

# philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University · Loyola Heights, Quezon City · 1108 Philippines

---

## Editor's Preface

Joseph L. Roche, S.J.

*Philippine Studies* vol. 27, no. 2 (1979) 131–136

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

---

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at [philstudies@admu.edu.ph](mailto:philstudies@admu.edu.ph).

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>  
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

## Editor's Preface

This issue of *Philippine Studies* is dedicated to the memory of Fr. Frank X. Lynch, S.J., an associate editor of this review for many years. Since his sudden death, September 1978, numerous tributes have been published – notably the special issue of *PSSC Social Science Information* (October–December 1978) entitled, “A Tribute to Frank Lynch, S.J.” Fr. Lynch has been honored as priest, social anthropologist, author-editor, teacher, and gentle friend; such tributes continue to be received; they ring true, with honest, personal sincerity. On an institutional level, the Ateneo de Manila University is in the process of establishing a Frank Lynch Memorial Chair in Sociology and Anthropology.

Perhaps the time has come for a different type of tribute, a reflection once removed from the close personal memories of the man, opening toward a broader, deeper reflection on certain truths that need more time and distance to come to light. The articles in this memorial issue provide the seeds for such a reflection, suggesting certain themes for quiet, more prolonged pondering, on the significance of Frank Lynch's life for us today.

Our issue opens with Dr. Scott's superb study of “Class Structure in the Unhispanized Philippines,” a subject of personal interest to Fr. Lynch as the author's preliminary footnote reveals. What strikes the nonprofessional reader in Dr. Scott's article is its unobtrusive scholarly methodology. From the simple but careful description of the different types of sources used, and the sequence and ethnographic present tense employed, to the modest, nuanced, concluding descriptions of each of the four major categories of societies analyzed, we have a concrete example of just the type of accurate, patient, pursuit of “reality” which Fr. Lynch himself sought and fostered throughout his career. To the casual observer, there is nothing here that would strike anyone

as extraordinary. Certainly, the time and effort devoted to the basic research is impressive; but these are not the key to the *primary* value of research studies such as this. Nor is the obvious advance in deeper understanding of Filipino traditions and culture, which the increase of essays such as this, will gradually bring about, the particular point in mind. Perhaps one has to be a teacher, or an editor of some review, or a thesis mentor, to experience this value, namely, the *discipline of mind* that amasses data and relates them in such a way that meaning and significance appear. It has something to do with the "high regard for the things of the mind" that Fr. Lynch listed as the first characteristic of an "intellectual." In any case, for most readers of *Philippine Studies* this capacity is an experienced value, whether in and from their own personal work, or in the work of others. It is, however, a value that deserves better of the academic community, so often caught up in a seemingly mad race of activities, proliferation of seminars, instant renewals, weekend "in depth" studies, and the like.

The following article, "Social Change and Religion Among the Bukidnon," by Fr. Cullen, is pertinent for a double reason. As a direct expression of concrete experience among the Bukidnon, it picks up a favorite Lynch area of research (see bibliography, nos. 4, 17, 88), and continues the essay of Dr. Scott in bringing one minority group's current status before our eyes: both the recent history of their many problems, and the encouraging "new approach" that has begun. But there is another reason why this article of Fr. Cullen is fitting in this memorial issue for Fr. Lynch. At the time of his death, Fr. Lynch was working on a revision of a symposium on minorities in the Philippines, authored by Bishop Francisco Claver and Fr. Cullen. The revision was never completed. This present article is subsequent to that symposium, and was forwarded to *Philippine Studies* by Bishop Claver. Thus Fr. Cullen's essay seems especially appropriate here — it helps, in a way, to complete the work Fr. Lynch had begun nine months ago.

One of Fr. Lynch's earlier interests, and in which he published (see bibliography no. 21), was the early Jesuit missions in Mindanao. Fr. Jose Arcilla, S.J., offers us a well-researched article on the mission policies of the Jesuits in Mindanao in the latter half of the last century. The attitudes of these Jesuits toward the Muslims, in rather striking contrast to that of the military and civil government, again brings to mind the old adage: he who

ignores the lessons of history is condemned to repeat them. There is much in the article to mull over – not only the openness and patience outstanding in at least a few of these Jesuits, but also their loneliness and the spiritual depth demanded of the “missionary.” In our present surge toward “total liberation” and our grappling with unjust structures and institutions, a reflective look at the past with its triumphs and failures might be especially in order.

Ms. Jeanne Frances I. Illo, of the Institute of Philippine Culture, worked closely for years with Fr. Lynch, particularly on the Bicol River Basin study. Her account of “Constraints to the Rural Women’s Participation in Philippine Development” brings to *Philippine Studies* readers a new and broadening area of research. Much of the worldwide women’s liberation movement has suffered, justly or not, from exaggeration and perhaps (no doubt?) reactionary male chauvinism. This article cannot be charged with such imbalance; rather it typifies the objective presentation of concrete data which is absolutely essential if Fr. Lynch’s second characteristic of an intellectual is to be realized, namely, “continually readjusting one’s conception of reality.” This willingness to change can be productive of authentic progress only if there is an input of true data. Ms. Illo supplies just such data; she brings out carefully the overriding importance of the structural situation, and of the attitudes, values, and expectations of society. For example, any successful reversal of the normal pattern of men as breadwinners and women as house managers, she points out, would demand as a precondition an openness to such a change on the part of society. For the non-social scientist, there may be a certain uneasiness in the admittedly useful description of development as the “widening of options.” Some would see further qualification as necessary if the authentically “human” quality of progress is to be achieved – which, of course, opens the discussion to philosophers, theologians, and others of similar ilk! But then again, Fr. Lynch was surprisingly at ease with them – he even promoted dialogue between various university faculties; hope burns eternal.

Our final two articles take up more controversial current issues, both of which were of particular interest to Fr. Lynch. In his “Economic Development and the Housing Problem,” Fr. Keyes argues against the prevailing common policy of government and leading private concerns. His position may well receive less than enthu-

siastic support from university faculties of economics. He candidly half expects this; nevertheless, there *is* a huge problem of housing; the present efforts here and abroad are not succeeding. The difficulty of government task forces and technocrats in understanding and responding to the actual needs of the people, is also a proven fact. [See, for example, John P. McAndrew's study on Andam-Mouswag, *Philippine Studies* 26 (1978): 391–425.] Fr. Lynch constantly wrestled with various versions of this same problem — his “On leaving bad enough alone” is one concrete example. Thus it may well be that Fr. Keyes' concluding positive suggestions have more to offer to even the professional economist who is engaged in working on the housing problem than might first be assumed. One thing is clear: this article pays tribute to the type of work Frank Lynch engaged in and encouraged throughout his career.

We conclude with an unsweetened, objective account of three studies on the socioeconomic aspects of Filipino sugar farm workers by Fr. Antonio J. Ledesma, S.J. — a study particularly fitting in view of Fr. Lynch's own pioneer work on this very subject (see for example nos. 104, 111 in bibliography). Today we are past the stage of “shocking revelations” and into the much more difficult era of accurate, detailed study and analysis, with an urgency toward possible effective response. Fr. Ledesma's essay praises the clear efforts of all three studies to “get the people's views,” and get down to the human level of the concrete problems studied, thus echoing a third Lynch characteristic of the intellectual: “an abiding, often hidden, concern about basic human issues.” The article does not attempt to give a full picture of the total scene in the sugar industry; there are human problems from the planters' and the centrals' points of view. Yet the data as presented are a necessary step toward any such synthesis, and perhaps easily constitute the most striking aspect of the total condition demanding a response.

The bibliography of Frank Lynch's works is not meant to be definitive; it is added to give the readers of *Philippine Studies* a concrete idea of the kind of work Frank did throughout his professional years. In the end, then, these publications, and the articles of this memorial issue, point to Frank as a man — a priest and Jesuit — who believed in the value and “rightness” of the intellectual, or better, of the whole spirit of someone formed and

trained and working to his highest human potential. Frank always worked in close cooperation with others; he experienced first hand the challenge of enlisting others in real cooperative effort — for example, his idea and ideal of a university faculty's active concern and cooperation in all university affairs, patently transcended the actual state of affairs. Yet there was no discouragement, no cynicism, no retiring from the field, for the simple reason — I should like to suggest — that Frank saw and felt and experienced, as any simple Christian can, the “more” in everything human. There is more to a good social scientist, and to everything social science as a science touches, than man alone. In Jesuit parlance, it is called: “seeing God in all things.”

“Seeing God in all things” — perhaps this will strike some as rather strange, somehow not “fitting” when describing a social scientist such as Frank Lynch. Others in the field might allow it, but only by “cheating a bit on the rules,” as it were. Certainly Fr. Lynch had all the necessary credentials: M.A. from the University of the Philippines, Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, as well as the expertise and professional ease in any scientific gathering, on any level, from the most sophisticated international conference to the simple barrio council. Yet this very scientific training was for Frank part of his total formation as a Jesuit priest. He was weaned intellectually on the utter conviction that no scientific truth could ever oppose his faith in the God revealed by Jesus Christ.

Even this can be misunderstood by taking it as a personal act of faith on the part of one who freely chose a religious vocation. If the significance of Frank's life-testimony were limited to that, it would be profitable, but not the whole truth. For ultimately we are speaking of *truth*: the grasp of what is. From this view, the intellectual apostolate of Fr. Lynch was not primarily that of a private belief that managed to span social science and the Christian Faith. Rather it was a witness to the stark truth that science and faith do ultimately mix; that a rigorous scientist can be an intense believer; that no human science can afford to forget this truth without opening itself to the peril of slipping from science to scientism — a most unscientific position. An essential aspect of any human truth is to realize its limitations. Perhaps, then, “seeing God in all things” may not be as strange as it might seem at first glance: it may help remind the social scientist that

the human beings he works with are persons with subjective dimensions that cannot adequately be quantified, and that all the tabulated data that help so much to understand this mysterious being always remain open to further dimensions that will ever remain un-objectifiable and untabulatable. It may also help remind the theologian, so tempted these days to dabble in economics, sociology, and political science, that it was in the hard, patient, rigorously scientific research that Frank Lynch witnessed to "seeing God," not in amateurish, ideological misuse of undigested data.

Perhaps this only illustrates the final Lynch characteristic of the intellectual, the "humble flexible seeker after truth, who eschews seeking power and wealth for himself." For Frank Lynch had learned by heart, at the very start of his intellectual career, the Ignatian version of the Gospel paradox: that power and wealth are to be found in that progressive gift of one's whole self – liberty, memory, understanding and will – offered to one's Creator and Lord, whose love and grace make one rich enough, desirous of nothing more.

*Joseph L. Roche, S.J.*