

Editor's Notes

The June 2016 issue of *Social Science Diliman: A Philippine Journal of Society and Change (SSD)*, brings together works on education, language, and history—subjects that have been given considerable attention since the 1980s. These subjects largely reflect and define the realities of Philippine society, thus marking their continued relevance in contemporary Philippines.

The articles in this issue are: Michael Arthus G. Muega's "Inclusive Education in the Philippines: Through the Eyes of Teachers, Administrators, and Parents of Children with Special Needs"; Ramon Guillermo's "Sariling atin: Ang nagsasariling komunidad na pang-komunikasyon sa disiplinang Araling Pilipino"; and Epifanio San Juan Jr.'s "Lagda ni Andres Bonifacio: Paghamon sa tadhana, himagsikan, at pagtupad sa kapalaran ng sambayanang Pilipino".

Muega's article discusses the knowledge and involvement of schoolteachers, school administrators, and parents of children with special needs (CSN) in the implementation of inclusive education (IE). Under IE, children with and without disabilities participate and learn together in a general education setting, which is considered a venue of human development open to all schoolchildren, regardless of their physical, emotional, and intellectual states.

Since IE aims at normalizing the lives of CSN, respect for diversity and inclusion and participation as basic human rights is one of IE's central ideas. With the challenges that the implementation of IE confronts in the Philippines—the lack of infrastructure and the absence of a strong

conceptual basis of IE, as well as the insufficient preparedness of schoolteachers and school administrators—the wisdom behind inclusion becomes noble. Hopefully, in the particular instance of IE, there is the concrete possibility of education to transform and uplift the lives of the Filipino people.

In “Sariling atin”, the Filipino language takes central stage as Guillermo discusses the possibility of a Philippine Studies community or Araling Pilipino (AP). Through a critical assessment of the philosophical underpinnings, practical application, and implications of Pantayong Pananaw (PP) by Zeus Salazar, Guillermo emphasizes the interdisciplinary nature of AP and how this may foreground the importance of language, literature, and the humanities in studying and writing about the concepts, theories, methodologies, and issues in the social sciences not only by Filipinos alone and in Filipino but also in other Philippine regional languages, as well as in English and in languages within and beyond the region of Southeast Asia.

These assertions and Guillermo’s take on PP bring to mind John R.W. Smail’s methodological proposition in his 1961 work, “On the Possibility of an Autonomous History of Modern Southeast Asia”. Smail’s work, which expands upon J.C. van Leur’s 1934 work, *Indonesian Trade and Society: Essays in Asian Social and Economic History*, explores the historiographical shifts between Euro-centrism and Asia-centrism in the writing of Southeast Asian history, using the case of Indonesia under Dutch colonial rule.

Unlike Salazar, van Leur, and Smail, whose core questions of who can produce and what is considered important and authentic in the production of knowledge of a particular group, Guillermo decenters ethnicity, nationality, and provenance as qualifications for inclusion in the community of scholars in Philippine Studies. What matters, he says, is the participation of scholars in dialogue with each other as they engage in the production of knowledge on Philippine Studies. This inclusive community constitutes what Guillermo calls autonomous Philippine Studies.

Bringing to the fore the material conditions in the “formation” of Andres Bonifacio and his establishment of the Katipunan that ultimately led to the Philippine Revolution of 1896, which highlighted the limits of ilustrado nationalism in Bonifacio’s demise, San Juan’s dramatic piece, “Lagda ni Andres Bonifacio”, limns the contemporary realities, particularly the socio-economic imbalances in Philippine society. The roots of these realities are traced back to the feudal political economy in the nineteenth century, particularly with the opening of the Philippines to world commerce at the end of the Manila Galleon.

Against this socio-economic canvass, San Juan reads Bonifacio’s revolutionary struggle through his classic 1896 patriotic call, *Ang Dapat Mabait ng mga Tagalog* and the *Dekalogo ng Katipunan*, a list of the duties and responsibilities of every member of the Katipunan. These works embody Bonifacio’s passionate beliefs and his aspirations of freedom for all under a just and equitable society. Freedom in Bonifacio’s terms, however, was not only about the pursuit of independence.

Rather, freedom was also a call for emancipation from social inequalities and discrimination that necessitates a parallel transformation of the self towards a life of virtue founded on reason, rationality, goodness, honesty, and respect for the public good—qualities that should be the foundations of a good citizenry. For Bonifacio, the “personal is political” and it is only in the union of the two that Filipinos will truly be deserving of their nation.

San Juan concludes that Bonifacio’s struggle continues and remains relevant for as long as inequities persist in Philippine society, and cites the on-going ethnic, national-democratic insurgencies under global imperial terrorism. A particular case closer to home is seen in Wataru Kusaka’s “Governing informalities of the urban poor: Street vendors and social order making in Metro Manila” (2010). Kusaka sets his work primarily in Quezon City, almost within the perimeters of UP Diliman, and explores the everyday struggles of the urban poor and street vendors as they negotiate strategies for survival within the bounded realm of state and society development projects, where for all parties concerned, the “end justifies the means”. In this highly nuanced work, Kusaka has not only shown the failure of the state to promote and uphold the welfare of those it has sworn to serve; he has also successfully demonstrated how the poor and marginalized could actually limit state power. These victories of the poor and marginalized, however, are ephemeral for in the end, their ways of life will never be legitimized, particularly in a society in the grips of an elitist and oligarchic ruling class.

Now I wonder, was Balagtas being prophetic when he wrote, “...*ang bayan kong sawi*.”

As a student of history, I have had the privilege not only of following and participating in exchanges on the above-mentioned subjects that have occurred in print, but also in attending some of the most engaging academic conferences where these have been debated on and which brought forth new perspectives that are all reflected in each of the articles. Hopefully, these articles will provoke a great deal of thought among you, our readers.

And so, what appears as a broadly themed issue within an imagined larger order of the multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary thrust of *SSD* are works that are actually held together by the commitment to pursue new paradigms and new ways of looking at both old and new issues while challenging or refining the current mode of analysis, so that *SSD* becomes “a place” not only to make research available but also “a place” to reflect upon research.

The June 2016 issue is my maiden issue and comes with many firsts. Apart from the articles, we have included Ramon Guillermo’s Historical Notes, “Siempre he encontrado en dicho camarada un verdadero espíritu revolucionario”: Tala hinggil sa ilang bagong tuklas na dokumento sa Arkibo ng COMINTERN hinggil sa mga mandirigmang Pilipino sa Espanya na kaanib sa Brigada Internacional (1936-1939)”. Guillermo shares newly found documents from the previously classified archives of the Communist International (Comintern) on the Filipino combatants

who fought on the side of the Republicans during the Spanish Civil War, and in so doing, provides new information on the history of communism in the Philippines.

We also feature two reflective essays by Gémino H. Abad and Ricardo T. Jose, to pay tribute to what once was the Faculty Center Building (FC), home to one of the intellectual power houses of UP Diliman, the Philippines' premier university.

And we wish to welcome three scholars who have graciously agreed to be part of our newly-revamped international advisory board: JC Galliard, Hal Hill, and Vineeta Sinha, as we remain grateful to two of our former international advisory board members, Harold Conklin and William Longacre, who have long passed away and yet whose contributions to the social sciences remain vibrant and relevant as ever. We also wish to thank Teow See Heng for serving in our international board until he decided to take a different and more reflective path, more peaceful and contemplative than the exciting but at times, highly-charged world of the academia.

Finally, the June 2016 issue of *SSD* breaks free from the unified template of the Diliman journals. Designed by Karl Castro, artist and designer and now considered the best in the Philippines, the new *SSD* "look" aims to be distinct with a balance of boldness and sustainability to reflect the dynamism of *SSD*—a journal rooted in the present but well aware of and engaged with the larger historical past. The new look comes in black—the color of gravitas.

With these armatures in place, we hope that we have managed to fulfill your expectations and that you will all look forward to our succeeding issues.

Thank you so much.

Ma. Mercedes G. Planta

May 2016