

Editors' Preface

One of the contemporary social problems explored in this volume is the so-called communication gap between the pace-setting urban centers and the laggard rural areas. A similar problem has reared its head in the educated community: the academic world finds it increasingly difficult to speak with the uninitiate, the non-academic but educated public.

Indeed, even within the groves of academe, birds of a feather are hard put to flock together unless they come from the same subdisciplinary brood. This state of affairs, which borders at times on the comic, but more often on the tragic, has led one scholar to this figured complaint:

Archimedes would have been able to talk with Galileo, Galileo and Newton would have no difficulty in understanding one another, Newton and Clerk Maxwell would find much in common, and Clerk Maxwell and Albert Einstein would probably share a common universe of discourse. But put together in the same room a professor of mathematical bio-physics and a historical geologist learned in the brachiopods of the Devonian age, and you have doubtless condemned two men to complete silence.¹

That the gap is there has long been recognized by many. To bridge it is a special concern of the Institute of Philippine Culture. This peculiar interest stems not only from the fact of its interdisciplinary approach to reality—which demands that one specialist *communicate* with another—but also, and more important, from the more general circumstances in which the Institute finds itself: it is part of a society that is fumbling for the elusive keys to social and economic change, and it feels constrained to disseminate its findings on the complex that is *our* culture to as wide and as varied an educated audience as possible.

Bridging the gap means, to put it crudely, cutting out the damned jargon, or most of it, at any rate . . . but how? The editors are aware that the goal they seek has not yet been

¹ *Albert William Levi, Philosophy and the Modern World (Bloomington, Ind., 1959), p. 15.*

achieved. The present volume may be described, in fact, as an uneasy truce between the contributing social scientists and the editors. The reader will notice, for instance, that some of the authors, notably Stone and Szanton, are considerably closer to our way of thinking than others, like Lynch and Himes. The latter two, however, admittedly started from farther out.

The editors see their goal as one of groping toward a language for the *Papers* that is both intelligible and precise. Beyond this, we feel that we also have to crystallize a distinct style, a unique personality for the *IPC Papers*. One can dimly perceive what this personality may ultimately be — in content, provoking, and of both general and professional interest; in language, intelligible yet precise; in style, daring and yet maintaining a continuity with tradition. We will be groping a long time, for this kind of personality is something that *grows* into a publication and *rubs* into the men behind it. One will only know what it is when it's there.

In conclusion, we would like to express our gratitude to those who, in one way or another, made this issue possible: to Arturo Luz for allowing us the use of his drawing for the cover; to Carlos Fernandez and Edgardo Rodriguez for their execution of the cover design; and to Ethel Lapitan and the rest of the IPC Staff for their advice, sometimes solicited.

W.F.B. and M.C.R.

June 12, 1967