

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The theme of this issue is applied science in general and applied sociology in particular. Applied sociology here refers to the utilization of the scientific methodology and findings of the field to further some scheme of social change that is considered desirable. There is now a growing appreciation of the role which sociology *as a science* can play in giving technical assistance to programs of social change. This represents a definite trend away from the previous pattern of expecting the sociologist to not only initiate reforms but to act as jack-of-all-trades as well in conducting the program of change. The role of an applied scientist may seem more narrow and less glamorous, but it is undoubtedly more efficient and seems to produce more lasting results.

The thorny question of social planning is dealt with in the article of Philip Hauser. This discussion is particularly refreshing in that it is based upon personal observations rather than a purely theoretical approach. The author stayed a considerable time in Burma where he came into direct contact with the practical problems that are faced by a young nation that still has many undeveloped resources. Although the article is based on observations made in Burma, the points noted can be applied to many other nations facing a similar situation, including the Philippines. A question which stems from this article that is also often a point of debate is, "should sociologists assist in programs of economic planning?" Some take the view that sociology as a science should refrain from active commitment to a scheme of values such as an economic planning program would entail. Others, however, hold that if sociology does not participate in such schemes, it is neglecting a duty to mankind and leaving the task to people who may even be less qualified. This problem is thus a sequel to any discussion of economic planning.

The article of Lillian O'Connor calls attention to an aspect of sociology which many today tend to give a mere passing notice. The subject referred to is the socialization of the individual, whereby he or she learns the culture of the group. In the beginning of this century, the rise of psychoanalysis, with its emphasis on early life experiences, focused attention on this topic. Two of the best known sociological pioneers in this area of study are Charles Horton Cooley and George Herbert Mead. As time passed, however, the interests of sociology began to shift.

Today the development of speech training as a specialized field has revived interest in the study of child socialization. The learning of a language is found to follow the same pattern as the acquisition of the other elements of culture. It also requires much time for learning and, once acquired, shows great tenacity in the face of efforts to produce changes. Thus the students of both

PHILIPPINE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Present Mailing Address:
Department of Sociology & Social Welfare
University of the Philippines.
Diliman, Quezon City

Socorro C. Espiritu *President*
Pilar A. Gonzalez *Vice-President*
Richard W. Coller *Secretary*
Ofelia R. Anganco *Treasurer*
Robert McMillan *Consultant*

Richard Coller *Editor*
Socorro Espiritu *Assistant Editor*
Bartlett Stoodley *Editorial Consultant*
Gabriel Fabella Jr. *Advertising Manager*

PHILIPPINE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

The PHILIPPINE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW is the Official Organ of the Philippine Sociological Society. Subscription is three pesos a year or one peso for single copies.

Business correspondence and subscriptions may be sent to the Treasurer or to the Secretary of the Society, c/o Department of Sociology and Social Welfare, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.

speech and sociology would tend to agree that although it is not impossible, it is at least extremely difficult to "teach an old dog new tricks."

A problem in field research which is seldom or never mentioned in classroom discussions is presented by Richard Collier. The basis of this problem lies in the fact that the researcher and his assistants are just as human as their subjects of study. Therefore, the common tie of social interaction that rises out of the study frequently affects the research work itself. Since the Philippines is entering an era of field studies, (we hope), this article may serve as a timely warning to future field research projects.

The article by Pilar Gonzalez represents an excursion into the realm of social philosophy. Areas of family life which apparently require change are first indicated. Then the point is brought forward that sociology, along with other social sciences, should be used to accomplish the desired changes. A considerable amount of effort along these lines has already been exerted in other countries. There have been established such institutions as pre-marital counseling clinics, family adjustment institutes, and clinics to re-organize families that have already collapsed. In all cases the sociological contribution has been significant. Whether or not such work can be begun in the Philippines in the near future is quite uncertain, but, as the article indicates, there seems to be a definite need for some such work to be done.

The articles in this issue only touch upon a few of the many possible applications of sociology. As society grows ever more complex it appears likely that the sociologist will be more called upon to engage in applied sociology. Whether or not we will be able to meet future calls depends largely upon the type of sociological training that is given to Philippine students in the present.

—R. W. C.

FREEDOM AND ECONOMIC PLANNING *

Philip M. Hauser

The literature on freedom and economic planning is polemical and often doctrinaire. The concepts involved are complex and the divergencies in basic ideological assumptions and approach to them are great. Thus "freedom" and "economic planning" are, on the one hand, regarded as antithetical; and, on the other, as complementary or even mutually dependent.

To begin with, although the concept "economic planning" is relatively unambiguous, "freedom" may have many connotations. These include political, personal, religious, and economic freedom. These categories are neither mutually exclusive nor exhaustive. But they may be used to help to illuminate an analysis of the interrelations of freedom and economic planning.

To assure a common universe of discourse, these essential freedoms may be defined as consisting of the ability to make individual choices with a minimum of restrictions or interferences by agencies of Government other than those imposed by broad considerations of health, safety, or morals. That is to say, the freedoms do not exist *in vacuo* but, always, within a framework of constraints imposed by a social order, whether informal or formal. Freedom is necessarily a degree of personal choice within an accepted social framework with varying orders of constraints.

Economic planning may be considered as consisting of a general effort to direct and control a national economy from a central source, the central government; and a set of instrumentalities to effect such direction and control. Here, also, degree is involved in the sense that economic planning may embrace very general and broad direction, or minute and detailed controls; and the economic planning instrumentalities may embrace the whole or given sectors of an economy.

If an empirical approach is taken in exploring the interrelations of freedom and economic planning, as defined, then certain generalizations may be made for the contemporary world. Where economic planning is practiced the most comprehensively and intensively, there is the least political, personal, religious, and economic freedom. The situation in the communist part of the world, containing about a third of the world's peoples, documents this generalization. In contrast, where there is the least economic planning there is the greatest amount of freedom in each of the senses specified. The free