

Preface to the Second Edition

In a freedom-conscious nation such as the Philippines, educators, businessmen, religious leaders, and public administrators share a basic concern: discovering ways and means to influence people freely to choose as they would in conscience have them choose. This may sound like double-talk, and in a sense I suppose it is. But it well expresses a challenge facing the Philippines today, namely, to achieve planned progress without coercion.

The response to this challenge will require an understanding of the people's thinking and believing, their liking or disliking, willing or refusing, acting or drifting. It is heartening that the need for this kind of knowledge is recognized by those whose duty or desire it is to change the Filipino's ways. Yet to date these agents of change have done little to fill the need.

Most active perhaps have been market-research personnel, but their investigations have been relatively few and confined for the most part to the discovery of consumer preferences. Furthermore, companies sponsoring this research are understandably reluctant to make their findings public property. A potentially significant study of the underlying causes of poverty and production, begun in 1960 by the Council on Economic and Cultural Affairs, Inc., is now at the stage of data analysis, but a report is not yet available. Many publications of the Community Development Research Council (University of the Philippines) are obliquely concerned with values but none has focused on the problem.

Of course almost everyone that has ever written about the Filipino has had something to say about his *usos y costumbres*, his *indole*, his character, or his way of life. One can start with early Spaniards Plasencia and Alzina, go on to the bilious Gaspar de Belen, to Modesto de Castro and Maximo Kalaw. He will come finally to such contemporary critics as Delfin Batacan, I. V. Mallari, E. P. Patanñe, Alfredo Roces, and Carmen Guerrero-Nakpil. In the writings of all these authors he will come across observations with the ring of truth, and find himself agreeing wholeheartedly with what is said. But when he asks if he can safely accept their statements as a basis for national policy and planning, he soon realizes how far we are from any tested truths regarding Philippine value orientations.

I cannot say how far the papers in this volume take us in our quest. What I do know is that they take us in the right direction. For their authors start with the assumption that what they say should be more than mere opinion, and preferably well-proven fact. Each has used the tools of his trade to get at some part of the truth, yet all admit the tentativeness of many of their conclusions. In short, they write as social scientists.

Mary R. Hollnsteiner is, like myself, a social anthropologist and a full-time staff member of the Institute of Philippine Culture. Her contribution originally appears as *IPC Papers*, No. 1, now out of print, but is included here in revised form. Jaime Bulatao, S.J., a clinical psychologist, is director of the Ateneo Central Guidance Bureau and chairman of the Department of Psychology. Both he and John Carroll, S.J., an associate professor of sociology at the Ateneo, are associates of the IPC.

Filipinos and others have said that these essays show some insight into Philippine culture, and to judge from their popularity (this is the fourth printing)* they have helped fill the need I spoke of above. Yet insight and insult are closely allied and only charity makes the difference. I hope the reader will find in these papers a palatable mixture of keenness and kindness.

FRANK LYNCH

Ateneo de Manila
January 11, 1964

* The author is referring to the fourth printing of the first two editions. In point of fact, the book has, as of the present, undergone at least eight printings and continues to top the "best-seller" roster of IPC publications.—Ed.