

EDITOR'S NOTE

First, an explanation. With the hope of financial ease and continuous publication, I broached to Dr. Jane Gallamaso, the current president of PHAVISMINDA, and Antonio P. Diluvio, MA, chair of USC Philosophy, the idea of having the journal jointly published by the PHAVISMINDA and the Department of Philosophy of the University of San Carlos (with the consent, of course, of its school officials). After several months of wait, the idea finally reaches its fruition. The first fruit is this edition of PHAVISMINDA Journal.

Our current issue is, perhaps by way of serendipity, a mix of our growing awareness regarding culture and postmodernism. This is serendipitous for without a specific theme, I notice a dominant focus from the submitted articles: culture.

Rosario Manzanares-Espina's article aptly introduces this issue with an attempt to trace our understanding of culture as a starting point for the Philosophy of Culture. How our consciousness changed and how this alteration led to the "crisis of culture" are concerns that will pique the reader's interest. Her question is "What 'lies at the heart of culture'?"

The second article analyzes one of the answers to the question concerning culture. In his piece, Eddie Babor discusses at length Dupré's analysis of Marx's notion of culture. The key issue he brings forward is the role of dialectics in Marx's view of culture. Babor's conclusions at the end of his work will surely encourage one to examine his discourse.

In an entirely different context, Jane Gallamaso's contribution presents what might be considered as two of the consequences of the clash of cultures: consumerism and environment. She addresses the goal of the human person in his disorientation amid these two issues and explores alternatives to solve them. Her offer is at best worth a piece of the reader's critical mind.

Ruby Suazo works on one aspect of culture, that is, symbols. In his paper, he expounds Ricoeur's symbolisms of evil. As a *homosymbolicus*, the human person's attempts at creating symbols,

especially evil symbolisms, affect his own subjectivity. This is the thesis where Suazo's article revolves.

Orlando Ali Mandane Jr.'s article focuses on technology, an element that intensely influences culture. Mandane analyzes Marcuse's view on technology as a critical theorist and uses the latter's analysis in evaluating the current Philippine technological environ. He tries to persuade the readers to examine their relationship to technology.

Gumercindo Garciano Jr., this time, discusses the political aspect. He explains Arendt's view on totalitarianism. Portraying the grim aspect of such political orientation, he stresses the dire consequences of totalitarianism. With our current Philippine political situation, this article is timely.

Fleurdeliz Altez's paper is our lone contribution on Lévinas. She elucidates the influences of Lévinas and presents some directions for textual analysis of his *oeuvres*. Her exposition might come handy to readers of Levinasian texts.

Focusing of what appears to be opposite themes, Antonio Diluvio traces the profound roots of Zen Buddhism and Karate-do. He argues that Zen No Mind, an important teaching in Zen Buddhism, is the right attitude and practice necessary for the learning and teaching karate-do. How is it taught? One needs to read the whole article to examine Diluvio's contention.

Also, Alvin Galeon argues that the *Lifeworld* is a concept devised by Habermas to complement his *Theory of Communicative Action*. Galeon presents his case. But it might be interesting to explore whether this Lifeworld is significantly different to the word culture.

Of course, Suazo's synthesis of the 28th PHAVISMINDA Conference will perhaps remind last year's participants of their wholesome experience in the mystical island of Camiguin.

Finally, I thank Fr. Teodoro P. Gapuz, SVD, Antonio P. Diluvio, MA, Jane Gallamaso, PhD, and everyone who in various ways made this journal possible.

Orlando Ali M. Mandane Jr.
Editor