

Sicat, Gerardo P.

**Working Paper**

## Two short memoirs on the development of Philippine social sciences

UPSE Discussion Paper, No. 2008,14

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

University of the Philippines School of Economics (UPSE)

*Suggested Citation:* Sicat, Gerardo P. (2008) : Two short memoirs on the development of Philippine social sciences, UPSE Discussion Paper, No. 2008,14, University of the Philippines, School of Economics (UPSE), Quezon City

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/46636>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



## UP School of Economics Discussion Papers

Discussion Paper No. 0814

October 2008

### **Two Short Memoirs on the Development of Philippine Social Sciences**

by  
Gerardo P. Sicat\*

\*Professor of Economics Emeritus  
University of the Philippines School of Economics

UPSE Discussion Papers are preliminary versions circulated privately  
to elicit critical comments. They are protected by Copyright Law (PD No. 49)  
and are not for quotation or reprinting without prior approval.

# **Two Short Memoirs on the Development of Philippine Social Sciences**

*by*

***Gerardo P. Sicat***

Professor of Economics Emeritus  
University of the Philippines

## **Abstract**

Two short memoirs are offered on the development of Philippine social sciences related to the contributions of two scholars. The first memoir is on Dr. Vernon W. Ruttan and the UP School of Economics during the 1960s. His contributions to the development of the UP School of Economics and of the Philippine economic profession as remembered here were incidental to his main work as the Chief Economist of the newly founded International Rice Research Institute in Los Banos, the Philippines. The second memoir is about Dr. Loretta Makasiar Sicat, political scientist, and the Philippine Social Science Council during the eventful decade from 1973 to 1984. During this period, the PSSC raised its profile and services and built a home for the social science societies in the country under private auspices with the support of the Philippine government and other major donors.

*Key words:* Social Sciences, UP School of Economics, Philippine economics, History of social sciences in the Philippines

# Two Short Memoirs on the Development of Philippine Social Sciences

*by*

*Gerardo P. Sicat\**

## *Abstract*

I. Vernon W. Ruttan and the UP School of Economics.....	1
ii. The Philippine Social Science Council Years Of Loretta Makasiar Sicat .....	4

## **I. Vernon W. Ruttan and the UP School of Economics**

A recent exchange of e-mail notes<sup>1</sup> from Emmanuel de Dios (dean of the UP School of Economics) and Mahar Mangahas (former faculty member of the School and founder and President of SWS, the polling firm) reported the passing of Dr. Vernon W. Ruttan, distinguished Professor of Economics at the University of Minnesota, at the age of 84 years. This made me think back about the three years -- 1963 to 1965 -- when Vern Ruttan joined the faculty as visiting professor. We were then a department of Economics, a unit of the College of Business Administration at the U.P. whose dean was Cesar Virata.

At that time in Diliman a fledgling group of young economists were working together. There was Amado Castro, the director of the IEDR, who was the most senior among relatively young faculty members who had just acquired freshly minted Ph.D.s from the finest economics schools in the US – Jose (Pepe) Encarnacion, Agustin (Dodong) Kintanar, Jr., and myself. With this group was also Richard W. Hooley, an American who had joined the economics faculty.<sup>2</sup> In all, this was a group schooled from different but strong academic traditions – (in the order of the faculty names mentioned:) Harvard, Princeton, Yale, M.I.T. and Columbia.

Economics at Diliman had just installed a new full time graduate program in Economics. Many graduate students were awarded scholarships to study in the full-time graduate program. The best graduates of the previous year by reason of generous scholarships from many colleges and universities were recruited. There were also three full-time scholars selected from applicants from Southeast Asian neighbors. This

---

\*Professor of Economics Emeritus, School of Economics, University of the Philippines

<sup>1</sup> Dated Wed 8/20/2008.

<sup>2</sup> Dick Hooley, a productive scholar whose specialty was financial economics, decided to live in the Philippines when Nelly, his Filipino wife, a fellow graduate of Columbia, reported back for work at the Central Bank of the Philippines. He sought a productive academic life at great personal financial sacrifice which he found at Diliman. He would move to the University of Pittsburgh in the 1970s.

scholarship-laden graduate program was underwritten by the Rockefeller Foundation. This was just before another wave of support for the growth of the school would come later, through the Ford Foundation, which sustained and supplemented these institutional thrusts.

Vern Ruttan became a visiting professor in 1963 under these circumstances. He did it via a circuitous route. He came to the Philippines to serve as (the first) agricultural economist of the International Rice Research Institute. IRRI was just starting its operations in its headquarters in Los Baños. In his appointment as the first IRRI economist, the young international research institute could not have found a better man.

Vern Ruttan did not have the obligation to become immersed in the academic affairs of the UP. But he joined the UP faculty perhaps as a good neighbor. He was a deeply committed scholar. Even though his job was one of research advisory role at a research institute, his greater calling beckoned him to contribute toward further scholarship in his line of work. I think he immediately understood that he could be of greater service to his UP neighbors by helping them in their academic programs. He must have sensed that to be a wise and well-appreciated outreach. The new IRRI offered good international salaries and disturbed the labor market equilibrium of the local host institutions. But he was not likely to help exacerbate that problem by just being part of an exclusive enclave. Good relations with the UP and the host scholars would bring some good dividends for IRRI and even to himself as a scholar. Perhaps he thought that he would become more effective in his new job if he had friends and colleagues from the larger UP community. As a result, and almost certainly, with the blessings of his own institution, he contributed some of his own time to work with the UP.

Almost immediately upon his arrival, Vern got busy trying to get to know the Filipino scholars in the economics world of the university. Instead of simply working with the Department of Agricultural Economics at Los Baños, he extended his sights on the Economics of Diliman in Quezon City. When he visited the Department, Vern struck a good note with all of us. With Pepe Encarnacion, then Department chairman, he agreed to participate in the Department's teaching program. Pepe enlisted him to teach a graduate course in the economics of agriculture that he could give comfortably in Los Baños at the IRRI. Our interested students could be harnessed to make a day trip to Los Baños, then as now a two hour trip from Diliman. In this, he also encouraged graduate students in agricultural economics from College, Los Baños. The course was a three hour once a week session of intensive lectures on the economics of agriculture.

Many of our graduate students trooped to Los Baños weekly for that lecture. As fortune would have it, the Department had acquired at no cost a first rate faculty member to teach the economics of agriculture to our students. In turn, Vern also got some of the Department's graduate students to work with him on his research topics at IRRI. This was how Mahar Mangahas and Aida Recto wrote their research studies which were part of Vern's interest of the moment about farmer market behavior in traditional agriculture in the country as their master's thesis. Relatively quickly through the contributions of his students, Vern Ruttan was able to finish two major studies about market response in

palay agriculture (Mahar's topic) and corn agriculture (Aida's). He served as thesis adviser and mentor and to these students. Of course, he had done more along economic research in the IRRI. Soon, IRRI research reports were not only about biology but also about the economics of rice agriculture in the Asian context. This economics touched on the effects of new varieties, irrigation, fertilizer and pesticide use, weeding practices and broadcast of seeds, and simple machinery to replace the carabao, and so on.

I had the pleasure of getting to know Vern up close. I had just returned to the UP in April of 1963 from studies abroad becoming the most junior among the UP Diliman economists. This was several months before Vern arrived in his new job. He was generous in commenting on some of my work which was then on production functions and industrial issues of development. He showed great interest in what I was doing. Moreover, he heartily participated in work that was collegial in nature. Pepe Encarnacion organized the economics textbook project involving the economics faculty, which I ended up putting together at the end. Among the roster of contributors were visiting professors (K. William Kapp, Theodore Ruprecht, and Gerald Sirkin) who visited the Department in close and overlapping succession. In this project we got also Filipinos from outside the faculty who were doing related work. These scholars were O.D. Corpuz (political science), Tito Mijares (statistics), and Emilio Quintana (agricultural economics). Vern contributed an insightful chapter on agricultural development. This was chapter 10, "Technological Change, Productivity, and Economic Growth." This chapter was driven by the theme of his research concerns in the economics of agriculture.

At about the same time, I organized towards the end of 1963 a conference on the Philippine economy of the period for the IEDR. Vern contributed a paper on the productivity issues linked with land reform, a very hot and topical economic issue of the time since the country's president (Diosdado Macapagal) had just proposed legislation on land reform which unfortunately was destined to fail. Vern's paper, "Land Reform and National Economic Development," discussed the economic rationale for land reform based on owner-occupied small farms, backed up by strong empirical support and by political philosophy. Vern's paper was the first to be submitted in line with the conference timetable. As a nervous young conference organizer, this gesture gave me great encouragement in pursuing the project.

I took over the editorship of the *Philippine Economic Journal*, the journal then of the Philippine Economic Society in 1964. Vern Ruttan was among the early scholars whom I badgered for economic studies of journal length that had a bearing on Philippine economic issues. The young journal perennially faced a shortage of materials, especially those written by Filipino economists and one route took was to explore the various sectors where economic studies were making their way in the Philippine government and in the universities. There were a lot potential economic papers in the government but not of academic quality and there was too little from the academic sector. Foreign visiting economists were a good source of contributions.

Vern supported the *Journal* by responding to my call for contributions. And he offered good materials from his own till. He supplied me with his essay, "On Schumpeter

and Development,” which was in the first issue that I edited, in 1965. This was a thoughtful update on a topic that was foremost in the work of agricultural development economists at the time. He would later incorporate this paper in his studies on agricultural innovations and productivity across international examples. A year later, he submitted two major articles to the *Journal* which I published in the same issue. The first of these was the research on rice and corn agriculture of Mahar Mangahas and Aida Recto that included Vern rightfully as the third author. The second paper was his own study, “Tenure and Productivity of Philippine Rice Producing Farms.” These were seminal works on important topics of Philippine economics at the time.

In the three years that he spent in the Philippines as an economist of the IRRI, Vern was also visiting professor at the UP. The economic research agenda that he put in place at the IRRI also benefited Philippine ideas in the economic development of agriculture. Studies on the economics of rice agriculture focused on productivity and the economics of choice regarding the adoption of new rice varieties by farmers. The challenge covered a wide group of Asian and other developing countries that had different terrains, horticultural traditions, water availability, and so on. There was no single success formula but several to be found and possibly replicated to other countries. Vern was a forerunner in bringing economic analysis close to the experimental work of plant scientists who were developing many strains of rice varieties for these countries in order to raise the world’s food supply.

Vernon Ruttan lived a long and productive life as an economist. In the short span of his work in the Philippines, he contributed to the development of the country’s economic profession.

[August 31, 2008]

## **II. The Philippine Social Science Council Years of Loretta Makasiar Sicat**

Your invitation\* to write a piece for the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of PSSC gives me a chance to pay a tribute to Dr. Loretta Makasiar Sicat<sup>♥</sup> in a personal way. This is decidedly a biased biography of her. Her story is intertwined with mine, for Loretta is my wife. Also, her story at PSSC is partly linked with some of my work at the national level. I think that Loretta has done well in her association with PSSC. Hence she deserves this story which is a significant part of the history of PSSC. I exceed the limits of your the restrictions on length of the piece but I hope that what I write will help to fill some gaps in the history of PSSC.

---

\* This memoir is written at the invitation of Dr. Virginia Miralao, the current Executive Director of the Social Science Council, on the occasion of the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the PSSC.

Loretta's entry point to the Philippine Social Science Council was through Political Science. She discovered the rigorous Political Science program of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology when I was a student there at the Economics department. To take advantage of her excellent surroundings, she applied and received an assistantship to study there during my second year of study. We arrived in Cambridge, Mass. as a couple in 1959 and began to raise our family there while I was a graduate student. When we returned to UP in 1963, our family had doubled in size and she had completed almost a full year of graduate study in Political Science at MIT studying at three-fourths time.

At UP upon our return, she was offered an instructor's job in the Political Science faculty. Dr. Onofre D. Corpuz, then Chairman of Political Science, recommended her for a Rockefeller study grant to continue her Ph.D. studies at MIT. She returned (alone) to Cambridge in early 1965 and finished her academics for the degree by 1966, returned to UP again to do her field work on the political socialization of young Filipinos for the doctoral thesis, gave birth to two babies in 1967 and in 1968, and in 1970 returned to MIT to claim her Ph.D. How fecund in all respects!

I can probably say in retrospect that the easy part of our education was that we were the recipients of generous scholarships to study by the Rockefeller Foundation on separate occasions for our graduate studies. The hard part of our "tuition" fees to study for our separate Ph.D.s was the task of raising two children per degree aside from learning the disciplines of our respective fields. As one can see, a woman's role is more difficult in that regard.

As a member and one time Chairman of the UP Political Science Department and later as an active member and President of the Political Science Association she eventually got drawn into the policy making board of the PSSC. This was during the time when the PSSC was still footloose, without a permanent office, and moving its venue where the chairman of the PSSC held sway. Meetings were held in some rooms at the UP departments and at times the Ateneo Institute of Philippine Culture where Frank Lynch worked.

When Loretta joined the PSSC Board, she worked with some of the country's eminent social scientists – anthropologists, psychologists, demographers, geographers, historians, linguists, economists and statisticians. These were the pioneers who were shaping the history of social science in the country, some of whom helped to found the PSSC. Part of the first generation of postwar leaders who paved the way for PSSC was still around and participating in the Board. When she joined the Board of the PSSC, he found the following as members: Frank Lynch, Alfredo Lagmay, Armand Fabella, Mercedes Concepcion, Cristina Parel, Rodolfo Bulatao, Eufronio Alip, Nathaniel Tablante, Emy Pascasio, and Abelardo Samonte. Over time, other names came into the fore – Andrew Gonzalez, Bonifacio Salamanca, Burton Onate, Gloria Feliciaino, Raul de Guzman, Vicente Valdepenas, Zelda Zablan and Consuelo Gutierrez – and still later, Domingo Salita, Leslie Bauzon, Ruben Trinidad, and Cesar Macuja. These are names that she interacted with in working on the PSSC's programs and projects. PSSC had limited resources to work with, but it had large hopes about the future.

In 1976, her peers on the Board of PSSC asked her to become chairman. She must have done quite well in dealing with her work because when the PSSC decided to expand

its activities, her PSSC colleagues asked her to become the full time Executive Director in the following year. I recall that she was not enthusiastic about the job at the beginning. Once in office, she put her heart to her duties and helped to build the PSSC. In this post, she would remain until 1984 shortly before my departure for work abroad in another new stage of my career.

Her accomplishments at PSSC were many. But I will focus on her efforts to make the PSSC a visible and permanent entity. The Board tried to strengthen the membership programs of the various social science societies. This created a demand for an office. When the relatively large Rockefeller faculty houses built for visiting professor residences became available for lease to UP professors, Loretta was quick to realize that that would give the PSSC a home and an address. In such cases where demand exceeded supply enormously, quick action established strong precedent if not priority. Justifying the use of such a house for a non-profit and non-UP organization rested mainly on the fact that UP professors who worked in the PSSC were also leaders in the social sciences in the country. So she quickly secured the lease of the house. That was the first year she had become chairman of the PSSC.

Two milestones in PSSC's history happened during this time. The first of these events was the Ford Foundation grant for the secretariat that was intended to be its last to the PSSC. The second was the Japanese donation that led to the building for the PSSC.

At about this time, I was occupying a cabinet portfolio in the Philippine government. I was the Director General of the NEDA and concurrently the Minister of Economic Planning. My job included the allocation of aid resources in the Philippine economy.

The Ford Foundation was an early supporter of the PSSC. Those who founded the PSSC had the US Social Science Research Council as the model for its organizational framework. For several years, the Ford Foundation had given seed grants to jumpstart the initial operations of the PSSC. As time elapsed, some kind of weaning process became inevitable. Then also, the Ford Foundation was experiencing aid-fatigue. It was also in search of new activities in the country and new programs in Southeast Asia. Also, its program finances were on the wane.

One day, Dr. John Cool,<sup>\*</sup> then the Ford Foundation official in charge of the Philippine country projects, asked to pay me a visit at NEDA. It was customary for such officials to call on government officials largely to inform about what their foundations were doing in the country. The charitable foundations, unlike government aid donors, dealt with their own clienteles with little state intervention as a matter of government policy. But it was essential for the foundations to demonstrate where and how they directed their resources.

Perhaps because John Cool knew that the Executive Director of PSSC was Loretta, he mentioned in the course of his summary of the foundation's projects that the Ford Foundation was to give a final grant to the secretariat of PSSC. This led to a little

---

<sup>\*</sup>Since I am recalling from memory, my guess was that it was John Cool who came to see me. But it could have been also Peter Geithner, who was the head for projects and programs affecting the Philippines, in the New York headquarters of Ford Foundation.

more discussion on the history of that involvement with PSSC as it aroused my curiosity. I noted that what Ford Foundation had planned to do to close their involvement seemed small and that as a grant to spend the money it would naturally be disbursed and dissipated as the need arose and as time passed. Thus, it gave only temporary relief. I therefore hit upon the thought that perhaps more resources could be appropriated so that the secretariat could have more financial resources that it could then invest and let to grow. In time this would provide some earnings to pay off secretariat expense. If Ford Foundation could raise the amount to a more substantial sum and release the money in one lump sum, I said, then the government could commit more money to double the Ford grant.

This off-the-cuff remark had to be backed up by actual deed. Without telling him how I would do it, I had a working plan. With the approval of the President of the Philippines, I could channel some resources within my powers as NEDA director general to sign on to help the Ford Foundation grant to the PSSC. I could ask the USAID director to channel some PL 480 money which was cash generated from Philippine purchases of US agricultural food aid to be used for the purpose. Therefore, I spoke with great confidence that I could deliver on the counterpart support. I was also not appropriating any money from the budget which would have been difficult to do. At the end of that meeting, John Cool and I shook hands on the proposal to raise the Ford grant. I put the ball in the hands of the Ford Foundation. As overseer of Philippine projects, Cool was to persuade his headquarters to raise the grant that had been already programmed for PSSC.

I would not have thought of this immediate suggestion if I had not had more first hand knowledge of the value that the PSSC could do to harness the intellectual resources of the social science disciplines. The periodic conversations that Loretta and I had over dinner and other occasions were therefore valuable in this regard. Loretta was not the attention grabber that some wives nag their spouses about. But she always succinctly told me about the unique problems that the PSSC faced. They were formidable. They were undertaking some small projects in helping social science activities and promoting coordinative efforts among the societies and preparing programs to be of continuous service and relevance to the Philippine societies. But the organization was immensely challenged by lack of resources. Poverty in resources also meant becoming invisible rather than prominent. An essential strength of any organization in raising money is often its financial stability. Such a public face was missing. A large begging bowl is often not a proper method in attracting resources from potential donors.

Thus, I had become aware of the activities and the problems of PSSC as if by osmosis through my conversations with Loretta. So when I told her of the John Cool visit and what we had agreed to do to help PSSC, it was an understatement to say that she was immensely pleased. She must have figured out what new activities such assistance could bring, including some measure of financial relief at least for the meantime. The rest of the effort then fell on Loretta and others at PSSC to influence Ford Foundation to raise the amount of the final grant for the secretariat work of PSSC. She succeeded.

About two decades ago, Dr. Bonifacio Salamanca, of the UP history department, was commissioned to write the history of PSSC up to that time.\* He paid attention to this important episode. Loretta explained to him those events to clarify the matter and provided specific documentation of this, including the xerox copy of the handwritten note of President Marcos on the decision memorandum of NEDA when he consented to the donation of government resources to the PSSC because it was a private organization with a public purpose.

The second big event of the PSSC is the story of how the Japanese government made a donation to house the social sciences societies in one building. Perhaps, this is the first time that some details in this episode are made in public. Sometime in the late 1970s, Japanese development assistance program added a grant program toward the building of facilities that contributed to a recipient country's human resources development. This arose out of Prime Minister Ohira's innovation in the Japan's aid program. This was a unique deviation from Japan's traditional programs of soft loans and other technical assistance programs for economic development purposes. This new element in the aid program was precisely to support the building of physical facilities used for human resources development. Its best feature was that it was grant assistance and that it did not require intricate discussions of counterpart funding. The Japanese government totally financed the building and contributed donation of equipment besides. But it was a tied grant.

I instructed my NEDA staff to include the building of a social sciences center among the items to be included in the yearly pipeline for this phase of Japanese assistance. The Japanese government was very receptive to the idea during the technical level discussions. The process of aid identification begins at the technical level and moves up to higher level approvals in the normal bureaucratic course of things. Soon, joint communiqués on the yearly assistance programs included the PSSC building in the pipeline and had high priority.

Loretta worked with the PSSC on the concept of a permanent building. She met with the Japanese aid representatives when talk about the prospects for the building became more advanced. Loretta argued that a permanent building would give a true home to the many social science societies of the country. The PSSC would be in a better position to help strengthen these societies and reinforce their sense of mission. When the aid program had advanced approval stage, she got busy with the work on the building concepts. Such a facility would provide offices and conference rooms of different sizes to meet the needs of the Philippine societies when they had conferences. Part of the offices could be rented to provide income to the PSSC. Thus, such a building, instead of hobbling the organization with huge maintenance costs would help provide PSSC with physical assets that could generate income while performing its public tasks. That could then help to make the society self-sustaining financially as well as boost its programs. Loretta brought this issue up to the Board and the idea became a major goal of the PSSC. It was one thing to plan it but the resource had to be provided. With the Japanese grant assistance, it was to become reality.

---

\*Bonifacio S. Salamanca, "The Philippine Social Science Council: The First 25 Years," *PSSC Social Science Information Bulletin* special issue, Vol. 23, Nos. 3-4.

For my part and through NEDA, it was a matter of getting the list of agreed projects to move forward. The aid projects from Japan were extensive and they were agreed on the basis of a list that was approved by the President of the Philippines. It was important to get the Japanese aid foreign ministry to agree to that list. Also it was important that the government did not change the components in the project list. That could happen. As the bureaucratic process of continuous iterations took its normal course, it was important to maintain vigilance at the home front. Sometimes – lo and behold! – someone with political clout could ambush and displace a project while no one was keeping watch. In the case of the PSSC building project, all went well quickly however on the approval side between the two governments.

The award and prosecution of aid projects could take time, caused by unexpected delays. From this viewpoint, the human resources building project for PSSC moved relatively quickly once the preliminaries of land location, plans for the building, and other contractual matters were finished. As tied aid, these programs were fully built by the Japanese government and it was Japanese government process at work: choosing their architects and their contractors. It was therefore important that specifications for the project had to be done with the recipient institutions, and that meant work for Loretta and PSSC. The specifications, requirements and design for the building had to be undertaken. These issues were not trivial for the PSSC.

And Loretta was immersed fully in this work. Her attention to detail not only included the design, orientation of the building, but also what amenities to put in. When she went to Japan on the invitation of the aid program offices, she was glad to find the scale model of the building already finished and that the construction schedules were already firm. The concepts that she and others had suggested concerning the design and structure of the building when the Japanese project engineers and architects visited in Manila had been substantially integrated into the plan. She had wanted to bring down the cost of building maintenance and the need to properly orient the building to make maximum use of sunlight and air flow. Air conditioning would be essentially individualized, not centralized. Moreover, on details that seemed minor, she was emphatic. For instance, because she understood the problem, she saw to it that a ramp for the entry into the building of the physically disabled was properly planned. When the landscape seller of materials and plants that had been squatting on the site posed a threat to the construction start, she suggested ways for the Japanese contractor expedite the process. The Japanese contractor paid fair compensation and the squatter hurriedly cooperated with the removal of the impediments.

Of course, the most important prior problem before construction could begin was to secure the land site. This had to be settled long before the work on the building would proceed. The only assets that PSSC owned were its office equipment, which was minimal. It had no land. To secure that land for the construction posed some legal and proprietary obstacles on the part of the potential donors.

At the beginning, there was debate in the Board where to locate the building. At first, the idea of locating it on private land – away from the dominant influence of UP and of Ateneo – was an attractive idea. But who would give private land for a non-profit activity like PSSC? The Ateneans (perhaps the gentle Frank Lynch might have favored this at the time, although during this time he had already passed away) would have

preferred that the building be located outside the UP and possibly in Ateneo. This would avoid the impression that PSSC was like an extension of a UP social sciences department. The idea of Ateneo yielding land for the PSSC was a question that Vicente Jayme, who was then on the Board, would explore with the Ateneo authorities. There were debates on the pros and cons of this at that end.

I think that Loretta could accept the long term prospect of independence of the PSSC from dominance by UP as a sound idea. In that way, the social sciences would develop in a more inclusive “national” manner. But how was one to execute this within the framework of a private building in private or non-government land if there was no privately made available land on which to construct the building? It was a great fallacy that the PSSC being located in UP would automatically imply UP dominance. In the end, the social sciences would grow strong where the institutions of learning and of research made that possible. The PSSC was in the end mainly a receptacle of the collective achievements of each and every social science discipline wherever it grew and developed.

In the final analysis, the only good and practical option was to locate in the UP. Ateneo’s authorities found it difficult to give up land that it could use for Ateneo’s own future growth. And then there were many issues of local and institutional conflict of laws that intruded, including the matter of local taxes, and the length and renewal status of the land lease.

Within UP, the matter also was not smooth. For UP, despite its abundance of land, the problem of PSSC’s standing as a private, non-profit institution, came back to raise the fundamental issue about the private use of public resources. The President of the UP then was O.D. Corpuz and he understood as well the needs of PSSC. But UP could not just sever land and donate it. Long term lease was the only alternative but that was not necessarily assured. In the end, the argument that the social sciences working with the PSSC included many UP social scientists in the country who were preeminent in the national scene and PSSC deserved UP assistance to advance the social sciences. It helped that many distinguished members of the PSSC were also very much respected scholars within the UP system. It helped definitely that Loretta assiduously promoted the idea that UP could lease a plot of land for PSSC because it was an institution, although private in its nature, that had a public purpose.

In this sense, the words that President Ferdinand Marcos wrote on the decision memorandum of the NEDA when he approved the idea of donating public money to counterpart the Ford Foundation grant was significant in the further growth of PSSC. Finally, it also helped that during this critical period I was a member of the UP Board of Regents.

Despite her work and dedication to the PSSC, Lor (I now use her preferred nickname among family and friends) always understood clearly where her priorities stood. Those who have dealt with her know that she was a quiet but effective worker, assertive in her own way but never intrusive nor difficult. She was in a way shy in that she seldom pressed her ideas unnecessarily. When confronted with difficult issues, one could easily tell how she stood on those issues by the questions that she asked. In her prime, she was a good communicator and a patient one who tried to steer decisions to her side without being unpleasant and pushy. She was chairman of the UP Political Science

Department in her mid-term when I was appointed (in addition to my national duties) to become a member of the Board of Regents. Immediately she tendered her resignation as chairman because as an administrative officer of the College she felt she was, ultimately, held directly under the supervision of the Board of Regents. She remained in the faculty, but she resigned her administrative post. She had that fine trait of *delicadeza* that is rare in such cases.

It was probably the PSSC's good luck to harness her services at about that time. In her position, she was working for something bigger than her own social science discipline. There were no barriers of the personal sort that was posed in her job at the PSSC, a non-profit institution designed to promote the progress of the nation's social sciences.

Recently this month, my children and Lor celebrated our 50<sup>th</sup> wedding anniversary in a close family dinner. And here as I end this essay, I talk of Lor's qualities that I had enjoyed over the years in the past tense. The stroke that she suffered three years ago had sapped away many of the abilities that she was very good at. Those qualities helped me immensely as a person and as an economist. She was my superb testing ground for ideas. She was an eloquent and perceptive debater on any issue – significant or inconsequential, world-changing or trivial – that we engaged in intermittently over the years of our married life. As all our children have noted during their growing years, two discussing Ph.Ds provided a prescription for a noisy and sometimes contentious and impromptu classroom before their eyes. She was a great listener who could distinguish between good or foolish ideas as well as between substantial and shallow people. She modulated me although she did not succeed fully. For me, she would always put aside her own work to make my English more clear and my thoughts wiser.

[October 22, 2008]