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Fr. Horacio Dela Costa, in his work The Background of Nationalism and Other Essays, made an attempt to assist the Filipino find beef up his ain sense of individuality, oppugning the superficiality of the usual Filipino ‘ s claim for national individuality. He says, “ It is easy plenty to state, ‘ I am Filipino ‘ . ” but so asks what stating it means when “ the really word itself is a foreign derivative with no exact autochthonal equivalent ” . The truth is that, as Father Dela Costa says, we do non even have a name we can name our ain. Father Dela Costa ‘ s essays in this text concerns to “ clear up the Filipino ‘ s sense of individuality and intent as a nation. ” ( p. seven )

In this text, Father Dela Costa gave light on the duty of the author in modern-day Philippine society. Here he writes about the concerns the author must maintain in head. The author as an creative person, he says, is responsible for conveying the right ‘ memorable ‘ experience in his text.

The author must be cognizant of the Filipino ‘ s sense of individuality. Startling, in fact, that Father Dela Costa started turn outing the Filipino ‘ s cultural individuality by doubting it. He asks, “ Do we hold a cultural individuality? ” ( p. 83 ) He wonders because what is evident is that Filipinos have cultural diverseness “ far more marked than any other Asiatic state ” . He recognizes that our adjacent Asiatic states have been subjected to Western cultural influence but he observes that none of them have experienced such interpenetration as the Filipino. This is the ground why he inquiries the Filipino individuality. The influence of the West have apparently been so much mixed with the Filipino ‘ s ain that it might, in a manner, have dominated what remains to be originally Filipino.

Father Dela Costa contends that Filipinos can non merely accept it as a given that the Filipino is culturally diverse, a mix of Asian and Western. He wants the Filipino to be cognizant of his ain and claim merely one, it can non be both. So much of the civilization may be influenced by the West such as the fundamental law and faith but Father Dela Costa contends that still, we can non be both. We must be one or the other, Asiatic or Western. He says that the Filipino who accepts both might be accepting so because he subscribes to the Aristotelean construct of orderliness wherein he likes to see things fit neatly in classs. To those who accept both, the Filipino is Asiatic because he is geographically from Asia but besides Western because of so much Western things he does culturally. However, this new class of being both might be disorderly after all. Father Dela Costa suspects a unsmooth sort of integrity here. ( p. 84 )

All in all, Father Dela Costa encourages the Filipino author to be cognizant of his individuality thru enlarged consciousness and refined esthesia of the present and past. This work of his purposes to authorise the Filipino to be cognizant of what he genuinely is and truthfully claims his civilization as his ain.

The Rizal Bill of 1956

Horacio dela Costa was asked to outline for the Church a pastoral missive on the Hagiographas of Jose Rizal ( peculiarly Noli Me Tangere and El Filibusterismo ) being included in the reading course of study of pupils in the Philippines. It is non something many know, but he really expressed a positive position of Rizal, acclaiming Rizal as “ builder of a state ” .

In bill of exchange Angstrom, he reinforced that Rizal was non person with an “ unreflective love ” for the state, intending that the Filipinos suffered under colonial regulation but this was non the lone cause of their agony. He went on to state that Rizal ‘ s books, contrary to popular belief, were in fact non looked upon unfavourably by the Catholic Church since the Church would ne’er acquire in the manner of the “ legitimate political and societal aspirations of any people ” ( Schumacher ) , which were expressed in Rizal ‘ s novels. However, a closer review of the novels reveals that his composing did non cane the Church but instead brought attending to the maltreatments and issues environing the establishment such as the world of “ unfaithful priests ” and inordinate fear of saints. Though it must be realized that these issues do non in any manner render Catholic philosophy as a whole nothing and nothingness. Therefore, in Dela Costa ‘ s position, it can be seen that Rizal was non aiming the Catholic Church with his novels but the offenses that its members commit in order to stain its rules.

The “ manner ” of Jesuit Education entails that a individual has morality closely intertwined with mind, “ an built-in relationship between the life of religion and the life of the head ” . ( Donahue 1992 ) This therefore implies that one may expose the values of his Jesuit instruction by doing certain that his sense of morality permeates his rational enterprises, that he is able to spot good with ground but besides able to see goodness, to see God in all things, no affair how hard it might look to be.

In this instance, Horacio Dela Costa integrated morality into his analysis of Rizal and his two novels by spoting Rizal ‘ s motivations through his authorship. It would be all excessively easy to travel with the sentiment of the bulk of the bishops who hired him to compose the pastoral missive by merely reprobating the inclusion of Rizal ‘ s novels in the reading course of study of schools. However, Dela Costa wrote out a missive with a more positive position of Rizal harmonizing to what his mind, every bit good as his sense of morality and goodness told him, which in bend gauged the morality that he could see in Rizal and his Hagiographas.

Rizal ‘ s novels tell of some negative facets of faith, such as corruptness in the character of Fr. Damaso and Salvi or even the spiritual complacence of Tiago, who prayed every bit much as a saint in the narrative but might non hold reflected this spiritual sense in footings of his actions. It would hold been all excessively easy for Dela Costa, or for anyone, for that affair, to disregard these illustrations as apparent unfavorable judgments of the Church, aimed at supplying those who do non back up the Church as an establishment with the fuel to rend them apart. However, Dela Costa was able to utilize his acute mind and sense of morality and goodness on Rizal ‘ s Hagiographas in order to nail penetrations that went much deeper. He was able to surmise that Rizal was non anti-Church ; his Hagiographas did non reflect a negative image of Catholic philosophy, but instead revealed the maltreatments and offenses being committed by the members of the Church, whether these be in the higher ranks such as the priests or ordinary laypersons.

Dela Costa was able to acknowledge Rizal ‘ s illustrations of inordinate fear of saints, malicious behaviour of spiritual figures, and other such unhallowed affairs as showing a base against how faith was presented to people during his clip ; how faith existed in people ‘ s lives back so. Dela Costa was able to acknowledge Rizal ‘ s morality and sense of goodness through his authorship when others could merely see bald-faced accusals and unfavorable judgments of a powerful establishment.

It is of import to possess a realistic image of the universe, a universe where enduring exists. In the universe today, it would be so easy for a individual to barricade things out if they should happen something unpleasant. However, a Jesuit instruction, in order to allow people see that there is goodness and God in everything must besides prepare people to accept and confront the world of a agony universe. Dela Costa would non hold taken Rizal ‘ s exposure of the negative facets of the Church as he did, if he did non take to see the universe for what it is, negative facets and all. He was besides able to understand Rizal ‘ s purposes to undertake agony at its beginning because he was besides able to take the clip to spot the dirty, painful image of world and avoid seting incrimination and accusals on Rizal, who the bishops thought had a negative position of the Church itself.

On Free Trade and Poverty

“ Free trade between an industrial state and an agricultural state is to the hurt of the agricultural state aˆ¦ Our negotiating place aˆ¦ can non be other than based on our national involvement aˆ¦ and at the same clip, on societal justness. ” ( Trade between the unequal, lecture 30 August 1968 ) . Harmonizing to Gatdula these averments made by Fr. De La Costa, based on recent findings by several international organisations, were deemed right and still really much relevant in today ‘ s free trade market. His plant from the yesteryear are still some of the chief models of today ‘ s society.

On poorness this is Fr. Dela Costa ‘ s position: “ We must now do our ain determinations and must take the full effects of the determinations we wrongly make, or weakly do, or cravenly fail to do. We no longer hold a female parent state or a colonial maestro to fault for our defects ; we merely have ourselves. ” ( Philippine Economic Development, 27 January 1966 ) Although non specifically directed towards the hapless and destitute, Fr. Dela Costa believes that we have full control over our lives and he wants the hapless to take control to seek to acquire themselves out of the hole they are presently in. They have to do a base and non merely fault whomever for their state of affairs.

Another penetration is that this phrase was written 40 old ages ago for it most likely was a job back so that Fr. Dela Costa saw, genuinely plenty this is still applicable in our lives today, particularly with our Filipino civilization of faulting others for the defects or negative results in our lives. Clearly seen in our electoral system wherein we are the 1s who vote for and make up one’s mind who our authorities functionaries are but when they do n’t execute up to par we blame them but in world the one to fault is us, for we are the 1s who voted for them. Fr. Dela Costa besides asserts that for our state to derive economic development all the people must lend, it must be a joint attempt. Undoubtedly this is true but the inquiry that he raises is that are we all willing to make this?