Mayroon bang Pilosopiyang F/Pilipino?
*Isang diskusyon sa pilosopo@kssp.upd.edu.ph.*

Renato B. Manaloto

Discourse on Filipino Philosophy still focus on formulating the bases and approaches that would make Filipino philosophy known and rise above the rest. The following are the aspects of the discourse that has been molded: (1) wholistic approach, (2) comparative analysis, (3) contextualization of western philosophy in Filipino awareness, (4) phenomenology of Filipino experience, (5) compilation of texts in philosophy written by Filipino and (6) in depth study of Filipino concepts. Results of the new discourses made are usually just the repetitions of these bases and approaches.

Though the bases and approaches used differ from each other and are conflicting at some point, this should not be a reason to delay the discourses made on Filipino philosophy. In fact, much can be gained from these types of discourses because though they somehow disrupt the continuity of these studies made, they are rather seen as improvements to it.

---

Renato B. Manaloto is currently an instructor at the Department of Philosophy, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of the Philippines, Diliman.
Sadyang hindi matatawaran ang pakinabang na naaidulot ng makabagong teknolohiya ng kompyuter sa pagpapalawak at pagpapaunlad ng mga diskurso sa pilosopiya ang hindi na kinakailangan magkatagpo o tagpo ng personal ang mga kasali. Karnakailan halimbawa ginawang lunsaran sa e-mail ang pilosopo@kssp.upd.edu.ph (sa pangunguna na rin ni Dr. Leonardo de Castro, tagapangulo ng UP Departamento ng Pilosopiya at sa tuong ni Prop. Peter Sy, coordinator ng computer lab ng KSSP) para sa mga diskurso sa pilosopiya. Nauna nga sa diskusyon ang Pilosopiyang P/Filipino. Ganito ang tanong ni Dr. de Castro:

Mga kaibigan,

Matatong ko nga isay — para sa inyo, maaaron bang Pilosopiyang Filipino (Pilipino)? Ano ba, para sa isay, ang maaring ibig sabihin nito?

Narito ang ilan sa mga katugunan sa tanong:

GINAGAWA MUNA BAGO ITINANONG KUNG ANO ITO

>R. Ibanea

Naalaala ko ang kwento ng isang propesor noong isang linggo sa round-table discussion ng Philosophy Circle dito sa Ateneo. Ang sabi ng isang propesor sa isang estudyanteng may katulad na tanong: Katulad raw ito ng isang higaè na masayang narnamasaya. Minsan tinanong siya kung paano siya maglakad. Pagkatapos nito, hindi na nakahakbang ang higaè dahil tinatanong nyo kung paano siya naglakad.


Pero dahil nakalubog tayong, lahat sa pagkameron nito, mahirap makalitaw na para bagang hiwalay tayo at pinag-uusapan “Ang mga Pilipino.” Dapat ding gawin ang paglitaw sa ito, paminsan minsan, para

PRODUKTO NG NAMIMILOSOPIYANG PILIPINO

> P. Khalid:

Well, it's like this: borrowing from American composer Leonard Bernstein, “American Music is Music composed by an American” and so a Filipino philosophy is a product of a Filipino who philosophizes. Now, if there is a problem about a Filipino “systematic” philosophy, I don’t think we should spend sleepless nights over it, let us just continue doing philosophy and something good will come out on it. For starters, the government, CHED particularly, industry should see the value of philosophy in a college curriculum. My idea is, just get the Filipino to philosophize then something of a Filipino philosophy will emerge. When I mean philosophize, it is more than asking metaphysical questions, but more of understanding our society, the Western & Eastern philosophers in a SCHOLARLY way, funding conventions like the Philosophy Association of the Philippines and the Philosophy Circle... these are ways where we can develop our philosophy of being Filipino. Let us not dwell whether we have one or not, let us roll up our sleeves and start to do scholarly philosophical works...

KAUGALIANG MINANA NATIN SA ATING MGA NINUNO

> M. Dela Cruz:

Sa aking palagay ang Pilosopiya ng mga Filipino ay isa lamang kaugalian na minana natin sa ating mga ninuno. Ito ay hindi natin ginaya sa mga banyaga. Halimbawa, ang pagtanaw ng utang na loob sa mga magulang natin. Sa pagtugon natin dito minsan iniwanan natin ang ating sarili para lamang nito, hindi ba parang pilosopiya ni Levinas?

Ang aking tanong ay, alam ba nila ang pilosopiyang ito? kilala ba nila si Levinas?
MAYROONG PILOSOPIYA ANG MGA PILIPINO PERO WALANG PILOSOPIYANG FILIPINO

> D. Odchimar III

Ang Filipino ay mayroong pilosopiya ngunit walang pilosopiyang Filipino.

Kung ang ibig nating sabihin ng pilosopiya ay isang pananaw o world view (perspektib) ay maraing ipagkaloob na mayroong mga pananaw na katanayan sa isang tao sa isang sitwasyon. Maaaring ang sitwasyon na kanyang kinaroroong ay magdulot ng kaibhan at mga pagbabag-ago ng pananaw.

Ang mundo samakatuwid ay kung papaano ito nararanasan ng isang tao o how it appears to the person. Dahil sa tingin natin ang mundo mula sa sitwasyon na kinaroroong natin malararang ang mundo ay ayon palagi sa kung papaano natin ito nakikita. Kung gayon, ang mundo ay pananaw lamang natin.

Tayo ay mga pananaw. Dahil cito wala kabut na isa man sa atin ay mayroong parehong tingin sa mundo. Maaring sabihin na tayo ay nananahan sa ibang ibang hiwa-hiwalay na mundo. Maaari lamang siro na magkakahawig ang pananaw natin sa mundo ayon sa kalapitan ng lugar na kinaroroong at mga impluensiya nito sa atin, ngunit ang pagka particular natin bilang mga highly specific na indibidwal na hinhiwalay ng time at space dahil sa tayo ay mga historical being situated in a material world o “phenomenon” ayon kay Kant o world of Appearances ayon kay Platc.

Ang pag-pangalan na Filipino sa mga pananaw ay isang pagtatangka na burahin ang lantay na pagkaptukad ng mga pananaw.

Ang pagpupumbalit na mayroon pilosopiyang Filipino ay isang malinaw na pagtatangkang ibukod ang nakabukod nang kaayusan.

Ako ba ay Filipino? Ano ba ang Filipino? Sino ba ang Filipino?...

 mga etnikong ideya, paradigm at pespektibo

>N: Manauat

For one who is working on identity issues: race and ethnicity, class, gender and sexual orientation, I find that these categories aren't as neat
as many of us think. IMHO, a person’s identity can not be boxed in so simple a manner. For example, i am all these: filipino, ex-catholic, “middle-class” (private-schooled but low-income — what can i do, i’m in the academe), lesbian feminist woman who does philosophy. But is what i do “Filipino” philosophy? is Filipino = the person’s nationality? are ideas, paradigms, and perspectives ‘ethnicized’? Is there a Filipino way of doing things, and if so, is it applicable to how one does philosophy?

Perhaps certain patterns may emerge but i am wary of falling into the structuralist’s trap of falsely speaking for everybody.

TATLONG LAPIT

Antropohikal, Tradisyunal (Historikal) at Konstitusyunal


Nasa ibaba ang palitan nila ng mga kuru-kuru. Iniayos ito sa paraang daya:ogo:

ANTROPOLOHikal NA LAPIT

*R. Gripaldo

The first is the anthropological approach which was popularized by William Graham Sumner in his book “Folkways.” In the Philippines, this is adapted by Leonardo Mercado, Florentino Timbreza, and others. This is the collective view of the Filipino people based on their languages, sayings, riddles, epithets, folklore, and the like.

*C. Sayson, Jr

But are they in fact philosophical views? This criterion begs this substantive question, by blurring the distinction between social philosophy (worldview, weltanschauung, pananaw sa buhay) on the one hand, and philosophy on the other.
R. Gripaldo:

The second is the traditional approach which is generally the one used by historians of philosophy which is the enumeration of the philosophies of individual thinkers. When we speak of "Greek philosophy," for example, we enumerate Thales, Anaximenes, Anaximander, Xenophanes et al. This is true with British philosophy," "German an philosophy," "French philosophy," etc. When we speak of "Filipino philosophy" in this traditional sense, we must be able to name Filipino thinkers like Rizal, Mabini, Jacinto, Bonifacio, up to the present time. This is the individual views of Filipino thinkers.

C. Sayson, Jr:

Again, this begs the question whether the work of such men as Rizal, Mabini, Jacinto, and Bonifacio is "act philosophy," and whether they are philosophers in addition to being revolutionaries.

R. Gripaldo:

The third approach I call the constitutual one in that the subject matter is definitely Western or Eastern (non-Filipino), but interpreted by Filipino authors, that is, "Filipino" as defined by the Philippine constitution. In the light of hermeneutics, since the writer/interpreter is a Filipino, then there is an interpretative input by a Filipino (as constitutionally defined). About 75% to 80% of writings in philosophy by Filipinos at present are of this nature. Examples of titles are: "The Social Philosophy of Plato," "The Ethical Philosophy of Confucius," "Zen Buddhism and the Will of the Wind," "The Theory of Justice of Aristotle," "The Private Language Argument of Wittgenstein," etc.

C. Sayson, Jr:

So, every dissertation written by a Filipino citizen in a foreign university, for example, no matter what the theme and point of view, is Filipino philosophy? Isn't it just philosophy that happens to be written by a Filipino? (I mean, of course it IS Filipino philosophy, but only in
an empty, legalistic sense. It’s like saying that Bernard Williams’
philosophy is British philosophy because he is a British subject, even
though he spends most of his time at Berkeley. The point is: Does the
question even come up in such cases?

ANTROPOLOHikal, TRADISYUNAL O HISTORikal

>R. Gripaldo

I do not have much time to elaborate on these three, but when
we ask the question, “Mayroon bang Pilosopiyang Filipino?” the answer
is definitely yes. However, if we want to be more specific, we can raise
the question, what do you mean by “Filipino philosophy”? The
anthropological, traditional, or constitutional approaches? Or all three?

>C. Sayson, Jr

When we look at our answers to the question “Is there such a thing
as Filipino philosophy?”, it is necessary to ask in what sense the answer
could be “no”. In the anthropological sense given above, the answer
could not possibly be no, since every culture has in fact some kind of
worldview. But many such worldviews are of a mythic character and
do not rise to the level of philosophical thinking. All myth is part of
the collective thought of a culture, but from this it doesn’t follow that
that culture has a philosophy. Thus, for instance, the worldview of
Homer’s ‘Iliad’ is considered part of Greek thought, but not of Greek
philosophy.

In fact none of the criteria proposed by Dr Gripaldo engages
the prior and substantive question, what is philosophy? Unless we are
clear about this, we are at risk of putting the emphasis on “Filipino”
rather than on “philosophy” whenever we try to characterize “Filipino
philosophy”.

HISTORikal NA LAPIIT AT PILOSOPHIASYON NG PANG-ARA WARA WARA NA
PAMUMUHAY

>R. Gripaldo

As I said in the my answer to the question “Is there Filipino
philosophy?” that I have no time to elaborate on the three
approaches to Filipino philosophy. I did discuss/explain in the first
edition of “Filipino philosophy: a critical bibliography” the meaning of philosophy. The title of the first chapter is “Towards a definition of Filipino philosophy” where the three concepts “Filipino,” “philosophy,” and “Filipino philosophy” are clarified. The best way really to respond to Prof. Sayson’s remarks is to read this chapter.

But I will quickly just say the following:

1) I am taking the point of view of a historian of philosophy. As such, any historian of philosophy transcends the quarrel of different philosophical schools in which one school denies that the other schools are engaged in philosophy. For example, Bertrand Russel distinguishes between a philosopher (one engaged in the philosophy of logical analysis) and a social critic (one who makes critical views about comments on life, society, etc.). David Hume and Rudolf Carnap rejected metaphysics as philosophy. On the other hand, the existentialists discarded logical analysis as meaningless to one’s life, etc. But a historian of philosophy considers all these as philosophy and includes them in his history of philosophy. While analytic philosophy emphasizes logic and continental philosophy emphasizes life, pragmatism tries to bridge the two by stressing both logic and life. Morton White argues that the hedgehog (existentialists, phenomenologists and the like) may lie down with the fox (analytic philosophers) and the result need not be grotesque. He suggests that the two types of philosophizing should be reconciled. Rorty began as an analytic philosopher who studied continental philosophy and ended up a neopragmatist (or a postmodern pragmatist). Of course, pragmatism need not be the only way to bridge the two camps.

>C. Sayson, Jr:

... But I never questioned any of that. There has never been any question of the pluralistic nature of philosophical method. To make it quite simple, there have been three main methods of doing philosophy: (a) logical/linguistic/conceptual analysis; (b) transcendental/phenomenological analysis; and (c) dialectic. And there has never been any question, either, that myth can be subjected to any or all of these modes of analysis. But there you have it: these are all modes of ANALYSIS. Even phenomenological description is, in effect, an analysis of the categories of our lived experience.
Sure, the point of view of a historian of philosophy exempts one from taking a stand on which method is the “correct” philosophical method; but it doesn’t exempt one from explaining why one thinks that myth is or can be considered philosophy. Perhaps this is explained in your book, but I hope the explanation can be formulated neatly enough in a short simple paragraph for those of us who have no access to it.

>E. Vera

Please clarify this point: If an historian of philosophy needs to transcend the quarrel of different philosophical schools in which one school denies that the other schools are engaged in philosophy, how does he or she know that both systems are philosophies? Is it because they just claim to be so? Compare this with an historian of science who needs to choose between different explanations for physical phenomena, classifying some as scientific, others as superstition. He might begin with a nearly animistic belief but after a while he rejects them. By the time he talks about the discovery of magnetism he no longer refers to astrology as a science. Similarly the historian of philosophy justifies the claim that say two lines of inquiry, existentialism and linguistic analysis are philosophical fields while provincial beliefs about peculiar nature of humans (such as all men are by nature polygamous) are not.

>R. Gripaldo:

2) In contemporary philosophy there is the philosophization of everyday life, that is, the attempt to efface the boundary between the low road to philosophy (unsystematic philosophical views about life, society, etc.) and the high road to philosophy (systematic thinking such as those of Plato, Kant, Schopenhauer et al.). I do not have much time to explain this, but the point is, “philosophy” has come down to us to have a very broad meaning that even myths (see Roland Barthes—a poststructuralist) can be philosophical. This is not to say that all myths, the social sciences, etc. are philosophies. All I am saying is that a philosophically-minded person can “see” philosophizing in them.
C. Sayson, Jr

... To say that myths can be "philosophical" is a statement so vague as to be practically useless. Anyway, I think I answered this point in reply to (1): that philosophy can be and is applied to the study of myth and with remarkable results as Barthes showed. But how does this show that myth is or can be philosophy?

Why do you categorize Plato as a "systematic" philosopher? To Plato, philosophy is the difficult and painstaking task of making conceptual distinctions. From his earliest work up to the very last, his dialogues are remarkable attempts to get clear about the meanings of certain terms (justice, virtue, good, friendship, courage—all ordinary concepts that are part of moral discourse).

E. Vera

Does the philosophically minded person "see" the philosophizing in them or does he put it there? It's one thing to examine a text whose author intends as philosophical, and then to "look for" the philosophy in it, but to "see" it in a myth or other common belief... it makes me stop and wonder. This view wouldn't include "personal philosophy" in the sense that, "Well, my philosophy in life is blah, blah, blah...", would it?

Anyway, I agree this leads to Dr. Gripaldo's next point...

R. Gripaldo

3) It really all boils down to "what is philosophy?" My answer to this is rather long, but can anyone give us a definition that will include all the "philosophical views" that are supposed to be included in any history of philosophy? Can Prof. Sayson give us his criteria of what ought or ought not to be included as philosophy which will suit the perspective of a historian of philosophy like Frederick Copleston? I will give you a clue: any definition of philosophy must take into account Wittgenstein's doctrine of family resemblances.

C. Sayson, Jr

... Does Father Copleston consider myth philosophy? I think not! And I didn't say that our problem "all boils down" to the
question, what is philosophy? I said that question needs to be answered first before we can do anything else. Lastly, family resemblances can be quite deceiving. If you follow family resemblances uncritically, you can be led insensibly down a slippery slope. A few months ago, a newspaper columnist wrote a fatuous editorial where he equated “critical thinking” with “making criticisms”, e.g., personal criticisms, and then drew the irresponsible conclusion that it is perilous to engage in critical thinking. The “argument” trades on the family resemblance between the terms “critical thinking” and “making criticisms”. (Fortunately his column did not go unchallenged.) Another example: In the Athens of Plato’s time there were family resemblances between the two terms ‘sophos’ and ‘sophistes’, such that it was unclear how to distinguish one from the other. Plato made a lifelong attempt to distinguish the two terms. The ‘sophos’ is one who can make distinctions between ideas in a reliable way, according to the nature of things as they really are; the ‘sophistes’ is one who wardenly disregards these distinctions for the sake of winning an argument and persuading his hearers, and for financial gain. Socrates was accused of being a ‘sophistes’ and put to death for it, but Plato showed mankind that Socrates was really a ‘philosophos’, i.e. a ‘cover’ of ‘sophia’, someone who is unswervingly committed to the human task of searching for the truth, not by having it revealed to him but by going out and engaging others in disciplined conversation. Philosophy, in Socrates’ and Plato’s minds, is an activity, not a body of doctrine.

Well, I guess that too is my conception of philosophy, and I think it’s a damn good one!

> E. Vera:

We can begin with the following guide questions:

1. What do these philosophical schools intend to do? — Almost all of these seek to explain or justify something, answering questions like, (a) What is real? (Covers just about everything from Thales to the present), (b) How should we act? (Same: I’m not an expert but doesn’t this sooner or later involve existentialism as well as ethics?), (c) Are my arguments for (a) and (b) good or bad? (Logic), (d) Is there only one way of assessing the correctness of my arguments?, (e) How do I justify my judgments?
I dare say the last question even sums up the ONLY question in philosophy. Everything else either rephrases the question or explores the details.

The next problem is distinguishing this from the physical sciences, comparative literature, or any other sort of inquiry...

I dare say the last question even sums up the ONLY question in philosophy. Everything else either rephrases the question or explores the details.

The next problem is distinguishing this from the physical sciences, comparative literature, or any other sort of inquiry...

2. It's the method and the depth — Philosophers answer their questions without necessarily using the scientific method (especially since some of them are busy examining the scientific method). I'm not too clear how to describe the "method" here, save perhaps to say that we use logic (but then again, what science doesn't?).

I notice, however, that serious philosophical enterprises seek ultimate justification for their claims. They keep to get the reason behind the last reason. at least until their spade is turned. Furthermore, they seek an ultimate general principle. I mean they seek a general principle, a rule that applies not only to the inquiry at hand but to every other inquiry. Note how Aristotle's theories, or Plato's before him, would have something to say about how to answer any question.

And compare how a modern student of the discipline would use Wittgensteinian techniques to answer any other question like, "What is justice?", "What is the nature of man?", and "Why do 7 and 5 make 12?"

Not all philosophers have written on so many subjects, but my point is that it's possible to apply their principles to other subjects. How would cartesian thinking explore ethics or politics? I am not versed in all of Descartes' writings but I think he wrote none on this subject. How different would it be from, say, Kantian ethics? If they didn't actually write on everything, at least their principles should be capable of being taken to other directions.

That's generality.
(Hmm. Maybe Descartes didn’t cover those areas because it didn’t interest him, or the project would prove too broad. But note how different philosophers can share a tradition, a way of doing philosophy, and team up on these philosophical problems. Which rationalist tackled ethics? Didn’t the Vienna circle do something like this (teaming up on problems)? Can we do something like this?)

3. Finally, it’s the discipline --- Given the length of time humans have existed on this planet, I bet people have tried to answer the foregoing questions. Even before Thales, even before Confucius, even before people lived in Mohenjo Daro, Harappa or what have you. Unfortunately, nobody did any writing, or if they did, these were lost. Think of philosophy as a great conversation between all the thinkers of the human race. Next, to participate, we have to be thorough. We imagine our arguments, justify it, and anticipate counter arguments... and then we write them down. Furthermore, we assume the truth of our conclusions and imagine their implications (if you find that modus ponens holds in all possible worlds, does this imply that logical principles are more real than to write them down.

Does this mean that unwritten thoughts are not philosophy? Only to the extent that some great thinker in human history isn’t deemed a philosopher... because no one ever heard of him.

Now, what would make philosophy Filipino? Probably the same criteria we use to refer to Continental philosophy, Anglo-American philosophy, Chinese philosophy, Ancient Greek philosophy, and Islamic philosophy. We normally talk like this to distinguish the way they do philosophy in some place from the way they do it in other places. Their theories were original, cogent, and supported. They also enjoyed prominence (or notoriety) in places outside their geographic location. If we want to have a Filipino philosophy in the same vein, we should continue writing our answers to the philosophical questions. By their generality, peculiarity, and coherence, shall our ideas distinguish themselves.

I imagine there will be other issues here like, “Should Filipino philosophy be in Filipino?” My first answer is “No, there’s no need.” Others feel that our very language delineates the kind of philosophical question we would pose, as well as how to answer
them. I used to think this way too but lately, I'm not so sure of my position.

**Family Resemblances at Modus Ponens. Bilang Paglilinaw sa**

**Philosopiya vs Mito**

> C. Sayson, Jr:

I intend the above points to be conjunctive; a thorough essay on how best to wear pajamas is not philosophy, and a shallow explanation of ethical principles ("Because the spirits decree it! Isn't that enough?") both fall short of the requirements.

This, like the proverbial hundred lawyers chained to the bottom of the ocean, is "a good start". What is the philosophical mode of explanation as contrasted with the mythic mode?

One thing we cannot do is to argue from resemblances. That is to say, we can't argue that since there are family resemblances between certain types of mythical thought and philosophy, then there must be and substantive relation between the two. Resemblance is not a transitive relation, i.e., if x resembles y and y resembles z, it doesn't follow that x resembles z. It's like the relation "mother of": If A is the mother of B and B is the mother of C, it doesn't follow that A is the mother of C.] Any resemblance between philosophy and myth is inconclusive as to their real connections.

On an earlier point raised, I'm not sure what it means to ask whether modus ponens is true in all possible worlds. Perhaps the point of the question is: whether modus ponens is validity-preserving for all formal systems. There's one philosopher who argued that modus ponens is masculine form of inference, that it expresses the male domination of society, and thus is valid only for a certain range of discourse. (I'm sorry I forgot her name, but she was mentioned prominently in an exchange of letters in the New York Review of Books several years ago.) The mistake here is in thinking that a form of inference can be critiqued on the level of the pragmatics of discourse, which opens the way to the kind of ideological critique she wants to do. It cannot—its critique must be done on the level of formal semantics. (Simple distinctions like this go a long way. It keeps you from worrying about problems that aren't really problems.)
> M. I. Lamongo:

Kung ating lihihalihin na isa sa mga paraan upang linangin ang “mga pilosopiyang Filipino” (atunang urt mga nilalang ito) ay sa pamamagitan ng paggamit ng wika ng Filipino, hindi maiiwasang harapin ang kakulangan ng mga pagsasalin ng mga akda (pilosopikal man o hindi) sa Filipino. Kahit sati hin natin sa marami-rami na ring mga aklat sa pilosopiya ang nasasulat sa Filipino (ng mga Pilipinong pilosopo), naroroon pa rin ang hind maitatarwang kakulangan at kahirapang matagpuan ng mga pangunahing teksto sa Filipino. (Sa isang TV show noong nakaraang tron, binigyang-pansin ni Homobono Adaza ang kakulangan/havalaing ng mga pagsasalin ng mga “classics sa world literature” sa ating mga bookstores.) Sa aking palagay, kung talagang seryoso tayo sa paglinang ng “mga pilosopiyang Filipino,” kailangan seryosohan din natin ang gawain ng pagsasalin. Siguro, kakulangan nating hikayatin ang isa’t-isa na magsagawa ng mga pagsasaling ito.


Gayunpaman, hindi pa rin maiiwasan ang mga kontrobersiyang TV show na tabanggit ko kanina. Ibinahagi naman ni Alex Magno na isinalin niya ang “The Prince” ni Machiavelli bilang “Ang Pinuno” at ipinabasa sa kanyang mga esudyante. At tinanong daw siya ng mga ito kung walang ingles noon dahil nahihirapan silang intindihin (nalaaliman?). At dahlil nga raw sa punong tita humababa ang kalidad ng edukasyon sa paggamit ng wika ng Filipino, ipinasya niyang bunalik sa pagtuto na ang ginagamit na wika ay Ingles.
Tabak Philosophy at Wikang Pilipino

> J. m.p. Javier:

...Sa aking palagay ay mayroong Filosopiyang Pilipino. Ang mga ginawa ng ating mga ninuno na pag-isip kan na maunawaan ang kanilang kinalalayan sa buhay ay tinatagang kong pamimilosopiya. Ang kanilang kaisipan ay ipinahahayag sa pamamagitan ng panulat ng ating mga naging bantog na bayani kabulang na sina Rizal, Bonifacio, atbp. Hindi ko alam kung ang iba pang mga bayani matapos ang 1521 at bago ang mga Ilustrado ay nagawang maipahayag sa pamamagitan ng pagsulat...Ang kanilang tinalakay, ang paksang kanilang pamimilosopiya ay ang ating KABANSAAN. Sasabihin ng isang nag-aaral sa kasalukuyan na sila ay Social or Political Philosophers. Ang ginawang pakikihamok ng mga Pilipino laban sa mga dayuhan para sa kalayaan at kasarinlan simula pa ng dumating ang mga Kastila (at hanggang sa kasalukuyan!) ay nagpakita ng kanilang pagiging gising o mulat ang mga mata at bukas ang kaisipan sa mga nagaganap sa kanilang paligid, sa buhay. At ito ang nagisisilbing batayan at nagubuonsod ng kanilang pamimilosopiya. Ang tawag ko rito ay TABAK PHILOSOPHY”). Sa katunayan, kung tataggapin natin na may “pattern” at “continuity” ang daloy ng Kasaysayang Pilipino ay naroroon at buhay pa rin ang pamimilosopiyang ito hanggang sa sandaling ito! Hindi yata tumpak na hanapin natin sa Pilipinas ang tinatawag na “pilosopiyang” nataguan ng iba sa Gresya o sa Tsina o sa Amerika, atbp.

Ang TUNAY na Pilipino ay namimilosopiya sa wikang Pilipino kahit pa sa impiyerno!!!—itong mabagsik na pananalitang ito ay para sa taong dapat lamang tamaan... Marahil hindi pa niya naiintindihan ang kahulugan ng “NO BLOOD NO HEROISM”... PARSON TO MORE SENSITIVE READERS AND BROTHERS... BUT I JUST WANT TO BE CLEAR...

Wikang Pilipino vs Tunay na Pilosopiyang Pilipino: Tungo sa Feministang Pilosopiyang Pilipino

> N. Mananat:

Pilosopiyang Pilipino sa wikang Pilipino? Heto na naman tayo... Sa bansang Pilipinas, d. lamang isa ang wika. Sa aking

Ano nga ba ang "tunay"(authentic) na pilosopiyaang Filipino kung mayroon nga nito? Para sa akin hindi madaling hanapan ng sagot ang katanungan ito. Mas marami pang katanungan ang ibubunga nito, e.g. mayroon nga bang pilipinoong kasarinlan (identity)? Kagaya ng nabanggit ko karamihan. May iba pang kategorya na dapat isaalang-alang maliban sa aiting pagkapilipino Maliban sa ethnicity, nariyan pa ang panlipunan-ekonomiyang basagdan, kasarian, orientasjon seksual, abilidad, etc. Kung mayroon ngang pilosopiyang Filipino paano tayo mamakasiguro na to ngayon at hindi lamang nagreprese nano sa status quo? Kagaya ng paraan ng pagtuturo ng pilosopiya sa kolehiyo. Naging pangkaraniyan na ang magtatag at panatilihin ang “canon.” Hindi na’t sila Platon, Aristoteles, Santo Tomas, etc., ang laman ng ating klaseng “Introduction to Philosophy” at ating itinuturing na “canonical”? Marami sa atin ang nagsasaaisang-tabi sa mga kababaihang pilosopo at hindi mula sa kanluran. Marahil hindi malayong magkaroon din ng “feministang pilosopiyaang Filipino”, hind: ba?


Gayunman, natatili ang tanong, "Mayroon bang Pilosopiyaang F/Pilipino?" hind lamang dahil sa pagbinas na makahanap ng pilosopiyaang
maituturing na pilosopiya ng mga Pilipino upang maahay sa mga kinitalang pilosopiya sa mundo gaya ng Pilosopiyang Pranses, Pilosopiyang Aléman, Pilosopiyang Inglès, Pilosopiyang Indiya atbp., kundi dahil na rin sa pagpapahayag na makilala ang sariing kaakahan na higit na pinahahalagahan sa kasahukuyang pamimilosopiya dahil na rin sa pananaw na (laluna ng postmodernismo) ang pamimilosopiya ay kaakahan. Sa pagsagot kasi sa tanong nagiging malinaw ang pagkilala sa sariling kaakahan.

Ilan lamang ang mga nabanggit sa iitas sa mga pamantayan/lapit/pananaw na sinubukan ng gamitin sa pagtatukoy sa Pilosopiyang F/Pilipino. Ilan pa sa mga ito ang: holistikong lapit ni Leonardo Mercado; komparatibong analisis ni Emerita Quito; pagasakonteksto ng pilosopiya kanluranin sa kamalayan Pilipino ni Leonardo de Castro; penemonolohiya ng karanasan ni Manuel Dy, Jr.; pagtitipon ng mga aklanang isinulat ng mga Pilipino sa pilosopiya ni Romualdo Abulad; tungo sa ikatutubong Pilipino at pagasahatutubo ng Pilosopiyang Pilipino ni Fiorentino Timpireza; pamamaraang vital thought at reflexive thought ni Ramon Reyes; antropologikal na paglalabas ni Dionisia Miranda at Albert Alejo; mga passusuri ng mga konseptong Pilipino ni Dionisia Miranda, Albert Alejo, Prospero Covar, Reynaldo Ileto, Zeus Salazar at Emmanuel Lacaba.


Nagkakaiba't nagustongalingalan man ang mga imhaing pamantayan/lapit/pananaw nakalauilong namang ang mga ito sa pagpapalawak at pagpapautlad ng diskurso sa pilosopiyang F/Pilipino. Sadya nga marahil na ang hinhibing ng kasalukuyang diskurso ay hindi ang kaagad na iisang
marami dahil sa ganito karaniwang nakikita ang hinahanap. At saka na nga natin marahil kailangang tukuyin ang ating hinahanap na matibay at katanggap-tanggap na pamantayan/laip/pananaw sa Pilosopiyang F/ Pilipino.

Samantala tayo na munang makisawsaw sa discurso.

**Mga Tala**


12 Sinuri niya ang mga konseptong "loob", "hiya", "kamalayan" at 'diwa' gaya na rin ng makikita sa kanyang Ang Kamalayan at Diwa: Isang paglibhaw ng ilang konsepto ng Kinagisang Sikolohiya (1977) at Wika at Diwa: Isang Pansikolinguistikang Analisis sa Halimbawa ng Konsepto ng "Hiya" (1981).

13 Mayroon din siyang pasusuring ginawa ukol sa "loob". Tingnan ang kanyang "Ang Loob: Ilang Tala sa Paglibhaw Pilipino" nasa Komunikasyon at Lipunan (Lungsod Quezon: Departamento ng Filipino at Panitikan ng Pilipinas, 1981)