

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Insight in a Bicultural Context

Mary Catherine Bateson

Philippine Studies vol. 16, no. 4 (1968): 605–621

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 30 13:30:20 2008

Insight in a Bicultural Context

MARY CATHERINE BATESON

OVER the centuries, the Philippines has been the scene of contact between many cultures but it is to Americans that Filipinos have been most heavily exposed since the turn of the century. Such contacts sometimes lead to insight and enrichment, but on the other hand they may produce friction, withdrawal, or feelings of inferiority on one side or the other. It is a fact of the modern world that it is less and less possible for any society to disengage from cross-cultural contact, but that specific bilateral relationships involving only two societies, whether produced by geographical factors now giving way to improved communications or by political factors such as imperialism, are loosening. In the future, each society will base its understanding of its own culture and way of life less on bicultural contrast and more on multicultural variation. Thus, just as the commercial and diplomatic ties of the Philippines will surely cease to be so heavily weighted in the direction of the United States and become diversified, so statements about Philippine culture will be less and less based on comparisons with American culture. Instead of bicultural statements, there will be more and more cross-cultural statements, in which Philippine culture may be compared with Thai and Brazilian and Irish and Ghanaian culture—and more especially with those cultures of Indonesia and Malaysia to which it is historically and ethnologically related.

This is a process which can entail increased clarity in the Philippine identity, as well as better social science. In

the meantime, however, it is perhaps useful to have a more articulate understanding of the nature of bicultural statements, both their special usefulness and their special danger. We need to know how to use them here both for individual growth and for scientific progress, and how to compensate for their dangers, whether they are made by laymen or by social scientists.

Every individual who reaches adulthood within the context of a coherent culture possesses an extraordinarily fine interlocking network of interpretations and conceptualizations with which he encounters his human and natural environment. Because of this system of responses he can be compared to a finely calibrated measuring instrument; his own culture provides the calibration, but when he is involved in an encounter with another culture the significant fact is that he has already long lived with a calibration. Thus, although he is unlikely to be able to specify the rules for chair height in his culture, he knows at once when he sits in a chair whether or not the chair conforms to these rules: his body has become sensitive to the shapes of chairs, within the context of his own culture, whether he is tall or short. As a result, he has a built-in device for discovering that the rules for chair height in another culture are different: the ache in his calves as he sits for long periods in a chair whose height is, for a member of his culture, *wrong*. The sense of discomfort he experiences when someone sits or stands too close (or too far away) is analogous. Here we are not dealing with a purely somatic response, since each culture in its own way uses physical space to symbolize interpersonal relationship. There is a tremendous range of cues to difference ranging from simple physical discomfort, to rage, embarrassment, or disgust.

The sudden experience of overwhelming accumulated fatigue, anxiety and frustration, when everything differs from these acquired calibrations, has been referred to by anthropologists as culture shock. It is because of this capacity to be struck by difference that every enculturated adult is potentially able to get insights into another culture and arti-

culate them. The ache in his legs tells him that the height of chairs is not arbitrary but systematic, part of a pattern which differs in any new culture from the one to which he is accustomed. As the weeks go by and the muscles in his legs adjust—become recalibrated—the insight may be lost, and he can only discover the difference in chair height from this newly gained position of insensitivity by an extraordinarily tedious sequence of measurements.

An anthropologist is trained to glean as much insight as possible from every experience of difference and discomfort he meets and non-anthropologists would do well to imitate him. If he finds the noise level high he will make a note of the headache it gives him, or the difficulty in sleeping or conversing, and then over a period of time he can observe the components of the noise, the rhythms it follows, and how noise is handled in the care of children and the solemnity of ritual. The term culture shock generally refers to a total sense of strangeness that occurs shortly after immersion in a radically different culture, but isolated instances of impatience or discomfort may continue over a long period of time and these continue to be valuable.

There is yet another aspect to the experience of culture shock which is that it takes a particular kind of discipline to use it as a source of insight. A more general response is one of withdrawal or dislike. Americans traveling for pleasure protect themselves from culture shock by staying in hotels in which the height and placement of the furniture seems *right*. They have formed communities that will reproduce this sense of rightness and familiarity in Makati or on the military bases. Filipinos, too, limit contact with the foreigners in their midst partly by shifting into Tagalog, and by a variety of other defensive measures whereby they try, understandably, to evade the experience of difference. Furthermore, the first generalization reached on the basis of contrast is likely to be negative, and highly over-simplified: "They (whoever they are) have no conception of tact (or sincerity); they just don't know how to make furniture so it's comfortable." Ideally, when members of another culture seem to one brutally tact-

less and their chairs hideously uncomfortable, one can relieve one's discomfort by searching for insight into this new and different notion of tact or the new standard of comfort.

The long and intensive period of contact between Americans and Filipinos and the many institutions, values and material goods which have been introduced here from the United States, provide Americans with a superficial sense of familiarity. It is my impression that it is for this reason that in the Philippines, more than in any other nation in Asia, Americans can postpone and evade the experience of difference. Here I am speaking not of those Americans who lead totally encapsulated lives, but of those who are in daily contact with Filipino colleagues in business or education. These are people who say for one year or even five years, "I find the Filipinos charming and have almost no difficulty relating to them," and yet may end their stay here with a deep sense of betrayal and frustration. Their experience has followed a curve which is perhaps unique: almost everywhere in Asia Americans have a sense of euphoria for the first few weeks, but in most countries it would seem that for sensitive individuals disillusionment follows fast, succeeded by a long period of coming to terms with difference of which one has become vividly aware, difference which cannot be denied. In the Philippines, the descent from euphoria seems slower and therefore much more painful. It is one thing to discover that one is a total outsider after a month, quite another thing to discover this after two years of committed effort and affection. The longer the period of believing that communication was proceeding without difficulty, the more bitterness is likely to result from the discovery of an undercurrent of hostility, of blank incomprehension, or that one is being "handled." All of these are recurrent in relations between Filipinos and Americans and all of them are almost impossible to respond to objectively, if they are only perceived for the first time after a major investment has been made in the relationship.

Whereas Americans regulate their contact with Filipinos by failing to observe the gap, Filipinos seem to regulate their contact with Americans by a clear recognition that difference

exists and a surprisingly shallow and incurious notion of what it consists of. Educated, upper-class Filipinos have been "handling" foreigners, often Americans, since childhood. They have learned to preserve the privacy of their family and friendship groups and to keep the relationship smooth. Filipinos who have travelled to the United States do seem to experience culture shock, often very painfully, as their oversimplifications are shattered, and often return with a brand new understanding of Americans they have known all their lives. Whereas Americans, for instance, fail to realize that loneliness or embarrassment are patterned and experienced differently by Filipinos, Filipinos may be amazed to discover that Americans have comparably acute experiences of these emotions at all. In effect, relations between Americans and Filipinos are complicated by the fact that it is possible for both to avoid confronting and coming to terms with the nature of the differences. Neither group really perceives the other as possessing a rich, differentiated, workable — as well as different—system of thought and behavior. This confrontation, with the possible healing insight that lies beyond it, occurs for Filipinos primarily when they travel abroad, and either comes to Americans too late or is limited to those who deliberately immerse themselves in the culture, forcing themselves to confront maximum differences early in their stay, often best achieved in the province rather than in Manila.

I would like to illustrate this problem of confronting differences with a set of three experiences, two of which occurred in the context of field research, while the third was an event in my own life which happened in the Philippines. In the summer of 1967 I was living in a barrio in Marikina. The special interest of my field work was the transition from rural to urban life among old residents who had not moved but whose rural community was slowly being engulfed in metropolitan expansion, as contrasted with those who had immigrated to this barrio from more stable rural settings. However, at this stage, I was simply trying to observe and get a sense of how life was lived.

The first event was a conversation between two women lasting approximately one hour. Ana was questioning Aling

Binang in detail about the death of Aling Binang's youngest child, a son, at the age of twenty, some six months before. Halfway through the conversation, Aling Binang began to weep, but the questioning continued almost unchanged. This is an event which gives me two kinds of data: one is the description of the conversation, as recorded by me afterwards; the other is the description of my response as a member of my own culture. The purely descriptive data would not push me to generalization and further thought were it not for urgency produced by a sense of difference. For my response as an American would be this: that Ana's behavior was unforgiveably crude and insensitive. American handling of bereavement requires that the bereaved person not be reminded of what has happened, not be asked to talk about it. Tact requires that the name of the dead person be mentioned only with extreme circumspection, that the details be glossed over, and the emotions not rearoused. As an American I felt outraged, very sorry for Aling Binang, embarrassed by the tactlessness of Ana; as an anthropologist, I knew that these feelings were probably extraneous, but useful as a cue for further investigation.

The second event was a *paglalamay* 'vigil' in the house of people I had not yet met, near to the house where I was staying. Coming home one day, I learned that a death had occurred, and that my family would be visiting, and would I like to come? I asked a series of questions about what would be happening, got instructions on how to give an *abuloy* 'contribution' of one peso to the young woman whose mother had died, and we went to the house: we stayed for a number of hours. Again, I have two kinds of data. One is a description of the familiar form of a *pāglalamay*: the body laid out in the coffin with *funeraria* lamps, the relatives gathered, people coming and going, expressing condolences and offering money and then standing and gossiping, the young boys and girls playing word games and flirting at the door, the gambling tables and barbecues set up around the outside of the house, with general merriment continuing through the night, all these activities audible in the room where the body was laid out, overlapping and intermingling; there is no need to go into

details here. The other kind of data concerns my own feelings: my strong reluctance to go to this house, an act which I as an American conceptualized as a terrible intrusion by a stranger; my extreme, almost paralyzing embarrassment over the act of giving the *abuloy*; the difficulty of entering into the word games, laughing, and imitating animal noises. American handling of death requires silence and stiff decorum, requires that the privacy of the bereaved be respected (they are supposed to want to be alone), and includes a suspension of all reference to the material facts of every day, represented to me in this situation by the money and the food (Americans may even be obscurely ashamed to discover that they are hungry on returning from a funeral).

The third event was the death, only a few hours after his premature birth, of my first child, in a Manila hospital. On the afternoon of that day I was able to describe, so that my husband and I would be prepared, the way in which Filipinos would express sympathy. They show concern, in this as in many other contexts, by asking specific factual questions and the primary assumption about those who have suffered a loss is that they should not be left alone. Rather than a euphemistic handling of the event and a denial of the ordinary course of life, one should expect the opposite. Whereas an American will shake hands and nod his head sadly, perhaps murmuring, "We were so sorry to hear," and beat a swift retreat, a Filipino will say "We were so sorry to hear that your baby died. How much did it weigh? How long was labor? Etc. Etc."

Had I not been in a position to make these generalizations and predictions, the most loving behavior on the part of Filipinos, genuinely trying to express concern and affection, would have seemed like a terrible violation and intrusion. In order to handle the affront and to control myself against breaking down in the face of sudden reminders of grief, I would have had to impose a rigid self-control which would have reinforced in the Filipinos the belief that many hold, that Americans don't really grieve. In a situation of this sort, the foreigner is somewhat protected by the knowledge of Filipinos that

their behavior may not be appropriate, which produces a general reticence and a hesitation to approach. However, those who overcome this reticence are likely to be those who most genuinely wish to be helpful. It is important to understand that the most alien customs can be comforting once their rationale is understood, as an agnostic may be touched to receive a Mass Card when he recognizes in the strange form, gentleness, concern, the wish to help. Some societies organize their recognitions of bereavement around an effort to help the bereaved control himself and forget, while other societies are geared to help him express and live out his grief. These different Filipino and American responses tie in with a number of other differences between the cultures. We can contrast the basically Catholic orientation of the Philippines where, in large families, both death and birth are familiar experiences, with the American position where both Catholics and Protestants are much more able to deny the rhythms of life and death, and where rigid self-control and privacy (conceived as solitude) are highly valued. Both cultures must confront the facts of death and pain, using all their resources to make them bearable, but in many ways Filipinos are fortunate in having a world view which allows them to face and not to deny the inescapable fact of death, including it in the rhythm of life and a continuing understanding of God's mercy. Americans treat grief almost like an embarrassing disease and, indeed, when it is repressed, grief can easily become pathological.

This particular instance of bicultural contrast illustrates a number of useful points. First of all, it happens to be an instance in which many of the clichés about Filipinos and Americans are reversed. In their handling of death, Filipinos behave in a manner which Americans might characterize as "brutally frank," and seem to go out of their way to evoke the expression of emotion, while Americans can only be called euphemistic and indirect, going to great lengths to avoid emotional outbreaks. Second, it illustrates a way in which a sense of discomfort can be transcended in new generalizations by anthropologists or by any layman who is prepared to look

critically at his own responses. Third, this is a case where a lack of knowledge would clearly have been painful and led to further misunderstanding, whereas, given sufficient insight, I was even grateful that my loss had occurred here, since I found the Filipino tolerance for the rhythms of life deeply healing. Lastly, I should point out that I would never have had this preparation if I had not done something culturally repugnant to me, intruded on the mourning of a stranger. Outside of the professional context where I acted in this way as an anthropologist, it would have taken a very special determination to get into a position to acquire the relevant knowledge. Few people are sufficiently disciplined to use the crisis in their own lives as the stimuli for new ethnographic insights, unless they have already been striving to know the other culture. I would reiterate: it is hard, in the Philippines, for Americans to get the early and vivid experience of difference which leads to insight. Nevertheless, the situation of bicultural contrast is a very productive one if it is fully met.

The sense of bicultural contrast, however, is only a beginning. The anthropologist entering a new field situation does indeed start from a disciplined use of culture shock, just as the layman can. Later, as his observations accumulate, he compensates for his dwindling sense of surprise and contrast with a growing understanding of how his different observations fit together within a system unique to the culture he is studying. Having made as much use as possible of his sense that everything is totally alien, he now experiences, through his increasing familiarity, the way in which everything "makes sense." Eventually he will hope to develop a description of a whole way of life that will convey this internal consistency, in which the height and placement of a chair, the adult response to a crying baby and to voices raised in dispute, and the rules about when to relax and the rhythms of the day can be integrated. Although he must start from an awareness of contrast, normally an anthropologist will try to avoid descriptions in which every feature of the culture he is describing is counterpointed by the contrasting feature in his own. He will try to describe the integration he has

learned to recognize in the other culture. Such a description of a culture in its own terms must deal with it as a whole, although it may include special points of focus and emphasis. Historically, there has been a tension in anthropology between methodologies which were basically contrastive and dealt with isolated details ("The people of X marry at sixteen whereas the people of Y marry several years before puberty...") and methodologies which were more holistic and tried to achieve a global description embodying the frame of reference of the people described. Each has a value and, whatever the form of the final published description, each has its place in the experience of the field worker. However, contrastive descriptions are most apt scientifically where the two cultures have a clear common origin, so that it is more illuminating to contrast Ifugao and Igorot or British and American than it is to contrast Filipino and American.

For better or for worse, the situation in the Philippines is resistant to the holistic approach and tends to support a sustained contrastive emphasis, which may be seen in most social science writing, so that we need to be more aware of both the advantages and the dangers of contrastive statements. Although it is certainly possible to stress the diverse sources and the variety of American culture, and diversity of long term historical influences is even more striking for the Philippines, we are presented with a contemporary situation in which the most striking cross-cultural feature is still the contact here in the Philippines between Philippine and American culture, through a series of different channels. Furthermore, the group of scientists who are attempting to develop progressively more detailed descriptions of Philippine culture is itself bicultural: most anthropologists concerned with the Philippines are either Americans or Filipinos; if Filipino, then most of them have studied in the United States or have been heavily influenced by American teachers and texts; if American, then they have frequently lived here for many years outside of a strict fieldwork context. Furthermore, relatively few of the professional anthropologists have done substantive fieldwork in any third culture, so that their own experience tends

to emphasize the differences between Filipinos and Americans, not the tremendous variety of human adaptations.

An examination of materials on Philippine culture shows that a contrast with American culture is often part of the development of the theory. Sometimes this contrast is explicit, but more often it is implicit, a product of the writer's previous experience and the context in which he works. However, even where this contrast is not intended by the writer, it may be unconsciously supplied by the reader. Social science writings on the Philippines are evidently often read with the assumption that those facts which are notable about the culture are the ones that provide contrast, and that points of similarity or parallelism need not be mentioned. If we write: "Filipinos often take siestas," and we omit to mention that they sleep at night as well, then the description implicitly becomes a statement of the differences between Philippine and American sleeping habits, rather than a balanced statement of the total patterning of rest and effort within this culture and climate. Statements of this sort are so familiar in conversation, in social commentary, and in social science writing, that if a comment is made which is *not* necessarily meant to be contrastive, it is read as if it were. Thus, it would almost be possible to create the unstated assumption that Americans never sleep when it's dark by commenting, "Filipinos sleep at night." Furthermore, one heritage of the decades of bicultural friction here is that a double expansion is sometimes made, giving the neutral statement the judgmental form so familiar in the bicultural context. It is as if the reader, American or Filipino, unconsciously added to each such descriptive statement the introduction, "*The trouble with the Philippines is that unlike Americans...*" Once a theory has been interpreted in this way, it is inevitable that many will do everything they can to refute it, regardless of the accuracy or value of the original statement. Such rereadings may be deeply unfair to the writer and deeply wasteful of his insight, which is rephrased so that it is both inaccurate and hostile. These rereadings are almost impossible to avoid in the bicultural situation and can only be partially prevented by efforts to be tactful. It may be that

the only solution is a careful counterpointing of examples, as in the discussion of bereavement above, in which the contrast is made explicit.

The risk of misunderstanding is heightened by the fact that much of the anthropology in the Philippines can not be really holistic in methodology. The prototype of a holistic approach in anthropology is the anthropologist who goes out, usually alone, and immerses himself totally as a participant observer in the culture of a small, relatively uncomplex group. Every detail is worthy of observation, his commitment is full time, and his goal is an integrated description, the classical "village study." A number of foreign anthropologists have done this here and then usually at the end they go home to continue their lives in a completely different culture; it is somewhat harder to do a holistic study of one's own culture. Furthermore, this classical methodology was developed for quite simple communities, and many of the most pressing problems here require knowledge gained in a more complex context. Therefore, although some Filipino anthropologists do excellent work of the holistic type, there is a tendency towards projects to study specific, circumscribed topics, which often use traditional sociological techniques, like teams of assistants presenting questionnaires, and may be combined with teaching or administration. Because much has been done, the thrust is increasingly towards detailed efforts to fill in gaps in our knowledge, rather than building up a picture of the whole which may be intuitive and sketchy. Research of this sort is appropriate to the present state of knowledge about the Philippines, but, as was described earlier, it tends to enhance the bicultural, contrastive trend.

Again, the need of applied anthropology (anthropological knowledge used to bring about change or development) is very often for contrastive statements. Good comparisons of different points in Philippine and American culture are here extremely useful, their usefulness far outweighing the danger. It is simply true that there exist large communities of Filipinos and Americans who can benefit from clear statements of their differences. However, because applied anthropology

is concerned with getting things done, it tends to entail value judgments, which may be overstated. Further, it would be wasteful to fail to take advantage of the tremendous resource for hypothesis formation that exists in the actual contact situation. Because Filipinos and Americans are continually offending, exasperating, or shocking one another, we can gain access in their very complaints to new insights. A certain amount of friction is inevitable; we are going to have to develop ways of talking about insights gained through friction producing situations that will not lead to further irritation.

We have examined the ways in which bicultural situations are conducive to insights and the fact that many failures of adjustment to the Philippines by foreigners may result directly from the fact that they have not been exposed to bicultural contrast of sufficient vividness. We have also looked at the role of bicultural awareness in the development of anthropological descriptions, especially for purposes of applied anthropology. Furthermore, we have seen that a bicultural emphasis is an almost inevitable result of the context in which anthropology is pursued here, as well as its great resource. Finally, we have seen that whatever the research approach used, research may be interpreted by the public in a bicultural context, generally reading in a bias which is unfavorable to the Philippines.

It is possible that the only protection against inaccurate bicultural interpretations of findings is to specify both sides of the contrast and the ways in which both cultures both succeed and fail in solving problems common to all human beings. Human beings in all cultures sleep; in all cultures they suffer loss and try to maintain the kind of interpersonal relations they find comfortable; in all cultures, pragmatic economic decisions must be made and some form of social order maintained. If statements about these problems are read as contrastive, then the contrasts must be drawn, and must include the fact that individuals are everywhere sometimes drawn into dysfunctional behavior by their cultures, and that wherever we care about producing change and a more rewarding level of human living, some aspects of culture

must be transformed. Out of such balanced statements we can try and draw, not a judgment of one culture, but a statement of how each culture falls short of complete adaptation, and possible directions of growth.

I want to close with one more anecdote of contrastive bicultural observation. The first cluster of anecdotes illustrated a bridging of alternative cultural solutions to the expression of sympathy, in carefully counterpointed ways. This last anecdote shows culturally patterned dysfunctional behavior on the part of both Filipinos and Americans, and one individual acting in a way which bridged and transcended the two cultures in which he had been educated.

One Sunday morning a fire broke out in the eleventh floor of a new thirteen-storey building on Ayala Boulevard, and when the fire department was summoned it became clear that the water pressure was not strong enough for hosing above the ninth floor. A large crowd gathered to watch the fire, which would perforce have to be allowed to burn unchecked in the upper storeys, and this crowd included a large number of Americans and Filipinos, including many connected with the business offices in that building.

I was able to watch the American response in three ways: introspectively in myself; in the Americans whose comments I could overhear; and in the behavior of an American executive whose firm rented the lower floor of the building. These responses fitted together very neatly.

In myself: I followed a train of thought in which I tried to think of something useful to be done in the absence of water-pressure; the only thing that occurred to me was that one might be able to enter and strip flammable curtains and carpets from the ninth and tenth floors. Listening to the crowd: Americans stood there and said, over and over, "You would think somebody would *do* something! How can they just stand there?" The American executive had taken off his jacket and tie and without assistance was carrying boxes, presumably filled with company records, from the ground floor offices into the building next door.

All of these exemplify the same theme, the importance of taking action. Americans tend to say to themselves (as I did), there must be something I could or should *do*. If they are uninvolved, they may stand by, without acting themselves, but assuming somebody should be acting. In this particular case, there really was little to do except stand and wait: my own project, as I recognized almost at once, was nonsense, since the floors involved were full of smoke and highly dangerous. So was the activity of carrying boxes to the neighboring building nonsensical: it was clear that the fire would not be allowed to burn lower than the ninth floor. It was, however, a response to a cultural need; any American directly involved at that point would have had to find some kind of action, whether it were helpful or even actually increased the danger, preferably action including direct physical effort. Inaction was the appropriate behavior, but it was culturally abhorrent. Americans tend to take a crisis situation as one which calls on them for a decision between positive courses of action; they have great difficulty even mentioning and discussing inaction as one of the alternatives. Sometimes (as in foreign policy) they get into a great deal of trouble by acting when they should sit still, yet in other situations this aspect of American "initiative" is a major source of strength.

The impossibility of saving the upper storeys was partly the unfortunate consequence of a Filipino tendency to undertake projects without working out in detail all possible contingencies, in this case the erection of a high-rise office building where water pressure was not available for adequate fire fighting. Decision making in the Philippines is not based on as elaborate a forecast of what could happen as in the United States, because there is less interest in stating and elaborating the details of different courses of action. This may be related to a valuable aspect of Filipino "initiative," a lively willingness to undertake new projects, often, however, without specifying their completion. On the other hand, the appropriate behavior of simply watching was not abhorrent to most of the Filipino audience: the fire was indeed beautiful and dramatic, and the Filipinos present could relax and enjoy

it. One might contrast these positions each with its special limitations as follows:

In decision making, Americans tend to say, "We must do something: Shall we do X or Y, and what follows from each?"

Filipinos tend to say "Do we need to do anything here? How about X?"

Perhaps the approach which transcends the limits of both would be to say, "Shall we do X or Y or nothing, and what follows from each?"

Both Americans and Filipinos can be driven to dysfunctional behavior by their cultures. Both Americans and Filipinos can learn to transcend their cultures in order to respond with full effectiveness. The transcendence is exemplified in one other person present at the fire, the executive of a company with offices in the upper floors of the burning building. He was able to combine a capacity for inaction, an exterior calm which corresponded to the situation in which there was nothing that could be done directly, with an immediate realization and pursuit of the only meaningful sort of initiative: negotiations with businessmen there in the crowd from whom he could arrange to rent working space so that work could be resumed at nine o'clock the following morning. He happened to be a Filipino who had had extensive contact with Americans, including studying in the United States.

This is an anecdote which explicitates bicultural contrast, and yet goes further in that it makes clear that there were not only two possible types of behavior but at least three. Within our knowledge of human diversity and inventiveness, there are of course many more. In looking at this anecdote, generalizations about the behavior of the Filipinos and the Americans can easily be recognized as related to important areas of friction, and yet there should be no preferential judgment here. Who knows but that the world we commonly inhabit may not in the end be more harmed by the American tendency to over react or (perhaps "over act?") than by

the Filipino tendency to under plan? One of the things we can all hope for the world is that more and more individuals will experience its diversity, not giving up their own cultural patterns but partially transcending them, as they become deeply aware of alternatives. Anthropologists have a special responsibility in serving this awareness and stating their observations in ways which deepen it, and in so doing they can usefully share the points of contrast which serve as the bases for their insights. Everyone placed in a bicultural situation, however, has the opportunity to move towards insight and, beyond that, to try and combine the strengths coming from two cultural sources, transcending the limitations of each.