



SDRC
Occasional Paper Series
No. 1 2012-A

**REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH BILL
IN THE PHILIPPINES:**
Sources of Conflict between the Church
and its Proponents

Rito V. Baring, Ed.D.

Social Development Research Center
De La Salle University

Philippine Copyright 2012
by Social Development Research Center-DLSU

ISSN 2244-0372

All rights reserved. No part of this series may be reproduced (in any manner whatsoever) without the express agreement of the author and the Social Development Research Center.

The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center.

Series Editor: Connie Jan Maraan
Layout Artist: Maria Catherine D. Domingo

About SDRC

SDRC is the Social Science research arm of the College of Liberal Arts of De La Salle University, Manila. Its mandate is to conduct research about, build capacities for, and promote public awareness and discussion of emerging social issues about quality of life, social development, and the nation's growth. The Center seeks to fulfill a two-fold mission: To serve as a hub in the Philippines and the Asia-Pacific region for research and advocacy, and to form a bridge between the academic community on the one hand, and the society and community it is serving on the other. Its vision is for Filipinos and Asian and Pacific peoples to enjoy an improved way of life, and to live under decent conditions, in an environment worthy of human dignity and respect.

Social Development Research Center
De La Salle University
2401 Taft Ave., Manila 1004 Philippines
Tel +632 524-5349 / 524-5351
Fax +632 524-5351
www.dlsu.edu.ph/research/centers/sdrc
www.sdrc.org.ph

Contents

Foreword i

Abstract ii

About the Author ii

Introduction 1

The Bill as a Philippine Agenda 1

Separation of Church and State 3

Attitudes towards Family 6

Human Sexuality: Divine Gift and Cultural Constructs 8

Human Life 9

Conclusion 13

References 15

Earlier Papers in the DLSU Occasional Papers Series 22

Foreword

The goal of this occasional paper series is to help contributors integrate or link their research agenda and personal advocacies through social science research. In the three decades of its existence, the Social Development Research Center (SDRC), through externally-funded research projects, has established its niche in many areas of social science research such as, but not limited to, health policy, upland development and social impact assessments. However, because funding agencies determine the parameters and outcomes of their own research agenda, there is little room for personal advocacies to be integrated in the implementation of projects. The occasional paper series hopes to address this gap by providing scholars a venue to express their take or advocacies on contemporary social development issues confronting the Philippines and the Asia-Pacific. The series, nonetheless, is not just another repository of highly opinionated essays. Contributions also have to be empirical or evidence-based. I therefore foresee the occasional paper series as an outlet for making basic researches in DLSU socially relevant by shaping public opinion or helping readers and even policymakers arrive at well-informed decisions on various social issues. In doing so, SDRC does not just conduct commissioned or externally-funded research but also aims to become an agent of change by shaping public opinion.

Recently, the controversial reproductive health bill has provoked debates nationwide. The first issue of the occasional paper series attempts to clarify the arguments for and against the enactment of the reproductive health bill into law from two perspectives. Showcased in this two-part maiden issue is Dr. Rito Baring's take on reproductive health from a theologian's point view. Dr. Baring is a faculty member of Theology and Religious Education Department. The second part presents arguments from Dr. Jeane Peracullo of the Philosophy Department on the same issue from the perspective of a feminist. Early versions of these papers were also presented in the Scientific Conference on Health Social Science held last October 14, 2011.

On behalf of SDRC, I would like to thank Dr. Baring and Dr. Peracullo for their articles for this maiden issue. Thanks are also due to Ms. Connie Maraan and Ms. Cathy Domingo, series editor and lay out artist, respectively, of this series.

With this, I would like to invite the members of the DLSU community to submit contributions that tackle contemporary social issues and their personal take on these issues.

Animo La Salle!



Dennis D. Trinidad, PhD
Director, Social Development Research Center

Abstract

This paper stems from a presentation made by the author during a panel discussion on the RH Bill in the Philippines held during the Scientific Conference on Health Social Science on October 14, 2011 at the College of St. Benilde Hotel in Manila. It describes how the current debate between the Philippine Church and legal proponents on the proposed Responsible Parenthood Bill in congress is anchored on three problematic attitudes and presuppositions that have served to hinder the resolution of the case: the belief in the separation of the Church and State; the attitude towards the family; and the understanding of human sexuality and life. The paper makes use of data taken from historical, doctrinal, and demographic sources and current scholarship on the issues. It concludes by underscoring the fact that any compromise on either the Church position or that of the RH Bill proponents will have to be in the form of adjustments in the Sanctity of Life or Quality of Life arguments.

About the Author

RITO V. BARING is an Associate Professor of the Theology and Religious Education Department (TRED) of the DLSU College of Liberal Arts. He has contributed to International Studies in Catholic Education, Religious Education Journal and the South and Southeast Asian Association for the Study of Culture and Religion (SSEASR) Journal, and has been peer reviewer for the Journal of Youth Studies published by Routledge, Taylor & Francis in the United Kingdom. Previously Program Director of the DLSU Manila Catechetical Center and Chair of TRED, Dr. Baring's areas of specialization are in Religious and Values Education and in Theology. He will be the lead convenor in the First National Conference in Catechesis and Religious Education to be hosted by DLSU in April 2012.

Introduction

The Catholic Church has emphasized that the rejection of the RH bill is not about a Roman Catholic verdict but a reflection of the “fundamental ideals and aspirations of the Filipino people” (Sison 2011). The Church’s position is anchored on her disagreement with the proposal's anti-life stance and problematic attitudes towards issues that affect religious expression. Christianity insists that artificial birth control methods are offensive to life because these tend to suppress the formation of life, particularly in the womb of the mother. In traditional Catholic positions, devices or means that directly hinder the development of life is offensive to life—hence, immoral. In reproductive health language, abortion cases reflect “unmet needs for contraception” which, if used, could have prevented unwanted pregnancies. While the RH framework identifies contraception as a necessary solution in the equation, the Church finds it problematic. It is in this perspective that the fundamental proposals in the bill are deemed immoral. The Church has gathered its forces to show its resistance to the proposal. The resistance has reverberated in many local churches in different parts of the archipelago. The local resistance offered by the Roman Catholic Church is now shared by the evangelical churches, and Islamic believers. These church communities in the country have used every means possible to disarm the threat provided by this proposal.

In response to this political and religious dilemma, this paper describes how the current debate between the Philippine Church and legal proponents on the proposed Responsible Parenthood Bill in congress is anchored on three problematic attitudes and presuppositions that have served to hinder the resolution of the case. The first is the belief in the separation of the Church and State. The second is the attitude towards the family. The third reflects the understanding of human sexuality and life. Data for this inquiry will primarily be taken from historical, doctrinal, and demographic sources and current scholarship on the issues.

The Bill as a Philippine Agenda

The Philippines, through the Philippine Population Management Program (PPMP-POPCOM 2002), has been advocating for decades the enactment of a “comprehensive population bill”. Its vision is “to improve the reproductive health of women, men and adolescents and guaranteed access to family planning information...” (POPCOM 2001a). The planned comprehensive population bill is designed to be an essential component of anti-poverty efforts that wholly address poverty, development and population issues. It makes available contraceptive

devices and sexual education to the younger population. Obviously, these measures are in response to the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) conceived in the UN Millennium Summit. The plan perfectly satisfies the goal of tying up reproductive and sexual health rights with the campaign for economic justice and poverty alleviation (Petchesky 2000, 12) so that the observance of the former is attained. Reproductive and sexual health rights are two of the fundamental human rights recognized in the Cairo International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) and the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, China. Towards this end, the government endeavored to ensure the accessibility of RH/FP supplies and services and pursue a reduced fertility replacement level of 2.1 by 2015 among others (POPCOM 2002; POPCOM 2001b). The attainment of these measures reflects government resolve to push forward the “health sector reforms” already crafted in the 80s through determined politically-assisted “decentralization” efforts (Lakshminarayanan 2003) in the local communities. The reduction in the Total Fertility Rate (TFR) in the country has been the subject of close international attention (Costello and Casterline 2002; Cabigon 2002a; Cabigon 2002b). Until recently, there remained a great need for high-level political support (Zosa-Feranil 2003) in the Philippines to realize the objectives. Understandably, the desire of the RH Bill proponents is a reflection of this effort to provide the missing pieces. But the Church is not about to give up the fight to resist this effort.

Within the concept of reproductive health is the implicit understanding that men and women exercise their human rights in relation to their sexual life. The exercise of one’s rights should primarily consider the person’s desires and preferences to attain the most in life. A number of theories support this orientation. One can find the Social Contract Theory of Thomas Hobbes (Leviathan) among them, where human rights are treated as a social contract. A related variant is the autonomist perspective, which emphasizes the individual’s bodily and personal welfare as the primary factor in matters of decision making. The exercise of women’s rights hinges on the concept of autonomy. This notion precisely applies to women’s rights for self determination. It is the autonomist perspective that has generated debates (Zagzebski 2007) and the most number of conflicts between the Church and other sectors:

Conservative social, political and religious movements worldwide (Christian, Jewish, and Islamic) react to what they see as the socially corrosive effects of the unlimited autonomy championed, in their opinion, by “liberalism” (Lakeland, 1997, 28).

Against the voices of religious conservatism, the resistance is also echoed by MacIntyre (1981) who has expressed disagreement with notions of an ideal human nature while advancing virtue ethics. The Church clarifies, however, that the exercise of one's right as a person is a moral platform that the individual should consider in view of his/her natural orientation. This view critiques an understanding of human freedom that is identified with extreme views of human autonomy (Guerra 2008). One's natural orientation, the Church insists, is deeply religious. Individual choices, therefore, cannot remain indifferent from one's religious identity. Every personal decision is consummated in honor of one's identity. The unpopular position of secular explanations regarding the human person in Christian-oriented discourses explains the inability of alternative positions to topple Church-initiated ideas regarding the human person. This ethical pluralism either undermines religious perspectives or promotes them. In this regard, "... religious perspectives can compete or collaborate with other religious views or nonreligious views, attempting to persuade the dialogue partner of the value of their particular ethical outlook" (Lakeland, 44).

Separation of Church and State

The Church may have no direct political or economic mandate but possesses certain political and social responsibilities (Fabros 1988) to look after the needs of each member so that a just and peaceful condition willed by God prevails. Unfortunately, a just social order is regarded no less by Friedrich August von Hayek (1948) as being incompatible with individual freedom. The 1974 Nobel laureate's neo-liberal position makes his ideas the subject of an intense theological critique (Chang 2003). At about the same time that the establishment of the western principle of separation was formulated, the Vatican launched its vocal adherence for religious freedom through *Dignitatis Humanae* (P. Paul VI 1965). Embroiled in the democratic process to listen to the voices of the people but driven to demonstrate the separation of Church and State, the current Aquino government is challenged to respect the principles of religious freedom. Since the Spanish occupation in the 19th century, the Church has traditionally played a significant role in Philippine politics. Throughout Spanish rule "Church influence was so strong, thinking became uniform, unorthodox ideas were condemned, and original scholarship was non-existent" (Aprieto 1981, 23). However this influence was not the case under the American regime (Aguilos 1999, 206) where the separation of both institutions was emphasized. Should the Aquino government and the legal framers of the Bill hide under the mantle of separation and disregard any attempts to stop its enactment?

strength of this political engagement was well pronounced during the years of Jaime Cardinal Sin. The contentious issue of religion entering into the public realm— e.g. in public education, cultural life or political life—is reflected in the struggle to understand the extent to which religious participation in political life can be legitimized. The stake of the separation of Church and the State in this equation rests not so much on separation per se but in the identification of two distinct realms that somehow meet in a particular social axis (e.g. democracies). The separation enshrined in the Philippine constitution draws the line between the temporal order expressed in political life and the religious order observed and promoted by the Church but does not exclude either side.

The principle of separation engenders a postmetaphysical mode of legitimacy of political regime away from the divine and toward a civil foundation. This shift in turn entails that justification for coercive law is made through a public use of reason as formulated and defended by John Rawls (Shabani 2011).

While Shabani's point may have emphasized the shift of centering in the legitimacy of political rule, numerous literatures have cited the significance and meaningfulness of religious participation in the public realm via scholarship in education, theology and Sacred Scriptures. Kwan (2002) cites Gordon Kaufman, who believed that public universities need theology to address the “cultural problems faced by pluralistic societies” (2002, 76). Terrence Copley (2008, 24) took notice of the fact that religious participation should enjoy equal spaces in society together with those who wish to advance secular indoctrination, which thus far has gone unnoticed. In his paper “The Task of Systematic Theology in the Contemporary University,” the respected theologian Wolfhart Panenberg also emphasizes the role of theology with regard to the investigation of the truth in the secular world (Kwan 2002, 66). Reflecting on these critical positions, religious neutrality in an educative environment appears awkward, as it undermines the rights of those who seek religious understanding side by side with those who seek secular advancement (Baring 2011). Following Kwan and Copley, this insight has exposed the limitations of the secular argument.

Tanner (2010) has proposed how the Christian experience of God in Christ can be a model for a social vision that promotes community and charity despite diversity in the political field. The traditional Christian view is that it is the propositions of religion that should penetrate the world (Clowney 1979, 9). The Church in this regard articulates the role of religious argument in secular society, which includes providing religious content alternatives “persuasion, evidential and

The separation of Church and State is a traditional subject of discussion under the Church-State paradigm (Edge and Harvey 2000) within discourses of law and religion. Edge and Harvey consider two other paradigms falling under this area, namely the civil liberties and the individual-community religious paradigms. The debate revolving around the principle of separation includes positions that emphasize or describe the autonomy of either the State or the Religious communities. The recent case in France (Adrian 2009) regarding the banning of the Muslim veil reprises the issue of political autonomy at the expense of religious observances. While the separation is founded on moral, legal and political grounds (Audi 1989), the French experience voices out the State's prerogative to level the playing field among religious stakeholders. Scott Idleman has argued that "religious free exercise must often be subordinated to preserve the supremacy of civil law and government" (2000, 183). From an American experience, Stephen Feldman (2000) points out that the Christian religiosity of America is a manifestation of the looming dominance of religion in the secular sphere. Okuyama (2009) also presents the issue of religion and politics as a brewing problem in Japan. A sample from proponents insisting on extended religious autonomy from the law (Brady 2006/2007) is an important case. Within this discussion, Hamilton (2006/2007) offers counter arguments to Brady's position.

The debate generated by the principle of separation is made more intense by concurrent discussions on the resuscitation of the valued place of religion in the social sphere. The recurrence of religion as a factor in the political and cultural life of the state (Turner 2011; Habermas 2005; Molendijk, Beaumont, and Jedan 2010; Haynes 2009) has become the recent focus of discussions in the field of sociology and humanities. European scholarship underscores this point in many conferences. The failure of the Secularization Theory to pin the demise of religion in society has reluctantly been admitted (Norris and Inglehart 2004, 4). As a result, sociological discourse has crafted new directions globally when the orientation of their inquiries notes the shift from Christian centering towards discourses on the "post-secular". For Habermas (2005), the post-secular shift will have to contend with the need to understand the new religious orientation in a secular environment. Apparently the growing secularism in a given society exemplified in liberal democracies (Bader 2003) does not necessarily mean the loss or hindering of religion in the marketplace. The Philippine scenario is distinguished from this global movement as it continues to describe the intense interaction between traditional Christian norms and the political leadership. One way of describing the interaction is to define the extent to which religion can contribute to an authentic change in the nation's political culture and system (Gonzalez 2010; Cosmao 1984). The

heuristic roles” (Audi 2000, 75). Paul Hanson, the renowned Bible scholar from Harvard University, articulates the essential link that swings between worship and political life (2005a), manifest Christian behavior in political life (2005b) and the world (1981). This series of lectures positively points to the sound biblical basis of any political participation by a Christian adherent. These scholarly works determine the depths of the biblical perspectives of the relationship between worship and secular life.

Attitudes towards Family

Another area of contention in the RH debate is the attitude towards family. The family is dragged into the picture when programs of population reduction are pursued. For the Church, these initiatives intend to bring down family size through available contraceptive devices. While the RH proponents believe the program only seeks to “assist couples, parents, and individuals to achieve their desired family size” (Bill Sec.16), the Church believes otherwise. It posits that the overall intended legal structure will inflict moral, psychological and spiritual harm on the family. Against the plan to reduce the replacement levels to below 2.29 by 2020, this counter-argument is raised:

The effect desired by population controllers, the slowing of population growth, will not immediately take place, due to population momentum, decreased mortality and longer lifespan. By the time population growth will have slowed down, the Total Fertility Rate will be way below the replacement level, and the average population age will be extremely high (Gaston 2007, 85).

This aggressive defense of the family asserts “propagation of life” (Clowney 1979, 9) as the fundamental purpose of families, and the State as “the institution of God identified for this propagation” (Ibid.). Traditionally, the Church regards the family as the “domestic church” (Lumen Gentium #11; Caffrey Bourg 2004). The Christian concept of family rests on the fundamental equality in dignity and the inherent goodness of man and woman (CCC #369). Man and woman are meant for each other in a relationship (CCC #371-372). Hence, to be called a family means to live one's dignity as gifted husband and wife in relationship to another. Marital relationship is ordered towards begetting children. Contrary to popular interpretations, the notion of Responsible Parenthood in Catholicism is not wanton child-rearing by couples in response to the Scriptural command, but a religious and moral responsibility to be undertaken with respect to God's will

(*Humanae Vitae* #10). Christianity insists that married couples are not absolutely autonomous in matters of decision-making. Through time, when modern families have been shaken by internal and external troubles, the Church has committed an inclusive attitude towards problematic relationships. The imperfect character of marital relationships makes married life the subject of constant pastoral attention. In 1981, Pope John Paul II's apostolic exhortation *The Role of the Christian Family in the Modern World* (*Familiaris Consortio*) emphasized that the Church remain committed even to Catholics who have divorced and remarried. For Sociology (Norris and Inglehart 2004), these accounts prove how traditional religion pursues the preservation of the family and the encouragement of couples to have children. For the Church, the proposed RH Bill is an encroachment on these valued religious truths and the moral norms attached to them.

An imminent issue within discussions on family life is the issue of same sex marriage, which stands to challenge the current theological notion of family as well as the understanding that the family grows out of a covenant relationship between husband and wife. This move bears several implications for the family and sexuality in terms of changing the definition of the husband/wife relationship, changing the concept of “husband,” and most of all redefining the fundamental image of a person either as man or woman— in a same sex relationship, a male may no longer be a “husband” only; in the same token a female may no longer be called a “wife” in relation to her partner (traditionally the third sex). An overhaul of traditional meanings is necessary to accommodate new applications. Before this can happen, a re-interpretation of relevant biblical readings (e.g. Genesis chapters 1 and 2) must be in place to provide some biblical basis for a reconstruction of the concept. But given the manner in which current Christian biblical interpretation and tradition is handled, this possibility does not appear to stand a chance of being entertained in the Church.

Another significant defense against attempts to control family size is the effect that a reduced family size has upon children. Sociological discussions focused on this issue are worth examining. Examples indicating some backlash resulting from attempts to control childbirth in families or actually reduce the number of children per family can be gleaned in some Asian accounts. For instance, in Japan the government has actively pursued a program to encourage its citizens to marry, in order to address an ageing population with low replacement levels (Morikazu and Makoto 2005, 167). This problem is currently shared by many western countries today (Washington Post 2001). These policies can encroach upon one's decision to marry or not. In China, it is also observed that children who were products of the one-child government policy in

the 80s had noticeable self-centered issues in thinking and behavior (Xiaoying 2005, 185). The vulnerability of these children is observed in the lack of a sense of responsibility, and a deficiency in caring attitudes and socializing traits. This can be contrasted with a child who belongs to an average large family in the Philippines, and typically shows community-oriented attitudes.

Human Sexuality: Divine Gift and Cultural Constructs

The Church identifies the offensive upon families as also being an attempt to undermine the fundamental value of the person. Issues of gender and sex are attached to current discussions on human sexuality. In Feminist perspectives (Redfern and Aune 2010), these issues remain to be in need of significant attention from religious and political institutions. Traditionally, Sociology views “gender” as a cultural and social construct, while “sex” is generally considered as immutable and physically conditioned. However, current sociological theories (i.e. Butler 1999) assert that “biological sex and social gender” are constructs within a particular condition. This sociological shift in gender-sex distinctions vis-a-vis the current biblical interpretation of the basis of male and female inevitably forms a new stage of debate between Christianity and proponents of same sex marriages. Adding to this tension is the observed reactions to the educative aspects of the government information campaign on sex and reproduction. The mandated POPEd program covering sex and reproduction in the secondary education curriculum is, as numerous comments have it, regarded by the Church as “the fallopian tubes type of education” (Zosa-Feranil 2003, 21). This packaging, the Church insists, does not necessarily address the essential relational dimension of sexuality and inadequately relates to expectations befitting a young student at the secondary level. In matters of sexuality, “parents have the duty and right to be the first and principal educators of their children” (Trujillo 1995 #5). Another problem in conversations on human sexuality deals with misperceptions of Church attitudes towards individuals. The Church maintains an inclusive stance towards all persons regardless of sex. It is to their actions that the moral judgment is rendered, not to their person. Even in their social status as “homosexuals,” the Church deems that they are subjects of Christian compassion, not of judgment and ridicule.

The Cairo ICPD in 1994 affirmed that the rights of every woman are an essential aspect of human rights. This recognition is actually shared by the Roman Catholic Church in its fundamental moral teachings (CBCP 1992). The recognition of human rights is biblically based (Genesis 1 and 2) and is deemed a consequence of human dignity. This biblical foundation expresses two fundamental insights: (a) the “fundamental equality of man and woman who are made in the

image and likeness of God” (Lawler, Boyle and May 1998, 34), and (b) that man and woman are meant for each other. The second insight affirms the relational existence of the individual. It is also fundamental to the man-woman marital relationship, in which man and woman “‘give’ themselves to one another by a free act of irrevocable personal consent” (Lawler et al. 1998, 36). These insights affirm the relational character of human sexuality in Christian frameworks (ECCCE 2005). Lawler et al. (1998) have pointed out how Jesus affirms the goodness of sexuality and marriage in Gen 1:27 (thru: Mt. 19:4; Mk 10:6) and Gen. 2:24 (thru: Mt. 19:5; Mk 10:7). This Christian teaching grounds the notion of human sexuality in biblical text. While recognizing the fundamental equality of man and woman, the secular notions do not share the Christian religious platform for understanding human sexuality. While the Church recognizes the Thomistic autonomy of nature, the Bill adheres to the autonomy of human rights.

Human Life

The title of the recent pastoral letter on the RH Bill by CBCP President Bishop Nereo Odchimar (January 30, 2011) emphasizes that a rejection of the Bill means choosing life. This pastoral position has defined the debate as being either in favor of or against life. The Church position ultimately brings the argument towards a sacred obligation—to protect the unborn baby. For the Church, this obligation is raised when RH proponents cite among others the fundamental reason that poverty in the Philippines is linked to overpopulation or rapid growth rate. Theories behind this argument express the relation between per capita income and TFR (Total Fertility Rate) in this manner: (a) if per capita income increases, then TFR decreases; (b) if per capita income decreases, then TFR increases. Bearing in mind these variants, the study of Mapa, Lucagbo and Ignacio (2010) affirms that “increasing the per capita income indeed reduces the TFR but its impact is minimal”. The Church also rejects the theorized relationship between Philippine poverty and perceptions of overpopulation on the following grounds: (a) poverty in the Philippines is not necessarily due to overpopulation. On the contrary, the Church insists that the economic poverty of Filipinos arises from mismanagement and corruption in government. Corruption is arguably one of the seedbeds of the unequal distribution of goods and services. To this issue, the question of whether economic growth in the Philippines has benefitted the poor (Virola et al., 2010) remains a relevant point—the Benigno Aquino III administration has gradually shown that despite the current population growth rate, an increase in economic growth is possible with sincere government programs; (b) the population control strategy attached to the proposal is categorized

as immoral since it impinges on the sanctity of human life; and (c) the Bill is a front for a larger national US agenda based on a declassified document, the NSSM 200 (USNSC 1974) identified with Henry Kissinger. The document's problematic assertion is cited (Brewda 1995) for its plan to “control” populations in the developing world in favor of US national security.

The Church position appears to enjoy support from certain scientific views (AFFP 2011) or studies that reject (a) any correlation between population growth and development (e.g. Simon Kuznets); (b) population control as an ingredient for economic growth (e.g. Michael Spence); and (c) “under-population” as the real issue and not overpopulation. The following ideas summarize the Catholic viewpoint:

The causes of our poverty are: flawed philosophies of development, misguided economic policies, greed, corruption, social inequities, lack of access to education, poor economic and social services, poor infrastructure, etc. World organizations estimate that in our country more than P400 billion are lost yearly to corruption. The conclusion is unavoidable, for our country to escape poverty, we have to address the real causes of poverty and not population (Sison 2011).

A more meaningful program arising from this explanation would be one that offers people empowerment. A case in point is the private business initiative of a conglomeration of private companies called the Philippine Business for Social Progress (Castillo 2008) which works toward poverty reduction. This and other local programs have provided direct interventions to empower the poor and create economic self-reliance. Building on this thesis, a series of papal encyclicals emphasizes that the concentration of economic opportunities in mostly highly developed countries is responsible for the poverty of many nations rather than overpopulation. The 1973 Pastoral Letter entitled “Letter of the Catholic Hierarchy of the Philippines on Population Problem and Family Life” (Alberto 1973) identified the unequal utilization and abuse of resources as being responsible for the poverty of the people.

Another area of conflict between the Church and the RH bill proponents is the debate between the “sanctity of life and the quality of life” (Wilcockson 2009, 3). The proponents of the sanctity of life are represented by those who view life as a divine gift. Variant positions considered under the “sanctity of life” argument include those of Immanuel Kant, revealed ethics, and the Natural Law arguments (Ibid). The later position has been traditionally embraced by the Roman Catholic Church. Natural law is articulated through Aristotelian philosophy and Thomas Aquinas'

arguments on nature and life. Aquinas believed that “God is the efficient cause of nature, so the world is purposeful and designed” (Wilcockson, 10). Christianity also grounds this argument on biblical foundations (Mt 13: 44-52; Rom. 8: 28-30). By this understanding, life has a destiny, a purpose that everyone is morally bound to pursue. This purpose obliges everyone to respect life itself so that its noble purpose is attained in the end. Those who seek to undermine life's end commit a serious offense against this divine gift. This constitutes the primary basis of the Church's counterarguments to the RH Bill. Considering the religious bearing of the sanctity of life, this position is regarded as a religious position.

In contrast, the quality of life (Wilcockson, 14-19) argument is advanced by several other proponents who endorse the following positions: the utilitarian view e.g. Singer (Best n.d.); human autonomy; human rights and consciousness. These proponents believe that “the value of life has to do with external or extrinsic factors such as the desire to live and the right to die. The chief feature of the Quality of Life view is that it removes the absoluteness of life and argues that “people also have a right to die when they wish” (Wilcockson, 3), without negative moral repercussions.

The involvement of these ethical and theological positions claims the idea that the sanctity of life is a fundamental religious attitude prior to the recognition of the rival alternative. Besides Christianity, the Sanctity of Life doctrine is also shared by Hindu and Islamic teachings. The Sanctity of Life and Quality of Life debate is represented by local groups who claim to be “Pro-life” (Sanctity of Life proponents) and “Pro-choice” (Quality of Life proponents). The Pro-life group calls upon everyone to take the necessary steps to preserve life to honor its sanctity. On the contrary, Pro-choice groups believe that every individual possesses every right in relation to their reproductive systems. This may mean the exercise of the right of choice in observance of one's autonomy. Unfortunately, the basic points of conflict—e.g. presence of soul and subjectivity in the individual—between these groups with regard to life has not been resolved by secular science. The ongoing debate between the “quality of life” and “sanctity of life” (Kuhse 1987; Ramsey 1978; Kuhse and Singer 1986) appears to be irreconcilable on the grounds of metaphysical difference (Long 1988). On the contrary, Singer and Kuhse (1988) think otherwise.

In the midst of popular perceptions of overpopulation and population explosion as the root of the rising problems of the world, the Church insists on the inviolable sacred value of life. Pope Paul VI issued *Humanae Vitae* (1968) to affirm the sanctity of human life and condemn any

attempts at justifying contraceptive use (Smith 1991) on account of the perceived bulging world population. The Catholic Social Teachings (CST) advances the view that human development should not compromise the dignity of life that resides in every person.

The thesis of overpopulation has reverberated in many academic papers (Demeterio 2007) using demographic data. Demographic data from these presentations are taken in terms of population density and population growth rate. But in its midst a brewing position citing current demographic and projected data reflects an alternative religious position pursued by the Church. Recent positions on the issue of overpopulation counts on Total Fertility Rates (TFR) as a significant demographic tool to counter the overpopulation thesis. According to the United Nations, TFR refers to the “number of children that would be born per woman” (unstats.un.org). The TFR is helpful in this regard to determine population projections, human replacement levels and human resources through the population pyramid. The average TFR for the Philippines is 2.29 children per woman (Dupâquier 2004). For 2005-2010, the UN listed the Philippines with a 3.23 TFR. The World Bank in 2009 released a list where the country also registered a 3.23 TFR. Below 2.29, the Philippines (Gaston 2007) runs the risk of duplicating the population crises currently experienced by Japan and most other western countries. The Church follows this thinking and considers as unrealistic every campaign to bring down the birth rate (*Solicitud Rei Socialis* #25).

Meanwhile, the slow fertility decline in the Philippines, despite consistent government policies (Herrin 2002), has been the subject of demographic attention (Costello and Casterline 2002; Cabigon 2002a). Demographers following this inquiry have failed to consider that Christian religious propositions towards life have found corresponding attitudes rooted in the hearts of an average Filipino family person. The affinity between the average Filipino appreciation of life and the Church's official position about life has, unknown to many, served as an antidote to this massive campaign to bring down the country's population. The theorized “overpopulation of the world” that projects world population to reach an alarming projected estimate of 11.9 billion people by 2050 (Gaston 2008, 1) is rejected as “misconceived”. The projected population estimate of the Cairo ICPD conference by 2050 is between 7.8 – 12.5 billion people (United Nations ICPD 1994). The rejection of the argued overpopulation thesis is sustained by experts (Meyer 2004, 58) who have sounded off, for some time now, an assertive rebuttal claiming that the world is actually going to face a downturn by 2050 due to a continuing drop in the TFR in many countries of the world. Instead of riding on the overpopulation claims, the thesis of an “underpopulated world” is currently on the rise due to several reported scientific evidences

(*Manila Bulletin*, August 30, 2001; *Washington Post*, March 18, 2001; *Friday Fax*, May 4, 2000; *Daily Telegraph*, Dec. 12, 2003; *Daily News Express*, Feb. 2, 2004; and *Daily Mail*, September 22, 2003).

Conclusion

The current RH Bill debate has underscored the following underlying issues within the problematic attitudes cited in this paper: First is the tension between the religious propositions of the autonomy of nature vis-a-vis the autonomy of human rights in nurturing human life. This conflict is extended towards similar claims of autonomy by the Church and the State under the principle of separation. Second, the tussle between the Church and the legal framers of the Bill presents itself as an opportunity for feminists to find out how religious and political institutions in the country can advance the feminist claim towards emancipation. Third, the correspondence between the average Filipino's inner attitudes towards life and the Christian doctrine about life appears to represent Filipinos' fundamental ideals and aspirations.

Having identified the points of disagreement between the Church and the RH Bill proponents, this paper underscores the fact that any compromise on either the Church position or that of the RH Bill proponents will have to be in the form of adjustments in the Sanctity of Life or Quality of Life arguments; concessions with regard to the absolute or relative character of the principle of separation of Church and State; or adjustments in the interpretation of the biblical grounds for the sanctity of marriage and the constitution of the couple in the marital life. The Church has clearly acted on the basis of immutable principles rooted in faith to address the fundamental human question of poverty. On the contrary, the RH proponents have rested on ever-changing demographic data to address poverty. But any of these adjustments will have to be shelved for now.

Politically, the fact of pluralism has required a change in the way citizens of faith and secular citizens engage each other. Parallel changes in their mentality have meant that reflexive religion and modern secularism acknowledge the legitimacy of each other's political claims without accepting its truth. (Shabani 2011, 343)

The current gap in understanding the issues revolving around reproductive health is reminiscent of the Galileo-Church controversy, where both sides made contradicting claims. In

that classic encounter, the Church in the end laid her claims upon authority over Galileo, to which the latter hesitatingly acceded. In discussing the Science and Religion relationship, McCann (2011) points out how the Galileo issue was a case of scientists in need of theological information, and of theologians in need of scientific understanding. The resurgence of religion and spirituality as influencing factors in the formation of the individual today cites the need of government policy makers and interest groups to consider the religious angles of the issue and to possibly strike a balance towards a workable compromise. Today, it must be noted that the manner by which the Church has pursued its arguments against the RH Bill has been done through the aid of theological and social scientific tools. The presentation of evidence, however, is now increasingly pushed with the aid of empirical data aimed at diffusing the argument raised by reproductive health proponents. This scenario has brought the offensive to their backyard. In this debate the Church has incorporated within its teaching function the task to inform the public not only about the basis of scriptural and theological reflection but about accounts of scientific evidence made available to social science. The application of empirical data in forming the moral positions of the Church was already in place in 1891, when the first Catholic Social Teaching *Rerum Novarum* was written by Pope Leo XIII.

Over and above all these academic and political arguments, a distinctive Catholic influence has remained anchored in the political life of the nation. After all, the post-secular period has not discounted the ruling impact of spiritualities and institutional religions in the social sphere. While some sectors clamor for the dismantling of this stronghold and have cited how Christian nations in other parts of the world have shifted in policies governing reproductive health and poverty alleviation, the Philippine Church has stood its ground—a testament of her communion with the aspirations and ideals of the Filipinos.

References

- Adrian, Melanie. 2009. France, the veil and religious freedom. *Religion, State and Society* 37(4): 345-374.
- Aguilos, Ramon Stephen. 1999. Church realities in the Philippines 1900-1965. *AHIC* 8(1): 203-213.
- Alberto, Tepisto V. D.D. December 8, 1973. *Pastoral Letter of the Catholic Hierarchy of the Philippines on the Population Problem and Family Life*. Manila, Philippines.
- Aprieto, Pacifico. 1981. *Book Publishing and Philippine Scholarship*. Manila: Daily Star Publishing Co.
- Audi, Robert. 2000. The place of religious argument in a free and democratic society. In *Law and Religion: A Critical Anthology*, Stephen Feldman ed. New York and London: New York University Press, 69- 95.
- _____. Summer 1989. The separation of Church and State and the obligations of citizenship. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 18(3): 259-296.
- Bader, V. 2003. Religious diversity and democratic institutional pluralism. *Political Theory* 31 (2): 265-294.
- Baring, Rito V. 2011. Plurality in Unity: Challenges toward religious education in the Philippines. *Religious Education* 106(5):459-475.
- Brady, Kathleen A. 2006/2007. Religious group autonomy: Further reflections about what is at stake. *Journal of Law and Religion* 22(1): 153-213.
- Brewda, Joseph. December 8, 1995. Henry Kissinger's 1974 Plan for Food Control Genocide. The Schiller Institute. Accessed from http://www.schillerinstitute.org/food_for_peace/kiss_nssm_jb_1995.html
- Butler, Judith. 1999. *Gender Trouble*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge.
- Cabigon, Josefina V. 2002a. Why is the Philippines lagging behind her Southeast Asian neighbors in fertility decline? Paper presented during the International Workshop on "Fertility Decline, Below Replacement Fertility and the Family in Asia: Prospects, Consequences and Policies" held at the Asian Meta Centre for Population and Sustainable Development, National University of Singapore, on 10-12 April 2002.
- _____. 2002b. The role of the Filipino youth and older persons in the implementation of the 1999-2004 Philippine Plan of Action for Older Persons. Paper presented during the International Workshop on "Re-engaging the Generations:

Intergenerational Programming in Social Services," 4-6 March held at the Asian Meta Centre for Population and Sustainable Development, National University of Singapore, Singapore.

Caffrey Bourg, Florence. 2004. *Where Two or Three are Gathered: Christian Families as Domestic Churches*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Castillo, Gelia. 2008. Corporate citizenship with a difference. In *Poverty Reduction: The heart of Business*, Annual Report 2008. PBSP monograph.

Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC). 1994. Manila: Episcopal Commission on Catechesis and Catholic Education (ECCCE), CBCP and Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Citta del Vaticano.

Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines. 1992. *PCP II Acts & Decrees*, January 20 February 17, 1991. Manila: CBCP.

Chang, Yoon-Jae. November 2003. Economic globalization and the Neo-liberalism of F.A. Hayek: A Theological Critique. *Quest* 2(2): 19-42.

Clowney, Edmund P. Spring 1979. *The politics of the kingdom*. Westminster Theological Journal (2): 1-11.

Commission on Population (POPCOM). 2001a. *Philippine Population Management Program Directional Plan, 2001-2004*. Mandaluyong City: POPCOM.

_____. 2001b. *Time to Act: Needs, Options, Decisions. State of Philippine Population Report 2000*. Mandaluyong City: POPCOM.

_____. 2002. *Philippine Population Management Program Strategic Operational Plan 2002-2004 (Draft)*. Mandaluyong City: POPCOM.

Copley, Terrence. 2008. Non-indoctrinatory religious education in secular cultures. *Religious Education* 103(1): 22-31.

Cosmao, Vincent. 1984. Political and theological exercise of the faith. In *Changing the World: An Agenda for the Churches*. Trans. from the French by John Drury. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 102-103.

Costello, M. and J. Casterline. 2002. Fertility decline in the Philippines: Current status, future prospects. Paper presented during the Expert Group Meeting on Completing the Fertility Transition, UN Secretariat, New York, March 11-14, 2002.

Daily Mail. September 22, 2003. Have More Babies, Say the Tories.

Daily News Express. February 2, 2004. Asian Economies Desperate for Babies.

- Daily Telegraph*. December 12, 2003. Have Three Babies to Sustain the Population.
- Demeterio, F.P.A. III. December 2007. The Philippine Church, State and People on the Problem of Population. *KRITIKE* 1(2): 97-112.
- Dupâquier, Jacques. November-December 2004. La population des continents et des États en 2004. In *Population et Avenir* (Paris), no. 670: 21. <http://www.population-demographie.org>.
- Edge, Peter W. and Graham Harvey, eds. 2000. *Law and Religion in Contemporary Society: Communities, Individualism and the State*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Episcopal Commission on Catechesis and Catholic Education (ECCCE). 2005. *Catechism for Filipino Catholics, Special Subsidized Edition for Filipino Catholics*. Manila: Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines.
- Fabros, Wilfredo. 1988. *The Church and Its Social Involvement in the Philippines*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Feldman, Stephen. 2000. A Christian America and the separation of church and state. In *Law and Religion: A Critical Anthology*, Stephen Feldman ed. New York and London: New York University Press, 261-277.
- Friday Fax*. May 4, 2000. European Pension Systems Set to Collapse. Low Fertility Blamed.
- Gaston, Gregory D. 2007. World population collapse: Lessons for the Philippines. In *Familia et Vita* XII(2), 84-113.
- _____. 2008. Misconceptions and clarifications on issues related to *Humanae Vitae* and the Reproductive "Health" Bill in Philippine Congress. Primer. Avenues 1-10.
- Gonzalez, Dennis. 2010. The missing ground in the evangelization of politics: Building ideological political parties. *Hapag* 7(1): 53-62.
- Guerra, Marc D. Fall 2008. Christianity and contemporary political life. *Logos, A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 11(4): 74-93.
- Habermas, J. 2005. Equal treatment of cultures and the limits of postmodern Liberalism. *Journal of Political Philosophy* 13(1): 1-28.
- Hamilton, Marci A. 2006/2007. Church Autonomy is Not a Better Path to "Truth." *Journal of Law and Religion* 22(1): 215-223.
- Hanson, Paul. July 26, 2005a. Lecture: "Worship: Touchstone of Christian Political Action." Unpublished lecture. De La Salle University, Manila.
- _____. July 28, 2005b. Lecture: "Paul of Tarsus Guide to Christian Political Witness," Unpublished lecture. Maryhill School of Theology, Manila.

- _____. February 2-5, 1981. "Community of Faith: The Christian Way of Being in the World." Four lectures as Thomas White Currie Lecturer, Austin Presbyterian Seminary, Austin, Texas.
- _____. 1985. "The Identity and Purpose of the Church." *Theology Today* 42: 342-352.
- Hayek, Friedrich von. 1948. *Individualism and Economic Order*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Haynes, Jeffrey, ed. 2009. *Routledge Handbook of Religion and Politics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Herrin, Alejandro N. 2002. Population Policy in the Philippines 1969-2002. Discussion Paper Series 2002-08. Makati, Philippines: Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Idleman, Scott. 2000. "Why the State must subordinate Religion." In *Law and Religion: A Critical Anthology*, Stephen Feldman ed. New York and London: New York University Press, 175-199.
- Kuhse, H. 1987. *The Sanctity-of-Life Doctrine in Medicine: A Critique*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 183-195.
- _____ and P. Singer. 1986. For sometimes letting - and helping - die. *Law, Medicine and Healthcare* 3(4): 1449-1453.
- Kwan, Kai-man. 2002. Christian theology as an academic subject in the university. *Quest* 1(1): 63-87.
- Lakeland, Paul. 1997. *Postmodernity. Guides to Theological Inquiry*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Lakshminarayanan, Rama. May 2003. Decentralisation and Its Implications for Reproductive Health: The Philippines Experience. *Reproductive Health Matters* 11(21). Integration of Sexual and Reproductive Health Services: A Health Sector Priority, 96-107.
- Lawler, Ronald David, Joseph M. Boyle, and William E. May. 1998. *Catholic Sexual Ethics: A Summary, Defense and Explanation*. 2nd edition. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing.
- Long, T. A. 1988. Infanticide for handicapped infants: Sometimes it's a metaphysical dispute. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 14: 79-81.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. 1981. *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Manila Bulletin*. August 30, 2001. Developed nations warned on aging crisis time bomb.

- Mapa, Dennis, Michael Daniel Lucagbo and Czarina Lei S. Ignacio. October 4-5, 2010. Is income growth enough to reduce fertility rate in the Philippines? Empirical evidence from regional panel data. Paper presented at the 11th National Conference on Statistics. Mandaluyong, Manila: EDSA Shangri-La Hotel.
- McCann, Dennis. August 18, 2011. Vatican II after Galileo. Unpublished lecture. DLSU, Manila.
- Meyer, Michael. September 27, 2004. Birth dearth. *Newsweek International*.
- Molendijk, A., J. Beaumont and C. Jedan eds. 2010. *Exploring the Postsecular: The religious, the political and the urban*. Leiden: Brill.
- Morikazu, Ushiogi and Makoto Watabe. 2005. Youth in the Japanese Society. In *Youth in Transition*, eds. Fay Gale and Stephanie Fahey. Bangkok: The Association of Social Science Research Councils (AASSREC) and the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia (ASSA), pp. 158-170.
- Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inghart. 2004. *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Odchimar, Nereo D.D. January 30, 2011. Choosing life, rejecting the RH Bill. Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines Pastoral Letter. Manila.
- Okuyama, Michiaki. 2009. The Yakusuni Shrine problem in the East Asian Context: Religion and politics in modern Japan. *Politics and Religion* 2(III), 235-250.
- Petchesky, Rosalind P. May 2000. Human rights, reproductive health and economic justice: Why they are indivisible. *Reproductive Health Matters* 8(15), Reproductive Rights, Human Rights and Ethics, 12-17.
- P. John Paul II. December 30, 1987. Sollicitudo Rei Socialis. On the Twentieth anniversary of Populorum Progressio. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_30121987_sollicitudo-rei-socialis_en.html
- Pope Paul VI. 1968. Humanae Vitae. On the regulation of birth. Accessed http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_25071968_humanae-vitae_en.html
- _____. December 7, 1965. Dignitatis Humanae. Declaration on Religious Freedom. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651207_dignitatis-humanae_en.html
- _____. November 21, 1964. Lumen Gentium. Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html

- Ramsey, Paul. 1978. *Ethics at the edges of life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 191-192.
- Redfern, Catherine and Kristin Aune. 2010. *Reclaiming the F Word: The New Feminist Movement*. London:ZedBooks.
- Shabani, Omid Payrow. 2011. The role of religion in democratic politics: Tolerance and the boundary of public reason. *Religious Education* 106:3, 332-346.
- Singer, Peter and Helga Kuhse. 1988. Resolving arguments about the sanctity of life: A response to Long. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 14: 198-199.
- Sison, Jose C. February 4, 2011. Reaching another crossroad. A Law Each Day (Keeps Trouble Away). *The Philippine Star*. [Http://www.philstar.com/Article.aspx?articleId=654222&publicationSubCategoryId=64](http://www.philstar.com/Article.aspx?articleId=654222&publicationSubCategoryId=64)
- Smith, Janet. 1991. *Humanae Vitae: A Generation Later*. US: Catholic University of America Press.
- Tanner, Kathryn. 2010. *Christ the Key*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Today. April 10, 2002. "Elderly Soon to Outnumber Young for the 1st Time-UN". p.6.
- Trujillo, Alfonso Lopez Card. 1995. *The Truth and Meaning of Human Sexuality. Guidelines for Education Within the Family*. Vatican: The Pontifical Council for the Family.
- Turner, Bryan. 2011. *Religion and Modern Society: Citizenship, Secularisation and the State*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- United Nations, ICPD. Report of the International Conference on Population and Development, Cairo, 5-13 September 1994. United Nations, A/Conf. 171/13: 18 October 1994.
- US National Security Council (USNSC). December 10, 1974. National Security Study Memorandum 200: Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security and Overseas Interests.
- Viola, Romulo, Jessamyn Encarnacion, Bernadette Balamban, and Rea June Lara. October 4-5, 2010. Has economic growth in the Philippines been Pro-poor? Paper presented at the 11th National Convention on Statistics. Mandaluyong, Manila: EDSA Shangri-La Hotel.
- Washington Post*. March 18, 2001. Underpopulation, not overpopulation, the real global problem.
- Wilcockson, Michael. 2009. *Issues of Life and Death*. Second edition. Access to religion and philosophy. London: Hodder Education.

- Xiaotian, Feng. 2000. Socialization of the only-child generation and its consequence. *Social Sciences in China* no. 6. (no pages indicated).
- Xiaoying, Wu. 2005. "The only-child generation: Chinese youth in a transformative era". In *Youth in Transition*, eds. Fay Gale and Stephanie Fahey. Bangkok: The Association of Social Science Research Councils (AASSREC) and the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia (ASSA), pp. 184- 190.
- Zagzebski, Linda. 2007. Ethical and epistemic egoism and the ideal of autonomy. *Episteme* 4 (3): 252-263.
- Zosa-Feranil, I. January 2003. Adolescent and youth reproductive health in the Philippines: Status, issues, policies and programs. POLICY Project. US Agency for International Development. Accessed http://www.policyproject.com/pubs/countryreports/ARH_Philippines.pdf

Earlier Papers in the DLSU Occasional Papers Series

No. 1	1975	Oriental Roots of Occidental Philosophy	Emerita S. Quito
No. 2	1976	The Turmoil of Change in Philippine-Japan Relations, 1565-1945	Aurelio B. Calderon
No. 3	1976	America is in the Heart: Ilokano Immigration to the United States, 1906-1930	Marcelino A. Foronda, Jr.
No. 5	1978	Recent Developments in High Energy Physics Lecture Series	Volkard Linke
No. 7	1979	Lectures on Comparative Philosophy	Emerita S. Quito
	1982	Herbal Medication in the Philippines and the Search for Its Scientific Basis	Luz Oliveros-Belardo
No. 8	1985	Lectures on the Dynamics of Urban and Community Development	Hans B. C. Spiegel
No. 9	1985	Ethnographic Research: Methods and Issues in the Study of Social Relations	Jonathan Y. Okamura
No. 10	1985	The Health and Nutritional Status of the Hanunuo Mangyan: Implications for a Community-Based Health Delivery System	Trinidad S. Osteria

Note to Contributors

The Occasional Papers Series was initiated at De La Salle University in 1975 and has featured topics in the social sciences, hard sciences, and the humanities. It is open to contributors from both within and outside the University who seek to express views on specific issues and to provide information that may be useful to other researchers, government, and the wider community.

Papers may be submitted to the Center by e-mail (sdrc@dlsu.edu.ph) as a Microsoft Word document. In addition, an additional electronic copy should be submitted in PDF format, to ensure that graphics appear as intended.

Contributors should ensure that their papers do not exceed 10,000 words. Please use the APA (author-date) system of citation. A style guide is available at <http://www.dlsu.edu.ph/research/centers/sdrc> or <http://www.sdrc.org.ph> to help contributors in formatting their papers.