

THE CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS ETHIC OF EMILIO JACINTO

John N. Schumacher, S.J.

THE POST-VATICAN II EMERGENCE OF LOCAL CHURCHES

The Second Vatican Council gave recognition to the collegial relationship of the bishops with the Pope, and to the role of the local churches within the Church universal, as well as calling for adaptation of the liturgy to local cultures. These and other decrees which explicitly or implicitly pointed the local churches in the direction of what is now commonly known as inculturation, would eventually lead many, especially in the so-called Third World local churches, to look more closely at their own indigenous cultures and historical experience as the background against which to rethink their pastoral practice in response to contemporary local problems. In turn, this would result in the centering of much theological activity, especially in these Third World churches, hitherto so Romanized and/or Westernized, on the development of their own theology as well, not in contradiction to that of the universal Church, but articulated in language and concepts more in consonance with their own culture and historical experience.¹

1. Among numerous examples which could be cited demonstrating this proliferation of local church theologies, see the German missiological dictionary, *Lexikon Missionstheologischer Grundbegriffe*, ed. Karl Müller and Theo Sundermeier (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1987), with its special articles on African, Chinese, European, Indian, Japanese, Korean, Latin American, and Filipino theologies. From one point of view, the recognition of European theology as likewise being merely that of one local church, not of the universal Church, is the most significant sign of the acknowledgement of pluralistic theologies of local churches in union with the Roman church. Reviewed by myself in *Landas* 2 (1988) 288-91.

This has subsequently led theology into a dialogue with cultural anthropology, history, literature, psychology, and other disciplines. One early attempt along these lines in the Philippines was an article by Fr. Vitaliano R. Gorospe, S.J., "Sources of Filipino Moral Consciousness," in which he dealt with

some common moral concerns and elements [of justice] found both in past sources of Filipino moral consciousness and today's Filipino Christian morality.²

Among the sources discussed by Gorospe were the customary law of national cultural minorities; eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Tagalog religious literature, like the long influential work of Fr. Modesto de Castro, *Urbana at Feliza*; and the principal versions of the *Pasyon*. He also touched on the idea of justice in the nationalist ethic of the Katipunan, as manifested in the writings of Andres Bonifacio and Emilio Jacinto. Since Gorospe's article limits itself to the concept of justice, as expressed in the Katipunan demands for racial equality between Filipino and Spaniard, it will perhaps be useful to take a wider look at the ethical thought of Emilio Jacinto, and explore some of the principal ideals of the national revolution expressed in his surviving writings.³

THE THEOLOGICAL VALUE OF THE KATIPUNAN LITERATURE

Some may question why a Catholic should look to a source of this type for moral values undergirding Philippine society,

2. Vitaliano R. Gorospe, "Sources of Filipino Moral Consciousness," *Philippine Studies* 25 (1977) 278-301. The quotation is on p. 279.

3. I limit myself to Jacinto, since it is the consensus of historians that it was Jacinto who played the major role in the articulation of the ideals of the Katipunan, while Bonifacio's role was rather that of the charismatic leader who originally organized and inspired the society. Before Jacinto became a member of the Katipunan, Bonifacio had himself drawn up a list of duties of the Katipunero, "Katungkulang Gagawin ng mga Anak ng Bayan" (*The Writings and Trial of Andres Bonifacio*, trans. and ed. Teodoro A. Agoncillo [Manila, 1963] 67), commonly referred to as the Decalogue of the Katipunan. But Bonifacio himself later replaced his own composition with the *Kartilya* of Jacinto as the foundational document of the Katipunan, recognizing its superiority in articulating nationalist ideals.

since the Katipunan was at least harshly antifriar, if not anticlerical and anti-Catholic. The simple answer is that, without fully granting that somewhat oversimplistic categorization of the religious attitudes of the Katipunan,⁴ the Katipunan was in fact the moving force behind the national revolution in which Filipinos as a people came to participate, and which they have accepted as the beginning of their national existence. Moreover, what the Philippines as a nation, and the Philippine Roman Catholic Church itself, are precisely in need of at this time, is a secular national civic ethic — that is, one not imposing on Filipinos of different beliefs Catholic moral doctrine, but at the same time taking into account the Catholic tradition which underlies so much of the national culture.

I think it is true to say that there are still sizable sections of the Catholic Church in the Philippines, particularly but not only, among the hierarchy and clergy, who, on the grounds that the Philippines is a "Catholic country,"⁵ see the official Catholic value system as the only valid one in Philippine society, despite the lip service usually paid to ecumenism and religious pluralism.⁶ This, I would submit, is not only violative of consciences of non-Catholics (and also of Catholics, when the attempt is made to use the *State* to impose religious values on them), but contrary

4. See my paper, "The Katipunan's Nationalist Program: Religious or Anti-Religious?", referred to in n. 13 below; and from a rather different, but not contrary, point of view, Reynaldo C. Ileto, *Pasyon and Revolution* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1979).

5. We prescind here from the question of whether such a concept is even theoretically — certainly not empirically — viable since the Declaration on Religious Liberty of Vatican II. In any case, the separation of church and state maintained by the Philippine Constitution (and by all previous Philippine constitutions) makes such a concept as "Catholic country," with its notion of a privileged position for one denomination, certainly untenable in fact. For the empirical evidence of the effects of the "Catholic country" concept, one need only look to what has happened in recent years to Catholicism as a reaction against the prototype of that concept, Spain as governed by the concordat between the Franco regime and the Vatican. Similar counterproductive effects are now manifesting themselves in the somewhat more moderate paradigms of Ireland and Poland, where the hierarchy has unwisely attempted to use the constitutional system to impose Catholic moral doctrine on the country as a whole.

6. For an explanation of, and some of the consequences of, this mentality, see my article "Foreign Missionaries and the Politico-Cultural Orientations of the Roman Catholic Church, 1910-1970," *Philippine Studies* 38 (1990) 151-65.

to the teaching of Vatican II on the freedom of conscience, and harmful in the long run to the Catholic Church itself, especially to its credibility.

It is surely true that no one who knows the history of the Filipino people can deny that Catholicism was the principal integrating factor of Filipino nationality until the late Spanish period, and that it remains a key integrating element of Filipino culture even today. But it was not, and certainly today is not, the only element. It was precisely the by then anachronistic identification of Spain-Catholicism-Philippines in the late nineteenth century which made it inevitable that the national revolution take the antifriar, and sometimes anticlerical and anti-Catholic, form that it did.⁷ Before a genuine Filipino sense of self-identity could emerge in the face of such a totalizing ideology as ruled nineteenth-century Spanish Catholic Philippines, it was necessary to create a basis for Filipino nationality which not only rejected Spanish sovereignty, but, though it did not attack Catholicism as such, would not be essentially dependent on Catholicism either.

This is precisely what Rizal attempted to do in his writings, and he concretized his vision in his short-lived Liga Filipina. Here, as Cesar Majul has demonstrated, Rizal laid the foundations for a national community which would be competitive and substitutive for those functions which were not being achieved under the Spanish church-state organization of society. Thus the way would be prepared for eventual separation from Spain.⁸

Hence, the Liga Filipina of Rizal was not merely reformist, as

7. As a matter of fact, even the Jesuits, though they were generally untouched by the antifriar attitudes and actuations of the Revolution, were guilty of sharing in the condemnation of Filipino nationalism and the Revolution. It was a Jesuit who wrote the absurd statement: "An honorable and Christian *Indio* cannot be an enemy of Spain without violating his conscience and without offending God gravely . . ." (Francisco Foradada, S.J., *La soberanía de España en Filipinas* [Madrid, 1897], quoted in my *Readings in Philippine Church History* [2nd ed.; Quezon City: Loyola School of Theology, 1987] 269). The alleged incompatibility of nationalism and Catholicism could scarcely be asserted more harshly, and this at a time when there had been no sign of any of the anticlerical and anti-Catholic measures which were to surface in certain quarters under the Malolos Republic.

8. Cesar Adib Majul, *A Critique of Rizal's Concept of a Filipino Nation* ([Quezon City], 1959), esp. 46-52.

is often said, though it looked to many reforms — to be carried out by Filipinos, with or without Spanish consent. Rather it was a separatist organization, neither promoting nor excluding that this separation should come by armed revolution,⁹ intended to prepare the Filipino people for independent nationhood by providing them with a secular (not secularist)¹⁰ or civil set of national values and ideals not defined by the Spanish (or even Filipino) clergy.¹¹ What Rizal was prevented from carrying through by his deportation a few days after the founding of the Liga, was the task taken up by Andres Bonifacio in the founding of

9. I have developed this distinction between separatism and commitment to armed revolution in the essay "The *Noli Me Tángere* as Catalyst of Revolution," in my book, *The Making of a Nation* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1991) 91-101, esp. 98-101.

10. The distinction, common enough today, deserves nonetheless to be highlighted, given the often anticlerical or antichurch sources with which we are dealing, as well as the confusion introduced by the "Catholic country" ideology. *Secular* values are those which do not depend on any religious sanction for their validity; *secularist* values or principles are those proceeding from an ideology which positively excludes or attempts to exterminate religious values, at least from public life.

11. Given the theological positions on church and society taken by the nineteenth-century popes and most Catholic theologians, it would not be surprising if the Filipino clergy tended to claim succession to the Spanish clergy as the guardians of Filipino moral values. Such a claim, in spite of its anachronism, at that time probably still had the support of the majority of Filipinos who gave thought to the question, if one is to judge from what happened at the Malolos Congress. Here the leading Filipino priests, with the probable exception of Fr. Gregorio Aglipay (under the control of Mabini), fought to defend the rights of the Church within a Catholic state. Though they were unsuccessful in preventing the enactment of a provision on the separation of Church and State, the provision was only passed by a clever maneuver on the part of the minority, and even a doctrinaire anticlerical like Mabini recognized its inopportuneness and had it suspended in the "transitory provisions." Their efforts, however, were more defensive against the extreme anticlerical and anti-Catholic minority faction than assertive of special prerogatives for themselves. See my account in *The Revolutionary Clergy: the Filipino Clergy and the Nationalist Movement, 1850-1903* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1981) 73-86; also Cesar Adib Majul, *Apolinario Mabini, Revolutionary* (Manila: National Historical Commission, 1970) 154-76. I believe, however, that though Majul admits the inconsistency of Mabini in claiming to stand for religious freedom, while attempting to subject even a church controlled by Filipino priests to the political interests of the government, he ends by pragmatically justifying Mabini's efforts at the establishment of a state-controlled church, which certainly went against the consciences of most Filipino priests. He also supposes Mabini's extreme anti-Catholic views to have been more generally held by the supporters of the Revolution than seems to me demonstrable or even correct.

the Katipunan, whose ideals were developed more articulately and put into writing by the pen of Emilio Jacinto.¹²

It was the Katipunan therefore that was the real successor to Rizal's Liga, not the second Liga Filipina, founded after Rizal's deportation by Domingo Franco and others with the purpose of supporting financially the campaign of Marcelo del Pilar and the newspaper *La Solidaridad* in Spain. Like Rizal's Liga, the Katipunan looked to eventual separation of the Philippines from Spain, but its immediate functions were the preparation of the minds of the people by a small well-indoctrinated group. It was only in 1896 that it turned toward creating a mass organization, and

12. There is some obscurity about the publication of Jacinto's writings. They are found in their presumed Tagalog original in Jose P. Santos, *Buhay at mga Sinulat ni Emilio Jacinto* ([Manila]: n.p., 1935). The foreword (*Paunang Salita* [pp. 5-7]) by Rafael Palma is dated 1928, while Santos' preface (*Bago Basahin* [p. 8]) is dated 1927. In it, however, he acknowledges his debt of gratitude to Dr. Jose P. Bantug for having (already?) made possible the publication (*nagpalimbag*) of the book, which, nonetheless, was copyrighted by Bantug only in 1935 (p. 2). At the end of the book (p. 94), however, there is a quotation in praise of the book from the *Philippines Free Press* for 12 April 1930. Whether there was simply a delay, for reasons unknown, in obtaining the copyright until so long after the publication, or whether the 1935 edition, the only one mentioned in Maxima Magsanoc Ferrer, *Union Catalog of Philippine Materials* (Quezon City: National Library and the University of the Philippines Press, 1976) 2:1425, no. 17829, was actually a second printing, is impossible to determine.

The provenance of the originals is also difficult to determine. Epifanio de los Santos Cristobal, father of Jose P. Santos, had published a biography of Jacinto in Spanish with partial translations into Spanish of some of Jacinto's works in the *Philippine Review* 3 (1918) 412-30, accompanied by an English translation by Gregorio Nieva. De los Santos is said by Teodoro A. Agoncillo in the introduction to his edition of the Nieva translation, to have found the letters of Bonifacio to Jacinto and certain other Katipunan documents in "a hen's nest in a Bataan town" in 1906 when he was governor of Bulacan and Bataan. But Agoncillo gives no further details nor does he mention how De los Santos acquired the other unpublished documents of Jacinto of which he makes use (Epifanio de los Santos, *The Revolutionists: Aguinaldo, Bonifacio, Jacinto*, ed. Teodoro A. Agoncillo [Manila: National Historical Commission, 1973] x). De los Santos and Nieva translated only parts of the Jacinto documents in the article of 1918 and it is the Nieva English translation of this text that Agoncillo reproduced in the National Historical Commission edition, even though he had earlier retranslated from the Tagalog in his *The Revolt of the Masses* those passages of the documents of Bonifacio and Jacinto that he reproduced there. Jose P. Santos says that he found Jacinto's originals among his father's papers and joined them to the biography (Santos, *Buhay*, 8).

It seems that no copy of the newspaper *Kalayaan* exists, and Santos possessed only a defective copy of Jacinto's article "Sa Mga Kababayan," of which the first two pages were missing, and which he does not reproduce. The only copies

moved inevitably toward armed revolution. Though written in Tagalog rather than the Spanish of Rizal's works, there is no mistaking the heritage from Rizal in the writings of Bonifacio and especially Jacinto, in spite of the originality of some of his contributions, as will be seen below.¹³

THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF JACINTO'S *KARTILYA*

Key to Jacinto's vision, like that of Rizal, was the concept of equality, based on the dignity of the human person.

Maitim man at maputi ang kulay ng balat, lahat ng tao'y magkakapantay; mangyayaring ang isa'y higtan sa dunong, sa yaman, sa ganda . . . ; ngunit di mahihigant sa pagkatao.¹⁴

(Whether their skin be dark or white, all human persons are equal; one may be superior in knowledge, in wealth, in beauty, but not in being more human.)

This principle is repeated in various ways in all Jacinto's

of Jacinto's or other articles from *Kalayaan* which are known, therefore, are those printed in a Spanish translation by Juan Caro y Mora in the "Documentos Políticos de la Actualidad," published by Wenceslao E. Retaña in his *Archivo del bibliófilo filipino* (Madrid: Minuesa de los Ríos, 1897) 3:52-68. (The pagination refers to that of the "Documentos," not that of the *Archivo*, which would be pp. 132-48). The article "Pahayag," by "Dimas Alan," entitled "Manifiesto" in the *Archivo* translation, pp. 58-64, is Jacinto's, as is that entitled in the Spanish translation, "A los compatriotas."

13. I have developed this more fully in the as yet unpublished paper, given on 7 July 1992 at the Katipunan Centennial Commemorative Conference held at the Ateneo de Manila University under the sponsorship of the People's Alternative Study Center for Research and Education in Social Development (PASCRES). But I had already indicated the substantial dependence of Bonifacio and Jacinto on Rizal in my 1979 essay, "The Propagandists' Reconstruction of the Filipino Past," now found in my book, *The Making of a Nation*, 114-15. Majul has also remarked on the dependence of Jacinto on Rizal in his various books on the Revolution.

14. "Mga Aral Nang Katipunan ng mga A.N.B.," in Santos, *Buhay*, 82. This work is usually referred to as the *Kartilya*. All translations are mine, though in a few places I have made some use of those of Gregorio Nieva, and of Agoncillo in his *Revolt of the Masses*, where he retranslated from Santos, *Buhay*. All subsequent page numbers added to the text of the quotations are references to the latter work.

writings, and from it he draws its logical conclusion — that given the equality and dignity of human persons, one's worth is dependent on his or her honorable conduct in accordance with that dignity:

Ang kamahalan ng tao'y wala sa pagkahari, wala sa tangus ng ilong at puti ng mukha, wala sa pagkaparing kahalili ng Dios, wala sa mataas na kalagayan sa balat ng lupa; wagas at tunay na mahal na tao, kahit laking gubat at walang nababatid kundi ang sariling wika, yaong may magandang asal, may isang pangungusap, may dangal at puri; yaong di napaaapi't di nakikiapi; yaong marunong magdamdam at marunong lumingap sa bayang tinubuan (ibid.).

(The worth of a person is not in being a king, not in the shape of his nose and the whiteness of his face, nor in being a priest, representative of God, nor in the loftiness of the position he holds on this earth. That person is pure and truly noble, even though he was born in the forest and knows no language but his own, who is possessed of good character, is true to his word, has dignity and honor, who does not oppress others nor help their oppressors, who knows how to feel for and care for his native land.)

The rest of the *Kartilya* spells out in detail the obligations this human dignity entails in a man — to do good to others, to defend those being oppressed, to be honest and true to his word, not to look on woman as an object for pleasure but as a faithful companion in life, to treat the wife, daughters, and sisters of others as he wishes his own wife, daughters, or sisters to be treated. In a word, true holiness (*kabanalán*) is to be found in charitable actions, in loving one's fellow human beings, in acting and speaking in accord with true reason.

Beyond this moral code the *Kartilya* demands something more — the dedication of one's life to a purpose beyond his or her petty personal interests:

Ang kabuhayang hindi ginugugol sa isang malaki at banal na kadahilanan ay kahoy na walang lilim, kundi damong makamandag (ibid.).

(The life which is not spent for a great and sacred cause is like a tree without shade, if not a poisonous weed.)

The code set down here was actually printed before 1896 and laid before prospective members of the Katipunan, as we know from the fact that whatever may have been the fate of Jacinto's original papers, which seem not to be in existence today,¹⁵ a printed version and other manuscript copies of the *Kartilya* were in the hands of the U.S. War Department before 1903, among the so-called Philippine Insurgent Records.¹⁶ Though it would be naive to think that all its precepts were always observed by Katipuneros — one need only point to the torture and execution of friar prisoners in Cavite by Bonifacio and one of his brothers — it was a set of principles seriously set forth to prospective members as expressing the ideals of their struggle.¹⁷

THE OTHER KNOWN WRITINGS OF JACINTO

As for the other writings of Jacinto, they may be divided into two categories. One comprises those which were published in the Katipunan newspaper, *Kalayaan*, which we have today only to the extent that they have been reproduced in Spanish translation in Retaña's *Archivo*.¹⁸ These are of minor interest for our purpose here, since they were written on the eve of the Revolution, and their main purpose was to make the Filipinos aware of their misery under Spain so as to stir them up to resist and eventually to revolt. They do not concern themselves directly with laying the moral foundations of the future Filipino nation.¹⁹

15. According to Agoncillo (*The Revolutionists*, xi), Jose P. Santos sold some of his father's collection to the Philippine government after the latter's death, and then, before the war, placed those parts he had retained in the library of the University of the Philippines for safekeeping, and thus lost all when the Japanese soldiers used the books of the library for cooking fires.

16. See the English translation in John R. M. Taylor, *The Philippine Insurrection against the United States*, ed. Renato Constantino (Pasay City: Eugenio Lopez Foundation, 1971) 1:215-17. Presumably this pamphlet is still to be found in the Philippine Revolutionary Records in the Philippine National Library. The records were shipped from the Philippines to Washington for Taylor's history in 1903, and were only returned to the Philippines in 1957.

17. For the torture and execution of the friar prisoners, see my book *The Revolutionary Clergy*, 49-50.

18. See n. 12 above.

19. Besides the articles of Jacinto in the first issue of *Kalayaan*, which we have only in Spanish translation, Jacinto is said by the principal sources to have

"LIGHT AND DARKNESS"

But Jacinto did devote himself systematically and at length to further development of the moral ideals for the "Anak ng Bayan," in his "Liwanag at Dilim," in which he expounds more fully some of the ideas of the *Kartilya*, and reflects and exhorts as well on other moral topics. Given the length of this collection, it will here be possible only to indicate the topics of the essays, and to make a few remarks on certain key points.²⁰

The theme of the work is well-expressed in the title "Liwanag at Dilim," for it is an effort, analogous to that which inspired

written all the articles for the only partially-completed second issue which was never published, due to the discovery of the Katipunan press and the outbreak of the Revolution in August 1896 (see De los Santos-Agoncillo, *The Revolutionists*, 165; Santos, *Buhay*, 25). It would seem that the unpublished pieces collected by Epifanio de los Santos and published in full by his son were not the articles Jacinto was preparing for the second issue, with the possible exception of the apparently unfinished anti-Spanish article "Ang Kasalanan ni Cain" (Santos, *Buhay*, 46-48). The other writings are three. The "Pagkatatag ng Pamahalaan sa Hukuman ng Silangan" (ibid. 48-56) and the "Samahan ng Bayan sa Pangangalakal," (ibid. 57-59), which were written in Laguna only in 1897-98, are practical documents for the political and economic organization of the region and the nation. The collection of moral essays, "Liwanag at Dilim" (ibid. 27-46), seems to be intended for publication as a book or pamphlet by itself, and De los Santos considered that "it is a code intended for publication for the use of the sons of the people," but unfinished and still in need of polishing (*The Revolutionists*, 171). It is only this pamphlet we will consider here as being relevant to Jacinto's moral thought, and indeed the most important of his writings, as distinct from the revolutionary propaganda such as he wrote for *Kalayaan*.

20. It should be noted that the De los Santos-Agoncillo version is simply the 1918 translation of Gregorio Nieva, which is both greatly abbreviated and not always faithful to Jacinto's original essays as found in Jose P. Santos' *Buhay at mga Sinulat ni Emilio Jacinto*. Apart from inaccurate translations, sentences and whole paragraphs are omitted without any indication of the excisions, and even separate sentences are combined into one for no apparent reason. It is rather disconcerting to think that Agoncillo, who had been aware of the unreliability of the Nieva translations to the extent that he made entirely new translations of the passages of Jacinto's and Bonifacio's works that he used in his 1956 *Revolt of the Masses*, should in 1973 simply reproduce the unreliable and grossly abridged 1918 translations. It is even more disconcerting that this book, *The Revolutionists*, should have been published by the National Historical Commission, and thus be given the stamp of an official translation of the writings of Jacinto, one of the major and most attractive figures of the national revolution, second only to Rizal in the intellectual and moral foundation he tried to impart to Filipino national consciousness.

so many of Rizal's writings, to help his people, especially the "Anak ng Bayan,"²¹ to distinguish the true values of Filipinos, represented by light, from the false ones of darkness. The first essay, "Glitter and Light" ("Ang Ningning at ang Liwanag"), sets the theme which runs through the following essays: that there is a difference between what *appears* to some people to be good or important or of value, and what is *really* such.

In the subsequent essays, the influence of Jacinto's reading on the French Revolution, with its professed goals of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, is seen clearly, as he devotes special essays to "Kalayaan" (pp. 28-30), "Ang Tawo'y Magkakapantay" (pp. 30-32) and "Ang Pagibig" (pp. 33-35). But the treatment of these topics is his own, both Filipino and Christian, as partially indicated by his substitution of "Pagibig" for Fraternity. He is, however, critical of the way that Christians have ignored these truly Gospel values.²² Not only are there frequent references to "ang Maykapal" and "Dios," but after founding human equality on human dignity ("ang pagkatawo ng lahat"), his ultimate argument is:

"Kayong lahat ay magkakapantay, kayong lahat ay magkakapatid" — sinabi ni Cristo (p. 30).

("You are all equal, you are all brothers" — Christ said.)

He hastens to add, however, that the first to set themselves above their fellowmen have been those who call themselves His representatives ("kahalili") and the pillars of His teaching, and whom the people have blindly believed. The same contrast will

21. In the Santos book, the term is capitalized. If this faithfully reproduces the original, the dedication which precedes the "Liwanag at Dilim" is addressed precisely to the Katipunero, "the Son of the People" who is repeatedly also identified as "anak ng dalita" ("son of poverty"). (Santos, *Buhay*, 26). Though the sufferings of the poor are a constant theme in the essays, there is also an appeal to the unifying of all the people of the Philippines and even of the world.

22. Relevant here is the homily of Pope John Paul II on a pastoral visit to Bourget, France in 1980, where alluding to the ideas of "liberté, égalité, fraternité," he said: "Those are Christian ideas. I say this, fully conscious that those who first formulated this ideal thus, did not refer to the alliance of the human person with the Supreme Wisdom" (quoted by Gustav Thils in *Revue Théologique de Louvain* 23 [1992] 260).

appear later and more strongly in the essay "Ang Maling Pagsampalataya" ("Wrong Belief"; pp. 40-45), which is devoted to contrasts between the sayings of Jesus in the Gospel,²³ and the behavior and teaching of those who call themselves His disciples (*alagad*), a term which, from the context, does not seem to be limited to the friars or even the clergy in general. Among his targets are the traffic in sacred things, lavish ceremonies and ornamentation of rich churches, and other such examples of "ningning."

It is significant, however, that there is no explicit mention of the friars as such, or even of priests, though such are clearly alluded to in his condemnations of those who call themselves God's representatives ("kahalili ng Dios"). His real target is all those, whether Spanish friars or Filipino priests or lay Christians who are false to Christ's command of love of neighbor. In this he is like Rizal, whose novels satirize not only the abuses of the Spanish clergy, but "religious" Filipinos whose thinking and conduct betray the Gospel of Christ.²⁴

At ang pagmamahalang ginawa ng mga Kristiano ay ang pagaapihan at pagdadayaan; at ang magkakapatid at magkakapantay, unang una na ang mga alagad, ay nagagawan ng katataasan, kayamanan at karangalan, upang masila ang maliliit at mga maralita (p. 42).

(And the way that Christians have showed love [as commanded by Christ] has been by oppressing and defrauding one another; and the way of showing brotherhood and equality, especially by those disciples, has been by using lofty position, riches, and honors to devour the little people and the poor.)

To be true brothers and sisters of Christ what is needed is

23. All the quotations are from the Gospel of Luke. Since no translation of the Bible into Tagalog during the Spanish regime is known, and the translations are somewhat free, it is to be supposed that Jacinto himself translated into Tagalog from a Spanish Bible (or just possibly Latin, since he may well have studied Latin at the Colegio de San Juan de Letran or in the University of Santo Tomas). In fact, according to the list furnished by Pio Valenzuela, in the little library shared by himself, Bonifacio, and Jacinto, there was a Bible, though he does not specify its language (De los Santos-Agoncillo, 91).

24. For Rizal's criticism of his fellow-Filipinos, see my book, *The Propaganda Movement* (Manila: Solidaridad, 1973) 79-80.

not some special prayers or practices, but to imitate Him in humility, goodness, and love for one's fellow human beings.

Saan man dumoon ang pusong malinis na pinamamahayan ng magandang nasa at ng matuid ay naroroon si Kristo; binyagan at di binyagan, maputi't maitim ang kulay ng balat (p. 43).

(Wherever there exists a pure heart where noble desire and reason abide, there Christ is; whether the person be baptized or not baptized, whether the color of the person's skin be white or dark.)

Nor should the evil and suffering of the world be attributed to the will of God; rather it comes from the evil deeds of His creatures, not from the purpose of the all-good Father. Nor does God need our words in praise of Him. He is Father of the whole human race ("Ama ng Sangkatawohan") and what he wants of us is to follow His ennobling and rational commandments ("ang gumanap at sumunod sa matuid at magandang utos niya"). These are to be found in our reason (*katuiran*), which comes totally from God.

Ang tunay na pagsampalataya, paggalang, pagibig at pagsunod sa Dios, sa makatuid ang tunay na pagsamba ay ang paggalang, pagibig at pagsunod sa katuiran . . . dahil sa ang buong katuiran ay nagmumula at namamahay sa kalakhan, kabutihan at pagka Dios ng Dios (p. 44).

(True faith, reverence, love, and obedience to God, and therefore true worship, is reverence, love and obedience to reason . . . because reason in its totality comes from and dwells in the greatness, goodness and "Godness" of God.)

ANTICLERICALISM OR ANTICATHOLICISM IN JACINTO?

It seems clear that Jacinto, like Rizal, rejects the institutional Church of his time, but the ethic he proposes is far from being rationalist in the European deist or agnostic sense; it is "reason" based on Christianity, on Jesus Christ and His Gospel, and the central motive it proposes for human behavior toward others is quite simply the fact that all are God's children ("pawang anak Niya"). At the end of this section, he adds his modest disclaimer,

indicating, no doubt, the wrestling his mind had undergone to synthesize the ideals he had gained from his readings on the French Revolution and other works similarly critical of Catholicism with his Christian faith and his reading of the Bible:

Naririto ang pagsampalataya na aking inaaring tunay at naaayos sa talaga ng Maykapal. Kung ako'y namamali maging dahilan nawa ng aking kamalian ang tapat kong nasa (p. 45).

(Here is the belief that I have judged to be true and in accordance with the will of the Creator. If I am mistaken, may my sincere desire be taken as the cause of my error.)

The other sections of "Liwanag at Dilim" whose analysis must be omitted here are the lengthy one on the relations between the government and the people ("Ang Bayan at ang mga [Gobierno] Pinuno"; pp. 35-40) and the brief, perhaps unfinished, one on work ("Ang Gumawa"; pp. 45-46). The first may be summed up by saying that the welfare of the people, the common good, is the sole and entire reason for the government's authority, legitimate as the latter may be in its origins. The following one on "work" rejects the interpretation of the book of Genesis that work is something shameful or a punishment for Adam's sin. Rather it should be seen as a gift of God by which a person benefits himself and others and distinguishes himself from brute animals.²⁵

THE ENDURING VALUE OF JACINTO'S INTELLECTUAL HERITAGE

Though there was no room in the Spanish-dominated Philippine church of the nineteenth century for Jacinto's reflections on, and exhortations to, a more genuine religious and moral belief, as expressed in the documents whose analysis we have briefly undertaken here, that does not deny their fundamentally

25. The interpretation of work as a punishment for original sin was long a Catholic commonplace. It is of interest to compare the ideas of Jacinto on work with the modern theology of work contained in the 1981 encyclical of John Paul II, *Laborem Exercens (On Human Work)*. In this document work is described as belonging to the nature of the human person, and receiving its dignity from the person, though its toilsomeness came from sin (*Laborem Exercens*, nos. 4 and 27). Jacinto would have found the approach congenial to his own discussion.

Christian character. There is little or nothing in the thought of Jacinto that a modern Catholic theologian would take exception to, and I believe the same could be said of other Christian denominations as well. Too long has the institutional Catholic Church rejected or handled gingerly the nationalist movement which gave birth to the nation. Too long also has the Revolution and its real or alleged intellectual and moral heritage been a handy weapon for anticlerical and anti-Catholic propaganda, often under the guise of history.²⁶

No doubt the nineteenth-century nationalists, Rizal and Marcelo del Pilar, Bonifacio and Jacinto, Mabini and Aglipay, and other lesser figures, exaggerated the abuses and ignored the good that the Spanish missionaries had done and were doing. But the nineteenth-century Church was sick — sick in Rome, sick in Spain, and the consequences were all too palpable in the sickness of the Philippine church.²⁷ The refusal to accept anything of the modern world was all too prevalent in the papacy, in Spain, and especially in the Philippines, where the nostalgia for an anachronistic clerical-dominated past could only close the minds of ecclesiastics to what was just and true and even Gospel-inspired in the aspirations of Filipino nationalism. This is true of Rizal's writings to a large extent, and even more true of Jacinto's, where the harsh edge some of Rizal's writings had received from his European background was perceptibly modified by Jacinto's emergence from a Filipino Christian context.²⁸

The intellectual and moral heritage of Jacinto deserves closer attention than it has received, either in its own time or subsequently, and more than the initial analysis given in this brief essay.²⁹ To mention only one point for illustration, the frequent reference to the "anak ng dalita" deserves much more attention.

26. For substantiation of both these statements, see my paper in n. 13 above.

27. See my *Readings in Philippine Church History*, 230-70.

28. It is ironic that it was two Marxist historians who have recognized the Katipuneros as, what they call, "Christians of fundamentalist inclinations," who "urged a rediscovery of gospel teachings that the religion of the friars had violated and forgotten. . . ." (Jonathan Fast and Jim Richardson, *Roots of Dependency: Political and Economic Revolution in 19th Century Philippines* (Quezon City: Foundation for Nationalist Studies, 1979) 83.

29. It is not argued here that the writings of Jacinto studied here actually had great influence in the Revolution. Only the *Kartilya* was actually circulated,

Without returning to the Marxist or pseudo-Marxist interpretations of Renato Constantino or Agoncillo, and maintaining the sufficiently documented middle-class character of the Katipuneros, certainly in the pre-1896 phase, the concern of Jacinto's writings with the poor needs to be explored and perhaps related to the participation of middle-class Katipuneros like Jose Turiano Santiago and Aurelio Tolentino or Lope K. Santos (whose father was an active Katipunero in the early period), in the labor movement of the early twentieth century. The work of Reynaldo Ileto in his *Pasyon and Revolution* has opened up another path into the religious thinking of Filipino nationalists, on which the last word has not yet been said.³⁰ And though no one can deny the contributions made by Teodoro Agoncillo to unearthing the sources of the history of the Katipunan and the Revolution, his highly personal, not to say dogmatic, interpretations of the sources, even apart from his tendentious anti-Catholicism, make his two books far from definitive, though indispensable for other historians. Needless to say, for all its value in bringing together documents, neither is the anti-Filipino history of Taylor satisfactory. It is to be hoped that the work now going on in preparation for the centenary of the Revolution by a number of historians will result in a deeper insight into the thinking and events which brought the nation into being. The thought of Emilio Jacinto, even the unpublished works, which no doubt reflect much discussion in the Katipunan that never was written down, deserves a significant place in such a rethinking of the Revolution.

and that can only be said with any certainty about the core nucleus of the Katipunan, such as it existed in early 1896. Whether the principles contained there continued to be inculcated during the evolution into a mass organization in 1896 is at least doubtful for Cavite, if one is to accept Aguinaldo's account in his *Mga Gunita ng Himagsikan*. Even less can we speak of the period after 1898. Certainly more research is needed to say anything further.

30. Reynaldo Clemená Ileto, *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1979). In the light of a more careful study of Jacinto, as well as of the early labor movement, I feel compelled to revise my criticism of Ileto's inclusion of the Katipunan in his interpretation. Though the ramifications of the subject are too complex to be treated here, I would certainly have to concede that I have insisted too much on the fundamentally secular orientation of the Katipunan in my essay, "Recent Perspectives on the Revolution," *The Making of a Nation, 186-89*.