

Jose Encarnación

A Memorial

Emmanuel S De Dios and Raul V Fabella

Motivated primarily by what the authors call 'an instrumentarian perspective', official circles are rediscovering the importance of global academic excellence. This essay argues that if public policy is to truly promote academic excellence, it is important to understand universities from within, through the lives of 'unalloyed academics' like the late Jose Encarnación. The country's most outstanding economist until his death in 1997, Encarnación was dean of the UP School of Economics for two decades and was later named Professor Emeritus, member of the National Academy, and National Scientist. His single-minded pursuit of excellence and unwavering commitment to the highest principles of scholarship continues to be the yardstick against which all academics must measure themselves.

THE ACADEMIC'S SOCIAL ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY HAS BEEN a long-standing issue in Philippine society, beginning with the literary debates spawned by SP Lopez's call for a 'red-blooded' proletarian literature in the 1930s to oppose the then prevalent idea of *art pour l'art*. At first engulfing literature and the humanities, these debates ultimately spilled over into the social sciences and ended with the call for social activism of the 1970s and 1980s. The argument finally prevailed that societal impact should be the urgent criterion for ideas—*es kommt darauf an (die Welt) zu verändern*—which led on the one hand to social activism and on the other to a convenient rationalization for succumbing to the blandishments of power.

In recent times, however, the pendulum seems to have swung back with the rediscovery of the value of 'pure' academic work. The success of science in influencing the course of firms, industries and entire economies has been primarily responsible for this. Industry has so integrated

EMMANUEL S DE DIOS is chair of the Department of Economics, University of the Philippines School of Economics. RAUL V FABELLA is dean of the University of the Philippines School of Economics.

backwards that even basic science and technology is now seen as commercially promising (witness, for example, the commercial human genome mapping project). Hence in the most industrialized economies, the largest corporations have generously endowed research laboratories in universities or have themselves set up giant R&D laboratories, blurring the distinction between what is basic and what is applied. This time, the natural and engineering sciences are the primary beneficiaries, but the social and other sciences have benefited as well, albeit belatedly and to a lesser extent.

Official circles have rediscovered the importance of global academic excellence, indeed to the extent that politicians and administrators fret about the University of the Philippines' position in league-tables of Asian universities. This belated appreciation is shallow, however, since it is motivated by an instrumentarian imperative. It did not emanate from an understanding of the ethos of academic life itself. Some indication of this misapprehension may be seen in the common perception that all that is needed to repair the situation is to throw more money

at the problem. Hence the political demand to build more universities, expand offerings, expand enrolment and so on.

If public policy is to truly promote academic excellence, it is important to enter the 'black box' of knowledge production and understand universities from within, as viewed subjectively by academics themselves. Contemplating the life of

academic exemplars may present a more accurate description of that globally-rare commodity—excellence. This at least is one excuse for an article on an academic appearing in a policy-oriented journal.

Until his death in 1997, José Encarnación Jr was the country's most outstanding economist. For almost two decades he served as dean of the School of Economics at the University of the Philippines, and was the primary force responsible for its development into the country's premiere institution of economics education. He was appointed University Professor, elected a member of the National Academy, and named National Scientist.

If public policy is to truly promote academic excellence, it is important to enter the 'black box' of knowledge production and understand universities from within.

To a generation reared on demands for social relevance and only too familiar with being both victims and wielders of power, the life of José Encarnación (1928-1998) will seem quaint and enigmatic. Encarnación never landed in the morning headlines, never proffered unsolicited policy advice, nor ever aspired to high public office. Indeed, during his entire career he always quietly but firmly turned down appointments even to higher academic office than dean. His entire life revolved around the university, which he never left, and the pursuit of his profession, which he put above all else. He was not what has since been most aptly termed a 'public intellectual' (Bautista 1999). Yet despite this—indeed because of it—he was a giant who commanded the respect and awe of his peers. He was the unalloyed academic.

A COMMUNITY OF MINDS

PEPE was the flower of his generation, one old enough to have witnessed World War II but not old enough to have fought in it. He and his peers witnessed the stark contrast between an urbane and peaceful pre-war society and the chaos and rapacity that followed it. Faced with this contrast, many of his generation were led quickly to cynicism and the all-too-ready embrace of pragmatism and *Realpolitik*, which culminated in President Ferdinand Marcos's grab for power. This was not surprising: if one believed the world divided into predators and prey, it was clear which side one had better choose.

Pepe and a few others, however, did not go down this route. Confronting chaos and deceit, they sought to recreate a world of order and lucidity; and if this was not to be found in the society around them, then it would be created in a community of the mind. It would have been difficult for a single person to maintain this ethos, and notwithstanding his self-sufficiency, Pepe thrived in the company of scholars. Fortunately, and in a way that is no longer the case, material conditions of academic life in the 1950s were still hospitable to such career choices. Either because remuneration was more generous or aspirations more modest, the prestige and income of instructors and professors were abreast with what business and government offered (indeed, as seen from the post-war growth of the 'university belt', higher education itself was a business that could pay well). UP's transfer to the Diliman campus

was conducive to the idea of being able to start afresh and making one's mark. The scholars who were thrown together and who lived as pioneers in a bucolic Diliman were virtually physically isolated as a community. This had the effect, however, of encouraging an almost single-minded focus of energies on the real tasks their profession demanded from them, namely, teaching and independent thought. Although some may with hindsight question the immediate social significance of the literary and social themes debated during the 1950s and 1960s, no one can doubt the passion and effort devoted to those struggles.

In contrast, one must wonder to what extent the erosion of quality in public universities owes to the decline of truly academic communities. Today the erosion of real incomes and prestige in academe—especially in the premiere state university, where no faculty promotions have occurred since 1996—has made the struggle for existence paramount. The result is that the time devoted by faculty to the true business of the university has been vastly reduced. Frequent leaves, resignations, early retirement, rampant absenteeism and lax standards point to a deep-seated academic anomie. The growing predilection for outside consulting and other forms of moonlighting has been rationalized as 'limited practice of one's profession' that enhances teaching and re-

...faculty delinquency, shirking and absenteeism are understandable when teaching is regarded as an unpleasant chore that stands in the way of greater earning possibilities in the 'real world' of consulting and 'limited practice'.

search. The basic fact, however, is that unlike in Pepe's times, a simple dedication to research and instruction in the university can by itself no longer support viable careers, and fewer and fewer individuals are willing to invest their time chasing the scholastic ideal.

Indeed, university affiliation increasingly signifies less of a career and more of a stepping stone. For the talented, academe is no longer the ultimate end, but simply another step toward one's real goal, which could be showbusiness, con-

sulting, lobbying, pamphleteering, gaining a post in government or an international agency, serving as intellectual retainer to some powerful politician, or perhaps running for elective office itself—the list could

go on. The devaluation of an academic career, in the sense that Pepe and his friends understood it, and its replacement by pragmatic and almost cynical imperatives go a long way toward explaining the quality problems confronted by public universities. After all, faculty delinquency, shirking and absenteeism are understandable when teaching is regarded as an unpleasant chore that stands in the way of greater earning possibilities in the 'real world' of consulting and 'limited practice'. Similarly, mediocrity and plagiarism become comprehensible if research is regarded as merely another tedious obligation to keep up the appearance of academic credentials. As an application of Encarnación's theory of choice would have predicted, a self-interested person's objective under such circumstances would be to maximize earnings outside, where rates are higher, subject to fulfilling the minimum required teaching and research. In this state, the fulfillment of academic functions is minimized.

The check to such tendencies must lie either in the standards of the scholarly community, or those of the individual himself. Pepe, of course, needed no one to tell him about standards; he did this much earlier in his career and raised the bar for himself much higher than others would have dared. But when everyone is out to lunch, it should cause no wonder that standards are lax. Superficially the volume of writing emanating from the University is almost staggering. But one suspects a good deal of it is *pro forma*. Few scholars bother to read and critique the work of their colleagues diligently, nor wish their work to be reviewed by others. A 'bad' Nash equilibrium such as this is an open invitation to mediocrity and plagiarism. At its root, however, lies the fact that the bonds of the scholarly community have been reduced to an abstraction.

One recalls the contrast provided by Pepe's times and his ways. As dean, he insisted that the faculty's ideas be aired through a series of weekly Friday lectures attended by their peers. He painstakingly read discussion papers put out by junior and senior faculty alike and gave comments. It was a way of giving them encourage-

But when everyone is out to lunch, it should cause no wonder that standards are lax. Superficially the volume of writing emanating from the University is almost staggering. But one suspects a good deal of it is *pro forma*.

ment, but also a way of keeping them on their toes—just to let them know someone was bothering to check on what they were writing. This was a two-way street, of course. During the daily ritual of taking lunch in the common room, he would often solicit opinions on his own work from his colleagues, in what was an honest effort to benefit from comments. But Pepe was always subtle, and his colleagues also understood this as a way of testing whether they would make fools of themselves. Pepe long ago realized that this regular intellectual give-and-take was the staple of life in the academic trenches. In a university, people need to come together to talk, read, criticize, reinforce or extend each other's work, and to probe each other's thoughts. Proximity yields 'positive externalities' in the production of knowledge. A sure sign of decay is when the sense of community among scholars fades and each goes about his own business, at which point the vital signs of departments in the university should be seriously examined.

CRITICAL MASS

WHEN Pepe took his first degrees in philosophy, both baccalaureate and master's, he was in the circle of brilliant young instructors around the legendary Ricardo Pascual¹ who exerted a strong and defining influence on the intellectual atmosphere in the UP of the 1950s. 'Pasky's boys'—among them Alfredo Lagmay, Cesar Adib Majul, Encarnación and Bonifacio Salamanca—shared an admiration for Bertrand Russell's ideas, and they were key figures in defining UP's agenda of secular and critical inquiry. Their brilliance and quality of mind made them too important to be ignored; OD Corpuz, himself a major figure of the times, called them the 'lions of the campus'. But their agnosticism and left-of-center views were too controversial, possibly even dangerous, for many in the university reared on piety and orthodoxy. For various reasons, the university authorities subsequently succeeded in sending off most of Pascual's protegés to pursue foreign PhD's in other disciplines. On the one hand, this led to the strengthening of other departments: Encarnación in economics, Lagmay in psychology, Majul in political science, and so on. On the other hand, it led to the eclipse of the philosophy department, which has since suffered the slings and arrows of comparison.²

This account of Pepe Encarnación's early years carries small but important lessons. The crucial element in fostering a deep and intense academic life and in making a mark in any field is a critical mass of high-quality minds working on a research program in Lakatos's sense.³ Apart from their obvious high calibre, the unique quality of 'Pasky's boys' was their being united in the methods and issues suggested by Russell's analytic approach to philosophy.

The same principle was to be proven later. It has not been sufficiently noted that Encarnación also became the center of a program to replace an inherited anecdotal and pamphleteering tradition in economics. He and others sought to re-establish economics in the Philippines on quantitative-abstract foundations, chiefly through the use of mathematical and econometric methods (de Dios 1999). An entire reform in the content of teaching and research methods ensued in the 1960s and 1970s, at whose forefront was the School of Economics faculty. The program begun by Encarnación, G Sicat, R Bautista, M Mangahas and others who shared the same paradigm and goals proved particularly fertile in mobilizing a growing research community. The success of this effort was enhanced by the emergence of new tools of analysis, new measurement techniques and new data. In addition, a raging policy debate on trade and industrialization strategy (i.e., import-substituting versus export-oriented industrialization) lent a special urgency and significance to academic research during the period. One could validly argue that the scholarly cohesion and intensity of intellectual activity at the School of Economics owed largely to its wholehearted embrace of this program and, as will be seen below, its willingness to be judged against the global standards this implied.

The rule that units and programs of a high standard must be founded on a core of scholars pursuing a common research programme is simple, but it is one that has repeatedly been ignored. Administrators and politicians alike have instead insisted on cobbling together programs and units—at times even entire campuses—without the critical minimum of quality faculty. The focus is shifted to land, buildings, plantilla items, and so on, rather than on people who are willing to work on a common enterprise. Mediocrity is the predictable result. The point is lost that physical facilities and levels of financial compensation are

not ends in themselves. Important as they are, they are mere means to attract a critical intellectual mass.

UNIVERSALS

IN the assessment of Encarnación's career and influence, much will inevitably be made of his unique personal traits. Indeed, assembling a core of scholars to work on a common research agenda is facilitated by strong academic leadership. Yet this must be placed in context, since Pepe was certainly not the first nor the last intellectual leader with charisma. It is in fact a useful study in contrast that Pepe never attempted to knit together a 'school', in the sense of a group of disciples who adhered closely to agenda and standards personally defined by him. The set of ideas most closely identified with him, namely, lexicographic preferences, in fact never attained a significant following. This curious aspect made Pepe different from other strong intellectual personalities—including his earlier mentor Pascual—who in their time deliberately sought to put their personal stamp on their paradigms and motivated others to follow these. As an intellectual leader, Pepe never clothed himself with a presumed infallibility outside of what could be demonstrated by superior reasoning and wisdom, although he confessed his dream-job would have been being the pope. He made a credible commitment to subject himself to the same rigid external standards as did the rest of the faculty. He made no secret of the journal rejections he received, demonstrating both his self-assurance and persistence, which he also demanded of others. A second factor involved the fact that the research program he fostered was not narrowly defined; it was methodological rather than substantive and hence catholic in nature. The challenge to apply analytic (chiefly mathematical and econometric) rigor in economics could be met after all by classicals, Keynesians and Marxists alike, whether the variety was paleo-, neo-, new or post. As a result, the common efforts Pepe fostered among his faculty never degenerated into a personality cult. Standards of correctness and vindication did not lie with Encarnación himself, but could be obtained externally by the scholar, through the international community of peers, a criterion to which Encarnación also willingly submitted himself. It was in this sense that

he led by example: he was himself one shining example that it could be done.

One of Encarnación's implicit but deepest convictions was that scientific inquiry was universal in nature. Scholarship, even in such a field as economics, might deal with different topics, be conducted in different areas and accommodate varying emphases, but the methods that distinguished good from bad science were invariant. More precisely, he subscribed to the idea that scientific method was the subject of a universal convention among a global community of science-workers, and that acceptance by this community was the ultimate test of the validity of one's work.

In many ways this put Encarnación and the economics tradition he influenced at odds with the indigenizing trends that came to pervade other social sciences. In the 1970s and 1980s other disciplines, notably history and psychology, sought to emphasize differences between local concepts and methods and those used by foreign scholars (Bautista 1999). No such trend prospered in economics, however, which had attained international univocity by the time Encarnación studied it.⁴ He viewed with skepticism the tendency among some intellectuals, no matter how influential in policy or public debates, to be content with a niche and following they had attained for themselves. Instead Encarnación himself strove—and urged his students to do so as well—to prove themselves by seeking publication in the mainstream academic journals. Encarnación played a pioneer role when in 1986 he worked to set up an endowment to give generous awards to economics faculty who published in prestigious academic journals. It was one of the disappointments of his later life, however, that the university failed to appreciate the importance of this initiative and to apply a similar scheme more generally. Only after his death would he find vindication, when the new leadership of the University, discomfited by low rankings in regional league tables, would acknowledge the importance of international publication through the institution of a system of research and publication prizes.

The emphasis on international acceptance and publication in international journals has at times been portrayed within the university as being unnationalistic. Almost certainly global standards are biased

against or at least insensitive to the nuances of local writing and local needs. Encarnación never adopted this attitude, however, since for him it was too close to providing a harbor for mediocrity. Standards of excellence are global, not foreign. He was certainly not unnationalistic.

Standards of excellence are global, not foreign... nationalism consisted in gaining international recognition for Philippine contributions to the discipline.

He thought, however, that nationalism consisted in gaining international recognition for Philippine contributions to the discipline. In this way Encarnación was a late child of the *ilustración*, Günter Grass' *Spätaufklärer*. He implicitly adopted the same agenda as the Rizáls, Del Pilárs and Lunas, who thought that the nation's salvation lay in bringing the

country up to the frontier of global knowledge and wisdom, and were motivated by the same agenda to excel in their studies and to prove themselves at par with the colonizers. In Pepe's case, it was the simple ethos of 'publish or perish' and the imperative of 'putting the Philippines on the map of economics', as he advised his students. In hindsight, this willingness to excel and be judged by universal standards would extend almost naturally to the real policies of economic openness that many of the School's faculty would come to espouse. In many ways, the ethos of 'publish or perish' was analogous to the imperative of 'export or die'; the vindication of ideas through global recognition was akin to being competitive at world prices.

Nor was Encarnación, in adopting this goal, particularly easy on himself. He refused in the first place to play the academic game of accepting simply what was fashionable in order to get published. His 'nonconformist orthodoxy' can be adequately illustrated only by describing the fate of his theory of 'lexicographic preferences'. Lexicographic preferences was the idea that human choices and behavior are better understood in terms of people acting according to a hierarchy of goals rather than, as standard theory would have it, maximizing an amorphous 'utility'.⁵ For various reasons, what for him seemed so basic an idea as to be almost intuitive met with a lukewarm reception throughout most of his career. (Even today, despite some progress, economists who work in this field are regarded as somewhat unorthodox.) Despite difficul-

ties in gaining due recognition from mainstream economics, however, Encarnación never entertained the idea that a *different* set of standards ought to be applied to his own work, or that those who received a poor hearing in the dominant paradigm should veer away from the mainstream of the discipline to form their own intellectual tribes. To the end, Encarnación remained confident of the value of his own work. And while he openly complained that the principal economics journals had become increasingly unappreciative of unorthodox viewpoints, he rejected the suggestion, floated by some of his contemporaries, that a distinct and different economics—for example, of ‘Asian’ or ‘Filipino’ bent—ever needed to be established. Only one crucible for economics existed—the international journals, and only one standard of vindication—recognition by the international community of scholars. If for the moment one’s viewpoint, of which one was morally convinced, failed to prevail, this simply meant one had to work even harder.

ETHOS

IF anything characterized Pepe Encarnación’s life, it was the single-minded pursuit of excellence, a goal from which he brooked no deviation. Upon Pepe’s death, his old friend and fellow National Scientist, Alfredo Lagmay, remarked that Pepe was one of the few who sought to live literally by Kant’s categorical imperative: ‘Act on that maxim whereby thou canst at the same time will that it should become a universal law.’⁶ This characterization is most apt and largely explains those traits and actions of Pepe’s which his acquaintances found entirely atypical. But the sense of the Kantian imperative must itself be understood carefully. As anyone who knew him would testify, Pepe was not a ‘moral’ man in the puritan sense: his lust for life and his awareness of physical human frailty were too well-developed for him to demand of others what he himself could not do.

To one human endeavor, however, Encarnación ascribed complete transcendence: pure intellectual, scientific activity. In this sphere, only absolutes operated. No human frailty was excusable, since by hypothesis, no inherent limitations to the collective human intellect existed. To resort to dishonesty or even self-seeking pragmatism in this sphere of the mind was to betray the code. Only in this way is it possible to

comprehend the almost complete dichotomy Pepe could make between personal and social relationships and scholarly ethics, an ability his contemporaries viewed with a combination of awe and dismay. Awe because it was a power few, if any, of them could muster; dismay because it seemed to violate social norms.

Pepe had a straightforward and, some thought, cold-blooded manner of dealing with what he regarded as gross violations of the scholar's code such as plagiarism, intellectual dishonesty and attempts to shirk the University's rules on fulfilling academic duties. His ability as an administrator to ignore personal ties and acquaintances was legend. He

The deeper message, of course, was that notwithstanding the low pay and social appreciation, the University—and academic life more generally—deserved respect as an end in itself. It should not, would not, be used as mere ornament.

jealously guarded the University's prerogatives. Notoriously, he laid down a rule in the School of Economics under which faculty members who took leaves of more than two consecutive years were inevitably asked to resign, a rule much harsher than in most other units of the University. The reason, compelling in itself, was that in the face of limits on hiring, these positions could be utilized more effectively by new entrants. It mattered little to Pepe that many of those affected by this rule were his close friends

and drinking companions. He simply laid down the law. The deeper message, of course, was that notwithstanding the low pay and social appreciation, the University—and academic life more generally—deserved respect as an end in itself. It should not, would not, be used as mere ornament.

Intellectual dishonesty was Pepe's *bete noire*. He could put up with honest mediocrity but would never countenance a deliberate obfuscation. On several occasions Pepe was asked to head or join committees to investigate cases of plagiarism or lack of scholarly integrity. In these instances, Pepe was always decisive when the evidence warranted, again brooking no appeals to personal ties or political considerations. The dean of another college was accused of plagiarizing material in a foreign textbook to include in a textbook of his own, and of dropping co-authors'

names. Encarnación maintained 'it was an open-and-shut case'. He himself drafted the brief decision asking the colleague to resign or be dismissed for cause.

He could go to extreme lengths to protect academic integrity. In one instance he ordered a re-examination in mathematical economics for the entire baccalaureate graduating class when it came to light that the earlier set of questions had been leaked and that the first exam may have been tainted. When a court case ensued to challenge his decision, he refused to recommend the whole class for graduation. When forced by the University to do so anyway on graduation day, he sardonically introduced the class to the University President as 'graduating class by court order'.

DIVISION OF LABOR

It is certainly possible to disparage as being antiquated the tradition from whose cloth Encarnación was cut. The implicitly Popperian tradition he worked in was pre-Khunian, and certainly pre-'postmodern'. It is even possible to give a partly sociological explanation for the ethos that prevailed in Pepe's earlier career and that guided him later in life. His years of graduate training, which by most accounts was highly influential in shaping his worldview, occurred in the 1950s, when the pursuit of axiomatization in economics—taking the form primarily of mathematization—was most pronounced. It has been suggested that this was due partly to the discipline's aspiration to the status of 'science' (understood primarily as an emulation of the physical sciences) as well as "an attempt to use the mantle of 'scientific neutrality' as protective camouflage during the academic freedom and loyalty scares of the McCarthy era" (Barber 1997).

Similar political trends were certainly present in the Philippines in Pepe's times, when the country experienced its own version of the McCarthyite madness through the Committee on Un-Filipino Activities. It might even be wondered whether Pepe's lack of political involvement during those times was due to a desire to keep politically 'clean'. However, it is an oversimplification and probably plain wrong to think that Pepe shied away from controversy simply because it was politically unorthodox or dangerous. That would have been out of character. He

was no stranger to controversy. As a member of the University's philosophy department, he was an agnostic and non-conformist in what were devout and timorous times. In the 1960s and 1970s, the era of activism and witch hunts, many of his best friends could hardly be considered politically 'safe'. Pepe was a close friend of Buddy Lava, the son of Vicente Lava, the first secretary-general of the Communist Party of the Philippines. Buddy's wife, Josefa Cabanos, had been a classmate of Ricardo Pascual (Dalisay 1999). When Horacio Lava, a brother of Vicente and one of the country's first PhDs in economics, was forced out of his position at the Central Bank, Pepe appointed him fellow for a year of the newly-created Philippine Center for Economic Development (de Dios 1999). Pascual himself was publicly accused of convening a communist *buklód* (party-cell), while Majul was summoned to a congressional anti-communist hearing for publishing an anonymously written tract on peasant war in a University journal that he edited. Those were very dangerous times politically, yet Encarnación maintained close personal ties with them all, even sharing their views on certain social issues. His staunch loyalties would not be swayed unless issues of principle were involved.

The Marcos years were an ambivalent period for Encarnación politically. Two of his sons were involved in student activism, and one of them was actually detained by the military. Some of his close acquaintances and members of his faculty were involved with the government as technocrats, while others became vocal critics. He would later confide he had initially thought Marcos's authoritarian rule provided an opportunity for undertaking real reforms—an attitude undoubtedly fostered by the presence in the government of some close associates such as G Sicat and C Virata. Through most of this period Pepe kept his own counsel. Even after his disenchantment with the regime, he would focus his energies and use his influence to preserve the core of scholars assembled at the School of Economics. With the support of Sicat, who was in the government, he set up an endowment fund to support research and teaching at the School of Economics, at a time when University budgets began to be eroded in real terms and he feared the loss of faculty resources. A political storm was gathering in the

meantime, to be followed by an economic crisis. It was only after Benigno Aquino's assassination, however, that he would cast his lot openly with the opposition and ultimately join the University's mobilization and march to EDSA.

Understanding Pepe's attitude during these times requires one to appreciate his views on the academic's role in society. At bottom a rational man who sought similar reasonableness in others, Pepe implicitly believed in a division of labor between academics and Keynes' 'practical men'. He thought of the academic enterprise as a social investment with a long time horizon, and therefore not one to be yoked to serve the issues of the moment. Responding to the latter was not academic work but what he would have considered merely consulting, 'pamphleteering' or simple politics. Furthermore, Pepe worshipped a logical hygiene that was sorely wanting in most political discourses, which quickly deteriorated into a Gordian tangle of likes and dislikes. The main social obligation of academics, in their implicit contract with society, was to produce ideas and to educate the succeeding generation of scholars and leaders. For Pepe, politicians did not teach advanced economic theory and academics did not presume to make policy. This rule prevailed unless crisis conditions themselves prevented academics from performing their obligation to society. A society in disarray will have undermined the terms of its own contract with the academic, requiring the latter to take a direct hand in influencing the course of social events, rather than merely observing them. Nonetheless, for Encarnación, to take to the streets, to accept a government position and to appeal directly to public opinion were an expediency forced upon an academic during a crisis. not a circumstance to be desired in itself. Pepe's was the course of Cincinnatus who, once the immediate danger to the republic had passed, returned home to plough his field.

...for Encarnación, to take to the streets, to accept a government position and to appeal directly to public opinion were an expediency forced upon an academic during a crisis, not a circumstance to be desired in itself.

NOTES

1. Pascual was one-time chair of the Philosophy department of the University of the Philippines.
2. There has recently been nostalgia about those times, with reflective people yearning for the years of lively confrontation. Even UP President F Nemenzo has publicly lamented the university's intellectual drudgery and called for a revival of high debate and criticism.
3. That is a series of theories with common heuristics and theoretical core.
4. Economics as a discipline had already undergone a debate that settled just this matter, namely the *Methodenstreit* in the 1880s between the national historical school of Germany and the logical-abstract side represented by the Austrian Menger.
5. The term 'lexicographic' refers to the process by which objects of choice are sorted out or eliminated according to successive criteria, much as one eliminates possibilities when searching for a word in a dictionary or lexicon by comparing successive letters. The term itself is due to the mathematician Felix Hausdorff who in 1914 used it to designate the ordering of decimal numbers. (See introduction to de Dios and Fabella [1995] for a more detailed discussion).
6. "Handle so, dass die Maxime deines Willens jederzeit zugleich als Prinzip einer allgemeinen Gesetzgebung gelten könne."

REFERENCES

- Barber, W. 1997. Postwar Changes in American Graduate Education in Economics. In AW Coats (ed), *The Post-1945 Internationalization of Economics*, pp. 12-32. Annual supplement to Vol 28 *History of Political Economy*.
- Bautista, MC. 1999. The Social Sciences in the Philippines: Reflections on Trends and Development. In V Miralao (ed), *The History and Development of Social Science Disciplines in the Philippines*. Vol 1 of *The Philippine Social Sciences in the Life of the Nation*. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.
- Dalisay, J. 1999. *The Lavas: A Filipino Family*. Quezon City: Anvil.
- de Dios, E and R Fabella (eds). 1995. *Choice, Growth and Development: Emerging and Enduring Issues. Essays in Honor of Jose Encarnación*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- de Dios, E. 1999. From Sanciano to Encarnación: Footnotes to a Genealogy of Economics in the Philippines. In V Miralao (ed), *The History and Development of Social Science Disciplines in the Philippines*. Vol 1 of *The Philippine Social Sciences in the life of the Nation*. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.
- Miralao, V (ed). 1999. *The History and Development of Social Science Disciplines in the Philippines*. Vol 1 of *The Philippine Social Sciences in the Life of the Nation*. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.