

A Theological Ethical Critique of Political Dynasties: A Sociobiological and Evolutionary Perspective

Lawrence Santiago PEDREGOSA ♦

Abstract: This article provides a theological ethical critique of political dynasties from a sociobiological and evolutionary perspective. Using Philippine politics as context, these biological theories are utilized to provide parallels by analyzing the strategies of political families to secure power that are akin to the social behavior of animals based on survival instincts. Not reducing the argument to mere biological determinism, these theories elucidate how the oligarchic political behavior of elites rooted in the limited view of kinship altruism is ethically problematic in contemporary societies that aspire for the realization of democracy especially when it is already habituated as political culture. When viewed from the theological ethical perspective, issues arising from the concentration of power, wealth, and influence among political clans resulting in social injustice, corruption, and weakening of democratic institutions are thus considered structurally and socially sinful. In this regard, the essay criticizes the limitation of politics primarily based on the narrow view of kinship ties for consolidating a democratic society founded on the principles of the rule of law, equality, and the common good.

Keywords: Philippine Politics • Political Dynasties • Sociobiology • Evolution • Theological Ethics • Social Justice

♦ Lawrence Santiago PEDREGOSA holds the degrees of Doctor of Theology (Ph.D.) and Sacrae Theologiae Doctor (S.Th.D.) from KU Leuven. He also acquired the degrees of Sacrae Theologiae Licentiatius, Sacrae Theologiae Baccalaureus (magna cum laude), and M.A. Advanced Studies in Theology and Religion (magna cum laude) from the same university. Before his studies at KU Leuven, he taught as an Asst. Professorial Lecturer at De La Salle University, Manila. He also received his degrees in M.A. Applied Theology from De La Salle University, Manila and A.B. Political Science from University of Santo Tomas, Manila. His research interests are ethics, metaphysics, political philosophy, critical theory, liberation theology, migration theology, and postcolonial theology. Email: lspedregosa@yahoo.com

L'ambition des Principaux profita de ces circonstances pour perpétuer leurs charges dans leurs familles : le Peuple déjà accoutumé à la dépendance au repos et aux commodités de la vie et déjà hors d'Etat de briser ses fers, consentit à laisser augmenter sa servitude pour affermir sa tranquillité ; et c'est ainsi que les Chefs devenus héréditaires s'accoutumèrent à regarder leur Magistrature comme un bien de famille, à sa regarder eux-mêmes comme les propriétaires de l'Etat dont ils n'étoient d'abord que les Officiers, à appeler leurs Concitoyens leurs Esclaves (a), à les compter comme du Betail au nombre des choses qui leur appartenoient, et à s'appeler eux-mêmes égaux aux Dieux Rois des Rois (b).¹

– Jean-Jacques Rousseau

Twelve voices were shouting in anger, and they were all alike. No question, now, what had happened to the faces of the pigs. The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say which was which.²

– George Orwell

Introduction

To introduce the Philippine culture of political dynasties is to present a short history of how Philippine democracy revolves around a small circle of elite families since the 1986 EDSA People Power Revolution. This 'Yellow Revolution' that ousted dictator President Ferdinand E. Marcos Sr. (1965-1986) was triggered by the united popular opposition due to Senator Benigno 'Ninoy' Aquino II's assassination on 21 August 1983. The downfall of Marcos's authoritarian regime, which ruled for more than a decade of patronage, cronyism, and human rights violation, eventually catapulted Corazon

¹ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, « Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité (1753), » *Œuvres Complètes Vol. III*, ed. Bernard Gagnebin et Marcel Raymond (Dijon: Bibliothèque de la Pléiade Éditions Gallimard, 1966), 187.

² George Orwell, *Animal Farm* (London: Seeker & Warburg/Octopus, 1945), 66.

‘Cory’ Aquino to the presidency (1986-1992).³ The 1986 EDSA People Power was a revolution because it steered the State into the Fifth Philippine Republic through the promulgation of the 1987 Philippine Constitution. While the Marcoses were political underdogs since their return to the country in 1991, the Aquino clan secured various political offices under the Liberal Party’s banner. In 2010, President Benigno ‘Noynoy’ Aquino III won the national elections by reliving the spirit of the 1986 People Power Revolution. His presidency was a reaction to the unpopular administration of President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo (2001-2010), daughter of President Diosdado Macapagal (1961-1965). During Aquino’s term, Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda) struck Tacloban Leyte on 8 November 2013, killing more than 6,000 people.⁴ Exchanged accusations of politicking between the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG) Secretary Manuel ‘Mar’ Roxas II and Mayor Alfred Romualdez of Tacloban created a lack of coordination to conduct rescue, relief, and recovery operations between the national and local governments.⁵ While Romualdez is

³ Primitivo Mijares, *The Conjugal Dictatorship of Ferdinand and Imelda Marcos* (San Francisco: Union Square, 1986 [1976]); Jose F. Lacaba, *Days of Disquiet, Nights of Rage: The First Quarter Storm and Related Events* (Manila: Salinlahi Publishing House, 1982); Raymond Bonner, *Waltzing with a Dictator: The Marcoses and the Making of American Policy* (New York, New York: Times Books, 1987).

⁴ “Typhoon Haiyan: Hundreds Unburied after Philippines Storm,” *Australia Network News*, 29 December 2013, <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2013-12-28/phils-typhoon-corpses/5177392> [accessed 22 June 2022].

⁵ David Dizon, “Mar blasts Romualdez: He’s twisting his Facts,” *ABS-CBNnews.com*, 10 December 2013, <http://www.abs-cbnnews.com/nation/12/10/13/mar-blasts-romualdez-hes-twisting-his-facts> [accessed 22 June 2022]; See also Anton Llanes-Avendano and Bea Cupin, “Transcript Romualdez, Roxas meet post-Yolanda,” *Rappler*, 14 December 2013, <http://www.rappler.com/nation/45914-transcript-romualdez-roxas-meeting-yolanda> [accessed 22 June 2022].

the nephew of Imelda Romualdez-Marcos, the wife of Marcos Sr., Mar Roxas, who belongs to the Liberal Party, is the grandson of President Manuel A. Roxas (1946-1948). These competing familial and political affiliations among government officials demonstrate how the Marcos-Aquino rivalry is deeply embedded in Philippine political history.

Thirty years of discontentment with the dominant 'yellow' politics of Cory Aquino to Noynoy Aquino led to President Rodrigo Duterte's (2016-2022) election to office. He campaigned under the popular pretext of fighting criminality and illegal drugs despite having a reputation for violating human rights when he was mayor of Davao City.⁶ As long-time mayor, Duterte and his children have simultaneously occupied various elected positions in Davao City. With weak political opposition coming from the Liberal Party, the dominance of President Duterte's administration foreshadowed the Marcoses' return to power who have been slowly occupying local and national positions throughout the decades. In the recent turn of events, the victory of President Ferdinand 'Bongbong' Marcos Jr. and Vice-President Sara Duterte-Carpio during the 2022 national elections attests to the perennial control of political dynasties on Philippine democracy.

A political culture rooted in elite families, however, raises the issue of whether political dynasties can ethically contribute to democratic consolidation. It may be argued that the concentration of power by a certain political dynasty is beneficial because it would lead to greater collaboration among government officials through kinship ties. However, issues of equal opportunity, transparency, and professionalism are areas

⁶ Danilo Andres Reyes, "The Early Duterte Presidency in the Philippines," *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs* 35/3 (2016): 111-137.

of concern because these are essential elements of modern democratic societies. In other words, political dynasties, which are rooted in strong kinship ties and whose goals concern the oligarchic perpetuation and concentration of power, have ethical implications for the preservation of democracy.

Power and wealth concentration among the elite is not only a social scientific phenomenon. Since institutions are embodiments of human personalities who have biological constitutions, life sciences can also elucidate a political ethical discussion in the light of sociobiology and evolutionary theory. This can be done by comparing the behavior of the political clans with the ethological understanding of genes, plants, and animals on how they interact with one another. These theories from the natural sciences, however, do not imply that one's biology strictly determines one's political behavior. Nonetheless, their insights can give a glimpse of a political dynasty's implications for the well-being of individuals and society. In this manner, ethical prescriptions can also be derived through a theological reading of the political issue. Methodologically, it contributes to a more attuned pastoral sociology to address political issues that concern the Church's mission to evangelize and promote social justice.

This article provides a theological ethical reflection on political dynasties from a sociobiological and evolutionary perspective. The first section discusses the context of political dynasties in Philippine politics as seen in its historical origins, growth, and practices that help them preserve their political influence. In the second section, the paper discusses sociobiology and evolution as ethical frameworks to analyze political dynasties. Third, the article gives a sociobiological and evolutionary analysis of political dynasties. A discussion on the relationship between (original) sin and evolution follows

this analysis in the fourth section of the paper. The fifth section highlights the common good of the human family as the universal aim of any political endeavor and evaluates political dynasties as a form of social-structural sin. The last section discusses political love, justice, and inclusive solidarity as means to challenge natural selfish tendencies that are systematically habituated through political institutions. The article argues that the proliferation of political dynasties has theopolitical ethical implications that are rooted in sociobiological and evolutionary mechanisms.

Setting the Context: Philippine Political Dynasties

According to Dante C. Simbulan, the history of political elites in the Philippines traces back to pre-colonial times in the person of the *datu*, a member of the *maharlika* or nobility, who acts as the local chieftain of a village called *barangay* which consists of 30-100 families.⁷ During the advent of Spanish colonization (1565-1898), the Spaniards gave special privileges to these *indio* leaders to retain their leadership functions as the *principalia* class together with the Spanish elite. As the mediating subaltern in the colonial structure, they were tasked as the *cabeza de barangay* (head of the *barangay*) to collect tribute from the locals for the Spanish government.⁸ In later periods of Spanish colonization, some of the native elite inter-married either with the *peninsulares* (Spaniards born in the Iberian

⁷ Dante C. Simbulan, *Modern Principalia: The Historical Evolution of the Philippine Ruling Oligarchy* (Quezon City: The University of the Philippines Press, 2005), 14-17. Cf. William Henry Scott, *Barangay: Sixteenth-Century Philippine Culture and Society* (Quezon City: Ateneo De Manila University Press, Year: 1994).

⁸ Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *History of the Filipino People, Eighth Edition* (Quezon City: Garotech Publishing, 2006), 77-78.

Peninsula), the *insulares/Filipinos* (Spaniards born in the Philippine Islands), or the *sangleyes* (Chinese merchants) which gave them more influence in the colonial society depending on *limpieza de sangre* or 'purity' of Spanish blood.⁹ Intermarriages among the *principalia* gave birth to the *mestizo* class, a racial stratum that served as the economic middle class of 19th century Philippines. Not only that they were educated by European ideals as *ilustrados* (enlightened), but they also had an economic advantage over *haciendas* or vast tracts of farmlands as tenants which were owned by the Spanish elite or religious corporations. Although some were privileged, the non-pure Spanish-blooded locals nonetheless faced abuses and discrimination from the Spanish colonial government and the Catholic Church, which eventually ignited the 1896 Philippine Revolution against Spain. Although independence from Spain was declared in 1898, the incursion of the United States resulted in the change of colonial masters and thus the transformation of Philippine society and politics.

American colonialism (1898-1946) introduced the democratic system of government in the country through 'Benevolent Assimilation'.¹⁰ Under the new colonial structure, Filipinos were allowed to elect their government officials under American sovereignty. The Filipino *principalia*, who mostly had Spanish or *mestizo* lineages, became the new political economic elite of Philippine society. They bought the previously Spanish-owned *haciendas* and maintained the feudal relations with the masses through patron-client ties who elected

⁹ Rolando V. de la Rosa, *Beginnings of the Filipino Dominicans: History of the Filipinization of the Religious Orders in the Philippines* (Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press, 1990), 6-14. During the Spanish colonial times, the term *Filipino* was only applicable to Spaniards born in the Philippine archipelago while the native locals were called *indios*.

¹⁰ Agoncillo, *History of the Filipino People*, 214-215.

them to secure public office in exchange for political favors and employment. This symbiotic relationship between landlords and peasants, even though unequal, is crystallized through the Filipino custom/value/norm of *utang na loob* (debt of gratitude). *Utang na loob* is a customary relational value and norm that makes a person indebted to repay the kindness extended by another person to one's best capability for a lifetime.¹¹ It is rooted in kinship ties but has become part and parcel of customary interactions in the village and beyond. In this manner, the *principalia* were able to establish their foothold in a town, city, or a province. Acquiring public office by the elites thereby assumed the role of traditional customs. Their grasp of local politics as mayors or governors gave them considerable influence that has often resulted in their future election in congress or the senate. Despite the imitation of the American style of government, ideological distinctions among political parties were not clear as turncoat politicians hop from one political party to another to vie for electoral campaign support. Philippine politics was therefore primarily imbued with or brought together by the charisma and power of elite political personalities rather than by the ideological platform of political parties.

After World War II, the Americans recognized Philippine independence in 1946. The post-colonial Philippines was still based on political personalities than political platforms despite the existence of two dominant political parties – the Nacionalista Party and the Liberal Party. Although in principle the former was oriented toward nationalist policies while the latter was more open to foreign influences, the composition of the national government mainly came from the succeeding generation

¹¹ Lucian Pye, *Asian Power and Politics: The Cultural Dimensions of Authority* (Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985), 121-127.

of political families before the war. The consolidation of political machinery by politicians in their local electorate through an intergenerational succession of their family members in public office gave birth to the current breed of political dynasties. During the Marcos dictatorship, the appointment of family relatives and cronies based on the loyalty of political clans in bureaucratic positions and government-sequestered corporations exacerbated the political culture of patronage. Since the political elite were capitalist landowners in the country, the public office became a tool to serve their business interests, thereby shaping what is branded as 'bureaucrat capitalism'.¹²

Although the dictatorial regime was overthrown in 1986, the transfer of political loyalties among political dynasties from Ferdinand E. Marcos Sr. to Corazon C. Aquino, who herself is a member of the Cojuangco-Aquino political clan, nonetheless perpetuated the proliferation of elitist political dynasties until the present times. This event later led to the multiplication of political parties in Philippine politics that usually form coalitions during elections either as pro-administration or as the minority opposition. This is despite the 1987 Philippine Constitution's provision in Article II, Section 26 that states: "The State shall guarantee equal access to opportunities for public service, and prohibit political dynasties as may be defined by law."¹³ This provision was a reaction to the experience of nepotism and corruption during the Marcos Sr.'s administration and the regressive Filipino political culture based on patronage. Although political dynasties can be described as the succession of family relatives in a political office through elections, the scope of the relationship of one politician to

¹² Amado Guerrero [Jose Maria Sison], *Philippine Society and Revolution* (Philippines: Aklat ng Bayan, 2005), 112-125.

¹³ *The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines*.

his or her succeeding relative to public office is not yet legally defined because of the absence of an enabling law.

Although party-list groups representing marginalized sectors such as farmers, laborers, and senior citizens in congress became constitutional alternatives through Republic Act 7941 *Party-List System Act*, the firm grip of traditional politicians on Philippine politics, society, and economy remains influential.¹⁴ Since 1987, numerous versions of anti-dynasty law were newly filed or refiled through various Senate and House Bills. A quick search of “political dynasty” or “political dynasties” on the Senate and House of Representatives websites reveals the following:

- 13th Congress (2004-2007): SB 12, SB 412, SB 1317, SB 1904, HB 5925 (which substituted HB 3335 and HB 4407)
- 14th Congress (2007-2010): SB 2649, SB 1468, HB 783, HB 2493, HB 3049, HB 4407, HB 5925, and HB 5669
- 15th Congress (2010-2013): SB 2649, HB 3413 and HB. 6660
- 16th Congress (2013-2016): SB 55, SB 1580, SB 1906, HB 3587 (which substituted HB 172, HB 837 and HB 2911)
- 17th Congress (2016-2019): SB 49, SB 230, SB 897, SB 1137, SB 1258, SB 1688, SB 1765, HB166, HB 332, HB 603, HB 825, HB 911, HB 912, HB 1793, HB 2134, HB 3861 and HB 8025
- 18th Congress (2019-2022): SB 11, SB 30, SB 264, SB 1480, HB 110, HB 145, HB 252, HB 395, HB 1978, HB 2134, HB 3149.¹⁵

These legislative proposals met an early demise at the committee level both in congress and the senate because such would undermine the position of most of the elected officials. These legislative proposals to prohibit political

¹⁴ *Republic Act 7941 An Act Providing for the Election of Party-List Representatives through the Party-List System, and Appropriating Funds therefor*, 3 March 1995.

¹⁵ Senate of the Philippines <http://legacy.senate.gov.ph/> [accessed 17 July 2022]; Republic of the Philippines House of Representatives, <https://www.congress.gov.ph/legisdocs/?v=billsresults> [accessed 15 July 2022].

dynasty have varying definitions regarding the degree of consanguinity or affinity among politicians, the simultaneous or successive occupancy of public office, and the scope of which political offices will be included. So far, the 1987 Philippine Constitution's anti-political dynasty provision is only implemented in the *Sangguniang Kabataan* (Youth Council) through Republic Act 10742 *Sangguniang Kabataan Reform Act of 2015*. Sec. 10 of RA 10742 qualifies that any *Sangguniang Kabataan* official "must not be related within the second civil degree of consanguinity or affinity to any incumbent elected national official or to any incumbent elected regional, provincial, city, municipal, or barangay official, in the locality where he or she seeks to be elected".¹⁶ Emil Marañon III opines that Sec. 10 of RA 10742, while not intended for other electoral posts, could become the enabling law for Art. II, Sec. 26 of the 1987 Philippine Constitution since it has already defined what constitutes a political dynasty. Its broader implementation, however, rests on the Supreme Court's decision on whether it is the proper legal interpretation to pursue.¹⁷

During the 2013 midterm elections, 80% of the 229 congressional district representatives belong to a political dynasty; among the Philippine provinces, 73 out of 80 are under the control of political clans.¹⁸ The elite

¹⁶ *Republic Act 10742 An Act Establishing Reforms in the Sangguniang Kabataan Creating Enabling Mechanisms for Meaningful Youth Participation in Nation-Building, and for Other Purposes*, 15 January 2016.

¹⁷ Emil Marañon III, "COMELEC'S Role in Implementing Ban on Political Dynasties," *Rappler*, 2 May 2019, <https://www.rappler.com/voices/thought-leaders/228094-comelec-role-implementing-ban-political-dynasties/> [accessed 15 July 2022].

¹⁸ Ted Regencia, "Family Affair: Philippine Political Dynasties," *Al Jazeera*, 11 May 2013, <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2013/05/2013511104835690790.html> [accessed 22 June 2022].

families' dominance in Philippine politics continued during the 2019 midterm elections in both the national and local political offices, which are seen among the surnames of elected politicians such as the Dimaporo family from Lanao del Norte province, Ortega from La Union, Marcos from Ilocos Norte, Mangudadatus from Maguindanao, and Tan from Western Samar to name a few. Based on the Ateneo School of Government's database, Ronald U. Mendoza, Leonardo M. Jaminola III and Jurel Yap discovered that political dynasties have been expanding since 1988 from "thin dynasties" (sequential succession of family members to public office) to "fat dynasties" (simultaneous succession of family members to public office). They write, "*Covering all local positions, the percentage of fat dynasties has increased from 19% in 1988 to 29% in 2017, growing at about 1%, or around 170 positions, per election period.*"¹⁹ They further state:

In 2019, 80% or 4 out of 5 governors are members of fat political dynasties. Meanwhile, vice governors have the second highest fat dynasty share at 68%. This was followed by members of the House of Representatives who have a fat dynasty share of 67%. Meanwhile, 53% of mayors and 39% of vice mayors are members of fat political dynasties. Lastly, from 1988 to 2019, municipal councilors had consistently registered the lowest fat dynasty share. In 2019, only 23% of municipal councilors were members of fat political dynasties.²⁰

¹⁹ Ronald U. Mendoza, Leonardo M. Jaminola III and Jurel Yap, *From Fat to Obese: Political Dynasties after the 2019 Midterm Elections*, Ateneo School of Government Working Paper 19-013 (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University, 2019), 2. Italics in original.

²⁰ Mendoza, Jaminola and Yap, *From Fat to Obese*, 8.

According to Sheila S. Coronel, political dynasties depend on 7Ms for their survival: 1) money, 2) machinery through political and social networking, 3) media/movies, 4) marriage with another political clan, 5) murder or mayhem of political enemies, 6) mergers of political parties as coalitions, and 7) myths to boost a candidate's reputation.²¹

These 7Ms serve as the sources of capital for a candidate to win the midterm elections, which are held every three years, or the national elections, which are held every six years. The 1987 Philippine Constitution allows mayors, governors (Article X, Section 8), and congress representatives (Article VI, Section 7) to run for three consecutive three-year terms. Senators (Article VI, Section 4) and the vice-president (Article VII, Section 4) can run for two consecutive six-year terms while the president (Article VII, Section 4) is only entitled to serve for one six-year term. However, in practice, once the term limit ends for politicians, they can aspire for a higher or lower political position or 'rest' for a while from politics while one of their relatives would replace them in their previous office. For this reason, it is common in the Philippines to have situations where the father is the provincial governor, the son is the mayor of the provincial capital, and the governor's brother is the district congressional representative of the province. In this manner, political dynasties make various elected positions in the Philippines a local family affair that consequently erodes the country's democratic life.

²¹ Sheila S. Coronel, "The 7Ms of Dynasty Building" *Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism*, <https://old.pcij.org/stories/the-seven-ms-of-dynasty-building/> [accessed 22 June 2022].

Sociobiology and Evolutionary Theory vis-à-vis Political Ethics

Understanding the formation of political dynasties, aside from the usual social scientific perspective through its political, economic, and cultural ramifications, is not usually discussed from the viewpoint of the natural sciences. Nonetheless, the connection between political culture and sociobiology can be derived through the study of behavioral patterns of other living beings to provide the biological dimension of this political phenomenon. Edward O. Wilson, the father of sociobiology, defines the scope of his proposed discipline.

Sociobiology is defined as the systematic study of the biological basis of all social behavior. For the present it focuses on animal societies, their population structure, castes, and communication, together with all of the physiology underlying the social adaptations. But the discipline is also concerned with the social behavior of early man and the adaptive features of organization in the more primitive contemporary human societies.²²

Sociobiology presupposes that the formation of human social organizations is rooted in evolution. As an interdisciplinary endeavor, sociobiology aims to give a structural explanation of human social reality with the help of principles derived from natural selection as seen in the adaptation mechanisms of other species. Sociobiology's goal is "to predict features of social organization from a knowledge of these population parameters combined with information on the behavioral constraints imposed by the genetic constitution of the

²² Edward O. Wilson, *Sociobiology: The Abridged Edition* (Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1975), 4.

species.”²³ Although predicting human social organization through comparison with other species is helpful, some scientists criticize that sociobiology is deterministic.²⁴ This is because the discipline’s investigation of naturalistic tendencies fundamentally rooted in animal behavior may undermine the complexity of human freedom as expressed in the variety of cultural environments. This tension has created a polarization on the issue of whether nature or culture has more influence on the constitution of human behavior concerning the formation of social organizations.

In this connection, one aspect of evolutionary theory is to claim that human behavior is determined by one’s genetic makeup. Although classical Darwinism did not include Mendelian genetics in the formulation of the theory of natural selection, Neo-Darwinism, which is the transfer of genetic traits based on ‘survival of the fittest’, thought that genes have a special role in determining human nature. An example of this conceptualization is Richard Dawkins’s *The Selfish Gene*. Dawkins claims that human “limited” altruism is naturally rooted in “selfishness” because genes are only programmed to be concerned for their survival and reproduction.²⁵ By extension, genes predispose any ‘survival machine’ – plants, animals, or human beings – to be selfishly concerned for its preservation. All actions of the human person are *a priori* based on its self-interest to adapt to various situations so that it can prolong its life and reproduce. In this manner, one’s inherited genetic pool, which traces back millions of years, is transferred to the

²³ Wilson, *Sociobiology*, 5.

²⁴ Richard C. Lewontin, Steven Rose, and Leon J. Kamin, eds., *Not in Our Genes: Biology, Ideology and Human Nature* (New York: Pantheon, 1984), 6.

²⁵ Richard Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene, 30th Anniversary Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 2.

next generation. As Dawkins succinctly states, “The gene is the basic unit of selfishness.”²⁶

The naturalist pitfall of basing human societies on animal and genetic behavior has ethical repercussions because freedom compelled by biology would undermine human rationality and dignity. By implication, demoting human freedom would result in the reduction of the human being to a mere animal that is determined by instincts. However, this concern should not be a hindrance in doing ethical analysis more so in theological reflections. Following Harry Frankfurt’s ideas, Stephen J. Pope argues that determinism can be distinguished either as “hard-wired” or as “soft-wired.”²⁷ While the former determines human behavior toward self-preservation, the latter, as a behavior open to alternatives, gives ample space of freedom to individuals to pursue their choice of means through culture to survive. In this sense, sociobiology and evolutionary theory are not obstacles to doing theological ethical analysis.

Human social organizations, even having strong correlations with animal behavior and genetics, are more fluid and complicated due to their cultural dimension. Although genes ‘selfishly’ direct human social organizations toward survival, they can only give an indirect influence on how species should adapt. As Dawkins writes, “The genes too control the behaviour of their survival machines, not directly with their fingers on puppet strings, but indirectly like the computer programmer.”²⁸ In this regard, even though individuals

²⁶ Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*, 36.

²⁷ Stephen J. Pope, *Human Evolution and Christian Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 164-165. Cf. Harry Frankfurt, “Freedom of the Will and the Concept of the Person,” *Journal of Philosophy* 68/1 (January 1971): 5–20.

²⁸ Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*, 52.

are naturally selfish, they still have the choice to become more altruistic to others to increase their chances of survival. This means that “The logical conclusion to this trend, not yet reached in any species, would be for the genes to give the survival machine a single overall policy instruction: do whatever you think best to keep us alive.”²⁹

Based on these premises, although sociobiology and evolutionary theories give a descriptive account of how biological determinism works in human societies, deriving ethical implications of human practices and behavior found in these disciplines is still possible because these give a hint on how prescriptions should be formulated to improve culture.

Analyzing Political Dynasties from Sociobiology and Evolutionary Theory

The presupposition mentioned above lends viability to an ethical analysis of political dynasties in the light of sociobiology and evolutionary theory considering that dynastic formation is based on natural inclinations. From the lens of sociobiology, it can be argued that the creation of political dynasties is akin to the animal behavior of kin selection, which is especially seen among insects that have eusociality such as bees, ants, and termites. Wilson states that kinship systems, whether animals or humans, provide at least three advantages: 1) alliances among the different tribes and sub-groups to avoid conflict, 2) the creation of mutual exchanges among its members, and 3) a support group for resources in case of scarcity or crises.³⁰ While kinship systems have their advantages through cooperation and altruism, these too have their disadvantages when applied to human social

²⁹ Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*, 60.

³⁰ Wilson, *Sociobiology*, 278.

organizations. As Pope mentions, “Kin altruism has often been taken in a negative way as indicating a tendency to engage in nepotism, callousness toward and manipulation of nonkin, myopic moral concern, and extended selfishness.”³¹ The ambivalence of kin relationship is likewise applicable to political dynasties whose goal is to dominate, secure, and perpetuate power through public office. Kin altruism among animals is therefore translatable to the analysis of practices used by political dynasties to secure public office for their political survival or dominance.

The hereditary transfer of genes from one generation to another among species is a good indication that it has strong capabilities to survive. The offspring inherits both dominant and recessive traits of its parents, most obviously seen in its physical characteristics, which help them adapt to a particular environment.³² In this sense, genes have a very long history since it is a product of synthesis from two adaptive ‘survival machines’. Similarly, the sociobiological indicator of political dynasties is the continuing intergenerational transfer of a particular government position to a family member as seen in their surname. Aside from the inheritance of physical characteristics of a political patriarch or matriarch, the name of the clan bears an inheritable historical narrative of their reputation. A positive reputation marked in the history of a political dynasty makes its younger family members viable candidates that can be groomed for public office. Through name recall, the surname helps the public associate the previous accomplishments and reputation of older political family members with their younger members as new political candidates during elections. In this sense, a

³¹ Stephen J. Pope, “Sociobiology and Human Nature: A Perspective from Catholic Theology,” *Zygon* 33/2 (June 1998): 288.

³² Wilson, *Sociobiology*, 35.

political dynasty leaves its legacy, either as a blessing or a curse, to its future members who aspire for public office in a particular locality. Thus, the dynamics of a political dynasty are like the adaptive mechanism of genes to survive because of the inheritance of past information that influences the reputation/behavior of a political agent in each territory.

Political dynasties begin creating their political machinery in a particular province, city or municipality, or *barangay* by mobilizing their supporters and networking with various socio-civic organizations. However, its maintenance requires many resources – economic, cultural, social, and symbolic capital – generated from a given territory.³³ In this regard, the establishment of a political bailiwick can be socio-biologically likened to animal territorial behavior. The protection of one's habitat expresses one's supremacy among other species that might intrude to acquire their necessary resources for survival such as food, potential mates, and their offspring. Aside from asserting one's dominance through confrontation, canines for example leave their scent when they urinate on a post so that they can mark their claim on a specific area. In the case of political clans, controlling a political territory gives them income through landownership and/or industries without interference, whether by legal or non-legal means, from rivals. The benefits of kinship systems are thus utilized to thwart or dominate non-kin members from one's territory. However, political territoriality should not be limited to elected public offices based on geographical

³³ Pierre Bourdieu. "Forms of Capital," In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. by John G. Richardson (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 241-258. For the discussion on the concept of symbolic capital, see Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinctions: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984), 244-256.

territory. A political territory can also mean the acquisition of an appointed government position by a family member to secure political favors that would be beneficial to the clan. However, since elected positions are manifestations of legitimacy coming from the people, it generates more social capital that is needed for elections than appointed positions. In principle, animal territoriality is equivalent to the natural tendency of a political dynasty to maintain, preserve, and expand its control of any government position. The higher the position in government acquired by the family members, the greater resources it will generate for their political clan.

Aside from kin selection and territoriality, the biological interaction of animals with non-kin species must also take into consideration the other practices of political dynasties to preserve dominance. In this regard, the 7Ms of Philippine politics mentioned by Coronel are useful to provide a sociobiological insight into this political phenomenon. Money is the most flexible resource for exchange such as the hiring of personnel to maintain one's political machinery by taking advantage of legal procedures or even doing covert illegal actions such as bribery of officials and vote-buying during elections.³⁴ In this sense, non-family supporters and a ruling political dynasty mutually benefit from each other like the biological mutualism among species even if the relationship is unequal.

³⁴ “Thus, in the national senatorial elections of the Philippines, it can be considered that money matters the most in order to be successful – even when compared with the traditionally highly regarded factors such as incumbency, political dynasty and membership of political parties.” Joseph Anthony L. Reyes, Brando Gabriel C. Arce and Nicolle Bien N. Madrid, “Do Money, Power, Family and Connections Really Matter in Politics? Analysing Factors of Success in the 2010, 2013 and 2016 Philippine Senatorial Elections,” *The Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies* 36/2 (2018): 48.

Marriages and mergers are higher forms of symbiotic relationships among political dynasties. Between these two, marriages between two political clans have more lasting benefits than mergers. Aside from a greater concentration of resources, marriages expand kinship relations, which consequently results in greater control of specific political territory or acquiring inter-territorial influence. The marriage of Benigno Aquino II and Corazon Cojuangco is a good example of political consolidation in Tarlac while the marriage of Ferdinand E. Marcos Sr. from Ilocos Norte to Imelda Romualdez from Leyte is an example of political dominance beyond one's traditional political territory. Through these marriages, political dynasties can catapult themselves to more influential government positions at the national level such as the senate, vice-presidency, or even presidency. Aside from marriages, alliances among political parties, whose candidates mostly come from dominant political clans, strengthen their political machinery by giving mutual benefits and influence on each other's territory. This situation is especially seen in the formidable alliance brokered by Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo between Ferdinand R. Marcos Jr. of Ilocos Norte allied with Sara Duterte-Carpio of Davao City during the 2022 national elections.³⁵ In this regard, political parties supporting a presidential candidate who emerges victorious during the elections receive favors from the new administration that would give them a further advantage in acquiring future political positions.

The utilization of media/movies and propagation of myths by political dynasties are reminiscent of communication patterns among animals as an expression of one's political posturing or dominance over the other.

³⁵ Philstar.com, "Former President GMA endorses Marcos-Duterte Tandem," *Philippine Star*, 5 April 2022 [accessed 19 July 2022].

These two are the ‘soft-power’ of politicians that can be used to increase their popularity or notoriety to the masses, especially during elections. Like the political use of media/movies and myths, peacocks display their beautiful plumage to attract potential mates. Likewise, the aggressive use of soft power is comparable to cobras that open their hood as a warning to enemies or roosters that spread their neck feathers and wings when threatened.

Murder and mayhem are aggressive practices of ‘hard power’ directed at political opponents that are equivalent to animal predation. Killing is a Machiavellian tactic of consolidating power. However, murdering a political opponent or its supporters, especially if it is popular, is risky. The result of doing an evil deed can backfire on one’s reputation which may result in losing elections. This means that the risk of conducting a series of political killings might lead to the termination of a political dynasty. Similarly, animals do not assert their aggression toward their rivals when it is not necessary to secure territorial dominance. Wilson mentions three evolutionary constraints that keep animals away from aggression.

1. First, a danger exists that the aggressor's hostility will be directed against unrecognized relatives.
2. Second, an aggressor that attacks an opponent with intent to destroy can expect to receive an all-out defense in return, with the added chance that both will be injured or killed.
3. Third, an aggressor spends time in aggression that could be invested in courtship, nest building, and the feeding and rearing of young.³⁶

³⁶ Wilson, *Sociobiology*, 122-123.

Elections are seasonal events to prove one's dominance over a political rival. Although it does not necessarily lead to one's death, candidacy in elections involves risks that may lead to the demise of a political clan's dominance. This is because election campaigns would drain a political clan's resources in case its candidates lose in the political derby. Unlike in other countries where state funds subsidize political parties, election campaigns in the Philippines are privately funded through financial contributions to mobilize one's political machinery. This political practice does not only make Philippine elections very costly but also mires them with corruption based on patronage. Through the rewards received from winning the public office as the incumbent administration, politicians can use this advantage to maintain their position for the maximum allowable number of terms and even transfer it to their younger family members.

Based on this sociobiological analysis, the survival strategies of political dynasties are not only biologically rooted but also culturally nurtured through exclusive solidarity among kins and their allies as well as fed by the dependence of the masses. Edward B. Tylor defines culture as "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society."³⁷ In his classic study, he analyzes that primitive societies keep their solidarity through magical practices as cultural attempts to understand, influence, manipulate, and dominate physical nature through the association of ideas for their survival.³⁸ Tylor writes, "Magical arts in which the connexion is that of mere

³⁷ Edward B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom*, Vol. 1 (London: John Murray, 1871), 1.

³⁸ Tylor, *Primitive Culture* 101-144.

analogy or symbolism are endlessly numerous throughout the course of civilization. Their common theory may be readily made out from a few typical cases, and thence applied confidently to the general mass.”³⁹ Seeing that a king functioned as magician and priest in primitive societies, James George Frazer observes that magical belief and practice operate through “sympathetic magic” based on homeopathic and contagious principles.⁴⁰ The homeopathic principle explains that any similar or analogous objects are believed to share positive or negative attributes. The contagious principle refers to the belief that an object would share positive or negative attributes of another object upon their contact. Frazer further argues that primitive magical and modern scientific worldviews are based on a uniform understanding of the physical laws of nature.

Thus the analogy between the magical and the scientific conceptions of the world is close. In both of them the succession of events is assumed to be perfectly regular and certain, being determined by immutable laws, the operation of which can be foreseen and calculated precisely; the elements of caprice, of chance, and of accident are banished from the course of nature.⁴¹

Henri Hubert and Marcel Mauss later analyzed that magic has three elements: the primitive society’s belief in 1) the special qualities of magicians, 2) their verbal and non-verbal magical rites or acts, and 3) their abstract, concrete, or personal magical representations. Based on the laws of homeopathy and contagion, they claim that

³⁹ Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, 106.

⁴⁰ James George Frazer, *The Golden Bough: A Study of Magic and Religion, Abridged Edition* (Palgrave London: Macmillan, 1983 [1922]), 14.

⁴¹ Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, 64.

magic cannot be individualized since its efficacy comes from the community members' beliefs. Hubert and Mauss thus give the study of magic a subjective dimension.⁴² Frazer and Mauss's anthropological findings would later be affirmed by Paul Rozin, Linda Millman and Carol Nemeroff's social experiment that measured how modern participants reject normally acceptable items when they become associated with disgusting objects. They aimed to show the universal applicability of magic based on homeopathic and contagious principles in modern society. They discovered that once an object is contaminated with a disgusting object (e.g. an apple or grape juice dipped with a sterilized dead cockroach), the participants' preference for the same juice type greatly decreased even if the new glass of juice did not contact the sterilized dead insect. In terms of the homeopathic principle, participants preferred to eat a fudge that is shaped like a muffin rather than eating the one shaped like dog feces.⁴³ These anthropological studies thus show how elements of primitive culture are retained in modern culture through their practitioners, rites, and representations that are analogous to nature.

In a similar vein, political dynasties' practices analogously operate like animals that strive to survive, dominate, and procreate through various symbiotic relationships as the natural basis of exclusive solidarity. As a political culture, political dynasties create alliances (i.e. magicians) by associating themselves with mass supporters and other influential politicians (i.e. community members) through practices (i.e. rites) that generate positive public opinion (i.e. representations) to

⁴² Henri Hubert et Marcel Mauss, « Esquisse d'une théorie générale de la magie, » *L'année sociologique* 7 [1902-1903] : 1-146.

⁴³ Paul Rozin, Linda Millman and Carol Nemeroff, "Operation of the Laws of Sympathetic Magic in Disgust and Other Domains," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 50/4 (1986): 703-712.

secure victory during elections. A notable example of ‘magic’ in Philippine politics is the so-called ‘Cory magic’ during the 2010 national elections. Corazon Aquino’s death on 1 August 2009 created a national nostalgia for the symbols of freedom evoked during the 1986 People Power Revolution. Bearing the clan’s name and reputation, Benigno S. Aquino III’s campaign against corruption by conjuring symbolic representations identified with the 1986 People Power Revolution acquired strong popular electoral support which catapulted him to the presidency.⁴⁴

The nurturance of this political phenomenon can be explained through Pierre Bourdieu’s sociological concept of *habitus* which is defined as:

Systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them.⁴⁵

The habituation of patron-client relationships and narrow kinship ties that are systematically institutionalized make political dynasties an enduring aspect of Philippine politics for the last century with its deep roots tracing back to pre-colonial times. In this aspect, construing that Bourdieu’s cultural concept of *habitus* is homologous to Dawkins’s natural concept of *meme* is useful to describe how cultural transmission works like genes through the replication of beliefs,

⁴⁴ Marian Pastor Roces ed., *Cory Magic: Her People’s Stories* (Quezon City: ABS-CBN, 2009).

⁴⁵ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1990), 53.

values, and practices as part of a “meme-pool” of a particular society.⁴⁶ This means that political dynasties can be referred to as a meme because it is an enduring inheritable structuring predisposition in Filipino political culture.

The proliferation of political dynasties results in an oligarchy. The concentration of power and wealth among political families who belong to the same social class leads to social injustice and elitism in the country which erodes democratic institutions. In this regard, political dynasties are comparable to biological incest of species that limits the gene pool of an offspring and weakens its fitness capability due to congenital disorders, which may lead to premature death. Given this premise, political dynasties have therefore theopolitical ethical implications because their oligarchic tendency hinders the state to achieve the common good. Without the just distribution of power relationships and wealth, the state is crippled to maintain the rule of law due to the potential rise of criminality and rebellion that kills the society like cancer.

Natural Selfishness and (Original) Sin: Evolution and Theological Ethics

The interplay of Christian ethics and natural science from a modern perspective is contentious because both fields of domain attempt to explain the origins of life and the cosmos. Modern science relies on empirical research that is open to falsifiability⁴⁷ while Christian theological claims are founded on divine revelation. Although this difference seems pernicious to each other’s objectives concerning the acquisition of knowledge, contemporary

⁴⁶ Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*, 189-201.

⁴⁷ Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), 56-73.

studies show how the two domains do not necessarily result in conflict. Stephen Jay Gould describes that conflict between the disciplines is averted through the concept of *Non-Overlapping Magisteria* (NOMA).

The net of science covers the empirical realm: what is the universe made of (fact) and why does it work this way (theory). The net of religion extends over questions of moral meaning and value. These two magisteria do not overlap, nor do they encompass all inquiry (consider, for starters, the magisterium of art and the meaning of beauty). To cite the usual clichés, we get the age of rocks, and religion retains the rock of ages; we study how the heavens go, and they determine how to go to heaven.⁴⁸

Despite this methodological development, NOMA makes dialogue between science and religion impossible. For this reason, it would be preferable to situate the relationship between the two disciplines by using the alternative concept of *Partially Overlapping Magisteria* (POMA) since both disciplines talk about the same reality although in a different technical language and worldview.⁴⁹ This methodological insight allows fruitful dialogue between science and religion while not necessarily resulting in conflict. In this way, the discussion on the sinful dimension of social scientific phenomena in the light of sociobiology and evolutionary theory is possible.

Although the dialogue between evolution and theological ethics has broadened the horizons of each field in recent years, the attempt to reconcile the two is not new. An example of this interaction can be traced

⁴⁸ Stephen Jay Gould, *Leonardo's Mountain of Clams and the Diet of Worms: Essays on Natural History* (Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011), 274.

⁴⁹ Pope, *Human Evolution and Christian Ethics*, 27.

back to an article by Norman Pearson in 1882. He formulates that the sense of sin based on an evolutionary framework is the natural experience of guilt that works as a “‘psychical analogue’ of the sense of physical pain” after violating moral norms.⁵⁰ Despite Pearson’s quasi-Freudian formulation, discussion on (original) sin from an evolutionary perspective will not be highlighted until the mid-20th century through the papal encyclical *Humani Generis*.

[T]he Teaching Authority of the Church does not forbid that, in conformity with the present state of human sciences and sacred theology, research and discussions, on the part of men experienced in both fields, take place with regard to the doctrine of evolution, in as far as it inquires into the origin of the human body as coming from pre-existent and living matter – for the Catholic faith obliges us to hold that souls are immediately created by God (*HG*, 36).

Despite the possibility of dialogue, the encyclical sees that the doctrine of original sin cannot be interpreted in consonance with evolution. This is because original sin is “actually committed by an individual Adam and which, through generation, is passed on to all and is in everyone as his own” (*HG*, 37). However, contemporary biblical exegesis on creation stories and the fall of Adam and Eve affirms that these are based on Mesopotamian myths that give etiological accounts of the origin of humanity and evil. In other words, the Adamic myth of sin should be recognized not as a scientific account but as an allegory that attempts to provide answers to existential questions that humanity has been pondering since time immemorial. These theological developments would later influence the Catholic Church’s stand on evolution when

⁵⁰ Norman Pearson, “The Sense of Sin and Evolution” *Mind* 7/28 (October 1882): 544-553.

Pope John Paul II recognized its status as “more than a hypothesis” in his address to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences on 22 October 1996.⁵¹

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin attempted to bridge the gap between theology and evolution by re-interpreting the notion of original sin. In his essay *Reflections on Original Sin*, he stated that “The only way in which we can do so is by spreading the Fall throughout the whole universal history, or at least by locating it *before a complete refashioning*, a recasting, of which the present order of things in its experiential totality, would be the result”.⁵² Original sin is not therefore a prehistoric single evil act but rather an ongoing alienating reality that affects humanity throughout history. By extension, this theological re-appropriation makes a discussion on social or structural sin, which is the dehumanizing institutional or social conditions, principles, and practices that hinder the actualization of the common good, feasible with an evolutionary understanding of original sin. In the words of Piet Schoonenberg, “Hence, with respect to the influence of procreation there should be no difference between original sin and the sin of the world.”⁵³

Daryl P. Domning proposes a solution to the ontogenesis of sin in the light of evolution. Like Dawkins’s line of thinking, Domning argues that the original sin of any life form is its natural inclination to be ‘selfish’ for its survival.

⁵¹ John Paul II, *Message du Saint-Père Jean Paul II aux membres de l’Assemblée plénière de l’Académie Pontificale des Sciences*. 22 October 1996.

⁵² Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, “Reflections on Original Sin,” in *Christianity and Evolution*, trans. René Hague (London: Collins, 1969), 54. Italics in original.

⁵³ Piet Schoonenberg, *Man and Sin: A Theological View*, trans. Joseph Donceel (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965), 187.

[T]he *overt selfish acts* which, in humans, demonstrate the reality of original sin (by manifesting it in the form of actual sin) do indeed owe their universality among humans to natural descent from a common ancestor. This ancestor, however, far from being identifiable with the biblical Adam, must be placed in the very remote past, indeed at the very origin of life itself. It was the common ancestor not only of all humans but of all other living things on Earth as well.⁵⁴

Natural selfishness itself, as an indicator of original sin, does not make a person sinful because all species are concerned with their survival. What makes people sinful is when they freely succumb to selfishness. Although individuals are genetically programmed toward selfishness, they still have the choice not to be swayed under its influence by choosing more altruistic means to survive. In this sense, original sin is the natural weakness of ‘survival machines’ to resist evil tendencies due to selfishness that would harm God’s creation. As Ansfried Hulsbosch affirms, “Original sin is the powerlessness, arising from nature, of man in his incompleteness as creature to reach his freedom and to realize the desire to see God, *insofar* as this impotence is put into the context of a sinful world.”⁵⁵ It thus shows the moral paradox that while human beings have natural selfishness to survive, which is ontologically necessary, it is also the root of their destructive sinfulness when corrupted through social injustices and inequality.

⁵⁴ Daryl P. Domning and Monika K. Hellwig, *Original Selfishness: Original Sin and Evil in the Light of Evolution* (Hampshire and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 140. Italics in original.

⁵⁵ Ansfried Hulsbosch, *God in Creation and Evolution*, trans. Martin Versfeld (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965), 47. Italics in original.

The Common Good of the Human Family versus the Social-Structural Sin of Political Dynasties

Liberation theology conceives the notion of ‘social sin’ or ‘structural sin’ to identify reified systems, situations, institutions, or structures that marginalize, oppress, and disempower people, especially the poor, from flourishing. Gustavo Gutiérrez derives this idea from José María González Ruiz’s ‘harmatiosphere’, the sinful sphere that conditions human history, to describe the objective dimension of sin.⁵⁶

Sin is given in oppressive structures, in the exploitation of man by man, in the domination and slavery of peoples, races and social classes. Sin appears, therefore, as fundamental alienation, as the root of an unjust situation and exploitation. Fundamental alienation, that, for the same reason, cannot be encountered in itself, only in given concrete situations, in particular alienations.⁵⁷

The Catholic magisterium later adopted social sin in *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia* by initially limiting its scope to subjective causes as the accumulated effect of individuals’ collective sinful actions that fragment the human family (*RP*, 16). For John Paul II, social transformation begins with individuals’ conversion to act

⁵⁶ José María González Ruiz, *Pobreza evangélica y promoción humana* (Barcelona: Nova Terra, 1966), 29 cited in Gustavo Gutiérrez, *Teología de la liberación: Perspectivas, decimoctava edición* (Salamanca: Ediciones Sígueme, 2009 [1972]), 222.

⁵⁷ «El pecado se da en estructuras opresoras, en la explotación del hombre por el hombre, en la dominación y esclavitud de pueblos, razas y clases sociales. El pecado surge, entonces, como la alienación fundamental, como la raíz de una situación de injusticia y explotación. Alienación fundamental, que, por lo mismo, no puede ser alcanzada en ella misma, sólo se da en situaciones concretas, en alienaciones particulares.» Gutiérrez, *Teología de la liberación*, 223.

in solidarity. In *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, he defines solidarity as “a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good” by conquering structures of sin. (*SRS*, 38). Likewise, Benedict XVI’s papacy affirms John Paul II’s teaching in *Caritas in Veritate* by subordinating social-structural transformation to personal responsibility (*CV*, 17). As seen in John Paul II and Benedict XVI’s papacies, the Catholic magisterium did not immediately recognize the objective dimension of social sin or structures of sin as the main cause of sin for the fear of weakening personal responsibility. In *Evangelii Gaudium*, Francis’s papacy changed the Church’s pastoral stance from his predecessors by prioritizing the need to reject “evil crystallized in unjust social structures” that hinder its missionary work (*EG*, 59).

Among the theological proposals to bridge the gap between sin’s subjective and objective dimensions, Nikolas Wandering argues that social-structural sin is the ongoing consequence of the sins that originated (*peccatum originale originatum*) from Adam’s original sin (*peccatum originale originans*). He sees that the German word for original sin *Erbsünde*, which means “inherited sin”, enriches the biological or hereditary interpretation of social-structural sin.⁵⁸ In this sense, political dynasties are not only social effects of the elite families’ collective will but also an inherited political-cultural structure that drives politicians to promote undemocratic practices. It also causes the multitude’s powerlessness by leaving them no other choice but to elect political dynasties, thus perpetuating the cycle of ‘dynastification’. Nonetheless, promoting the common good exposes the political

⁵⁸ Nikolaus Wandering, *Where should One search for “Original Sin”?: A Dialogue between Theology, Philosophy and Science*, 5 March 2003, <https://www.uibk.ac.at/theol/leseraum/texte/342.html> [accessed 14 July 2022].

dynasties' seemingly 'charitable' intentions to mask their selfish interests. Narrow notions of moral responsibility grounded on exclusive solidarity with their kin and political allies make public service to the multitude of Filipinos hypocritical.

Catholic social teaching has repeatedly taught that the common good must be promoted by having the human family as its universal aim. The Second Vatican Council in *Gaudium et Spes* defines the common good as "the sum of those conditions of social life which allow social groups and their individual members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfillment" (*GS*, 26). It further states that "Every social group must take account of the needs and legitimate aspirations of other groups, and even of the general welfare of the entire human family" (*GS*, 26). While the nuclear family's welfare as *ecclesia domestica* through love is necessary, love should also be expansive especially with the poor through inclusive solidarity. Drawing from the Sacred Scriptures that active commitment to love one's neighbor is a moral imperative, John Paul II clarifies in *Centesimus Annus* that "This duty is not limited to one's own family, nation or State, but extends progressively to all mankind, since no one can consider himself extraneous or indifferent to the lot of another member of the human family. No one can say that he is not responsible for the well-being of his brother or sister" (*CA*, 51). In *Fratelli Tutti*, Francis acknowledges the difficulties of promoting the common good in nation-building, more so in realizing the human family as a historical-political project (*FT*, 178). The contemporary global challenges brought by conflict and fear that threaten the human family entail the practice of political love to promote fraternity as the fundamental human vocation. In this regard, politics becomes "one of the highest forms of charity, inasmuch as it seeks the common good" (*FT*, 180).

Hindering the realization of Art. II, Sec. 26 of the 1987 Philippine Constitution despite the vicious experience of nepotism and cronyism reveals the political dynasties' selfish motivation crystallized in the political culture. Even if politicians from elite families have the intention to serve the people, securing an elected position is not the only way to help them. Without the intention to strengthen democratic institutions, public service only becomes a cover-up for stronger patron-client ties to gather votes during elections. Filipino lawmakers who lacked the will and effort to legislate an anti-political dynasty law warrant this theopolitical ethical criticism. Their lukewarm interest shows their desire to prevent greater democratic participation based on meritorious qualifications. Political dynasties actualize the corruption of the good (i.e. the charitable intention to serve) based on narrow kinship interests (i.e. to concentrate power and wealth) by perpetuating the ambivalent network of exploitative relationships (i.e. patronage politics). As the inherited cause of weak institutional checks and balances, political dynasties are, therefore, socially and structurally sinful because it does not promote the common good of the human family.

Political Love, Justice, and Inclusive Solidarity against the Reign of Greed

These theological presuppositions lead to the ethical evaluation of political dynasties based on sociobiological findings in the light of the Christian faith. Given that political dynasties result in the concentration of power and wealth by the few, its proliferation in democratic societies is a form of social injustice and therefore sinful. It promotes an exclusivist understanding of human relationships that only kin members and their allies are worthy of leadership roles in society by treating other

potential political candidates as threats rather than dialogue partners toward the common good. In this sense, the monopoly of political institutions under the control of a particular clan is an elitist practice of not recognizing the potential capability of the people. It weakens love as a theological virtue by limiting its circle among kin and allied members. Aside from weakening the rule of law, marginalization, and elitism, it threatens national, social, and communal life by creating an environment of insecurity due to a lack of trusting relationships.⁵⁹

The institutionalization of greed through entrenched political dynasties promotes elitism, which consequently leads to inequality and social prejudice, due to the widening gap among social classes. Daniel Dorling argues that the inbreeding of prejudice is a wider form of racism. For him, the concept of race is not limited to skin color but can also be considered an identity classification system of the varying peoples in each population. Dorling suggests, “It [racism] was an extension of the old rationalisation used by aristocrats to justify their luxurious existence when almost everyone else had to toil. The difference now was that the justification was not just being applied by a few families, but entire social groups were behaving like aristocracy.”⁶⁰ This premise shows that a polarized distinction between the elite and non-elite is the foundation of racism. It can be similarly construed that the biological roots of racism are *speciesism* or the promotion of selective prejudice against a particular species akin to how political dynasties secure their power.

The problem of political dynasties does not only show how a government operating through patron-client

⁵⁹ Michael Sandel, *Justice: What's the Right Thing to do?* (London: Penguin Books, 2009), 266.

⁶⁰ Daniel Dorling, *Injustice: Why Social Inequality Persists* (Bristol: The Policy Press, 2011), 147.

relationships and narrow kinship ties is contrary to the ideals of democracy. It also demonstrates how it is contrary to the message of Christian love that should be extended to non-members of the same social identity as seen in the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:25-37). As Paul states to the Galatians about how Christian love should be practiced, “There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28 NRSV). Paradoxically, while selfishness to survive is ingrained in one’s nature, cultivating exclusive solidarity just to survive leads to the death of the state as a political body, which thus shows sin’s mortal consequence (Rom 6:23). Inspired by the Gospel message and the 1986 EDSA People Power Revolution, the Second Plenary Council of the Philippines in 1991 has long recognized economic inequality and political dynasties as the root causes of Filipino destitution (PCP II n. 24). As its basis for social action, the Catholic Bishops’ Conference of the Philippines (CBCP) has repeatedly since then issued pastoral statements not to vote for politicians from political dynasties.⁶¹

⁶¹ See Catholic Bishops’ Conference of the Philippines, *Pastoral Exhortation on Philippine Politics*, 16 September 1997; *Pastoral Exhortation on Political Culture*, 25 January 1999; *CBCP Statement on Charter Change*, 7 July 2003; *Renewing our Public Life through Moral Values*, 29 January 2006; *Pastoral Statement on the Alleged “People’s Initiative” to Change the Constitution*, 7 April 2006; *CBCP Pastoral Statement on the 2007 National Elections*, 8 July 2007; *“Reform Yourselves and believe in the Gospel!” (Mark 1:15)*, 27 January 2008; *Lay Participation in Politics and Peace*, 12 July 2009; *A Call for Vigilance and Involvement*, 24 January 2010; *Proclaim the Message, in Season and Out of Season (cf. 2 Tim 4:2)*, 28 January 2013; *Filipino Catholic Laity: Called to be Saints... Sent forth as Heroes!*, 1 December 2013; *Elections and the Duty of the Christian*, 5 June 2015; *Bringing Christ to Politics*, 11 August 2015; *Pastoral Guidelines for Discerning the Moral Dimension of the Present-Day Moves for Charter*

Politically, legislating an enabling law that would clearly define the scope of prohibiting family members to succeed in public office is the solution to the problem. However, since few political families monopolize the present government, transforming the system begins with the electorate by supporting political candidates and parties, especially those who do not belong to political dynasties, advocating the legislation of an anti-political dynasty bill. Aloysius Cartagenas even suggests that Church leaders should get involved by not just preparing qualified individuals for political leadership but also advocating “for the birth of genuine political parties of the poor or parties based on policies that represent them”.⁶² In this manner, government policies will not be beholden to the whims of a few influential families. This makes the government more transparent to the people since transactions are not dependent on kinship ties. Even if the natural selfish tendencies of human beings remain, at least it is not nurtured as a cultural system by corrupted political institutions.

Politicians should be made accountable to the people through social justice and equality to change the political system.⁶³ However, beyond the implementation of justice based on the rule of law is also the importance of forgiveness and reconciliation. This is not only for the resolution of feuds among political clans but also for the victims of social injustices perpetuated by the lack of government direction to promote the common good due to selfishness and greed. In this aspect, the state should be

Change, 29 January 2018; *Seeking the Common Good*, 28 January 2019; *Don't Leave God when You Vote*, 28 April 2019.

⁶² Aloysius Cartagenas, “Religion and Politics in the Philippines: The Public Role of the Roman Catholic Church in the Democratization of the Filipino Polity,” *Political Theology* 11/6 (2010): 853.

⁶³ Jerry D. Imbong, “The Political and Economic Vision of Pope Francis: Implication for Philippine Church Mission,” *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 45/3 (2021): 212-220.

considered a ‘survival machine’ that is willing to promote solidarity with the poor, deprived, and oppressed through more altruistic practices of its citizens regardless of their familial, economic, racial, or political affiliation.

Conclusion

From the ten-year period of the Macapagal-Arroyo presidency, the return of a ‘yellow’ Aquino presidency in 2010, and the brutal Duterte presidency in 2016, the return to the rule of the Marcoses in 2022 shows how political dynasties still predominate in the Philippines. The victory of President Ferdinand Marcos Jr. and Vice-President Sara Duterte shows how political dynasties endured over the years through various symbiotic relationships with their kin and allied political parties. Their concentration of power and wealth threatens Philippine democracy founded on the rule of law, human rights, transparency, and equality. From a sociobiological and evolutionary perspective, elections have become a derby of political families akin to animals that strive to survive, dominate, reproduce, and secure territory.

This article on theological ethics is by no means an exhaustive sociobiological and evolutionary analysis of Philippine political dynasties. Despite its limitation, the sociobiological and evolutionary roots of this social scientific phenomenon have shown how political culture is patterned on the biological interaction and behavior of other species. While it is acknowledged that human beings are also animals, it is also popularly known that politicians are often caricatured either positively or negatively as animals. Even the social contract theorist Thomas Hobbes saw that the political nature of a human being is akin to a wolf – *homo homini lupus* – “*Man to*

Man is an arrant wolf'.⁶⁴ Similarly, congressional representatives and senators are satirically depicted as *buwaya* (crocodiles) in Philippine politics because of their greed for power, wealth, and prestige which resembles the reptilian predator's capability to devour large amounts of food. These metaphors projected on traditional politicians show that the nature of politics is like a jungle of wild animals, which is not without reasons especially if it has sociobiological explanations.

The literary relationship between animals and politicians rings the Orwellian statement "All animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others" as a fable to the outcome of the Russian 1917 October Revolution.⁶⁵ George Orwell's *Animal Farm* portrays the irony that leaders of revolutionary causes tend to forget their original motivation to liberate the people from oppression when they are already in power, even becoming more ruthless than the tyrants they replaced. This Orwellian depiction of politics is like the case of Philippine politics where the ideals of the 1986 People Power Revolution to end patronage politics were later followed by the return and proliferation of political dynasties in the country. These historical examples show how the pigs in *Animal Farm* have become indistinguishable from their former human owner who maltreated them.

However, animals should not be demeaned as lower species because even they have a sense of compassion, fairness, and reconciliation.⁶⁶ Although human beings

⁶⁴ Thomas Hobbes, *De Cive: The English Version*, ed. Howard Warrender (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983 [1651]), 24. Italics in original.

⁶⁵ Orwell, *Animal Farm*, 63.

⁶⁶ Frans de Waal's study of reconciliatory behavior among primates is one notable example that animals have natural capacities to resolve conflicts. Cf. Frans de Waal, *Peacemaking among Primates* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1989); Frans de

are genetically programmed to be selfish for their survival like animals, they have the choice to overcome this selfishness by cultivating more altruistic practices based on the positive aspects of nature. In this manner, human nature and culture flourish through a more inclusive practice of solidarity and justice in the light of Christian love. As Romano Guardini reflects on the proper course of what is to be human, “Politically, in the broadest meaning of the word, we are approaching a state in which the economic, social, national conditions of one country have repercussions all over the world. Just as no one class in a country can long remain in poor social, economic, or hygienic conditions without affecting the whole nation, so also no particular group can flourish long and truly when conditions as a whole are not in good order”.⁶⁷

Waal, *Good Natured: The Origins of Right and Wrong in Humans and Other Animals* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1996).

⁶⁷ Romano Guardini, *Power and Responsibility: A Course of Action for the New Age*, trans. Elinor C. Briefs (Chicago, Illinois: Henry Regnery Company, 1961), 69.

Bibliography

- Agoncillo, Teodoro A. *History of the Filipino People, Eight Edition*. Quezon City: Garotech Publishing, 1990.
- Benedict XVI. *Caritas in Veritate*, 29 June 2009.
- Bonner, Raymond. *Waltzing with a Dictator: The Marcoses and the Making of American Policy*. New York, New York: Times Books, 1987.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "Forms of Capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by John G. Richardson, 241-258. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Stanford University Press, 1990 [1980].
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinctions: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Cartagenas, Aloysius. "Religion and Politics in the Philippines: The Public Role of the Roman Catholic Church in the Democratization of the Filipino Polity," *Political Theology* 11/6 (2010): 846-872.
- Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines. *Pastoral Exhortation on Philippine Politics*, 16 September 1997.
- _____. *Pastoral Exhortation on Political Culture*, 25 January 1999.
- _____. *CBCP Statement on Charter Change*, 7 July 2003.
- _____. *Renewing our Public Life through Moral Values*, 29 January 2006.
- _____. *Pastoral Statement on the Alleged "People's Initiative" to Change the Constitution*, 7 April 2006.
- _____. *CBCP Pastoral Statement on the 2007 National Elections*, 8 July 2007.
- _____. "Reform Yourselves and believe in the Gospel!" (*Mark 1:15*), 27 January 2008.
- _____. *Lay Participation in Politics and Peace*, 12 July 2009.
- _____. *A Call for Vigilance and Involvement*, 24 January 2010.
- _____. *Proclaim the Message, in Season and Out of Season (cf. 2 Tim 4:2)*, 28 January 2013.
- _____. *Filipino Laity: Called to be Saints... Sent forth as Heroes!*, 1 December 2013.
- _____. *Elections and the Duty of the Christian*, 5 June 2015.
- _____. *Bringing Christ to Politics*, 11 August 2015.
- _____. *Pastoral Guidelines for Discerning the Moral Dimension of the Present-Day Moves for Charter Change*, 29 January 2018.
- _____. *Seeking the Common Good*, 28 January 2019; *Don't leave God when you vote*, 28 April 2019.

- Coronel, Sheila S. "The 7Ms of Dynasty Building" *Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism*. <https://old.pcij.org/stories/the-seven-ms-of-dynasty-building/> [accessed 22 June 2022].
- Dawkins, Richard. *The Selfish Gene, 30th Anniversary Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- De la Rosa, Rolando V. *Beginnings of the Filipino Dominicans: History of the Filipinization of the Religious Orders in the Philippines*. Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press, 1990.
- Dizon, David. "Mar blasts Romualdez: He's twisting his Facts," *ABS-CBNnews.com*, 10 December 2013, <http://www.abs-cbnnews.com/nation/12/10/13/mar-blasts-romualdez-hes-twisting-his-facts> [accessed 22 June 2022].
- Domning, Daryl P. and Hellwig, Monika K. *Original Selfishness: Original Sin and Evil in the Light of Evolution*. Hampshire and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- Dorling, Daniel. *Injustice: Why Social Inequality Persists*. Bristol: The Policy Press, 2011.
- Frankfurt, Harry. "Freedom of the Will and the Concept of the Person," *Journal of Philosophy* 68/1 (January 1971): 5–20.
- Francis. *Evangelii Gaudium*, 24 November 2013.
- Francis. *Fratelli Tutti*, 3 October 2020.
- Frazer, James George. *The Golden Bough: A Study of Magic and Religion, Abridged Edition*. Palgrave London: Macmillan, 1983 [1922].
- Gould, Stephen Jay. *Leonardo's Mountain of Clams and the Diet of Worms: Essays on Natural History*. Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011.
- Guardini, Romano. *Power and Responsibility: A Course of Action for the New Age*. Translated by Elinor C. Briefs. Chicago, Illinois: Henry Regnery Company, 1961.
- Guerrero, Amado [Sison, Jose Maria]. *Philippine Society and Revolution*. Philippines: Aklat ng Bayan, 2005.
- Gutiérrez, Gustavo. *Teología de la liberación: Perspectivas, decimoctava edición*. Salamanca: Ediciones Sígueme, 2009 [1972].
- Hubert, Henri et Mauss, Marcel, « Esquisse d'une théorie générale de la magie, » *L'année sociologique* 7 [1902-1903] : 1-146.
- Hulsbosch, Anfried. *God in Creation and Evolution*. Translated by Martin Versfeld. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965.
- Imbong, Jerry D. "The Political and Economic Vision of Pope Francis: Implication for Philippine Church Mission," *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 45, no. 3 (2021): 212-220.
- John Paul II. *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia*, 2 December 1984.
- John Paul II. *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 30 December 1987.
- John Paul II. *Centesimus Annus*, 1 May 1991.

- John Paul II. *Message du Saint-Père Jean Paul II aux membres de l'assemblée plénière de l'Académie Pontificale des Sciences*. 22 October 1996.
- Lacaba, Jose F. *Days of Disquiet, Nights of Rage: The First Quarter Storm and Related Events*. Manila: Salinlahi Publishing House, 1982.
- Lewontin, Richard C., Rose, Steven, and Kamin, Leon J. eds. *Not in Our Genes: Biology, Ideology and Human Nature*. New York: Pantheon, 1984.
- Llanes-Avendano, Anton and Cupin, Bea. "Transcript Romualdez, Roxas meet post-Yolanda," *Rappler*, 14 December 2013, <http://www.rappler.com/nation/45914-transcript-romualdez-roxas-meeting-yolanda> [accessed 22 June 2022].
- Marañon, Emil III. "COMELEC'S Role in Implementing Ban on Political Dynasties," *Rappler*, 2 May 2019, <https://www.rappler.com/voices/thought-leaders/228094-comelec-role-implementing-ban-political-dynasties/> [accessed 15 July 2022].
- Mendoza, Ronald U., Jaminola, Leonardo M. III and Yap, Jurel. *From Fat to Obese: Political Dynasties after the 2019 Midterm Elections*. Ateneo School of Government Paper 19-013. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University, 2019.
- Mijares, Primitivo. *The Conjugal Dictatorship of Ferdinand and Imelda Marcos*. San Francisco: Union Square, 1986 [1976].
- Orwell, George. *Animal Farm*. London: Seeker & Warburg/Octopus, 1945.
- Pearson, Norman. "The Sense of Sin and Evolution," *Mind* 7, no. 28 (October 1882): 544-553.
- Philstar.com. "Former President GMA endorses Marcos-Duterte Tandem," *Philippine Star*, 5 April 2022 [accessed 19 July 2022].
- Pius XII, *Humani Generis*. 12 August 1950.
- Pope, Stephen J. *Human Evolution and Christian Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Pope, Stephen J. "Sociobiology and Human Nature: A Perspective from Catholic Theology," *Zygon* 33, no. 2 (1998): 275-291.
- Popper, Karl. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Pye, Lucian. *Asian Power and Politics: The Cultural Dimensions of Authority*. Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Regencia, Ted. "Family Affair: Philippine Political Dynasties," *Al Jazeera*, 11 May 2013, <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2013/05/2013511104835690790.html> [accessed 22 June 2022].

- Republic Act 7941 An Act Providing for the Election of Party-List Representatives through the Party-List System, and Appropriating Funds therefor*, 3 March 1995.
- Republic Act 10742 An Act Establishing Reforms in the Sangguniang Kabataan Creating Enabling Mechanisms for Meaningful Youth Participation in Nation-Building, and for Other Purposes*, 15 January 2016.
- Republic of the Philippines House of Representatives, <https://www.congress.gov.ph/legisdocs/?v=billsresults> [accessed 15 July 2022].
- Reyes, Danilo Andres. "The Early Duterte Presidency in the Philippines," *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs* 35, no. 3 (2016): 111-137.
- Reyes, Joseph Anthony L., Arce, Brando Gabriel C. and Madrid, Nicolle Bien N. "Do Money, Power, Family and Connections Really Matter in Politics? Analysing Factors of Success in the 2010, 2013 and 2016 Philippine Senatorial Elections," *The Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies* 36, no. 2 (2018): 28-51.
- Roces, Marian Pastor ed. *Cory Magic: Her People's Stories* (Quezon City: ABS-CBN, 2009).
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. « Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes. » *Œuvres complètes*, edited by Bernard Gagnebin et Marcel Raymond, 109-223. Paris : Éditions Gallimard, 1964, [1755].
- Rozin, Paul, Millman, Linda and Nemeroff, Carol. "Operation of the Laws of Sympathetic Magic in Disgust and Other Domains." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 50, no. 4 (1986): 703-712.
- Ruiz, José María González. *Pobreza evangélica y promoción humana*. Barcelona: Nova Terra, 1966.
- Sandel, Michael. *Justice: What's the Right Thing to do?* London: Penguin Books, 2009.
- Schoonenberg, Piet. *Man and Sin: A Theological View*. Translated by Joseph Donceel. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965.
- Second Plenary Council of the Philippines. *Acts and Decrees of the Second Plenary Council of the Philippines*, Pasay City, Philippines: Paulines, 1992.
- Senate of the Philippines <http://legacy.senate.gov.ph/> [accessed 17 July 2022]
- Simbulan, Dante C. *Modern Principalia: The Historical Evolution of the Philippine Ruling Oligarchy*. Quezon City: The University of the Philippines Press, 2005.

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre. "Reflections on Original Sin." In *Christianity and Evolution*. Translated by René Hague. London: Collins, 1969.

The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines.

Tylor, Edward B. *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom, Two Volumes*. London: John Murray, 1871.

Typhoon Haiyan: Hundreds Unburied after Philippines Storm," *Australia Network News*, 29 December 2013, <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2013-12-28/phils-typhoon-corpses/5177392> [accessed 22 June 2022].

Vatican II. *Gaudium et Spes*, 7 December 1965.

Wilson, Edward O. *Sociobiology: The Abridged Edition*. Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1980.