

PAUL RICOEUR'S REFLEXIVE PHILOSOPHY: TYING THE FILIPINO SELF TO THE FAMILY

Ruby S. Suazo

University of San Carlos, Philippines

บทคัดย่อ

บทความนี้ต้องการอาศัยการวิเคราะห์เชิงวิภาษวิทยา ทำการอธิบายให้ชัดเจนถึงข้อเท็จจริงเกี่ยวกับการดำรงอยู่ของอัตตสภาวะ ส่วนที่เป็นจิตสภาวะของข้อเท็จจริงนี้คือรูปแบบการเข้าใจตนเองที่สูงส่ง บทความนี้ประยุกต์วิธีมองปัญหาเรื่องอัตวิสัยของริเกอร์เพื่อทำความเข้าใจเรื่องอัตลักษณ์ของชาวฟิลิปปินส์ โดยเฉพาะอย่างยิ่งความพยายามของริเกอร์ที่จะจดจรรี้อัตตาสีใหม่ “ภายใต้สิ่งที่เป็นปัญหาของการกระทำในฐานะที่เป็นสนามของศักยภาพ” ในทำนองเดียวกัน การที่ผู้วิจัยมุ่งแสวงหาอัตลักษณ์ของชาวฟิลิปปินส์ก็เป็นการคาดหวังถึงชัยชนะของความหมายเหนือการไร้ความหมาย ซึ่งในที่สุดแล้วจะนำชาวฟิลิปปินส์ไปสู่การแสวงหาตัวตนที่แท้จริงสะท้อนออกมาภายใต้การพยายามที่จะสร้างชาติ ในขณะที่ริเกอร์พยายามจะอธิบายข้อเท็จจริงเกี่ยวกับความมีอยู่ของอัตตาโดยอาศัยการไขสื่อกลางหลายชนิด (สัญลักษณ์และคำรา) ผู้วิจัยก็พยายามสร้างความชัดเจนเกี่ยวกับอัตลักษณ์ของชาวฟิลิปปินส์ โดยอาศัยการมีความหมาย (นัยสำคัญ) ของครอบครัว

Abstract

This essay wishes to clarify, through reflective analysis, the *fact* of the subject's own existence. This consciousness of this *fact* is a form of heightened self-understanding. It applies Ricoeur's approach to the problem of subjectivity to the clarification of the Filipino identity. Particularly his attempt to re-inscribe the subject “within the problematic of action as

a field of potentialities”. In the same fashion, the researcher’s quest for Filipino identity anticipates the triumph of sense over non-sense that will ultimately lead the Filipino towards his quest for genuine selfhood as reflected in the conscious effort towards nation building. While Ricoeur endeavors to explain the fact of the subject’s existence by way of its several mediations (symbolic and textual), the researcher, on the other hand, attempts the clarification of the Filipino identity by way of the significance of the family.

I. Introduction

Some consider the issue regarding the Filipino identity a thing of the past. They feel that researchers have already exhausted this subject matter. Nevertheless, I am compelled to re-visit this issue in light of the fact that Philippines has not yet reached its desired goal – an integrated development where every Filipino at least enjoys the minimum requirements for a decent life.

Concerning this problem of development, several approaches have been implemented, but they have not yet borne fruit. Foremost of them is the moral recovery program. Right after the EDSA I revolution, Licuanan, for example, points out that the government embarked on a moral recovery program for the reason that “[s]elf-interest and disregard for the common good rears its ugly head. We are confronted with our lack of discipline and rigor, our colonial mentality, and our emphasis on *porma* (form). Despite our great display of people’s power, now we are passive once more, expecting our leaders to take all responsibility for solving our many problems”.¹ The government embarked on this program because of the following needs: the need for economic recovery, the need to reestablish democratic institutions, and the need to achieve the goals of peace and genuine social justice. Former Pres. Gloria Macapagal – Arroyo also formed the Presidential Commission on Values Formation because of “the existence of the Filipino’s strong desire to see the establishment and institutionalization of just and moral governance and the imperative to have a continuing and intensified drive against graft and corruption, patronage politics, apathy, passivity, mendicancy, factionalism and lack of patrio-

tism”.²

This exercise suggests that Filipinos believe that the cause of our present troubles have to do with values, specifically cultural values. This has remained the main thrust of the values education curriculum which is “a response to a general feeling on the need for social transformation after the February 1986 People Power Revolution”.³ This thrust is spelled out even more clearly in the goals of the Values Education Program: “to provide and promote values education at all three levels of the educational system for the development of the human person committed to the building of a *just and humane society* and an independent and democratic nation”.⁴ There are several frameworks to look upon these different values. To name a few, there is the widely disseminated *The DECS Values Education Framework* of Minda C. Sutaria et al., the *Filipino Value System* framework of Serafin Talisayon and the *Philippine-Value System* framework of Tomas Andres. If Filipino identity is based upon what we value most, then the question arises as to which among our values we hold the dearest – to which of these values we can truly identify ourselves. The moment this value is identified, it is to become “a rallying point for unity, self-discipline, and love and pride in one’s country”.⁵

Here I have found the approaches of Paul Ricoeur helpful. One of the routes that Ricoeur follows in understanding the self is through Jean Nabert’s “reflexive philosophy”. Accordingly, reflexive philosophy which concerns the possibility of *self-understanding* takes at reflexion as the “act of turning back upon itself by which a subject grasps, in a moment of intellectual clarity and moral responsibility, the unifying principle of the operations among which it is dispersed and forgets itself as subject”.⁶ Grasping the self in a moment of intellectual clarity and moral responsibility can be expanded to include an entire people.

II. What Reflexive Philosophy is

Ricoeur explains that “the idea of reflexion carries with it the desire for absolute transparency, a perfect coincidence of the self with itself, which would make consciousness of self indubitable knowledge. . . .”⁷ However; this desire for absolute transparency is not intuitively possible. It is

only disclosed “through the mirror of the objects and acts, the symbols and signs”.⁸ Consequently, reflection becomes interpretation.

Ricoeur explains further that all interpretation aims at overcoming the distance between the past cultural epoch to which the text belongs and the interpreter himself. To overcome this distance, the interpreter appropriates the meaning of the text to himself. He makes familiar a foreign text by making it his own. In so doing, there is a conscious effort on the part of the interpreter to arrive at a complete understanding of oneself. This, however, is only possible through his understanding of the other. Thus, hermeneutics is surmised as .self-understanding by means of understanding others”.⁹ Self-understanding by means of understanding others signifies reflection, which must not be qualified as a blind intuition. For reflection not to be a blind intuition, it must be mediated by the expressions in which life objectifies itself. Ricoeur explained that,

reflection is nothing other than the appropriation of our act of existing by means of a critique applied to the works and the acts which are the signs of this act of existing. Thus, reflection is a critique. . . in the sense that the cogito can be recovered only by the detour of a decipherment of the documents of its life. Reflection is the appropriation of our effort to exist and of our desire to be by means of the works which testify to this effort and this desire.¹⁰

Ricoeur understands that .the increase in subjectivity... goes hand in hand with an increase in reflection and meaning. Subjectivity is granted us in and through the great variety of experiences that have shaped a cultural heritage”.¹¹ The aim of reflexive philosophy is .to appropriate in praxis an originary dynamism which grounds human existence and with which the conscious, practical self does not coincide”.¹² Through reflection, the subject recaptures itself through the expressions of life that objectify it. Nevertheless, Ricoeur recognizes the risk of the subject’s misinterpretation due to the setting in of false consciousness. This is why he also emphasizes that reflection is .the task of equating my concrete experience with the affirmation: *I am*. (Ricoeur 1974). This does not, however, dampen his spirit for he is positive that this is the very reason why herme-

neutics becomes relevant. Hermeneutics exists due to misinterpretations.

Reflexive philosophy becomes pertinent to Ricoeur's project because it is neither direct nor immediate. In fact, reflection needs to be doubly indirect for the reasons that "existence is evinced only in documents of life [and that] because consciousness is first of all false consciousness, and it is always necessary to rise by means of a corrective critique from misunderstanding to understanding".¹³

Nabert's ethical philosophy seeks to recapture the primordial source of human existence, a quest made indirectly possible through the interpretation of the signs in which the "desire-to-be" is inscribed. This view implies that there is at least a direct relationship between the understanding of the signs of the "desire-to-be" and self-understanding. Henceforth, self-understanding passes through the signs in which the self inscribes itself. Ricoeur believes that there exists a relationship that is frequently disregarded, the relationship between the act of existence and the signs through which this act is represented. For Ricoeur, the sign that mediates the subject and its experience is inscribed in language. Language in turn is also inscribed in the text.

Ricoeur employs the theory of the text¹⁴ because he finds it a good guide for showing that "the act of subjectivity is not so much what initiates understanding as what terminates it. [Moreover, he takes] this terminal act [as] characteris[ing] appropriation". To reiterate what has been said above, the rejoining of subjectivity is not the one that supports the meaning of the text. It only responds to the matter of the text as proposed meanings unfold in front of the text.

The ultimate aim in reading a text remains the *understanding* of what it means to the reader. To understand the text is to interpret it. And, by interpretation, this means "the concrete outcome of conjunction and renewal".¹⁶ Conjunction and renewal are necessary elements for the reason that to read is "to conjoin a new discourse to the discourse of the text. [Furthermore,] this conjunction of discourses reveals... an original capacity for renewal which is its open character".¹⁷ Thus, "an interpretation is not authentic unless it culminates in some form of appropriation (*Aneignung*), if by that term we understand the process by which one makes one's own (*eigen*) what was initially other or alien (*fremd*)".¹⁸ As Ricoeur expounds:

By ‘appropriation’, I understand this: that the interpretation of a text culminates in the self-interpretation of a subject who thenceforth understands himself better, understands himself differently, or simply begins to understand himself. This culmination of the understanding of a text in self-understanding is characteristic of the kind of reflective philosophy which... I have called ‘concrete reflection’.¹⁹

Nonetheless, appropriation implies “a moment of dispossession of the egoistic and narcissistic ego”.²⁰ It is “the... making-one’s-own, of the ground of one’s existence, the home of the subject”.²¹ Thus, the moment of appropriation marks the appearance of the subjectivity of the reader.

III. Ricoeur’s Reflexive Philosophy and the Filipino Self

In connection with this, I apply Ricoeur’s approach to the problem of the self to the seeking of the value whereby the Filipino self is very much attached. A parallelism emerges between Ricoeur’s project of understanding the meaning of the self and my project of appropriating a meaning of the Filipino self. Inasmuch as Ricoeur mentions that the self in self-reflection can only be glimpsed through the mirror of the objects and acts, the symbols and signs wherein they are disclosed, I share in the position that culture which is “the totality of a people’s enduring shared patterns of thinking, feeling, and acting in response to their life-needs”²² is made visible through symbols.

The Filipino self needs to be fully understood by closely studying the pervasive symbolism of the Filipino self: its cultural values. Nevertheless, there are many values that are very dear to the Filipinos; the dearest of them all is the family. Thus, the attempt to understand the Filipino self is to be done by way of the Filipino’s orientation of the family.

Ricoeur’s re-appropriation of the meaning of the self developed in the course of his studies of the philosophers of the subject is not for the sake of adding into the voluminous studies about the subject. His project

is postured to re-inscribe the subject “within the problematic of action as a field of potentialities”.²³ In other words, his desire to understand the meaning of the subject is consciously directed towards the postulation of the meaningfulness of the existence of the subject. Although there is no possible way of verifying this, “the desire for meaning, the hope for the ultimate triumph of sense over nonsense in our lives, the triumph of reconciliation... is not delusory”.²⁴

Similarly, the pursuit to understand the Filipino self foresees a similar result. Henceforth, the Filipino self should be known because it is expected to become an impetus to act; it serves as “a rallying point for unity, self-discipline, and love and pride in one’s country”.²⁵ Further, De Quiros points out the significance of identity saying:

[W]hat’s the big deal about identity? Well, look at countries like Thailand, Singapore and Malaysia, and look at us. With nations as with individuals, you have no sense of self, you will never know, and do, what you want. You will only know, and follow, what others tell you to.²⁶

The importance of knowing one’s self depends on the ability of the person to appropriate his decision upon his own.

The assumption is that the moment the Filipino understands who he is, he can extend such knowledge to the societal level and eventually create a wave of true national sentiment. Arguably, knowing the Filipino self can lead to a sense of meaning and an understanding of his reason for being. Consequently, this can give the Filipino a sense of direction.

Presently, since the Filipino has not yet found a locus of control, he is unable to give direction to his endeavors. Inasmuch as the Filipino has been shaped by diverse influences, both Eastern and Western, with their opposing tendencies, he becomes confused. Seeing the best and the worst of both worlds is supposedly advantageous to the Filipino. But ignorance about his reason for being makes him incapable of threshing out the good influences from the bad influences, something that can lead his nation to the desired stability and integrated development.

Inasmuch as the way to know a nation’s identity is by its values - as Roces puts it – the Filipino self must discover itself in its values.²⁷ In

the research of Talisayon, he found out that the core or central clusters of the Filipino value system revolve around seven values, with *family/kinship* orientation as the core value.²⁸ Agoncillo echoes that among the many values, the Filipino is known for close family ties.²⁹ Jocano also recognizes the importance that the Filipinos give to the family³⁰ as it gives higher premium to its interest than to the interest of the community.³¹ He believes that “*the family is basic to the life of Filipinos. It is the center of their universe. Much of what they do, what they think, and what they idealize, among others, are first learned within the narrow confines of the family before these are enriched, modified, or frustrated by other institutions in the larger community*”.³² Curiously, the significance of this value is overwhelming because the state has strongly recognized the primacy of the family in Philippine society as enshrined in the *Philippine Civil Code and the Philippine Constitution of 1986*.³³

The family is discerned “as a defense against a hostile world and a unit where one can turn to in case [a family member] has a serious problem”.³⁴ However, this seems to counter the idea of thinking nationally for this tends to make a Filipino act parochially. Family orientation is indeed very crucial to the Filipino.

Historically, Covar points out that during the Formative Period of the Philippine history, the Filipino was concerned with the *ginhawa* (inner comfort) of the *tao* (person) and the well-being of the *sakop* (ward). As the Filipino progressed in the Period of Struggle and National Consolidation, the concern now turned to civilizing of the ‘natives’, first as Spanish *mesticillos*, and then as little brown Americans who eventually became the *ilustrados*. While the Filipino during this period did begin to think about national interest and general welfare, this was undermined by the colonizers who exploited the Filipino’s family-centeredness by pitting one family against another family, one region against another region.³⁵

As we now enter the 21st century, social scientists and communicators usually ask, “What happened to the society and culture during the Formative Period? Were they wiped out during the Period of Struggle and National Consolidation? Is there anything left in the indigenous culture and society which we could rally around the Period of Cultural Solidarity?”³⁶ He then declares, “Our answers to these questions shall help guide us in our quest for values beyond 1998”.³⁷

Ramirez believes there are still things left in the indigenous culture and society that subsist in the Period of Cultural Solidarity. The traces of the Formative Period pervades in what Ramirez calls as the suppressed culture that operates vis-à-vis the dominant culture imposed by the colonizers. It might be thought of that the operating values during the Formative Period are insignificant for they are now relegated to the collective unconscious of the people. However, Ramirez elucidates that they are not insignificant for they have “become the soil in which any external item from other cultures may be grafted to assume its own unique growth and evolution”.³⁸ This hidden dimension, she explains further, “is sometimes more powerful than the external elements of a culture [for it] lives in the minds and hearts of people”.³⁹

During the Period of Struggle and National Consolidation, the people’s operating values of the Formative Period were pushed aside. By the use of whip, people were forced to adopt the value system of the colonizers without positively understanding the impact of the modern practices of modernization. They adopted the practices of the colonizers out of fear, practices which were not completely assimilated and grafted to the indigenous soul of the people.⁴⁰ In the words of McCoy, although Spain and the United States tried to forge a strong bureaucratic apparatus based upon their own laws and social practice, they could not induce compliance through shared myth or other forms of social sanction because the modern Philippine state did not evolve organically from Filipino society. They derived their authority from the implied coercion of colonial rule.⁴¹ Consequently, Filipinos became very religious and devout Christians, but the sharing of material goods with others, most especially to the needy, was quite difficult for them. Also, nowadays, with free enterprise, people earn more money but it is not necessarily equated with hard work. People realize that if one is clever enough, one can get money through gambling, scheming (like in graft and corruption) or some illegal way.⁴²

The simultaneous demands of these two incongruous systems on the Filipino create conflict situations which satisfy neither value system fully. Thus, in the supposed Period of Cultural Solidarity, there is really no solidarity that happens for the reason that the operating values in the Formative Period (the traditional value system) and those of the Period of Struggle and National Consolidation (the dominant value system) are con-

tinually in conflict in this period of supposed solidarity.

No matter how passionately the Filipino strives for national solidarity, the interests of the family interfere with the interests of the nation, which might be the reason why the Filipino has the difficulty of achieving a true sense of nationalism. For this reason, to reconsider the family orientation as a core Filipino value is an imperative. This proposal reflects Bago's perception that integrated development in the Philippines will only be achieved if the cultural values of the Filipino be re-aligned according to the intentions of the Filipinos as a nation.

Based on the analysis of various authors, family orientation as a value is seen as a hindrance to the desired development of the Filipino when it interferes with the workings of institutions with supposedly universalistic value assumptions. The pervasiveness of this family orientation can be witnessed in the constitution of political dynasties, nepotism, family corporations and profit-making educational family corporations and even religious organizations who are also not immune from the encroachment of family interests. Corruption is likewise a disease traceable to the desire of the Filipino to secure his own family. The aforementioned instances are known hindrances to national development.

In like manner, the aforementioned instances are under the hands of the Philippine elite. Inasmuch as an elite is defined as those who have or may have the power to influence the thinking of the citizenry, send charges through the body politic and civil society, alter the power configuration of the nation, and in some instances be able to seize power at the top⁴³, then the initiative of concretely redirecting the nation falls to their hands.

However, historically speaking, the elite segment of the society had been derailing the desire of the Filipino citizenry for a developed and prosperous nation for all. Let us take for example, Jose Rizal sets up *La Liga Filipina* in Manila on July 3, 1892 with the aim of inculcating moral and political principles among the population in order to attain a greater unity.⁴⁴ Moreover, on July 7, 1892, Bonifacio establishes the *Katipunan* (Brotherhood) with the aim of uniting all Filipinos in terms of a single ideology. He enables the masses to rally behind his *Katipunan* (Brotherhood) because of his vision to bring back the *kasaganaan* (bountifulness) and the *kaginhawaan* (prosperity) that the Pre-Spanish Philippines enjoyed.⁴⁶ This was the central mantra of his article published in the one and

only issue of *Kalayaan* (Freedom), the official publication of the *Katipunan*, which they attributed the rapid growth of its membership.⁴⁷ The cry for *kalayaan* (freedom), also becomes the driving force for Filipinos to persist in fighting against the Spanish regime.

However, when the revolution was won, the expected national consolidation of the Filipino spirit did not materialize because of the *ilustrado* and the *principalia*'s jockeying for power and opportunities just to assure the economic security of their own families. This demoralized the organization from the top down to the rank and file and eventually resulted in the rift between the *ilustrado* and the masses.⁴⁸

During this period, although the spirit of nationalism is very pregnant and vibrant, Abueva maintains that "historically, some heroes and leaders have been inspiring models of a socially concerned and nationalistic leadership, but many leaders have also used their power and authority for their own benefit and for perpetuating their power and dominance in society. The latter reinforce the common tendency of citizens to be selfishly individualistic and family-oriented".⁴⁹ Likewise, Agoncillo, as cited by McCoy, accuses the educated *ilustrados* of Manila's nineteenth-century elites for betraying the Revolution of 1898 and collaborating thereafter with American colonialism.⁵⁰

In the Period of Cultural Solidarity, the Filipinos were already granted their independence and there was no more inherent fear of the colonizers. But at this time, they regressed to the ideological enculturation of the Formative Period: which emphasized the economic well-being of the *sakop* or ward, instead of increasing the emphasis on national interest and general welfare. The one that has been relegated to the unconscious has now resurfaced.

The family, although seen as the focal point of the Philippines' underdevelopment, is also seen to be the facilitator of genuine national development. Taking the cue from Camilo Osias, reflecting on one of the Filipino languages, the Ilocano language, he realizes that an all-inclusive consciousness is imbedded in the psyche of the Filipino waiting to be roused up. His analysis of the four personal pronouns, first person under the nominative case of the Ilocano language comes out with four levels that can be made as indicators of the development, attitude, and outlook of the Filipino. Going into the four major stages in the process of broaden-

ing his concept, the Filipino may graduate from what he calls as the *Siac* (I) stage to the *Data* (You) stage then to the *Dacami* (We – exclusive) stage, and ultimately, to the *Datayo* (We – all inclusive) stage. His vision is for a Filipino to move out of the *Siac* stage and grow into the *Datayo* stage and not become stuck in the *Dacami* stage.⁵¹

This inner transformation must be done in the context of the family. The family as a microcosm of the society can serve as the jumping-off point for the re-consideration of the family as a core value. The success of this endeavor is seen to be decisive when the transformation is spearheaded by the elite forces of the society. Only when the elite forces of the Philippine society lead the Philippines accordingly, that is, when there is consistency between their words and deeds, will the Philippines achieve its perennial dream of a developed nation.

Even Confucius, although he sees a parallel between running a family and running a state, does not isolate the family from the state. In fact, he admonishes that “people not only loved their own parents and children, but loved the parents and children of others as well. . . . All men shared their social responsibilities, and all women had their social responsibilities and respective roles. Natural resources were fully used to benefit all, and were not appropriated for selfish ends. People wanted to contribute their strength and ability to society for public gain”.⁵² In the same end, Pope John Paul II preaches that “by means of his work man commits himself, not only for his own sake but also *for others and with others*. Each person collaborates in the work of others and for their good. Man works in order to provide for the needs of his family, his community, his nation, and ultimately all humanity”.⁵³

Ultimately, even with the many regressive tendencies of family orientation as a core value, it still possesses several praiseworthy and noteworthy characteristics such as the promotion of “sobriety, education, skills, diligence, devotion to the group rather than individual interests, unconditional respect for hierarchy and emphasis on non-confrontational approaches towards human relations”.⁵⁴

IV. Conclusion

As a conclusion, we might say that the transformation of the idea family into a *national family* depends on the positive contribution and leadership of the elite. It is the elite forces of the society who have the power to act as a force to lead us towards a developed and prosperous Philippines. So far, since colonization, instead of fostering cultural solidarity, they regressed to the securing of the well-being of the *sakop*. And this clannish and baranganic perspective of the family orientation became an impediment to all the governmental institutions with supposedly universalistic application. But in the present time, the elite must feel secure enough to recognize the existence of the under-privileged other. The said material prosperity should propel them to act on the ethical intention “*as aiming at the ‘good life’ with and for others, in just institutions*”.

Endnotes

¹Patricia B. Licuanan, “A moral recovery program: building a people – building a nation”, in *Values in Philippine culture and education: Philippine philosophical studies I*, ed. Manny Dy, Jr. (Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press) & The Council For Research in Values and Philosophy, <http://www.crvp.or>

²Gloria Macapagal – Arroyo, *Executive Order no. 314: Creating the Presidential Commission on Values Formation* (Manila: Malacañang, April 30, 2004), http://www.ops.gov.ph/records/eo_no314.htm (accessed November 5, 2006).

³Adelaida Bago, *Curriculum Development: The Philippine Experience* (Manila: De La Salle University Press, 2001), 132.

⁴Bago, 132.

⁵Emmanuel Mangubat, “Basic Considerations for Attaining a Truly Filipino National Identity”, *Philippine Journal of Education*, 60 (December 1981), 297a.

⁶Paul Ricoeur, P. “On Interpretation” *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics, II*. trans. K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson (Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1991), 12.

⁷Ricoeur, “On interpretation”, 12-13.

⁸John B. Thompson, “Editor’s Introduction” in Paul Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action, and Interpretation*, ed., trans, and intro. John B. Thompson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 17-18.

⁹Paul Ricoeur, "Existence and Hermeneutics" in *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*, ed. Don Ihde (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974) 16-17.

¹⁰Ricoeur, "Existence and Hermeneutics", 17-18.

¹¹See. John Van den Hengel, *The Home of Meaning: The Hermeneutics of the Subject of Paul Ricoeur* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982), 15.

¹²Van den Hengel, 15-16.

¹³Ricoeur, "Existence and Hermeneutics", 18.

¹⁴Morrison comments that "a theory of texts is important in Ricoeur's hermeneutic as it offers the interpreter space for the application of critical tools. True appropriation of a text's meaning is a reflexive action realized at the intersection of ontological naiveté and critical distancing". Bradley T. Morrison, *A Phenomenology of Marital Dynamics and Pastoral Care* (1992), <http://www.xcelco.on.ca/~btmorrison/ricoeur/Ricoeur&Systems.html> (accessed July 7, 2006).

¹⁵Paul Ricoeur, "Phenomenology and Hermeneutics" in *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, 113.

¹⁶Ricoeur, "What is a Text? Explanation and Understanding" in *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, 158.

¹⁷Ricoeur, "What is a Text?", 158.

¹⁸Ricoeur, "Metaphor and the Central Problem of Hermeneutics" in *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, 178. See also, Ricoeur, "Phenomenology and Hermeneutics", 113; Ricoeur, "What is a Text?", 159; "Appropriation" in *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, 185.

¹⁹Ricoeur, "What is a Text?", 158.

²⁰Paul Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and Surplus of Meaning* (Texas: The Texas University Press, 1976), 94.

²¹Van den Hengel, 194.

²²Mina Ramirez, "The Dominant and Popular Cultural Systems in the Philippines", *Reflections on Culture* (Manila: Asian Social Institute, 1991), 14.

²³Kathleen Blamey, "From the Ego to the Self: A Philosophical Itinerary", *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*, ed. Lewis Edwin Hahn (Illinois: Open Court, 1995), 597.

²⁴G.B. Madison, "Ricoeur and the Hermeneutics of the Subject". *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*. ed. Lewis Edwin Hahn (Illinois: Open Court, 1995), 89.

²⁵Emmanuel, 297a.

²⁶Conrado de Quiros, "A Question of Identity" [article online]; available from http://www.inq7.net/opi/2002/mar/20/opi_csdequiros-1.htm; accessed September 3, 2003.

²⁷Alejandro R. Roces, "A Nation Is Known By Its Values" in Lourdes R. Quisumbing and Felice P. Sta. Maria, *Peace and Tolerance: Values Education Through History* (Pasay City: UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines, 1996), 122-124.

²⁸Serafin D. Talisayon, “Values In Our Quest for Freedom (1896-1898) and Their Application for Future Development” in Lourdes R. Quisumbing and Felice P. Sta. Maria, *Peace and Tolerance: Values Education Through History* (Pasay City: UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines, 1996), 105. This is a result of Talisayon’s compilation and review of almost a hundred academic journals and opinion articles about Filipino values, orientations or attitudes, and idiosyncrasies. He was able to discern commonalities and consensus among various authors, and reduce them into a set of identifiable value clusters with some internal consistency or coherence.

²⁹Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *History of the Filipino People*, 8th edition (Quezon City: GAROTECH Publishing, 1990), 6-7.

³⁰Stella Go says that the Filipino’s stress on the importance of the family can be attested by the voluminous existing literature studying the Filipino family. The Research for Development Department of the Development Academy of the Philippines even compiled in one volume bibliographies together with a directory of agencies and individuals involved in studying or working with the family. Stella P. Go, *The Filipino Family in the Eighties* (Manila: Social Development Research Center, De La Salle University, 1993), 2-4.

³¹F. Landa Jocano, *Filipino Value System: A Cultural Definition* (Manila: PUNLAD Research House, Inc., 1997), 9.

³²F. Landa Jocano, *Filipino Social Organization: Traditional Kinship and Family Organization* (Manila: Punlad Research House, 1998), 11.

³³Alfred McCoy, “‘An Anarchy of Families’: The Historiography of State and Family in the Philippines” in *An Anarchy of Families: State and Family in the Philippines*, ed. by Alfred W. McCoy (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1994), 7.

³⁴Isabel S. Panopio and Realidad Santico Rolda, *Society and Culture: Introduction to Sociology and Anthropology* (Quezon City: JMC Press, Inc., 2000), 79. Cf. Jaime Bulatao, *Split-level Christianity* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1966), 26.

³⁵Prospero R. Covar, “Unburdening Philippine Society of Colonialism” in Lourdes R. Quisumbing and Felice P. Sta. Maria, *Peace and Tolerance: Values Education Through History* (Pasay City: UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines, 1996), 171.

³⁶Covar, “Unburdening Philippine Society of Colonialism”, 174. Jocano shares the same perspective with Covar and Ramirez as to the Filipino’s retaining his old values. Jocano reveals that in the midst of the rapidly changing environment, “the old rural patterns are retrieved and used to handle the pressure of adaptation to the changing environment. This keeps the traditional institutions, values, and sentiments alive. Thus, if one removes the outer trappings of modernity... one discovers that underneath the veneer, the Filipinos are still traditional in their institutional values and community outlook, even if they are in grey flannel suits”. Jocano, *Filipino Social Organization: Traditional Kinship and Family*

Organization (Manila: Punlad Research House, 1998), 3.

³⁷Covar, “Unburdening Philippine Society of Colonialism”, 174.

³⁸Mina Ramirez, “Toward a Revolution of Mindsets: A Critique of the Present Socio-Cultural System” in *Reflections on Culture* (Manila: Asian Social Institute, 1991), 4.

³⁹Ramirez, “Toward a Revolution of Mindsets”, 4.

⁴⁰The researcher considers this as a palpable possibility considering the general reverence that the Filipinos extend to these colonizers without extending the same sentiment to the Chinese, the Indians, and the Arabs.

⁴¹McCoy, 11. Cf. O.D. Corpuz, *Bureaucracy in the Philippines* (Manila: Institute of Public Administration, University of the Philippines, 1957), 128-213.

⁴²Ramirez, “Toward a Revolution of Mindsets” in *Reflections on Culture*, 5. See also, Ramirez, “The Dominant and Popular Cultural Systems in the Philippines” in *Reflections on Culture*, 19.

⁴³Teodoro C. Benigno, “The Philippines’ Elites”, in Here’s the Score, *The Philippine Star* (July 20, 2001). Based on his opinion as to the meaning of elite, Benigno enumerates six types of them in the Philippines: the Filipino Politicians, the Filipino businessmen, the clergy, the military, the media, and the left.

⁴⁴Cesar Adib Majul, *The Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Philippine Revolution*, reprint edition (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1996), 3.

⁴⁵Majul, 4.

⁴⁶Ileto cites the annotation of Rizal to Morga’s *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* that pointed out the flourishing indigenous civilization in the archipelago even before the arrival of the Spaniards. Reynaldo Clemeña Ileto, *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1979), 83.

⁴⁷Ileto cited Pio Valenzuela, one of the organizers of the katipunan, saying that “hundreds of people nightly joined the Katipunan” after the distribution of the *Kalayaan*. Ileto intimated that “Bonifacio himself was surprised at the rapid growth of the society. From the time he had founded it in 1892 to the appearance of *Kalayaan* in January 1896, it had only some three hundred members. But from the middle of March to the outbreak of hostilities against Spain in August 1896, its membership rose sharply to 30,000”. Valenzuela, Ileto said, “attributes the sharp rise in membership to the ‘effect of the periodical on the people’”. Ileto, *Pasyon and Revolution*, 82. Cf. “The Memoirs of Pio Valenzuela” (original in Tagalog), in *Minutes of the Katipunan* (Manila: National Heroes Commission, 1964); Teodoro Agoncillo (1956), *The Revolt of the Masses* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines).

⁴⁸Bonifacio irks the leading citizens because they believe that if he is to progress, the existing boundaries and hierarchies in the province would be threatened. Mabini, as Cabinet President of the Malolos government, was subjected to harassment because he was born to very poor parents. Ileto, *Pasyon and Revolution*, 111 & 117.

⁴⁹Jose V. Abueva, “Some Indicators and Explanations of the Weakness of Filipino Nationalism” in *Filipino Nationalism: Various Meanings, Constant and Changing Goals, Continuing Relevance*, ed. Jose V. Abueva (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1999), 814.

⁵⁰McCoy, 2. Cf. Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *Malolos: The Crisis of the Republic* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1960), 644-45. See also Renato Constantino, *The Philippines: A Past Revisited* (Quezon City: Tala Publishing Services, 1975), 232.

⁵¹Camilo Osias, “The *Tayo* Concept” in *The Filipino Way of Life: The Pluralized Philosophy* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1940), 3-4.

⁵²Alfredo P. Co, *Philosophy of Ancient China, reprint edition* (Manila: UST Publishing House, 2002), 116.

⁵³Pope John Paul II, *Laborem Exercens*, n.10 in Rev. Robert A. Sirico and Rev. Maciej Zieba, O.P., eds. *The Social Agenda: A Collection of Magisterial Texts* (Vatican City: Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2000), 87; [book online]; available from www.thesocialagenda.org/pdfs/english.pdf; accessed April 10, 2006, 112.

⁵⁴Alejo Jose G. Sison, “Business and Culture in the Philippines: A Story of Gradual Progress” (Instituto Empresa y Humanismo, Universidad de Navarra), [article on-line]; available from <http://www.unav.es/empresayhumanismo/2activ/seminario/miembros/sison/ii26/>; accessed December 6, 2005.

⁵⁵Paul Ricoeur, *Oneself as Another*, trans. Kathleen Blamey (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 172.

References

Abueva, Jose V. (Ed.) (1999). *Filipino nationalism: Various meanings, constant and changing goals, continuing relevance*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Agoncillo, Teodoro A. (1990). *History of the Filipino people*. Quezon City: GAROTECH Publishing.

Agoncillo, Teodoro A. (1960). *Malolos: The crisis of the republic*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Bago, Adelaida (2001). *Curriculum development: The Philippine experience*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.

Benigno, Teodoro C. (July 20, 2001). “The Philippines’ Elites”, in Here’s the Score, The Philippine Star.

Blamey, Kathleen (1995) From the ego to the self: A philosophical itinerary. In L.E. Hahn (Ed.), *The philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*. Illinois:

Open Court.

- Bulatao, Jaime (1966). *Split-level Christianity*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Co, Alfredo (2002). *Philosophy of ancient China*. Manila: UST Publishing House.
- Corpuz, Onofre D. (1957). *Bureaucracy in the Philippines*. Manila: Institute of Public Administration, University of the Philippines.
- Covar, Prospero R. (1996). Unburdening Philippine society of colonialism. In L. Quisumbing, F. Sta. Maria, *Values education through history: Peace and tolerance*. Pasay City: UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines.
- De Quiros, Conrado (2002, March 20). *A question of identity*. Retrieved September 3, 2003, from http://www.inq7.net/opi/2002/mar/20/opi_csdequiros-1.htm.
- Hahn, Lewis Edwin (Ed.) (1995). *The philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*. Illinois: Open Court.
- Ileto, Reynaldo C. (1979). *Pasyon and revolution: Popular movements in the Philippines: 1840-1900*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Jocano, F. Landa (1997). *Filipino value system: A cultural definition*. Manila: PUNLAD Research House.
- Jocano, F. Landa (1998). *Filipino social organization: Traditional kinship and family organization*. Manila: Punlad Research House.
- Licuanan, Patricia (1994) A moral recovery program: building a people - building a nation. In M. Dy, Jr. (Ed.), *Values in Philippine culture and education: Philippine philosophical studies I*. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press & The Council For Research in Values and Philosophy. Retrieved December 6, 2005, from http://www.crvp.org/book/Series03/III-7/chapter_iv.htm.
- Macapagal – Arroyo, Gloria (April 30, 2004). *Executive order no. 314: Creating the presidential commission on values formation*. Manila: Malacañang. Retrieved November 5, 2006, from http://www.ops.gov.ph/records/eo_no314.htm.
- Madison, G.B. (1995). Ricoeur and the hermeneutics of the subject. In L.E. Hahn (Ed.), *The philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*. Illinois: Open Court.

- Majul, Cesar Adib (1996). *The political and constitutional ideas of the Philippine revolution. Reprint edition*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Mangubat, Emmanuel (1981). Basic considerations for attaining a truly Filipino national identity. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 60 (December), 297-298.
- McCoy, Alfred (1994). 'An anarchy of families': The historiography of state and family in the Philippines. In A. McCoy (Ed.), *An anarchy of families: State and family in the Philippines*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Morrison, Bradley T. (1992) *A phenomenology of marital dynamics and pastoral care*. Retrieved July 7, 2006, from <http://www.xcelco.on.ca/~btmorrison/ricoeur/Ricoeur&Systems.html>
- Panopio, Isabel S., Rolda, Realidad S. (2000). *Society and culture: Introduction to sociology and anthropology*. Quezon City: JMC
- Quisumbing, Lourdes and Felice Sta. Maria (1996). *Values education through history: Peace and tolerance*. Pasay City: UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines.
- Ramirez, Mina M. (1991a). The dominant and popular cultural systems in the Philippines. *Reflections on Culture*. Manila: Asian Social Institute.
- Ramirez, Mina M. (1991b). Toward a revolution of mindsets: A critique of the present socio-cultural system. *Reflections on Culture*. Manila: Asian Social Institute.
- Ricoeur, Paul (1970). *Freud and philosophy: An essay on interpretation*. (D. Savage, Trans.). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ricoeur, Paul (1974). *The conflict of interpretations: Essays in hermeneutics*. (D. Ihde, Ed.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Ricoeur, Paul (1976). *Interpretation theory: Discourse and surplus of meaning*. Texas: The Texas University Press.
- Ricoeur, Paul (1981). *Hermeneutics and the human sciences: Essays on language, action, and interpretation*. (J.B. Thompson, Ed., trans., and intro.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ricoeur, Paul (1991). *From text to action: Essays in hermeneutics*, II. (K. Blamey and J. B. Thompson, Trans.). Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

- Ricoeur, Paul (1992). *Oneself as another*. (K. Blamey, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Roces, Alejandro R. (1996). A Nation is known by its values. In L. Quisumbing, F. Sta. Maria, *Values education through history: Peace and tolerance*. Pasay City: UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines.
- Sirico, Robert A. and Maciej Zieba (Eds.) (2000). *The social agenda: A collection of magisterial texts*. Retrieved April 10, 2006, from www.thesocialagenda.org/pdfs/english.pdf.
- Sison, Alejo Jose G. (n.d.) *Business and culture in the Philippines: A story of gradual progress*. Retrieved December 6, 2005, from www.unav.es/empresayhumanismo/2activ/seminario/miembros/sison/ii26/.
- Talisayon, Serafin D. (1996). Values in our quest for freedom (1896-1898) and their application for future development. In L. Quisumbing, F. Sta. Maria, *Values education through history: Peace and tolerance*. Pasay City: UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines.
- Thompson, John B. (1981). "Editor's Introduction" in Paul Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action, and Interpretation*, edited, translated, and introduced by John B. Thompson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 17-18.
- Van den Hengel, John. (1982). *The home of meaning: The hermeneutics of the subject of Paul Ricoeur*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.