

DISCUSSION 13

MR. TRIUMFANTE: I would like to address my question to Dr. Abad.

I really am very intrigued with that "debunking" frame of perception you discussed in this forum. My question is: What happens after you have "debunked"?

DR. RICARDO ABAD: You see, the process of "debunking" starts when you expose the myth. Once you have exposed the myth, you are able to identify *mores* as a kind of constraint for people to live by.

It was Dr. Simbulan who said, "If you know the course of action, then do it!"

Now that should be just the attitude of a social scientist, if he were to be capable in identifying ways in which society should function better.

So "debunking" is the preliminary step in searching for better alternatives for the future.

MR. TRIUMFANTE: There is the danger, however, of the social scientist's injecting his own message, his personal prejudices and even his own conceptual framework or scheme!

DR. ABAD: That is right. But you should try to analyze as objectively as possible—in the same way that a doctor does when examining your disease. It is here where your personal values come in. And you have to use them. Otherwise, how could you plan for the better?

MR. TRIUMFANTE: But we also encounter other "debunkers" who think they have other proposals by which society may be structured better.

DR. ABAD: Yes, but later on, it all becomes but a matter of power play. And there will be adoption, finally, of a particular program.

MR. R. BUCOY: Dr. Abad, you mentioned something about social fiction, and I think you made a very fitting generalization in referring to the works mentioned by Dr. Villacorta as social fictions.

How come you referred to these works as social fictions?

DR. ABAD: I was not referring to scientific works; I was referring, rather, to works by politicians, government officials, leftists, rightists, moderates—statements, you know, of vision of what it is like to live in some sort of a particular political order.

Dr. Villacorta read some of them with feeling and I think there was some reaction from the audience—they were laughing when he read it.

So now, I mean, things like that are—to me—man-made ideas; they can be changed. They are not natural; they are neither permanent for immutable.

DR. REMEGIO AGPALO: Dr. Abad, the nature of a political system is that it would like to establish a political myth. In fact, no political system can maintain itself if its political myth is undermined. So let us take it as given that all political systems—democratic, totalitarian, authoritarian, primitive or modern—like to maintain themselves. And in order to maintain themselves, they must have a political myth.

Now you are suggesting that the job of the political scientist is to *subvert* that myth. Well, of course, this is a rather strong word but whatever word we use—debunk, subvert, or unmask—the result is still the same. What happens next is that a critical tension arises between the scholars and the political system. But, unfortunately, the scholars cannot get out of the political system! They may get out of the Philippines and go somewhere else—perhaps, to the US, but once they are there, they will still be under the rules of the American political system. So there is really no escape!

Thus your suggestion to debunk the political system can only end up either in death or in prison!

There are quite a few who ended that way. Rizal was one of them. Of course, Socrates, too!—if you were to include the ancient ones.

DR. ABAD: Well, to debunk is not to fault-find. You can analyze the myth of your political system and you may counter the conclusion after undergoing a critique of a critique, assessing both what is good and what is bad, until you find that particular myth which is most viable for a particular system.

Now I do not use the word "truth" because there is no such thing. You may just say such and such is workable and you have, in a sense, debunked the system!

So if the political scientists and sociologists have made a

thorough assessment and have said that it is perfectly alright, they have, in a way, debunked the system.

MR. QUIBOYEN: Dr. Abad, when you made a sweeping generalization of the works of Filipino political scientists, calling them social fictions, you explained that social fictions are man-made and therefore not natural.

Can you give us examples of works that are not man-made—not natural—and can therefore be considered as non-social fictions?

DR. ABAD: There is none. As far as I'm concerned, even theology is a human projection grounded on history and on a particular time and place. And the same is true of ideas.

MR. QUIBOYEN: So all works are social fictions?

DR. ABAD: Yes. We live with our own meanings here. And there is no other way of understanding that but to take an anthropologist's perspective.

MR. EFREN ROMERO: *May ilan akong obserbasyon tungkol sa mga napag-usapan natin ngayong hapon.*

Bakit daw ang political science ngayon ay nawawalan na ng kahalagahan sa tingin ng karamihan?

Sa palagay ko, isa sa mga dahilan ay sapagkat karamihan sa atin ay hindi talaga sincere sa ating mga ginagawa. Karamihan sa atin ay part-time political scientists lamang; hindi talaga tayo full-time sa ating paghahanap sa katotohanan at pangangailangan ng ating bansa sa larangan ng political science.

Ngayon, kung bakit nagkakaganito ay, sa palagay ko, dahil sa karamihan sa atin ay parating nasa pamantasan lamang; parating nasa silid-aralan na lamang. Kaya kung, halimbawa, itinatanong ng estudyante kung ano ang dapat gawin, o ano ang dapat na solusyon sa mga problemang hinaharap natin, karamihan sa mga teachers ay hindi nasasabi kung ano ang course of action.

Ito ay hindi sa dahilang sila ay natatakot sa militar kundi, sila mismo ay di nalalaman kung ang pinaniniwalaan nila ay totoo o hindi__kasi sa aklat lang nila ito nakuha.

Pangalawa ay, sa palagay ko, ang attitude natin sa political science ay para mag-analyze lamang, mag-describe, maglabas ng libro—at ang isang libro ay 20 taon kung tapusin!—mga gawaing sa palagay ko ay isa mga tinatawag ni Dr. Simbulan na "triviality" ng ating discipline.

Kung ano ang nangyayari, hindi tayo nakakapagpaliwanag

kasi hindi natin nalalaman kung ano talaga ang katotohanan. Ngunit, katulad ng sinabi ng isang pilosopo sa Tsina, "Ang katotohanan ay nakukuha lamang kapag ang ating nalalaman ay naisagawa—p naisapraktika—natin."

Ngayon isang katanunga lamang Kay Ginoong Abad. Sinabi mo na ang isa sa mga dahilan kung bakit hindi ka naniniwala sa ideolohiya ay sapagkat ito ay dinadala lamang o ginagawa ng isang taong may vested interest na pahahalagahan ang vested interest ng isang grupo ng mga tao. Sa palagay ko ay hindi ito masama sapagkat kung ang vested interest mo ay interest ng karamihan, dapat mong ipagpatuloy ang iyong paniniwala. Ngayon kung neutral ka, at wala kang vested interest, ano ka?

Sana ipaliwanag mo ang stand mo tungkol sa sociology ng iyong "debunking" na sinasabi mong pinaniniwalaan mo. Ganoon lang at salamat.

DR. ABAD: First of all, I did not say that I am against ideology. I think we all live with myth and we need myth—we need meaning—and that is very cultural.

Now, as I have said, if you assess a particular political myth and you find out that it is quite viable, then by all means, follow it. I am not against believing a myth; I am not against believing a vision.

And I am not against ideology. What I am saying is that because a myth—an ideology—comes from a group of persons—or it is a set of ideas promulgated by a group of persons—by its very nature then, it is limited. Ideologies are not bad. They are only limited because they fulfill the vested interest of a particular group.

Second, I am not neutral. I wince at the thought of somebody being tortured by the military—everytime I hear one. And I react against the corruption and evils of Martial Law. In this respect, I am not neutral.

But what I want to make is a distinction of being able to practice my own code of ethics—my own beliefs. You may even say, my own myths, but that is alright. Each one of us should be entitled to his own myth. Thus, in this respect, again, I want to clarify because I resent the thought of it, I am not neutral.

MR. ALEX MAGNO: Well, since we are basically concerned with assessing the relevance of political science as a course, I would like to say that in the process, we should take cognizance of the basic structural constraints on us—both as scholars and as social

individuals.

MR. RAMON ZAMORA: I would like to address Dr. Abad.

You said a while ago that ideologies, values and attitudes of people constitute myths in our life. I am not a sociologist and therefore I am not aware of words used by sociologists, but I think to sue "myth" in this sense would be a misnomer.

DR. ABAD: I apologize for the confusion. I have no offhand definition of "myth" except that it is a "view of reality" by a particular person or group.

However, the word "myth" may be properly understood in the context of values and attitudes. These two are meant to be "certain meanings to life"—or kinds of meaning people attach to reality.