1910).
- ¹⁸ (Manila: Esfuerzo Obrero, Inc., 1918), p. 3.
- ¹⁹ Cristino Jamias, *The University of the Philippines: The First Half Century*, (1962), p. 39.
- ²⁰ George A. Malcolm and Maximo M. Kalaw, *Philippine Government* (New York: Heath and Company, 1932), Rev. ed.
- ²¹ (New York: The Century Company, 1916).
- ²² (New York: The Century Company, 1916).
- ²³ (Manila: Oriental Commercial Company, 1925).
- ²⁴ (Manila: 1948).
- ²⁵ The above facts were taken from various sources, such as catalogues of the University of the Philippines, annual reports of the President of the University of the Philippines, and a biographical sketch of Maximo M. Kalaw in *Builders of the New Philippines, Encyclopedia of the Philippines*, IX (Manila: 1936), pp. 323-25.
- ²⁶ M. Kalaw, *Philippine Government* (Manila: 1943), p. 9.
- ²⁷ (Manila: University Publishing Company, 1932), rev. ed., 1947, p. ix. The other book by Aruego was also published in Manila by University Publishing Company.
- ²⁸ Arturo Tolentino, *The Government of the Philippines* (Manila: R.P. Garcia Publishing Company, 1950).
- ²⁹ Enrique M. Fernando, *The Constitutional Government of the Philippines* (Manila: German Fernando and Company, 1951).
- ³⁰ Primo Tongko, *The Government of the Republic of the Philippines* (Quezon City: R.P. Garcia Publishing Company, 1960).
- ³¹ Vicente Albano Pacis, *Philippine Government and Politics* (Quezon City: Bustamante Press, 1962).
- ³² Gerardo S. Espina, *Philippine Government* (Quezon City: Panamao Publishing House, 1981).
- ³³ Remigio E. Agpalo, "Political Science in the Philippines," in S.S. Hsueh, ed., *Political Science in South and Southeast Asia* (Asian Political Science Association, 1966), p. 60.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 61-62.
- ³⁵ Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., "Summary of Dependence and Liberation," *Philippine Political Science Journal*, Nos. 5-6 (June-December 1977), p. 3.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

- ³⁷ Rodolfo Bulatao, *et al.*, "A Profile of the Philippine Social Scientists," *First Southeast Asia Workshop of Social Scientists* (Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council, 1979), p. 68.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 73.
- ³⁹ Remigio E. Agpalo, "Opening of the Golden Jubilee Celebration and Remarks," June 14, 1965, University of the Philippines.
- ⁴⁰ The records of the University of the Philippines were destroyed during World War II when the original campus and buildings of the University in Manila were completely destroyed by bombing. The extant annual reports of the President of the University of the Philippines and other official records are incomplete, even at the archives of the University of the Philippines. Between 1920, when the Department graduated its first student with a bachelor's degree and 1923, there are no available annual reports at the archives. The annual report of the President from June 1, 1924 to May 31, 1925, however, is available. On page 44 of this report, it says: "Last academic year, the University conferred upon recommendation of this committee [on graduate studies], twelve master's degree: 1 in political science. . . ."
- ⁴¹ The first Ph.D. graduate was Emerenciana Y. Arcellana. See her curriculum vitae.
- ⁴² See Note No. 39 above.
- ⁴³ Emerenciana Y. Arcellana, "Political Science and Political Regeneration," *Philippine Political Science Journal*, No. 1 (June 1974), p. 48.
- ⁴⁴ Annual Report of the Department of Political Science, University of the Philippines, Current Year 1981. The small number of students who graduated in comparison to very much greater number of students enrolled is explained by the fact that an enrolled student maybe counted four or five times, depending upon the number of courses he was enrolled in. The very small number of graduates in B.S. Foreign Service is due to the fact that this program was abolished in 1978.
- ⁴⁵ Jamias, *op. cit.*, p. 99.
- ⁴⁶ [University of the Philippines], Catalogue 1916-1917, *Announcements 1917-1918* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1917), pp. 113-14.
- ⁴⁷ [University of the Philippines], General Catalogue 1922-1923, *Announcements 1923-1924* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1923), pp. 133-41.
- ⁴⁸ [University of the Philippines], *Catalogue 1947-1948* (Manila), p. 131.
- ⁴⁹ [University of the Philippines], *General Catalogue 1958-1959, Announcements 1959-1960* (Quezon City: 1963), p. 217.
- ⁵⁰ [University of the Philippines], *General Catalogue 1963-1964, Announcements 1964-1965* (Quezon City: 1963), p. 259.
- ⁵¹ The Departments (of the College of Liberal Arts, which was reorganized to form three colleges—the University College, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences) established at that time were transformed into Disciplines.

- ⁵²The three colleges that sprang from the College of Liberal Arts were brought together again as College of Arts and Sciences at that time, and the Disciplines were called Departments once more.
- ⁵³According to Robson in a study by UNESCO in 1954, the main areas of political science as laid down by the International Political Science Association are (1) Political Theory; (2) Government; (3) Parties, Groups, and Public Opinion; and (4) International Relations. Robson, *op. cit.*, p. 183.
- ⁵⁴Agpalo, "Political Science in the Philippines," in Hsueh, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-66.
- ⁵⁵[University of the Philippines], *General Catalogue II 77-78* (Quezon City: 1978), pp. 415-19.
- ⁵⁶Elmer Vigilia, "Some Observations on the Teaching of Political Science as a Discipline in the Philippines," *Philippine Political Science Journal*. No. 1 (June 1974), pp. 70-71.
- ⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. 71.
- ⁵⁸(Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1922).
- ⁵⁹(Manila: La Pilarica Press, 1926).
- ⁶⁰(Manila: Oriental Company, 1925).
- ⁶¹(Manila: Oriental Company, 1929).
- ⁶²(Manila: 1932).
- ⁶³(Manila: National Teachers College, 1936).
- ⁶⁴(Manila: Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Company, 1936).
- ⁶⁵(Manila: Ilagan and Sanga Press, 1940).
- ⁶⁶(Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1944).
- ⁶⁷(Manila: 1949).
- ⁶⁸(Manila: 1953).
- ⁶⁹(Manila: 1956).
- ⁷⁰(Manila: 1958).
- ⁷¹(Manila: Lyceum Press, 1959).
- ⁷²(Manila: University Publishing Company, 1936 and 1937).
- ⁷³(Manila: 1948).
- ⁷⁴(Manila: University Book Supply, 1977).
- ⁷⁵George A. Malcolm (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936).
- ⁷⁶_____ (Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1951).
- ⁷⁷Dapen Liang (Hongkong: South China Morning Post Press, 1939).
- ⁷⁸Grayson Kirk (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1936).

- ⁷⁹ Joseph Ralston Hayden (New York: MacMillan Company, 1942).
- ⁸⁰ Jorge Coquia (Manila: University Publishing Company, 1955).
- ⁸¹ John Romani (Manila: Institute of Public Administration, UP, 1956).
- ⁸² Onofre D. Corpuz (Manila: Institute of Public Administration, UP, 1957).
- ⁸³ Jose V. Abueva (Manila: Institute of Public Administration, UP, 1959).
- ⁸⁴ Frances L. Starnes (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961).
- ⁸⁵ Juan F. Rivera (Manila: Pedro B. Ayuda and Company, 1962).
- ⁸⁶ Remigio E. Appalo (Quezon City: Office of the Coordinator for Research, UP, 1962).
- ⁸⁷ Raul P. de Guzman, ed. (Manila: Graduate School of Public Administration, UP, 1963).
- ⁸⁸ George E. Taylor (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1964).
- ⁸⁹ Jean Grossholtz (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1964).
- ⁹⁰ Carl Lande (New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asian Studies, 1965).
- ⁹¹ Onofre D. Corpuz (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965).
- ⁹² Aprodicio A. Laquian, *The City in Nation Building: Politics and Administration in Metropolitan Manila* (Manila: School of Public Administration, UP, 1966).
- ⁹³ Robert B. Stauffer (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1966).
- ⁹⁴ Cesar A. Majul (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1967).
- ⁹⁵ Enrique Voltaire Garcia II (Quezon City: Bookman Printing House, 1968).
- ⁹⁶ Jose V. Abueva and Raul P. de Guzman, eds. (Manila: Bookmark, 1969).
- ⁹⁷ William J. Pomeroy (New York: International Publishers, 1970).
- ⁹⁸ Dapen Liang (San Francisco: California Gladstone Company, 1970).
- ⁹⁹ Jose V. Abueva (Manila: Solidarity Publishing House, 1971).
- ¹⁰⁰ Harvey A. Averch et al., (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971).
- ¹⁰¹ Alejandro M. Fernandez (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1971).
- ¹⁰² Remigio E. Appalo (Manila: College of Public Administration, 1972).
- ¹⁰³ Raul P. de Guzman and Proserpina D. Tapales, eds. (Manila: College of Public Administration, 1973).
- ¹⁰⁴ Cesar A. Majul (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1973).
- ¹⁰⁵ Mamerto S. Ventura (Quezon City: Filipiniana Publications, 1974).
- ¹⁰⁶ Estrella D. Solidum (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1974).
- ¹⁰⁷ Shi-Ching Hsiao (Quezon City: Bookman Printing House, 1975).
- ¹⁰⁸ Robert B. Stauffer (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1975).
- ¹⁰⁹ Augusto Caesar Espiritu (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Law Center, 1976).

- ¹¹⁰ Benedict J. Kerkvliet (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977).
- ¹¹¹ Alejandro M. Fernandez (Quezon City: NSDB-UP Integrated Research Programme, 1977).
- ¹¹² Claude A. Buss (Stanford: Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, 1977).
- ¹¹³ Man Mohani Kaul (New Delhi: Radiant Publishers, 1978).
- ¹¹⁴ Ledivina V. Cariño and Arturo G. Pachó, eds. (Manila: College of Public Administration, UP, 1978).
- ¹¹⁵ David A. Rosenberg, ed. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977).
- ¹¹⁶ Augusto Caesar Espiritu (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Law Center, 1979).
- ¹¹⁷ Jonathan Fast and Jim Richardson (Quezon City: Foundation for Nationalist Studies, 1979).
- ¹¹⁸ Cesar A. Majul (Metro Manila: Office of the Commissioner of Islamic Affairs, 1980).
- ¹¹⁹ Emerenciana Y. Arcellana (Bicutan: National Research Council of the Philippines, 1981).
- ¹²⁰ Stephen R. Shalom (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1981).
- ¹²¹ Rolando Yu and Mario Bolasco (Manila: St. Scholastica's College, 1981).
- ¹²² Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., *Philippine Political Science Journal*, No. 7 (June 1978): 120-28.
- ¹²³ Temario C. Rivera, in Temario C. Rivera *et al.*, *Feudalism and Capitalism in the Philippines* (Quezon City: Foundation for Nationalist Studies, 1982).
- ¹²⁴ Alexander R. Magno, in Temario C. Rivera *et al.*, *ibid.*, pp. 87-105.
- ¹²⁵ Vigilia, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
- ¹²⁶ Balatao *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
- ¹²⁷ Vigilia, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
- ¹²⁸ Balatao *et al.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-72.
- ¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 174.
- ¹³⁰ Agpalo, "Political Science and Its Challenge to the Association," p. 21.
- ¹³¹ *Manila Times*, August 9, 1962, p. 6-A.
- ¹³² Charles E. Martin, *Philippine Political Science Journal*, No. 1 (June 1974): pp. 3-17.
- ¹³³ Philippine Political Science Association. "Inaugural Programme and Symposium," March 16, 1963.
- ¹³⁴ *Philippine Political Science Journal*, No. 1 (June 1974).

¹³⁵ See Shirley C. Advincula, "Report of Activities of the Philippine Political Science Association for 1981- 982," a copy of "By-Laws of the Philippine Political Science Association," as amended on August 1, 1981 and August 15, 1981.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

¹³⁷ These 11 social science organizations are: Linguistic Society of the Philippines, Philippine Association of Social Workers, Philippine Economic Society, Philippine Geographical Society, Philippine National Historical Society, Philippine Political Science Association, Philippine Society for Public Administration, Philippine Sociological Society, Philippine Statistical Association, Psychological Association of the Philippines, and Anthropological Association of the Philippines. Besides these 11 regular members, the PSSC has 17 associate members, such as the Institute of Philippine Culture (Ateneo de Manila University), Law Center (University of the Philippines), and Research Institute for Mindanao (Xavier University).

¹³⁸ Wilfrido V. Villacorta, "Philippine Social Science Council Agenda for the 1980s," Bulletin No. 85, National Research Council of the Philippines, Symposium on the Social Sciences in the 1980s, (1981): pp. 10-23.

¹³⁹ Fredegusto G. David, "Research Under the office of Research Coordination and the NSTA-UPS Integrated Research Programme A," 1982. Mimeo., Table I.

¹⁴⁰ Emerenciana Y. Arcellana, "Political Science and Political Regeneration," *Philippine Political Science Journal*, No. 1 (June 1974), pp. 46-47.

¹⁴¹ Interview with Dr. Loretta Makasar Sicat, April 11, 1983.

¹⁴² Villacorta, *op. cit.*

¹⁴³ Remigio E. Agpalo, "The Philippines: From Communal to Societal Pangulo Regime," *Philippine Law Journal*, 56 (March 1981): pp. 56-58.

¹⁴⁴ Salvador P. Lopez, "A Modest Proposal for the Agenda for the Social Sciences in the '80s," Bulletin NO. 85 National Research Council of the Philippines, Symposium on the Social Sciences in the '80s, (1981), p. 2.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁴⁶ See Appendix A

¹⁴⁷ See Section II, pp. __ above.

¹⁴⁸ University of the Philippines Diliman. *General Catalogue, 1996-1998*, pp. 222-224.

¹⁴⁹ The listing is chronological by year of publication, but among the books published in the same year, the listing is not necessarily chronological, for I cannot tell which of the books published in the same year was published earlier or later.

¹⁵⁰ The data on the activities of the PPSA under the presidency of Dr. Makasar Sicat were obtained in an interview with her on January 15, 1998.

¹⁵¹ National Social Science Congress II, 24-26 November 1988. *National Science and the Economic Recovery: Papers and Proceedings of the National Social Science Congress II* (Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council, 1990)

- ¹⁵² Carmencita T. Aguilar, ed., *Cooperation and Conflict in Global Society* (International Federation of Social Science Organizations [IFSSC], 1991).
- ¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- ¹⁵⁴ Felipe B. Miranda, ed. *Democratization: Philippine Perspectives* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1997).
- ¹⁵⁵ Carl Friedrich. *Man and His Government* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963), pp. 2 and 28; and *The New Lexicon Webster's Dictionary of the English Language* (New York: Lexicon Publications, Inc., 1991), p. 651.
- ¹⁵⁶ Marcelo H. del Pilar. *Monastic Supremacy in the Philippines*, a translation into English by Encarnacion Alzona (Quezon City: Philippine Historical Association, 1958). The Spanish version, *La Soberania Monacal en Filipinas*, published originally in Spain, 1889, is also included in this volume.
- ¹⁵⁷ The first essay was serialized in *La Solidaridad*, on September 30, 1889, October 31, 1889; December 15, 1889, and February 15, 1890. The full text in English translation is found in Jose Rizal. *Political and Historical Writings* (Manila: National Heroes Commission, 1964), translated by Encarnacion Alzona, pp. 130-163. The second essay was serialized in *La Solidaridad*, on July 15, 1890; July 31, 1890; August 15, 1890; and August 31, 1890. The full text in English translation is found in Jose Rizal, *Political and Historical Writings*, pp. 227-265.
- ¹⁵⁸ The full text of this document is in Jose Rizal, *Political and Historical Writings*, pp. 309-316.
- ¹⁵⁹ Remigio E. Agpalo, "Jose Rizal Rizal: Filipino National Hero and His Ideas of Political Modernization," in *Adventures in Political Science* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1996), pp. 45-61.
- ¹⁶⁰ The full text of this document is found in Jose P. Santos, patnugot, *Buhay at Mga Sinulat ni Emilio Jacinto* (Manila: 1935), pp. 61-63. An English translation by Teodoro A. Agoncillo is found in Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *The Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunon* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1956), pp. 83-85.
- ¹⁶¹ the full text of this work is in Jose P. Santos, *Buhay...* pp. 27-46.
- ¹⁶² the full text of this document is in Jose P. Santos, *Buhay...*, pp. 48-56. An English translation is in Gregorio F. Zaide, *Philippine Constitutional History and Constitutions of the Modern World* (Manila: The Modern Book Company, 1970), pp. 122-127.
- ¹⁶³ The full text of this decalogue is in Alfredo S. Veloso, Translator and Editor, *Memoirs of the Philippine Revolution* by Apolinario Mabini (Quezon City: ASVEL Publishing company, 1964), Vol. I, pp. 116-118.
- ¹⁶⁴ The full text of this document is in *ibid.*, pp. 118-143.
- ¹⁶⁵ the full text of this document is in *ibid.*, pp. 143-186.