

UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
LIBRARY

PANORAMA

THE PHILIPPINE MAGAZINE OF GOOD READING



Manila from the air

APRIL, 1966

75 Centavos

Tell Your Friends

about the *Panorama*,
the Philippines' most
versatile, most significant
magazine today.

Give them

a year's subscription — NOW!
they will appreciate it.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

..... 1 year for P8.50 2 years for P16.00

..... Foreign subscription: one year \$6.00 U.S.

Name

Street

City or Town Province

Enclosed is a check/money order for the amount specified above.

Please address all checks or money orders in favor of:

COMMUNITY PUBLISHERS, INC.
Invernes St., Sto. Ana, Manila, Philippines

PANORAMA

THE PHILIPPINE MAGAZINE OF GOOD READING

Vol. XVIII

MANILA, PHILIPPINES

No. 4

COMMITMENT TO GREATNESS

The crisis which our country has to face today demands consummate commitment to excellence in every possible field of endeavor from the way we handle our national economy to the way we play politics. If greatness is another name for excellence, our national crisis, can be conquered only by conquering our habits of mediocrity. We still have to see our educators, scientists, artists, physicians, politicians, priests, etc. truly excell in their respective functions motivated only by their sincere desire to concretize their personal response to the Christian message by responding to the challenge of their respective vocations. It is only after they shall have braved the disciplines of excellence will they be able to come to church with a clear Christian conscience because only then can they say in all honesty that their Christian commitment has challenged them to commit both themselves and their country to greatness. — *Portion of a letter to Manila Times Columnist A. R. Roces, April 7, 1966, by Fr. Ben J. Villote, University of the Philippines.*

- A plea for the election of an independent body which shall meet, for the first time in the history of the country, to draft with full freedom a new constitution of the Republic of the Philippines.

THE NEED FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Conditions prevailing in the Philippines since the end of the last War warrant a serious reexamination of the basic governmental structure of our country. Since the 4th of July, 1946, when direct American influence over our public affairs was formally ended by the declaration of Philippine independence, the country has undergone a series of local and national disturbances which have disclosed to our observant citizens certain weak and unsuitable provisions of the present Constitution. These deplorable conditions affecting our body politic have developed under a governmental set-up largely made possible by certain constitutional provisions alien to our traditional conception of authority and duty.

This sad situation has enabled unprincipled persons in both public and private life

to take advantage of ill-defined responsibilities and non-existing restraints on official conduct and to capture power and prestige for their personal benefit. The excessive employment of money in elections threatens the maintenance of our democratic system. The gross misuse of government property and facilities in political campaigns and a habitual indulgence in personal vilification of candidates in newspapers and other methods of communication are sources of serious danger to public peace. They undermine social order and constitutional morality and expose the people to internecine strifes. The civil service has to be strengthened in several ways to fortify the basic organs of administration. It needs a much stronger guarantee of independence from partisan dic-

tation to enable it to recruit persons of high ability and tested integrity. The selection of judges needs improvement.

Taxpayers are oppressed by needless and irresponsible multiplication of government units and employees which reminds us of Parkinson's Law, and by a terrific addition of worthless activities. The criterion of public purpose, which alone makes a tax legal and just and which should be strictly and honestly observed, is ignored in a senseless orgy of spending public funds.

To say that the political affairs of the country, the moral behaviour of governmental officials and employees, and the tone and direction of business are in a state of serious confusion is to repeat a commonplace and banal observation. Without going any further, which is quite simple to do, these and a host of other valid reasons call for some changes intended to improve our present Constitution. At any rate, a general survey of the operation of the agencies established by our Constitution by special representa-

tives of the people with the end in view of replacing outdated features is doubtless necessary and urgent after a lapse of 31 years covering a period of colonial status and a period of national independence.

It is, of course, true that a good government depends more upon men of ability, honor, and integrity than solely upon laws and constitutions; but it is also true that many men of this type could only be attracted to government service under a constitution which could be so implemented that it could reduce the number of opportunists, adventurers, and semi-literates to compete with them for public offices by foul, degrading, and impertinent tactics.

It is but pure cynicism to assert that the Filipinos have been so influenced by cultural conditions of such a nature that any change in our Constitution will not improve our ability to solve our problems. There are still many in this country who are competent, honest, and sincere who would willingly serve the country even with the social and political ad-

versities now existing, provided that conditions of public service are changed under a constitution which largely reflects the best of our own historical and political ideas, social values, customs, and traditions.

Structurally our Constitution is largely American in origin. As such its basis were the conditions existing in the thirteen American colonies of England in 1776. It is not sufficiently adjusted to our own country and people whose cultural conditions, social ideas, and native political beliefs rest upon a background not quite identical with that of the Americans. A reorientation is urgently needed in view of our efforts to discover and assert our identity.

The delegates to our Constitutional Convention of 1934-1935 did introduce some changes not found in the American system, such as the unicameral legislature and a presidential term of 6 years without reelection, features which students and critics of government here and in America considered wise and desirable alterations. Unfortunately, these were almost immediate-

ly removed by amendments suggested to the Assembly by a President who wanted a much longer term of office for himself and who dominated the political party which controlled the National Assembly.

But even if these features were to be wholly or partly restored, the Constitution still contains provisions which are quite alien to the national ethos and so are left to slumber in peace. Some parts are contradictory to each other and have misled government officials into disregarding fundamental principles. Institutions of basic value to a modern state, such as one which should be given full and independent control over the nation's currency and monetary policies or one that assures a knowledgeable decision on educational and scientific development independent of political action, are not adequately provided in the present Constitution. The corrupting influence of power endangers the national welfare and democracy when all decisions on every subject, including those which require special expertise, are placed in the hands of political or-

gans such as Congress and the President.

The Constitution permits two methods of amending its provisions. The initiative is left with Congress. One method is for Congress to make the amendment proposals by a three-fourths vote of all the members of each house. Another is for Congress to call a constitutional convention, again by a three-fourths vote, to approve proposals for amendments. It is for Congress to choose which of these two methods should be used. But if the amendments are to be satisfactorily adjusted to the basic features of our country and the character of our people, they should be left to a constitutional convention to propose.

The Constitution does not, of course, prescribe a criterion as to when it is proper for Congress alone to make proposals for amendments and when it is better for it to call a constitutional convention for making the proposals. Much depends upon the nature and purpose of the projected changes of the Constitution which are deemed imperative. But to be more specific, amendments

intended to alter the powers, privileges, duties, qualifications, disqualifications, terms of office, salaries, and perquisites of the President, members of Congress, the judiciary, or other offices provided in the existing Constitution as well as the fundamental rights and privileges of the people can best be decided and should be decided only through a constitutional convention. Not being connected with the existing organs of government, administration, or legislation, a convention could be expected to act with less prejudice and more freedom and impartiality than Congress. Moreover, it is more difficult for the President to exert pressure on convention delegates. For instance, months before the Constitutional Convention of 1934-1935 was held, President Quezon expressed strong objection to a unicameral legislature. He told some persons about it. A number of delegates, however, strongly advocated the unicameral plan and with the help of the Manila newspapers, which published a number of editorials in its favor, President Quezon re-

mained silent on the subject. The result was that the majority of the Convention was ultimately persuaded to adopt the unicameral legislature designated as the National Assembly.

But about four years later President Quezon thought of having the Constitution amended. It was then time for him to push through his personal preferences. With his control over the Nacionalista Party, it was easy for him to prevail upon the National Assembly itself to propose the necessary amendments reviving the Senate and removing the prohibition against the reelection of the President. Thus, he was able to accomplish through the legislative power of proposing amendments what he failed to see adopted in the Constitutional Convention.

For Quezon to favor a lengthening of his term even in this runabout way was to follow the practice of some undemocratic governments in Latin America. High Commissioner Francis Sayre, therefore, recommended a veto on this amendment by President Roosevelt on the ground that it was a step of

"exceeding danger to democracy" and a way to indefinite tenure and eventual dictatorship. Roosevelt, however, was then on the way to running for a twelve-year term and so could have been accused of inconsistency had he disapproved the 8-year term for Quezon. Incidentally, not satisfied with holding the office for 8 years, Quezon was able to persuade Mr. Osmeña to step aside from the presidency and to persuade the U.S. Congress to permit him to continue in office till the end of the War. Unfortunately for him death cut short his expectation.

The same case was experienced in pushing through the so-called Parity amendment to the Constitution. This measure or the idea behind it was opposed by the majority of Filipino leaders. It could never have been approved thru a constitutional convention. Therefore, President Roxas had to make Congress propose the Parity amendment which he had so wanted to see adopted. He even went to the extent of having some senators and representatives deprived of

their seats in Congress because he suspected them as unfriendly to the Parity amendment. A constitutional convention, which is more directly representative of the people, would never have approved such disgraceful change of the Constitution of a free people.

These two instances show that Congress could be easily influenced by partisan considerations and by official pressure to propose undesirable changes. It is quite obvious that if a change contemplated is simple and does not involve the interests of its members, Congress may properly be left to make the proposal. But in cases of basic alterations of the fundamental law, it is best for Congress to let the people elect special representatives to deliberate on proposed changes in a constitutional convention.

To our Senators and Congressmen this appeal is presented:

Give the people a chance to select as members of a constitutional convention men and women who in their opinion are best fitted to do one particular work —

to propose necessary amendments to the Constitution.

Give the people a chance to be represented in a constitutional convention which is completely free to propose changes in the structure of our government, changes that may affect the position and functions of the President, the Senators, the Congressmen, and other government agencies.

Give the people a chance to select delegates to a constitutional convention who are not at present enjoying government powers, privileges, and special advantages and are not, therefore, influenced by any thought of preventing the introduction of changes that may adversely affect their actual position in the government and their political standing.

The plebiscite for the final approval of the draft of a constitution cannot be seriously considered as an institution that makes a constitutional convention unnecessary as suggested by certain persons. Composed of millions of voters, it cannot initiate proposals of amendments with sufficient judg-

ment and deliberation. Its use is confined to merely saying Yes or No. It can accomplish this task with greater assurance of correctness when the proposals of amendments are the direct product of men and women specially selected by the people to make them.

One more point should be remembered on the selection of delegates to the constitutional convention. Authorities on the question are unanimously agreed that the legislature or Congress has no legal right to name specific persons or groups to sit as delegates in the convention. Neither is Congress authorized to provide that the delegates shall be elected at large. The delegates have to be chosen from "the various localities" of the country. By this method, according to authoritative opinion, the convention becomes truly and fairly representative of the people. The practice of including *ex officio* delegates

finds no valid support from authorities on constitutional conventions.

The Filipinos have never had a chance to hold a constitutional convention with complete freedom of action and under conditions of political independence since the Malolos Constitution was drafted and approved about 67 years ago. If for no other reason than to give them an opportunity to select delegates to formulate with utmost freedom a constitution more suitable to the conditions of their own country, our Congress should consider it their duty to call a constitutional convention to amend or revise the present Constitution. No expenditure of public funds could be deemed too high for this purpose. A general and careful revision of the basic law upon which our political, social, and economic structure is to rest is worth all the money the public treasury and Congress could muster. — V. G. Sinco.

- Filipino decisions on helping or not helping South Vietnam has provoked this column which concludes: "In this country there are no political parties, political philosophies, or political convictions."

POLITICAL INDICATOR

If one is interested in the dynamics of Philippine politics, the Vietnam bill is a highly fascinating case study. The bill threads through our entire political landscape making an excellent guide to the Philippine political system. One can look at the history of the Vietnam bill and see the forces of political action, or one can see the national reaction from our leaders to the barrio folk, and perceive the machine works of the national structure. The bill was first introduced during the Macapagal era. It was presented with the magnificent endorsement of the Secretary of Defense then. Speaker Villareal then returned from Vietnam and stated that aid of a military nature would be "provocative" and ill-advised. When the bill was introduced however, he descended the rostrum as Speaker and worked for the passage of the bill in two days.

• • •

But elections had by this time excited the nation. The form of aid to Vietnam became a campaign issue. Macapagal was roundly scored by the opposition candidate for president, Ferdinand Marcos, stating in strong terms, that military action in the guise of engineers was foolhardy. After the elections, with the Marcos victory, there was a "change in emphasis" and the new President then unequivocally endorsed the bill which advocated the same form of military aid labeled army engineers, to Vietnam. Since Villareal remained Speaker of the House, it was merely a replay of his previous role. Thus, the Vietnam issue as political issue, was of no significance in actual fact because the candidate who won a mandate from the people while running on the stand on non-military aid to Vietnam, simply changed his mind.

• • •

In the background thrives comments about US pressure. There is heavy hinting about "compensations" conditioned on our amenability to sending our flag into the battlefields of Vietnam. Aside from sudden and flattering visits from US officialdom, including Vice President Humphrey, Secretary of State Rusk, and Undersecretary William Bundy, we had President Marcos talking to US military personnel about fighting for freedom and being photographed in the cockpit of a US fighter plane wearing a pilot's headgear. Incidentally, this reminded us of the photograph of Gen. and Mrs. Cao Ky dressed like space pilots in their conference with President Johnson in Hawaii.

• • •

With the US shadow in the background let us look at the reaction of our leaders. There were those gloriously happy to get into Vietnam and fight for freedom and democracy, including two congressmen volunteering to march into the fray. What is the party stand? Well, the Nacionalistas refuse to take a party stand, and the Liberals likewise. We are going resolutely to war, and neither of the major parties want to take a stand on it. Only President Marcos is assuming a stand, and only a handful of independent-minded legislators are against it, but they are on their own. In this country there are no political parties, political philosophies, or political convictions. —
By Alfredo R. Roces

GREATEST LIE

Popular opinion is the greatest lie in the world.
— *Carlyle.*

- The war fought by the Filipinos against the U.S.A. would have resulted in American defeat if the Filipinos had received guns and better weapons, as now shown in the difficulties Americans now encounter in Vietnam.

THE FALL OF MALOLOS

One of the first acts of General Wesley Merritt after the capitulation of Manila on August 13, 1898, was to order General Anderson to rid the city of armed Filipino revolutionists. General Aguinaldo received a telegram from the American general to forbid any of his troops to enter the city.

General Aguinaldo instead sent a commission to discuss the matter with General Anderson but the American officer instructed the Filipino commissioners to deal with General Merritt. The commissioners told Merritt that the withdrawal of Filipino troops from the city should be done provided that the American authorities agreed to put in writing certain conditions, namely, joint occupation of Manila, protection of the Filipino shipping by Admiral Dewey and "the restitution to the revolutionists of the areas to be evacuated in the event that

the United States recognized by the treaty Spain's dominion in the Philippines."

Merritt stuck to his demand for the immediate withdrawal of the Filipino troops without conditions. A week after General Elwell S. Otis assumed command of the American forces succeeding General Merritt he was ordered by the U.S. War Department to use force if necessary in effecting the removal of the Filipino forces from the confines of the city. General Otis sent a letter to General Aguinaldo not only to reiterate the stand taken by General Wesley Merritt but even to threaten General Aguinaldo "with the use of force if the American demand is not complied with within one week."

The revolutionary leaders who were with General Aguinaldo, particularly Generals Artemio Ricarte, Pio del Pilar and Mariano Noriel, became angry upon receipt

of Otis' letter. They realized that the Americans were here but not for humanitarian reasons after all. General Aguinaldo realizing the gravity of the threat and the state of his forces' unpreparedness managed to advise prudence and moderation to his subordinates. He managed however to convince Otis to change the tone of his demand from an ultimatum to that of a request which the latter did.

On September 14, the Filipino forces moved and evacuated "some of the suburbs" beyond the area specified by the Americans. Meanwhile the seat of the Revolutionary Government was transferred to the town of Malolos. But General Otis at this stage was not satisfied by the evacuation of the Filipino troops. He demanded that Paco, Pandacan and other areas be freed from Filipino forces. General Aguinaldo, however, insisted on the right of his troops to stay put in Pandacan, although he ordered his men under pain of being court-martialed "not to interfere with the affairs in the city of Manila and its suburbs."

Filipino-American relations up to the outbreak of armed conflict was not altogether smooth. Numerous clashes between them occurred inside and outside the city. Filipino troops getting inside the city were insulted to the extent of being disarmed. The Americans, on the other hand, complained of the annoyance they suffered from the Filipinos when they left the city.

In February 1899 the Filipino-American relations grew from bad to worse. The Filipino forces were deployed around the city "in a semi-circle with a radius of about three miles having the mouth of the Pasig river as center. About this time the strength of the Filipino forces was estimated to be as follows: 3,000 men in Caloocan; 400 in Pasig; 1,200 in Malate; around 500 each in Sta. Ana, Paco, Pasay, and Pandacan. Opposite the Filipino lines the American troops were also deployed in same semi-circle pattern. North of Pasig River was a division under Major-General Arthur MacArthur. Major General Thomas Anderson was in-

charge of another division south of the Pasig River.

On February 4, 1899 at 8:30 in the evening the tension which characterized the Filipino-American relations exploded. Private William N. Grayson who was reconnoitering the surrounding areas of their outpost in San Juan fired at a group of four Filipino soldiers who failed to stop when challenged to halt.

The Filipinos were caught by surprise. It was Saturday night and most of the troops were on week-end pass to visit their relatives and families. At the critical moment only General Pantaleon Garcia was at his post at Maypajo, while Generals Paciano Rizal, Noriel, and Ricarte and Colonels Cailles, San Miguel and several others were absent.

The following morning the Americans started their offensive against the Filipinos. The brigade of General Otis under General MacArthur's division made a blitzkrieg attack against the Filipino defenses in La Loma. General Hale's brigade did the same to the Filipino defenses in San Juan del Monte. Heavy

fighting took place near the waterworks. Finding difficulty, General Hale secured the support of the gunboat "Laguna de Bay" which shelled the Filipino positions by the Pasig River. With the destruction of Filipino defense lines the capture of waterworks and reservoir was made easy. At this stage Col. Stotsenberg with his brigade also cut across Mandaluyong, and occupied Cainta and Taytay four days after the outbreak of hostilities.

General Antonio Luna on being aware of the tense situation, issued an order on February 7, 1899, designed to arouse the sentiments of his countrymen with an instruction "to liquidate the enemy" saying:

"To the field officers of the territorial militia:

"By virtue of the barbarous attack made upon our army on the 4th day of February without this being preceded by any strain of relations whatsoever between the two armies, it is necessary for the Filipinos to show that they know how to avenge themselves of treachery and deceit of those who, working

upon their friendship, now seek to enslave us.

"In order to carry out the complete destruction of that accursed army of drunkards and thieves, it is indispensable that we all work in unison, and that orders issued from this war office be faithfully carried out.

On February 10, the Filipino defenses at Caloocan were softened by naval guns and General MacArthur's artillery. General Antonio Luna with his 4,000 poorly armed men had to retreat toward Polo to avoid being murdered.

By the fall of March the American force had 950 officers and 23,000 men. General MacArthur was in command of the 2nd Division consisting of the 1st Brigade, composed of the Kansas and Montana Volunteers and two batteries of the 3rd Artillery under General Harrison; the 2nd Brigade composed of the Colorado, Nebraska, South Dakota, and six companies of Pennsylvania Volunteers under General Hale; and the 3rd Brigade composed of the 7th U.S. Inf., 17th U.S. Infantry, the Minnesota and

Wyoming volunteers and the Utah Artillery under General Hall.

General Antonio Luna at this stage, was the military operations' Commander-in-Chief. The Filipino Army now had a total of 30,000 men but only 16,000 were actually armed. Its artillery consisted of obsolete cannons.

General Otis knew then that General Aguinaldo had established his headquarters at Malolos which was the capital of the Revolutionary Government. To terminate the war, Aguinaldo and Malolos must be captured at the earliest time possible. He knew too that the bulk of the Filipino forces was in the north.

On March 25, the Americans began their northward offensive against the Filipinos. Hale's Brigade made a lightning attack at the Filipino defenses north of the city but was repulsed by the Filipino troops who engaged them in hand-to-hand combat at San Francisco del Monte. The superiority of their arms forced the native troops to be routed, however, the brigade encountered heavy losses at Cabataan, Tali-

napa, and Tuliahan river along the Novaliches road. General MacArthur's artillery saved them from suffering more losses.

Meanwhile the Otis brigade managed to push northward via the railroad tracks. Contact with the Filipino troops was made at Marilao on March 27. Fierce fighting took place in the afternoon when the Filipinos after retreating in the morning made a surprise counter attack on the same day, killing fifteen and wounding seventy Americans. On the 29th, at about 10:00 a.m. Bocaue was taken. The Filipino defenders at Bigaa were routed at noon of the same day.

At Malinta and Polo the Americans suffered heavy casualties. After a spirited fight General Luna directed his troops to retreat to Meycauyan. Gen. Irving Hall, in an attempt to out-smart the defenders, got himself wounded.

On the 30th of March the American Army cautiously moved to Malolos expecting a fierce encounter "to take place owing to the political significance of the capital."

General Mac Arthur stopped his forces within two miles of the town. His scheme was to unleash a thirty minute artillery barrage to the town proper before encircling it the following day.

Colonel Frederick Funston of the Kansas Volunteers description of the American entry into Malolos reads:

We were now less than a mile from the nipa houses in the suburbs of Malolos. I was in the railroad track with the division commander (MacArthur), when he asked me if I would like to take a few men and feel my way into the town. I said I would be glad to, and took Lieutenant Ball and about a dozen men from Company E, leaving the regiment in command of Lieutenant-Colonel Little for the time being. Moving rapidly over to the left of the regiment, our detachment found a narrow road leading into the capital, and we went up it on the jump, now and then halting for a few seconds, to peer around the corners. The road soon became a street and here we were

joined by the ubiquitous Mr. Creelman, quite out of breath from his exertions in overtaking us, he having "smelled a rat" when he saw us leave. We were fired upon by about a dozen men behind a street barricade of stones, gave them a couple of volleys, and then rushed them. A minute later we were in the plaza or public square, and exchanged shots with a few men who were running through the streets

starting fires. The buildings occupied by Aguinaldo as a residence and as offices and the Hall of Congress were burning. We gave such cheers as a few men could and I sent back word to General MacArthur that the town was ours. In a few moments troops from all the regiments of the brigade, as well as the brigade commander himself, joined us. — *By Pedro Gagelonia in Variety of March, 1966.*

LEARNING'S PILLARS

Seeing much, suffering much, and studying much, are the three pillars of learning. — *Disraeli.*

■ The Speaker of the British House of Commons here explains the way Parliament works and the nature of his job as Speaker.

TRADITION AND EFFICIENCY IN PARLIAMENT

Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that Parliament clings too much to ceremony and ritual and tradition nowadays?

I would not want one scrap of that tradition which embodies the history of the growth of British democracy to go. For example, when Black Rod comes and we shut the door in his face, we are reminding ourselves of the time in history when the House of Commons was deciding that Charles II's brother should not become King of England because he was a Catholic, and Charles had sent Black Rod to dissolve Parliament, while the Commons were insisting on passing their law before Charles dissolved them.

While it is helpful to remember such a thing, when Black Rod does come, and the Commons proceedings have to be interrupted to go to the Lords to hear, say, the Royal Assent, isn't it

often very inconvenient to members, and haven't they often protested about this?

No, very rarely: we usually know when Black Rod is coming; though there have been two or three times since the war when Black Rod's entry has been a little inconvenient and when the Commons (or some of them) have protested their own inalienable right to carry on with the business they wanted to.

Isn't it possible that the ritual and ceremony, because it is so deeply rooted in history and tradition as you pointed out, induces an atmosphere which is resistant to change, particularly in matters of parliamentary procedure?

Maybe in parliamentary procedure, but not in the issues which divide the House. Do not imagine the procedure of Parliament is merely romantic; most of it

is 300 years' diluted common sense. It is not to prevent members from fighting, but to see that they fight in a clear, honest, and courteous way.

Could I remind you of what you said when you gave evidence as Deputy Speaker, before the Select Committee on Procedure: you said that you were a traditionalist, and that traditions were part of the glory of Parliament, but you also said 'I would say cut out the mumbo-jumbo by all means'. What did you have in mind when you were talking about 'mumbo-jumbo'?

Sometimes when the House wants to show displeasure with a Minister, we reduce the vote that we are giving to that Minister's department. My Deputy has to put that in a form in which a sum of £16,123,900 is moved and the amendment is to be £16,123,800. I think we could shorten that. There are little bits of the formulae that we use that might conceivably be shortened.

In other words, if tradition stands in the way of efficiency, you would try to deal with it?

That is roughly what I said before the committee.

There has been a spate of articles and books in recent years critical of Parliament, suggesting that its reputation has declined, its prestige has suffered. Do you agree with this? Do you think there is any ground for this — are you worried about it?

It is one of the myths of Parliament that the old Parliament consisted of Gladstone and Pitt and Burke, all the great figures, making wonderful orations without any scenes: this is the best behaved Parliament of the century.

But do you not sense today, Mr. Speaker, a mood for change in the way Parliament goes about its work, among many of the younger generation?

We have probably the keenest and most intelligent intake into this Parliament of any in the last fifty or sixty years, and obviously they want to make their contribution; obviously they feel a little frustrated. Democracy is participation, and the problem of democracy, and the problem of Parliament, is to make the fullest use of

abilities of every member. This has got to come. This is what the uneasiness is about.

As one who has given over 1,000 lectures in your time, on Parliament and how it works, do you think that the way Parliament work is adequately understood by the electorate as a whole?

I believe in communication. I said at Geneva, about six weeks ago, to the parliamentarians of Europe, that parliamentary democracy has got to make the fullest use of all the resources of modern techniques. I think they must come to terms with television, for instance. I would want this Parliament, any Parliament in the world, to make the fullest use of this new instrument of communication.

When Parliament considers this matter, as it is going to do in the Select Committee on the subject, how would your views be given?

Televising Parliament

If the Committee asked me I would give evidence before them, as Speaker, or really as a Member of Parliament of some years' stand-

ing. There is a case for and against the televising of Parliament. I would not want Parliament to become merely a show. There is something very intimate about the debating in the House: it is person to person. The fear of some of the older members is that televising may make it a sort of formal performance. Nobody will want that. On the other hand, I think this is a tremendous new means of communicating to the democrats of Britain the heart of their democratic institution.

May I ask you to explain a couple of points which perhaps are not properly understood by the public, and certainly not understood sometimes by students of Parliament. Why is it that there sometimes seems to be a difficulty about someone like the Prime Minister making a statement on some worldshaking event, even when the House wants him to do so?

Somebody once said: 'Parliament can do anything except make a man a woman'. But Parliament must be unanimous if it wants to break its own procedure. If the

House of Commons unanimously wants to do something it can do it. And on the two very rare occasions you have in mind there was a difference in point of view between the Government and the Opposition. But if the Government and the Opposition made up their minds that something had to be done, procedure would not stand in the way. And indeed the Prime Minister, perhaps as of right (and the Leader of the Opposition similarly), can overrule most of the basic procedures of the House.

Turning to all-night sitting, which is another thing that puzzles people, how do you justify that — if indeed you do justify it — as a sensible way of conducting business?

If I were a selfish human being I would be against all-night sitting, because whenever the all-night sitting takes place, one thing is quite certain: that I and my Deputy, Sir Samuel Storer, carry the biggest burden; we are there all the time. But I would fight to the last gasp for the all-night sitting. This is one of the

resorts of democracy. If a man does not like what the Government has done, it is his job to use every vestige of his parliamentary power to impress that on the Government, and that includes all-night sittings. And when do you get most of the all-night sittings? On the Finance Bill, as I know to my sorrow, having taken the longest and most complicated Finance Bill through. It was painful for me but it was very precious for the country.

Some Speakers in the past have left their mark on parliamentary democracy; they have influenced the way Parliament has developed. Can a Speaker hope to do that nowadays?

Artist and technician

It is difficult to be objective about yourself. In the line of Speakers, I would hope not to let the job down. It would be a myth to say that the Speaker is merely a machine interpreting the rules of parliamentary procedure. He must know the law of Parliament, but he is dealing with 630 human beings. Politics is an art as

well as a science. The Speaker should be an artist as well as a technician.

You said in your evidence to the Select Committee: 'I am one of those who think that the power of the executive is growing and that it ought to be diminished'. What can you do as Speaker to support that philosophy and put it into action?

My predecessor, a long time ago, said that 'if the Speaker keeps the House to the rules of order he is by that same token preserving the rights of the individual member against the executive'. All the procedure of Parliament has been devised with two ends in mind: one is to preserve the rights of the individual back-bencher, of the tiniest minority, while closures and guillotines on the other hand see to it that in the end the majority rules. Both have rights; I have to preserve both rights.

Do you think that your policy — with the co-operation of the House, that is — of speeding up Question Time as much as you have done, might weaken the pressure which Parliament can

put upon the executive by going a bit too quickly?

I talked to the House about that recently. It is not my policy: the House of Commons itself felt that questions were taking too much time, and I had a pretty clear instruction from the House to speed up questions. There is a danger; for every man his question is the most important one in the world. This is what he came to Parliament for, so did 629 waiting for their questions. The Chair's job is to see that he allows the full rights of a questioner without jeopardizing the full rights of somebody else who is waiting in the wings to come and take the stage. This is a matter of judgment, it is a matter of balance, and it must also be a matter of seeing if the question itself is a \$60,000,000 question that the House has a chance to get its teeth into it.

One of the greatest academic authorities on the British Constitution, Sir Ivor Jennings, said about the Speakership: 'The qualities required of a Speaker are not really very high, and so great is the prestige of the

office, and so careful are all parties to maintain his independence and authority, that any reasonable man can make a success of the office'. Is that fair, do you think?

I have had that at the back of my mind for a long time, and I bow to Sir Ivor Jennings. I spoke at a grammar-school dinner recently and the Headmaster referred to boys of ability who were there, and boys of modest ability, and I said to the diners: 'If you are of modest ability don't worry; you may not become Prime Minister or Leader of the Opposition but you have the chance to become a Speaker'. I think that's about it.

What is the most difficult part of your job? Because there are some very difficult aspects indeed, despite what Sir Ivor Jennings said.

I think the real heartache of the Speaker is choosing who is going to speak in a debate.

How do you do that? Do you make up your mind before the debate, or do you make it up as you go along?

All the time. Members write to me to say: 'I'd like to be called in such a debate; this is my reason, I'm an agriculturist, I'm a great farmer, this is an agricultural debate, I've not spoken for the last six months'. That is happening all the time. They come to me in the Chair, they stand up in the House. For instance, at least forty-five men wanted to be called in the Territorial debate. It is almost true to say that all of them had equal claims. My job is to balance these minutiae of equality or disparity between them. It is a heartbreaking job.

One has heard it said, indeed one has read it in authoritative works, that in fact the Whips of the main parties make their list of people whom they would like to see called to go in to bat for them, as it were. Do you get such a list, and do you pay any attention to it?

That may have been true in history. Neither of the chief Whips would dare to come to me and say: 'I think you ought to call so-and-so'. I make my own choice.

And do you choose people according to whether they are likely to make a more interesting contribution in debate? Are you concerned with how good the debate is?

This is one factor — but there are a hundred factors. And there is the fact that a man has not spoken for a long time. There is the fact that a man have very intimate and special reasons — he has just come from Japan and we're debating Japan: a hundred and one things. And in the last resort, if two men have exactly the same right on the Speaker to be called, you may be inclined to call the man who does not speak as long as the other one.

Do you ever get bored sitting in the Speaker's Chair?
Never.

Is this because of the constant factor that you might be called upon to make a ruling, or are you always in-

terested in any speaker, however boring he may be?

I am interested in Parliament; I took this highly complex Finance Bill through last year but was not bored. I was fascinated all the time, even though we were on abstruse and difficult technical subjects. At any moment, too, a speaker may drift out of order. The Chair must be awake and aware all the time.

You have to make a number of very quick decisions, don't you, in which you cannot always refer to your advisers?

This is true. I meet the clerks every day; we discuss what is going to happen, what is likely to happen, the implications. But when Parliament is sitting the issues are arising, and most of the issues that arise are those you have not prepared for. The decisions are on the spot. — *From 'People to Watch' (BBC-2)*

- **Filipino-American relations as viewed by an independent American journalist on the basis of current problems.**

FILIPINO NATIONALISM AND THE AMERICANS

A few days ago, I urged that Congress take a vote without delay on the controversial Vietnam Aid Bill so as to enable us to move on to the discussion of more pressing domestic problems. But now that the political situation in South Vietnam has taken a turn for the worse, it may be wiser to shelve the Vietnam Bill until conditions clear up in that dissension-torn country.

The main argument being fielded by the administration, after all, in favor of sending 2,000 Filipino engineers to Saigon is that the South Vietnamese government made a specific request for this type of assistance. It is only logical that we should determine whether this government will remain in powers before taking a vote on committing our engineers.

This does not mean that we are any less concerned

about the future of South Vietnam. But our foreign policy, far from being rigid and inflexible, should be dictated by common sense.

• • •

The lead article in the March 12 edition of "The New Republic," a prestigious magazine published in Washington DC, is entitled: "The Philippines — Sugar, Rice and a Great Deal of Vice." It was written by Alex Campbell, an old Asia hand, who is now the periodical's managing editor.

In his story, datelined "Manila," Campbell asserts that "the White House is said to have used every possible pressure, including sending Hubert Humphrey to the Philippines twice in a matter of weeks, to get a reluctant (President) Marcos to 'show the Philippine flag' in South Vietnam, by dispatching a military engineering unit there and so become

ing the first Asian member of the Southeast Asian Organization to respond to the Saigon government's appeal to SEATO for military help.

Notice how candid they are, even in Washington DC, about the fact that what is wanted in Saigon is Filipino MILITARY involvement. Over here, we're still talking euphemistically about "construction engineers" and inserting clauses into the bill about prohibiting the proposed engineers from getting into a fight with the Viet Cong. Let's get rid of the sugar-coating once and for all. It takes two to tango, but only one side to start a battle — and the Viet Cong have already announced that they intended to start one.

• • •

Campbell further comments that "Filipinos have reasons to be sensitive about their special relationship with the United States."

"Some Americans," he declares, "still behave as if the Philippines is nothing more than a company town, and they, the Americans are the company. They find the labor docile on the whole, and

cherish the illusion, dear to all tycoons, that the workers revere their bosses and are loyal to the company. It follows, of course, that any unrest that makes itself felt must be caused by agitators, probably Communists. Filipinos don't love Americans, or hate them either; they do resent them. After having been ruled first by Spaniards, then by Americans and also brutally overrun by Japanese, the only way many Filipinos seem able to express the nationalist fervor they genuinely feel is to resent the United States."

• • •

The "New Republic's" editor notes that "Americans here mutter darkly about 'Communists' when what actually happens is that Filipino nationalist sentiment is coolly inflamed by forces that are concerned with profits. A rising class of Filipino businessmen wants to elbow out foreign capital, especially American, in order to have the exclusive rights to exploit an abundant and intelligent labor force whose members are lucky if they earn as much as \$50 a month. Filipino

capitalists own the newspapers and magazines that feature loud 'left-wing' criticisms of the US."

Campbell concludes: "In spite of their depressing economic situation and appalling politics, Filipinos are cheerful, warmhearted, impulsively generous and essentially optimistic people who tend to believe that they will always manage to muddle through somehow. They are neither pro-Communist nor pro-Chinese. Chances are they will tolerate the American bases for as long as they are supposed to — the agreed date is now 1985 — and may tolerate American business beyond 1974. But in terms of international relations, neither date is really far off, and before either is reached, more Filipinos will be thinking seriously about their place in Asia and their relations with China. US policy ought to be receptive to that. If it isn't, the next demonstrations at the US Embassy in Manila may

be neither small nor decorous."

• • •

Not all of Campbell's remarks may make us happy, but they were made by a veteran observer who covered Asia for several years and lived in Japan for four years, at the end of which he wrote the bestseller, "The Heart of Japan." Perhaps one reason he can write about both Filipinos and Americans with such detachment is that he is a Scotsman, born in Edinburgh in 1912, and a former correspondent of the London "Economists."

His views are intriguing, for they give us an insight into how foreigners see us. They should be equally interesting to Americans here for they were not written by those whom they seek to dismiss as "Little Bungs" or fire-eating nationalists. I don't agree with everything Campbell observed in his article, but one thing can be said — he lets the chips fall where they may. — *Maximo V. Soliven, Manila Times.*

- Besides literary thieves or plagiarists of whom there are many, even among the so-called great in the Philippines, there are also parasites as portrayed here.

LITERARY PARASITES

Few people realize the insuperable problems that meddlers, sycophants and parasites create for the average author. The rich and famous have always been set upon by parasites. "Poor but proud" people beg money outright from Edison, Ford and Rockefeller, while *soidisant* prodigies send manuscripts to successful authors for free criticism. There is not much to choose between these two evils: the first picks the philanthropist's pockets, the second the author's brains.

Intrusions by letter are the commonest impositions; verbal requests for various favors follow a close second, and there are a hundred other insidious forms. Once in a blue moon the author will receive an anonymous letter expressing delight at his latest book and asking for nothing in return. But such letters are rare as unexpected checks. Most let-

ters are not even worth the time required to open and discard them. Here is one. After a number of shallow compliments, the lady writer comes to her real motive:

Therefore, I would love to receive a personal reply from you, if you please. Of course, I realize that I am merely a stranger to you, but your answer would be doing me a very great honor indeed! Unless you consider them too personal, please answer the following questions: Which do you consider the greater influence — heredity or environment? Why? How can one face the death of a beloved one if reason forbids one to believe in immortality? What are the titles of your favorite books, and who are your favorite authors? Which of your own poems do you favor, and why? What are your hobbies? What is your philosophy of life? What do you consider the world needs

most in order to make it a better place in which to live? What would you say, is the greatest thing in life?

There are three chief reasons for these impositions on authors. The first is the patronizing attitude. The public is all too inclined to feel that the author is its toy, that he exists by its whim and tolerance. The second reason is the hero-worshipping attitude. The famous man always has been in the public eye and consciousness, and by some curious twist, the world elects him godfather. He should feel pleased at being made much of!

The third reason centers around the author's unsystematic life. Consider the average writer — he has no office, no office hours, no secretary. Why should his time not be at the disposal of you and me and our grandmothers? If he is without means — and poets are no longer supported by patrons of art — he cannot afford a buffer. All too easily taken in by the clamor of these "lost and distracted souls," he surrenders his time and services.

Consider the plight of the hapless author who sits down to breakfast and finds a mountain of letters. Why should he not grow perceptibly inhuman as he reads? He is swamped with requests for inscribed books from librarians in North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Maine. (Each state has libraries for colored people, sailors, consumptives. Old Ladies' Homes, convicts, for the newly converted, etc.) Requests come in to, write a preface for a hopeless book of verse; requests for his autograph, his photograph; his favorite poem, story or novel; requests to criticize a rejected manuscript; urgent notes to lend his name to charities, movements, causes, which publicity-stunt devotees assure him will bring great prestige. He is asked won't he please copy out his favorite work in longhand for Susie Bean's scrapbook; won't he please write letters of introduction to other celebrities in the interests of a prospective editorial job; he is asked to judge short story contests and award prizes — a privilege generally ending in polite massacre.

If he is an anthologist, so much the worse for him. His throat is cut by indignant champions of an omitted author. Why is Lydia Conchshell from Keokak, Iowa, omitted? Friends press him to do an obituary of a fellow poet, an assignment which by comparison leaves death itself without a sting. "Shy" literary acquaintances request him to review their first effort, which means favorably, of course; after which the review will be used as a publisher's blurb.

England can testify to what havoc autograph collectors have reduced banks. Creditors who received checks signed by Shaw, Galsworthy, Hardy and other notables, would neglect cashing them, hoping for a bullish autograph market. When a bearish market came along, hundreds of these checks would suddenly be dumped on the bank cashiers. To outwit these pests, such checks are now signed by the authors' secretaries.

Elsie Singmaster's mail staggers her afresh each morning. "Dear Madam," she read one morning, "Mr. daughter has written a very

good story which was published in her High School Magazine. She does not intend to pursue a literary life, having good matrimonial prospects. Do you want to make an offer for the plot of her story for your own use? Answer, stating price you will pay, and I will forward story if price is high enough."

Although Gamaliel Bradford insists he has not yet lost the zest that comes from having a charming woman (as to the charm he is willing to give her the benefit of the doubt) ask for his autograph or photograph, he is annoyed when the petitioner neglects to enclose postage. Booth Tarkington says that if he answered all the mail he receives, he would not have time to do anything

"My troubles as an author," testifies Thornton Burgess, "are nothing as compared with the flood of letters that come to me as a naturalist, because of my radio broadcasts. Apparently I am supposed to be a living encyclopedia. One correspondent says, 'I have a white albino, I would like your opinion of them.' An-

other lady asks me to send her a cure for rheumatism. . . ."

Arthur Stringer makes moan over an abomination that will find a large answering chorus: "A new and growing evil," he says, "which seems to be encouraged by English teachers in public schools, is the pest of school children writing for autographs and life sketches, because they are 'studying' a certain author."

Bertrand Russell writes: "In common with other authors, I suffer a good deal from persons who think that an author ought to do their work for them. Apart from autograph hunters, I get large numbers of letters from persons who wish me to copy out for them the appropriate entry in *Who's Who*, or ask me my opinion on points which I have fully discussed in print. I get many letters from Hindus, beseeching me to adopt some form of mysticism; from young Ameri-

cans, asking me where I think the line should be drawn in petting; and from Poles, urging me to admit that while all other nationalism may be bad, that of Poland is wholly noble. I get letters from engineers who cannot understand Einstein, and from persons who think I cannot understand Genesis, and from husbands whose wives have deserted them — not (they say) that would matter, but the wives have taken the furniture with them, and what in these circumstances should an enlightened male do? I get letters trying to get me to advocate abortion, and I get letters from young mothers asking my opinions of bottle-feeding.

Little wonder that an author comes to look upon these parasites as something worse than charity-seekers. They interfere with his work and embitter him into the bargain. — *By Clarico Lorenz Aiken, Condensed from the Bookman (June, '30)*

■ Here is a brief sketch of the life of a Filipino intellectual.

TEODORO KALAW

Students of contemporary history remember him as an intellectual leader who was in the forefront of the campaign for Philippine independence. As close adviser to presidents Quezon and Osmeña, Kalaw was an active participant in the epoch-making events especially during the first two decades up to the Commonwealth period.

Kalaw's intellectual leadership can be traced to as far back as his student days. He attended the Escuela Pia, Escuela de Latinidad, Colegio de San Juan de Letran, Instituto de Rizal and Liceo de Manila where he won honors in all academic subjects and most medals for scholastic excellence.

At 13, in Letran, Kalaw obtained "sobresaliente" in all courses. In all these schools Kalaw showed early promise of becoming a great writer and leader. After graduating with high honors from the Liceo, Kalaw took

up law in the Escuela de Derecho, the first Filipino College of Law, where he was graduated at the age of 21. He became the college director later.

At 23, Kalaw was offered the editorship of *El Renacimiento*, the most influential newspaper at the time. With him in the staff were such literary luminaries as Fidel Reyes, Claro M. Recto, Pedro Aunario, Jesus Balmori, Manuel Bernabe and others.

At 26, as an elected representative from the third district of Batangas to the Philippine Assembly, his most important contributions were those creating the Commission on Independence and reorganizing the executive departments of the government. The first measure was in preparation of the Philippines for self-rule, and the second was for creation of the positions of cabinet undersecretaries to serve as link and effect continuity of department functions often

disturbed by change of political climate.

At 33, Kalaw was appointed undersecretary and three years later succeeded Rafael Palma as secretary of the interior. During the two-year period from 1923 to 1925, he was made executive secretary and chief adviser of the Commission on Independence. The years from 1929 to 1939 was his longest continuous service in one office, when he was appointed director of the National Library. His predecessors were such eminent scholars as Epifanio de los Santos, Macario Adriatico and Dr. Pardo de Tavera. Long before this, in 1916, Kalaw had a short stint as the Library director for one year.

Among his works were: *Hacia la Tierra del Czar*; *La Constitucion de Malolos*; *El Devorcio en Filipinas*; *La Ideas Politicas de la Revolucion Filipina*; *Principios de Vida Social*; *Teorias Constitucionales*; *Como se Puedo Mejorar Nuestra Legislacion*;

El Plan Constitucional de la Revolucion Filipina; *El Ideario Politico de Mabini*; *Manuel de Ciencia Politica*; *La Masoneria Filipina*; *La Revolucion Filipina*; *Court Martial of Andres Bonifacio*; *La Compania del Coumintang*, *Dietario Espiritual*; *Gregorio del Pilar*; *Las Cartas Politicas de Mabini*; *El Espiritu de la Revolucion*, *Cinco Reglas de Nuestra Moral Antigua*, and *Aide-de-Camp to Freedom*, his autobiography, translated from the Spanish by his daughter Senator Maria Kalaw Katigbak and published by the Teodoro M. Kalaw Society.

Retana, that famous Rizal biographer, in praise of *Hacia La Tierra del Czar*, a book written by Kalaw after and about his trip to Russia, said: "The chief characteristic of Kalaw is his virility. . . his spirited ingenuity. Kalaw, as no other writer of his country, has that first requisite, an artistic temperament. . ." — V. G. Suarez in *Manila Bulletin*.

■ This effective method of teaching young children should be learned by Filipinos.

INTRODUCING THE MONTESSORI SCHOOL IN THE PHILIPPINES

Sending your child to a Montessori School, it is said, is watching him make what Newsweek calls "an intellectual leap."

Substantial claims have been raised about the concentration of psychologists and educators on teenagers and children above six years. In recent years, however, the picture has change. In the United States, there is a "re-awakening" to the "intellectual potential of early childhood education." In coincidence with this shock of recognition is the surge of Montessori schools. The popularity of the Montessori methods which are well on the way to being adapted and applied in various countries, including the Philippines, stems from the emphasis on the development of the intellect of the child in as early as two-and-a-half years old.

"Let the doctors and nurses worry about vita-

mins," Dr. Maria Montessori, founder, used to say. Teachers, she said, should concentrate on the intellectual development of the child.

The Montessori plan is based on the belief that the first six years of the child are the explosive period for assimilation, and how much mental development occurs within this period determines the performance of the child when he enters the university and his achievement in life in general. With the use of a special program of activities and sensorial materials, called "launching pad to abstract learning" and for which Dr. Maria Montessori, founder is noted for, Montessori teachers guide the kids in understanding the "complicated and confusing" world of adults.

Manila and rural areas will soon have their own Montessori schools with the establishment of a Montes-

sori center which will train teachers (and parents as well) on the famous system. A project of Operation Brotherhood International, the Center is directed by Mrs. Preciosa Soliven, who has recently returned from an observation and study program at the international centers in Peruvia (Italy) and London, under grants from the Italian Government and British Council, respectively. The teachers in turn will put up Montessori schools in the various O.B. project sites. Mrs. Soliven is currently conducting a model class consisting of 3-6 year-old children of OBI personnel and friends, and her nephews and nieces.

The model class at first glance looks no different from another nursery class. Toys, furniture, equipment are miniature; there are songs, games, rhymes, storytelling and refreshment breaks. What makes it different Mrs. Soliven says, are the individual attention given each child, followed by collective attention as soon as he gets adjusted to the group, and the sensorial apparatus.

In a word, a Montessori school is a "school-house." Here tots see and feel their homes (they iron and wash clothes, sweep the floor, twist door knobs, pour water, carry flower pots); through sensorial apparatus, they distinguish different sounds, surfaces, and forms. They have botany, arithmetic, geography, language. Mrs. Soliven stresses, lest that scares you, that the method is not to teach the child to read or write, but to prepare him for these subjects through simple approaches. In language, for instance, the kids know that words have specific sounds. They learn to hold a pencil, identify leaves, for mental pictures of countries on the map. They start to count.

The cultural activities, (botany, geography, science), says Mrs. Soliven, "are the keys to the bigger universe. You can't put the whole world before the child so you give him a globe. You can't show him the whole forest, so give him a leaf."

The Montessori school was started by Dr. Maria Montessori 70 years ago when, working with mental-

ly retarded children, she employed her own sensory materials which resulted in the kids' passing a test conducted along with normal children, with better grades. When her program was used among normal children, the achievement speed was double. Dr. Montessori then was assigned by the Italian government to work with slum areas, where children spontaneously and naturally worked with her materials. An advocate of individual freedom, she was in conflict with Mussolini. She fled to Spain where she organized a Montessori teachers training institute in Barcelona, then established another in Holland, (now run by her son Mario) and commuted for lectures to London and Germany. The method reached the United States eventually, wavered in the 1930's due to the popularity of the progressive method but picked up seven years ago and has since then enjoyed immense popularity.

Mrs. Soliven, who taught for four years in Mrs. Telly

Albert Zulueta's kindergarten in San Lorenzo village prior to her trip to Europe, said Montessori methods are applicable everywhere.

"The child is universal. The only difference is where you find him, where he is born. During the first six years, children absorb mannerisms of their parents and of people, the way they laugh, their accent. At six, they are able to absorb the culture and religion of the country. So in practical life, we give them what is found in the Philippines. Instead of a vacuum cleaner or a mop, we use the *walis*. We use the *batya*. Ideally, we should use Tagalog, but since we are preparing our kids in this class for English, then we use English."

Mrs. Soliven is holding a class for parents and teachers in May and June, after which she ~~and~~ will start her Teachers' Training class, which is open to college graduates, preferably, A.B., majoring in home economics, psychology, and child study. — *Dominic M. Torre Villas in Manila Bulletin*.

- A Filipino woman is here presented whose energy, objectivity, and ability have made possible the gradual development of a sort of an Asian Nobel Prize in this part of the world.

THE LEADER IN THE MAGSAYSAY AWARD

For a number of months each year, an attractive Filipina with laughing but discerning eyes goes sleuthing around Asia — from Afghanistan to Japan — in the finest fashion of Scotland Yard.

But unlike Scotland Yard detectives who are usually out for criminals, Miss Belen Abreu scouts for spirit of service akin to the late President Magsaysay from anyone, anywhere in Asia — be he a highland eye doctor, a woman educator, a labor leader or merely a prime minister.

As executive trustee of the Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation, Miss Abreu is charged with the responsibility of examining on the spot the nominations for the coveted Ramon Magsaysay Award. Her findings and the material she gathers about nominees become the

basis for the deliberations and final decision of the seven-member board of trustees.

Belen Abreu's ability to distinguish chaff from the grain — an oftentimes painstakingly difficult job as the chaff is frequently almost as good as the grain — has resulted in a consistently high quality of awardees since 1958. Today the R.M. Award has come to be known as the Asian Nobel prize.

As the "workhorse" of the foundation's board of trustees, Belen is its prime mover, it is she who gives direction and *esprit* to the foundation's activities which promise to branch out in diversified intellectual endeavours with the completion of the 14-storey Ramon Magsaysay center soon.

Among the projects envisioned by the foundation are the expansion of the Ramon Magsaysay Asian Library to

50,000 volumes, making it the largest library of its kind in the country, the Vital Issues Series, a sustained series of studies on national problems and the Magsaysay Papers and Memorabilia.

At present, Miss Abreu is busy with her pet project in raising funds for the construction and establishment of the RM center. The fund campaign, headed by Col. Nicanor T. Jimenez, seeks maximum involvement of the barrio people in whose selfless service the late beloved Chief Executive made his greatest mark.

The fact that a woman should shoulder this varied responsibility is no wonder at all in Belen's case, for she has brought to the job long years of training in responsible positions, intense personal discipline, a good head and single-minded devotion — qualities exceptional even in the supposedly more efficient male sex. This combination of assets has drawn unqualified praise from admirers here and abroad.

Belen's training had its roots in her early years in Mexico, Pampanga. Her father, Apolinar Abreu, a

teacher of the old-school type, was a firm believer in the value of higher education and personal discipline and sought to instill this belief in his children. As a young girl, Belen wanted to study stenography instead of playing with other young girls soon after elementary school. In high school, this knowledge of stenography fared her well: summer vacations saw her working as secretary to the representatives of pre-war American companies such as General Motors and United Steel. Years later, studying for a degree in public administration in New York University, Belen supported herself by accepting typing jobs for her American classmates at the standard rate of 25 cents a page.

After high school, she decided to take up law in U.P. which was interrupted, however, by the war. She took the bar immediately after the war, garnering a grade of over 90. During the war years, she assisted at the U.P.'s Marina Institute, a free school for poor but deserving students organized by the U.P. Alumni and

named in honor of Commissioner Jorge Vargas' wife, Marina. Belen taught stenography for free. From her secretarial jobs she moved on to the Commission on Elections as a stenographer.

In the Comelec she fell under bosses steeped in the old school who, as she loves to relate to her staff, "would throw a piece of typewritten job in your face when it doesn't come up to their standards." She disliked them for it then, but soon discovered that she was the better for that kind of training. Doubtless she developed her keen sense of perfectionism from them.

From stenographer, Miss Abreu rose to become chief attorney of the Commission on Elections. In that job, she was in charge of setting the machinery of elections in motion, following strict timetables which could not be disrupted without causing nationwide repercussions. It involved everything, from the simplest mechanical preparation of election forms to actual troubleshooting. Belen Abreu's name for years was on the lips of every Comelec worker in the country.

In the commission, Belen's good mind and sound judgment became her staple stock and politicians learned to rely on her for advice. At present, years after she has left the commission, senators and congressmen still run to her during election quandaries.

In 1957, the Rockefellers, shopping around for an executive trustee for the newly organized foundation, quickly signed her up for a nine-year contract which was renewed in 1965. Belen Abreu had not known Ramon Magsaysay personally, but she had tremendous admiration for his performance in keeping the 1951 elections clean and for his program of government.

As executive trustee of the foundation she puts in regularly more than ten hours a day; during the March and August seasons, the death and birth anniversaries of the late President Magsaysay, she would ordinarily pack an 18-hour day, only to go home for a quick shower and come back fresh and about her work. Her young female staff members (the foundation has an all-girl staff)

feel squeamish about leaving at five on the dot, for their boss never leaves that early, not even when sick. Arriving for a long trip abroad, it isn't surprising to find Belen catching a taxi at the airport and heading straight for the office, bags and all. Sundays usually find her making a quick trip to the office before proceeding to her farm in Tanay, Rizal. The foundation's peekaboo efficiency, particularly during the climatic month of August, the award season, makes outsiders wonder, especially when they find out how small the actual working staff is. At present, no ceremony of Malacañang or the department of foreign affairs could quite equal the flawlessness of a Ramon Magsaysay Award ceremony.

A lioness for efficiency, Belen has cultivated intense personal discipline over the years. Her large spacious home on Samar avenue, Quezon City, is spotlessly clean, "like a hotel before the occupants arrive," as one staff member described it. The gardens are well-attended under her personal supervision. About her person,

she is neat and well-groomed, rather than stylish and fashionable, although she can be so when she chooses to be. Every morning she takes her "constitutional walk" around the block before breakfast and then drives herself to work in Malate. When weight problems begin to slow her down, it is time to take up her hula lessons at the YMCA. She recently took to modern dancing and her skills are usually displayed during office parties. Physical exercise is usually accompanied by disciplined dieting, consisting of meat without any seasoning and some boiled greens.

Gifted with a quick and curious mind which reaches out in long-range projections, Miss Abreu has strong opinions about almost anything, from vocational education to the Luneta beautification project of the First Lady. Once, passing in front of the St. Jude church on J. P. Laurel street, she commented unfavorably about the way vendors have made a marketplace of the place of worship. Her female companion remarked that this was part of the Filipino way

of life and that these vendors had become an institution for the children. Whereupon she turned around and exclaimed with full conviction: "But we have changed our way of life if we are to progress. Nor everything that is part of our way of life is good for us."

A mind as lively as hers needs sustenance, and Belen manages to insert at least an hour before retiring for the day to catch up on her reading. The leading Asian dai-

lies are part of her reading material. To encourage intellectual curiosity in her staff, she initiated an office practice whereby staff members report on a book or a periodical of their choice on a rotation basis, one report per week.

It is a tribute to Belen that male professionals of high standing regard her as a peer. — *B. Olivares-Cunanan, Manila Bulletin, Mar. 20, 1966.*

LOW RATING OF POLITICIANS

The man who can make two ears of corn, or two blades of grass, grow on the spot where only one grew before, would deserve better of mankind, and render more essential service to the country, than the whole race of politicians put together. — *Swift.*

PIONEER IN COOPERATIVES

Tomas V. Confesor served so well his country both in times of peace and war that his people could live contentedly, honorably and democratically. In peace he was an economist, educator and statesman; in war he was a provincial executive and the fiery resistance hero.

Born in Cabatuan, Iloilo, on March 2, 1891, Confesor was one of the three sons of the couple, *Maestro* Julian Confesor and Prospera Valenzuela. Although at times he had to subsist solely on bananas and sweet potatoes because of poverty, he graduated with honors from the Iloilo high school in 1908.

After teaching for one year, Confesor left for the United States of America where he scrubbed floors, washed dishes and dusted window panes to support his studies in the University of California where he received the degree of bachelor of philosophy in economics in 1914.

Upon his return Confesor was appointed the school supervisor for the district of Jaro in Iloilo. In 1922 he was elected the representative of Iloilo's third district in the Philippine Legislature where he distinguished himself as the "Stormy Petrel of the House" because of his consistent crusade against corruption in the government. He was twice re-elected.

With his sponsorship Act 3425, popularly known as the Cooperatives Marketing Law, Confesor boosted the cooperative movement in the Philippines. As a result farmers all over the country began forming marketing and producer cooperative associations. Governor General Dwight F. Davis regarded him as an "economic wizard."

Governor General Theodore Roosevelt Jr. designated Confesor the first Filipino director of commerce in 1933, while President Manuel L. Quezon named him the head

of the National Cooperatives Administration. He organized credit associations and agricultural cooperatives which "liberated many farmers from loan sharks and unscrupulous traders."

In 1935 Confesor was elected as delegate from Iloilo to the Constitutional Convention that drafted the Constitution of the Philippines, and at the same time the assemblyman from the third district of Iloilo to the first National Assembly under the Commonwealth government. He won the governorship of Iloilo in 1937.

Confesor was serving his second gubernatorial term when the Japanese invaded the Philippines in 1941. He was offered a cabinet post in their puppet government, but he turned it down. Following his refusal to cooperate, the enemy repeatedly raided his Manila home. So he escaped on a sailboat to Iloilo.

Immediately Quezon named Confesor the wartime

governor of Free Panay and Romblon. He then organized the civil resistance movement and as its head went underground as he openly defied the entire might of the Japanese imperial forces. As a guerrilla leader he preferred to "suffer in honor than to enjoy life in ignominy."

For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service to his country during World War II, Confesor was decorated by President Sergio Osmeña with the Philippine Legion of Honor, degree of commander, in January 1945 in Leyte.

Following the liberation of the Philippines that year (1945), Confesor was appointed the secretary of the interior in the reconstituted Commonwealth government by Osmeña. The following year he was elected to the Senate but died of heart attack on June 6, 1951, without completing his six-year term. — *Abstracted from Manila Times.*

- This is a privileged speech delivered by Congressman Aquino before the House of Representatives March 21, 1966. Being a logger himself, he defends his side.

OF FORESTS, FLOODS, AND THE TIMBER INDUSTRY

A great misconception has swept the minds of many of our people on the subject. They blame those who produce dollars for our economy out of our timber resources, for many ills due to other causes.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time the mistaken notion on floods and forests be ended. It is for this reason that today I have decided to take the floor for a vital industry.

The timber industry is a relatively new industry. It was only in the middle of the '1950's that our country has found a thriving market for our wood products abroad. In such market, it has strong competition. As an infant industry therefore, it needs earnest and sustained government support.

Not so many, Mr. Speaker, have succeeded in taking off from the crude manner of utilizing our timber resources

to mechanized process. For one to be successful, he must be backed up by adequate capital. For capital to be adequate, it must be substantial.

Such requisite for an industry to grow has imposed on those engaged to sink lifetime earnings, millions of pesos in their ventures. They face big risks and hazards. But they contribute immensely to the nation's economy.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the timber industry, in a little over 10 years, has grown to the third biggest dollar earning export industry of the country. Credit its growth to the enterprise of those who succeeded in the business. Credit it, to the labors and sacrifices of those who have cast their lot in the industry; credit it to their daring, their sustained effort, their capacity for hardships, and to their tenacity and de-

termination to succeed in life. Credit such success to the vast experience they harnessed and to their outlook in business, economics and management.

To those who pioneered in the industry and succeeded should go the honor and laurels in having transformed our timber resources which lay idle and prostrate and without utility for centuries into dollar resources, into economic goods, into money circulated for economic growth and for the good life and advancement of our people and of the nation.

However, on the other side of the ledger, Mr. Speaker, the industry and those engaged in it are heaped with endless blame for the wanton and criminal destruction of our forests. Those in the industry are blamed for the tragedy brought by typhoons and floods, and for almost anything which causes harassment to our national patrimony.

Justice and fairness demand utmost caution, Mr. Speaker, for many have hazard and advanced erroneous conclusions destructive to the industry. Many have

poisoned the minds of our people that the industry has caused national catastrophe. Those in this preoccupation have maligned, impaired, and degraded the good name of an industry which brings tremendous benefits to our people. They do not realize, that anything destructive to the industry is destructive to our economy. It is doubly destructive to the nation and its leadership.

It all started perhaps, with the layman's sharp approach to mass psychology, that a belief has firmed up on the effects of forestal cutting on the flow of floods. Such belief, baseless as it is in fact and in truth, has been so articulated that at the drop of a hat, the timber industry gets the ax. Even our media of information has been carried to the conclusion that it spells disaster.

I wish to clear this misconception, Mr. Speaker, I wish to do justice to the industry and, on the basis of scientific findings shatter to pieces the notion that the timber industry is the reason for floods, for damages to life and property, for des-

truction of our much valued watersheds.

The Republic of the Philippines has not done much in this particular line of study, but long years of scientific study and research in the United States has elicited the following findings.

According to the findings of Kittredge at the time director of the US Weather Bureau and a ranking member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, in his book entitled, "Forest Influences," deforestation or reforestation do not affect considerably the water flow of streams or rivers. In no occasion, Kittredge stated, has reforestation appeared as a method of flood control. Conversely, the authority added, it cannot be alleged that deforestation causes floods.

These findings of Kittredge was supported by the findings of Col. H. M. Chittenden of the US Corps of Engineers, also an influential member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Colonel Chittenden, in a paper submitted to the American Society of Civil Engineers, entitled: "Forests

and Reservoirs in their relation to stream flow, with particular reference to navigable rivers," stated in his findings that forests have no material influence on stream flow.

This conclusion of Colonel Chittenden was subsequently supported by a report of the Special Committee on Flood Prevention of American Society of Civil Engineers. In a report submitted to the Society on its findings, the Special Committee on Flood Prevention pointed out that even advocates of reforestation as a means of flood control failed to give any quantitative determination on effects of forests upon floods.

Again, these findings of the American Society of Civil Engineers' Special Committee on Flood Prevention, was corroborated by the late Allen Hazen, another reputable member of the society, who, after extensive and meticulous investigation has reached the same conclusion.

These findings, Mr. Speaker, are beyond question by laymen like us. Unless further scientific studies and research show otherwise, it is only fair and just and reasonable that we submit our-

selves to the binding effect of what has been found true and valid conclusions. It is such a valuable document which should be preserved for policy guidance, for which reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask that same be included, in the proceedings, as part of my speech.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that there has been wanton and criminal destruction of certain forest areas. But certainly, such criminal acts were not and are not committed by legitimate loggers. They who invest millions in the timber industry want it to stay and grow. They have taken leadership in the economic field and have nurtured the industry to the third biggest dollar earning export of the country.

But take the kaingineros, Mr. Speaker, they ravage our forests and do not even contribute to the coffers of the State. They do not pay taxes. They invest no capital. And there are the pirates of the trade who, without permit or license, and against the regulations, invade our forestal zones and destroy the trees indiscriminately. They are not legi-

itimate operators, Mr. Speaker, they are enemies of public good and public interest. They are also enemies of loggers whose good name and business they destroy. For, most often, they are being mistaken for loggers. And they have aroused public hatred, indignation and condemnation against those righteously engaged in the industry.

The kaingineros and the pirates of the logging industry, who do not care to what will happen to our patrimony, deserve severe penalty. They should be metted heavier penalty, and our laws should provide more punishment against these sinister group who dastardly destroy our forests.

In justice to the Bureau of Forestry and the Department of Agriculture, and the personnel who comprise the working forces of these agencies, we cannot blame them for the rampant denudation of our forest areas. They lack the force that can execute effectively our forest laws and regulations. They also lack funds enough to cover program of effective enforcement. These agen-

cies, Mr. Speaker, need more fiscal support to employ men adequate to apply forest laws and regulations and enforce them.

The loggers, Mr. Speaker, also deserve government assistance. They need more credit facilities. They desire more sound policy on forest exploitation and utilization so that they can employ sound planning and programming of their operations. It is now our duty in Congress to provide this, Mr. Speaker.

To discourage squatters and kaingineros from ravaging our forest resources, they should be relocated. Vast and fertile lands along opened roads and highways in Mindanao and other places of the country are lying idle. They have been cleared and made ready for cultivation. But they are still, in our records of government, classified as forest lands. Many have squatted on and cultivated these areas. But they cannot call these land their own. The release of these areas, Mr. Speaker, to those who have established possession and have made improvements on them will help lo-

cate squatters and kaingineros. Giving them lands they can call their own may prevent them from destroying our forests zones. It is high time, therefore, that our forest classification be updated.

The Administration, Mr. Speaker, is committed to a program which will provide more incentive and encouragement to the processing of wood products. This is very laudable. I fully agree with President Ferdinand Marcos, and I completely endorse his commitment to the wood industry in his State of the Nation Address and I quote—

The promotion of the wood production industry by lifting the percentage tax on all domestic sales of logs for manufacture or production into wood products and by imposing a tax on all foreign sales of logs. We have the necessary capacity and potential for producing veneer, plywood, wood pulp and other wood products for export. If there be a necessity for setting up new wood processing factories or expanding existing ones, a portion of the increment from this tax policy shall be made available as loans for finan-

cing these industries. It is indeed incongruous that by our expensive logging exports are provided foreign competition of our wood products with the valuable raw materials which makes strong competition possible — unquote. To this, I add that circular sawmills should be discouraged by reason of the small recovery made on raw materials.

The loggers, want a new light of day in business. Mr. Speaker, that is why, it is the desire of both entrepreneurs and investors in the logging business that the Bureau of Forestry be headed by one of experience. It's director must be seasoned in forestry matters. He must understand the logging business and the mechanics of logging operations. The Director of Forestry must also have the capacity to anticipate problems which may come the way of the industry.

A limit to the cutting of timber, in order to preserve our patrimony, deserves support. Such limit is needed in order that we can carry on for a long time the supply of the best mahogany in the world market. Limit to

timber cutting must also be coupled with sustained conservation and reforestation. Our source of raw material supply and of our valuable dollar earnings must be conserved if not augmented.

This underscores the need for selective logging, Mr. Speaker, and, with the policy to encourage wood processing to realize more dollar earnings from our wood products should be a policy of long-term license grant to wood processors. It is in keeping with sound policy, to discourage short-term grant of licenses to loggers. It only impels fly-by-night operators to rush accumulation of profit. As a consequence, they often disregard regulations. They labor on the fear that next time their licenses will not be renewed or extended. This stifles investment, Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, long-term licenses affords them sound planning. It gives them boldness in investment for they can find stability in operations and foresee more guarantee of return of capital and of profit.

This forum, Mr. Speaker, must bring realization to

the truth. Let us not entertain fear that the cutting of big trees in our forests will cause us less water supply or that such cutting will cause deluge or big floods. Let us not labor under a mistaken notion, a misconception that the loggers have caused undue depletion of our patrimony. Let us submit to the scientific findings of authorities who made studies in the field.

Let us wage a bigger campaign against the kaingineros

and the pirates for they comprise the group of men who philander our forests. Let us put more teeth to policy involving the wood industry. Let us line up measures which can firm up these ends. Let us prevent reckless destruction of our forests as we give incentive and encouragement to wood processing. Those engaged in this industry deserve added support from the Government. — *By Rep. Jose C. Aquino.*

MENTAL DECAY THRU INDOLENCE

The failure of the mind in old age is often less the result of natural decay than of disuse. — Ambition has ceased to operate; contentment breeds indolence, and indolence decay of mental power, ennui, and sometimes death. — Men have been known to die, literally speaking, of disease induced by intellectual vacancy. — *Sir B. Brodie.*

- English is indispensable if we plan to learn the science, the technology, and culture of America, England, and other English speaking countries.

ENGLISH AND FILIPINO

Can users of English who do not think in English, use English effectively and with profit? Do those who obtain their education through medium of English and yet do not think in English, profit to the full with what they are supposed to have learned? Heretofore, pupils and students were forced to think in English by making them use English all the time, so that they could profit to the full with the education that they were getting through medium of English. Is this still being done in our schools?

Advocates of the propagation and use of Pilipino all over our country would recommend the use of Pilipino in our educational system instead of English. This would be all right if our only aim in education is to propagate and hold on to Filipino culture. But if we would learn, in addition, about the strength and wisdom of other people, if we

would study their culture and more so their science and technology, we must do so through the medium of their respective languages. Translation is almost impossible and practically useless. Consequently, those who would study Spanish culture could do so best through the study and the use of Spanish. Those who would study English culture, science and technology, America's and England's particularly, could do so adequately only by studying English well and using it fully. And this is what we are trying to do. But our efforts will fall short of desirable levels if we do not do our thinking in English as we use it in our schools. And we cannot use English effectively in our daily pursuits if we cannot readily think in it. This we can only do by using English all the time, except when we are studying and delving in things innately Philippine. — Domingo G. Ampil, *Sta. Ana, Manila.*

- This memorable speech delivered by Senator Claro M. Recto at the Philippine Columbian Club, on the 75th birthday anniversary of President Manuel L. Quezon is a remarkable analysis of the political life and genius of Quezon as compared to the record of his successors of today.

THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF MANUEL L. QUEZON

I have been asked to speak to you tonight on the political philosophy of Manuel Luis Quezon. If by political philosophy we mean a system of integrated principles consistently followed as a guide for political action, then Manuel Luis Quezon had none. As I recall our association in the past, both as habitual antagonists and as occasional allies, that is the only conclusion at which I can honestly arrive, and it finds support in his own autobiography, *The Good Fight*.

No slight is meant by this assertion upon his illustrious memory. As a politician, Quezon was, first and foremost, a realist and there is nothing wrong with a politician being a realist. On the contrary, politics is one struggle theorists can hardly survive. Senator Tañada's Citizens will do well to ponder on this eternal truth.

I was saying that Quezon had no political philosophy, practiced or avowed. If he had a philosophy, it was empiricism in its most rudimentary and instinctive form. In any particular political situation, Quezon did what was politically useful and convenient, whether or not it was consistent with any preconceived and formal program of action. He was a good fighter, and, above all, a master political strategist and tactician whose consuming and overriding objective was victory.

Every politician, if he is to be successful, must be an opportunist in the better sense of the term, and Quezon, the consummate politician, knew best of all how to take advantage of every opportunity. That is not implying that he was unprincipled. He believed in repre-

sentative democracy, and, I shall show later on, preserved and guarded the electoral processes with loyalty and sincerity. He believed in our political independence, in the historic destiny of the Malayan race to which it was his pride publicly to proclaim that he belonged, and built his entire career on the ideal of nationalism.

But these beliefs, these convictions, these principles — if you wish to call them that —, did not and could not provide him with a political philosophy, distinctly his own. Every Filipino was for democracy and a republican form of government. Every Filipino was for independence and national sovereignty. After the death of the "Partido Federal", which occurred before the elections for the First Philippine Assembly, the political battles of his time were fought, not upon these issues, which could not divide the nation, but upon the rivalry, more or less concealed, for factional power and personal leadership. In those circumstances a political philosophy was unnecessary; it might even be a disadvantage.

Thus Quezon was pro-American when the American administration was favorable to his party and to his leadership, and anti-American when it was not. He was pro-American under the Wilson administration and its Quezon-made representative in the Philippines, Governor Francis Burton Harrison; he was anti-American under the Republican administrations of Coolidge and Hoover and their rugged pro-consul here, General Leonard Wood; and he was pro-American once more under the Democratic administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his faithful vicar in Manila, our beloved Frank Murphy.

When he quarrelled with Governor General Wood, he announced dramatically his preference for a government run like hell by Filipinos — a desire, I might observe, that at long last has been satisfied — to a government run like heaven by Americans, and accused his political opponents, the Democrats, of cooperating with the Americans against the true interests of the nation. But having won his point and elected Ramon Fernandez

over Juan Sumulong in a special poll in the old 4th senatorial district of Manila, Rizal, Laguna and Bataan, he promptly proceeded to cooperate with General Wood's apparently more complaisant successors, like the aristocratic Governor Stimson, whom he proclaimed the best Governor-General the Philippines ever had.

His party was brought to national power by the slogan of "Immediate, Absolute, and Complete Independence," but, when he was resident commissioner in Washington, eager to return home with a personal triumph, he endorsed and won congressional and presidential approval for the Jones Bill, which made independence contingent upon the vague condition of the establishment of a stable government, and later he again gave his support to the Fairfield Bill, which provided for independence at the end of a 25-year transition period.

We are still familiar with the historic controversy over the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Bill. Quezon secured its rejection by the Philippine Legislature because he foresaw correctly

that his political leadership would be threatened by Osmeña and Roxas, who had obtained the approval of the independence act in the American Congress. He excoriated the bill as a fraud, denounced the retention of American bases as an intolerable infringement on our future sovereignty, and foretold the darkest calamities if Independence were accepted upon its terms.

But when he himself brought back in triumph the Tydings-McDuffie Act, he proclaimed it to be entirely satisfactory although it did not differ in any essential from the bill he had so vehemently assailed.

This was, in my considered judgment, the finest hour of his long political career. The Hare-Hawes-Cutting bill had been maneuvered through the United States Congress only with the greatest difficulty, to the extent of that Congress repassing it over the veto of President Hoover. Osmeña and Roxas had powerful friends in the American Congress, and Roxas was so sure Quezon would never be able to secure another independence act after the re-

jection of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting bill, that he publicly promised to go on bended knees to the pier and kiss Quezon's foot if the latter succeeded in doing so.

It was a challenge that no one, perhaps not Quezon himself, believed could be met. But Quezon, ever the realist and empiricist, raised here a fund of about half a million pesos, and by judiciously expending it in Washington performed the political miracle of the decade by securing the enactment of a new independence bill: the Tydings-McDuffie.

With such masterful and spell-binding victories, what did Quezon care if some disgruntled enemies accused him of inconsistency? He was a political philosophy unto himself. He must have drawn inspiration from those Whigs in the early years of the English Parliament, who, in the words of Maurois, showed "a ceremonious respect for the Crown even when they were dethroning kings", and who could "advance the most daring ideas in the most archaic style, and utter the word democracy with an aristocratic drawl."

It is about time that we scrap the legend that Quezon was a sincere and a frank, brutally frank, politician. It was the silliest, shallowest judgment ever passed upon that great man. It does him an injustice, because it charges him with naivete, the worst insult to a brilliant and skillful player in the game of power politics. Quezon was a successful politician precisely because he was a master of political intrigue. He knew how to build strong and loyal friendships even among political opponents, but he knew also how to excite envy, distrust, ambition, jealousy, even among his own loyal followers. Many a garden of Eden was lost to the unwary politicians that inhabited them, because of the serpents he quietly let loose and nurtured there. He played Roxas against Osmeña, Yulo and Paredes against Roxas, Sumulong against Montinola, the *Herald* against the *Tribune*, the Alunan group and the *plantadores* against the Yulo group and the *centralistas* in the sugar industry, dominating both by means of the loan-giving and loan-denying

power of the Philippine National Bank. He caused General Mascardo to form his own organization of veterans to counteract the one founded by General Aguinaldo. While Doña Aurora was a fervent and devoted Catholic, he had on his side the Masons and free thinkers, Protestants and Aglipayans, until he himself became a Catholic convert some time before he ran for the Presidency of the Commonwealth. He combined with the Democratras against the Osmeñistas in 1922, and then nimbly abandoned them in the same year and coalesced again with the Osmeñistas to organize the House of Representatives, only to desert the Osmeñistas and again combine with the Democratras in 1934 for the rejection of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law.

If political philosophy requires consistency, then Quezon never allowed it to bother or disturb his plans. When he challenged the leadership of Osmeña, he attacked it as dictatorial, "unipersonalista," and rallied to his side all the discontented members of his party with the pledge of a collective lea-

dership, a leadership that would be "colectivista." But having won his fight, and Osmeña having humbly accepted his defeat, while giving Quezon an oblique lesson in party discipline by relegating himself to the self-described position of a buck private (*ultimo soldado*), Quezon became even more "unipersonalista" than Osmeña, although he concealed his stranglehold on the party with more finesse, contriving to make his followers believe that they themselves were deciding what he had already determined in advance. But, as Disraeli said of Sir Robert Peel, protectionist in the Opposition, free trader on the Treasury Bench, "you must not contrast too strongly the hours of courtship with the years of possession."

In that same struggle for party leadership, Quezon did not hesitate to use the State University as his political forum, and raised the enthusiasm of the students in his favor. But when Roxas, during the Pro-Anti fight, turned the trick against him, he castigated the students for meddling in politics, hotly advised them to stick to their

books, and criticized their mentors for allowing the academic sanctum to be sullied with politics. In those days the rule of decency still prevailed, and Quezon's reproof was sufficient to bring about Rafael Palma's resignation as President of the University of the Philippines.

He made the ringing declaration that his loyalty to his party ended when his loyalty to his country began, in order to justify his revolt against Osmeña. But having established his own leadership he enforced loyalty to party so effectively that no one of his followers thought it could be different from loyalty to country.

And yet his penetrating political intellect sometimes betrayed him. When we were writing the Constitution he was in perfect accord with us that we should provide for a single presidential term of six years, but having been elected president, and having served four of those six years, he allowed himself to be, so to speak, flattered by a group of sycophants into having a constitutional amendment adopted to permit his reelection and lengthen his term

to eight years. He sought my support believing I could lend authority to the amendment because I had been the President of the Constitutional Convention, but I curtly declined. This brought a breach in our friendship which was never healed. He died before we could become frankly reconciled, but not before, in pursuit of the same obsession, he had persuaded the United States Congress into suspending our Constitution and allowing him to remain as president-in-exile for the duration of the war.

But the usually sagacious and provident Quezon had not made allowances for the inscrutable decrees of destiny. Exile and later death removed him from the presidency upon the expiration of his original 6-year term. I am convinced that a mysterious providence has given its sanction to the original decree of the Constitutional Convention that no president shall be reelected, and it cannot be defied with impunity. Osmeña lost the 1946 elections, and Roxas was suddenly struck down in 1948 in the midst of his own preparations to run for a second

term. The over-ambitious, the over-reaching, the power-mad fools who now live in a paradise of their own imagining, might do well to beware of this historic taboo and this fateful curse against a presidential reelection.

But no grim foreboding haunted Manuel Quezon in the days of his power and glory when he was putting into practice the charming and elegant motto of Disraeli: "Life must be a continued grand procession from manhood to tomb." Like the great English premier, Quezon also believed that "life is too short to be little." He ruled in the grand manner, relishing to the full the glittering appellation of "Excellency," which only colonial governors had worn before him, in the sumptuous palace of Malacañan. He loved his titles, loved them so much that he had legislation passed providing that municipal executives cease to be called "Presidentes" like himself and content themselves thereafter with the modest title of "alcaldes."

Quezon loved power, and he knew how to keep it. But he kept it, like the realist

that he was, in the only way in which it can be kept in a democracy, by winning the faith and love of the people. There must be some psychological similarity between love and politics, between women and multitudes, because Quezon was fortunate with both. He had the instinct for the right approach, for the cajoling phrase, for the charming attitude. He knew when to wait, and when to dash in for his prize. He knew how to couch his desires in accents seemingly irreproachable and sincere. He knew when to command, and when to obey; when to resist, and when to yield; when to begin; and when to stop; when to give the winning embrace and when to deliver the *coup de grace*.

His present-day successors have his appetites without his potency, his ambitions without his wit, his love of power without his conscience, his human afflictions without his magnificence. The same providence that gave us yesterday the Quezons and Osmeñas and Sumulong, has given us, to test our endurance, the Neros and Caligulas of the present.

Although he was a realist and an empiricist, Quezon was fortunately endowed with a democratic conscience. He did not hesitate to use the full powers of the administration against his political opponents. He was lavish and calculating in his exercise of the rights of patronage and allocation of public works funds. But he never overstepped the bounds of these legitimate forms of political warfare. He was zealous in maintaining the purity of electoral processes. This was the heart of democracy, and Quezon guarded it even against his own party and his own immediate political interests.

I have in mind one particularly dramatic election, when former Senator Alejo Mabanag, defeated the Nacionalista candidate, Alejandro de Guzman, in the old second senatorial district composed of Pangasinan, La Union and Zambales. Mabanag, a Democrata, was duly proclaimed and seated, but a protest was filed by De Guzman. At that time, if you will recall, there were no electoral tribunals, and protests were heard by a

committee of the corresponding chamber, which afterwards made its report for the approval or disapproval of the whole body. In the Senate, as in the House of Representatives, the Nacionalista Consolidado Party was in the majority, and naturally they also controlled a majority of the committee that heard De Guzman's protest. The completely partisan conclusion reached by that committee was that Mabanag had lost the election, and should be unseated, allegedly because of various irregularities, among them the misreading of ballots in his favor. Now, this was plainly impossible because De Guzman, as the majority candidate, had two of the three inspectors, and it was inconceivable that the lone minority inspector of Mabanag had been able to misread ballots on the gigantic scale necessary to give him a fraudulent victory. In fact, the contemplated report of the committee was such a flagrant piece of party injustice that three Nacionalistas, Senators Briones, Vera and Generoso, crossed party lines to support Mabanag.

I was then the *de facto* minority floor leader in the Senate, and, knowing Quezon's character, I took the matter up with him. I suppose that any other party missed me, but Quezon proved to be, as I knew he would be, an honorable exception to the rule. He listened attentively to my argument, but inclined to feel that he could do nothing to interfere with the judgment of the committee. Finally, knowing that he had an implicit faith in the judicial mind, I suggested that an umpire be appointed among the judiciary, to go over the evidence and, in a purely personal and unofficial capacity, determine which of the two candidates, the majority or the minority man, had really won. With characteristic rapidity of decision, Quezon accepted my proposition, and then added, with a smile, that he nominated my brother, Judge Alfonso Recto of Laguna, for the job of umpire. Naturally, I protested that any decision reached by my brother would be suspect to the majority party, but Quezon insisted,

reminding me that my brother Alfonso was a Nacionalista, and I had to yield. I do not think it was because he was my brother, but rather because the evidence was inescapable, that Judge Recto ruled in favor of Mabang. Immediately, just as I had expected, the majority party members protested that the decision was partial and prejudiced, and Quezon agreed to appoint another unofficial arbitrator. This time another Nacionalista judge was chosen, Judge Carlos Imperial, later to become an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and he, in turn, decided in favor of De Guzman. It was my turn to protest, and, knowing the profound respect in which Quezon held the then Chief Justice Ramon Avanceña, I suggested that we secure a final decision from him, again of course, in a purely personal and unofficial manner.

What followed was certainly a test of Quezon's impartiality and statesmanship. Avanceña, taking strong exception to being dragged into that sort of partisan struggle, had to yield to Quezon's

earnest appeal, and consented to take the case under advisement. First he gave his opinion in favor of Mabanag. Then the majority Senators headed by Benigno Aquino somehow were able to convince him that he had been wrong, and he changed his decision to rule in favor of De Guzman. We were taken aback by this change of heart, but Briones, Vera, and Generoso, all, it should be remembered, Nacionalistas, assisted me in persuading Avanceña to change his decision all over again in favor of the Demócrata candidate. We were successful, and I asked the Chief Justice to write Quezon a short note, which he did, saying that Mabanag had really won, and that this time his opinion was final.

It was a terrible blow to those intransigent Nacionalista Senators. What complicated matters was that De Guzman was, by marriage, an *ahijado* of Mrs. Quezon, who had already presented him with a new suit for the special occasion of his oath-taking. The Nacionalista Senators, excepting naturally those three who took Mabanag's side, were on the verge

of rebellion. They were determined to have their own way after so many delays and complications, and to unseat the opposition candidate. A ~~less~~ ^{flatter} reader than Quezon would have found it easier to go back on his word, and to listen to the dictates of party interest and convenience. Instead, Quezon took it up as a challenge to his leadership. He asked for the papers of the case, and told his Nacionalista followers that, sick as he was, he would have himself carried to the Senate on a stretcher, and there he would make a speech and vote for Mabanag, staking upon the vote his own presidency in the Senate. It was one of those admirable gestures that made Quezon truly great, and it was one of his moments of true greatness. In the face of his intransigence, the members of his party retreated, the committee report was changed to conform with Justice Avanceña's final findings, and the Senate voted to maintain Mabanag in his seat.

I have recounted this episode in our political history at some length because I think it is a model of that

devotion to the sacredness of the popular will, which we all need in these trying times. What was Senator Mabanag to President Quezon? Mabanag was a Democrata, a member of the opposition, an antagonist of President Quezon himself in the Senate. In fact, afterward, during the Pro-Anti controversy, this stubborn Democrata whom Quezon saved from being unseated, refused to take the side of the Antis, and went over to Osmeña and the Pros. Yet, for the sake of this political opponent, or rather for that of the people who had cast their votes for him, and whose will had to be respected, Quezon defied the members of his own party, disappointed his own wife, whose sympathies were naturally with her *ahijado*, staked his Senate Presidency, and refused to sanction any subversion of the popular mandate. Of what a different breed are the successors of President Quezon in power!

Again to quote from Disraeli, "when the eagles leave, the vultures return." Quezon's present-day successors are not birds of the same noble breed. Quezon's scorned

frauds, as he would have not only scorned but punished terrorism in the most exemplary manner, because he firmly believed that without free and honest elections no republican form of government could survive. And besides, he knew his own strength. The eagle does not stoop to eat carrion. That is for vultures alone. But lesser politicians, conscious of their weakness, suffering from incurable complexes, take on more ignoble parts, and must let cunning and treachery and mendacity make up for courage and sagacity and truthfulness. They are content to feed on the sores and ulcers of the body politic, slowly pecking it to death in the grisly expectation of fattening on the corruption of the corpse.

But if Quezon had no political philosophy, he surely had a political conscience and a personal decorum which have been stunted in his successors. The magnificent political era which he began in manly challenge, noble pride and great intellectual power, is now coming to its end in malice, imposture, lunacy and cowardice.

Quezon did not hesitate to allocate public works funds and distribute patronage for political purposes; his present-day successors do not hesitate to spend even money that has been set aside for different purposes, and spend it on fictitious public works with brazen manipulations of vouchers and payrolls. He was not above intrigue; but his successors have developed intrigue into blackmail. And while Quezon held at bay frauds and attempts at terrorism, they have not been deterred by the scruples that were his and have assaulted, with every illegitimate weapon they can wield, the very citadel of democracy.

It is time for this era to end. Or rather, *it* is for us now to end this era. A political philosophy may have been unnecessary, even a hindrance, in the long decades when we were a subject people, free from ultimate responsibilities for the conduct of our government, and when rival leaders could play the game of power for its own sake. But now that we are an independent republic, entrusted alone with our own destinies, we must have lea-

ders with a consistent and fundamental view of humanity and the world, a philosophy which shall guide them unerringly and steadily through all the vicissitudes of the nation's existence.

Quezon himself, if he were alive today, would have been the first to perceive the coming of a new age, for, although it was mercifully concealed from him by providence, a terrible price for his political realism and opportunism was to be exacted by a mysterious destiny from those he loved best on earth.

At the very summit of his career, as President of the Philippines, driven by a consuming desire to serve all the humble people who had stood by him in his long and arduous climb to power, driven also perhaps by the instinctive realization that power carries with it a commensurate responsibility, Quezon embarked upon his famous campaign for social justice. But he conducted that campaign with his usual pragmatism, ever obsessed by the actual, the local, and the immediate. He lambasted judges who, in his opinion, were not sufficiently sympa-

thetic with the lot of the workers; impulsively promoted those who glibly parroted his program; and, in the political field, flattered and pampered new forces that he neither understood fully nor could hope to control. In Pampanga, he openly displayed his sympathies for the fledgling socialist-communist group of Pedro Abad Santos, playing host to and breaking bread with him in Malacañan, and, in frequent visits to that province, honoring him with his company to the extent of ignoring the local authorities.

Undoubtedly, to Quezon's shrewd practical mind, the socialist-communist movement never seemed to have a deeper significance than that of a visionary political faction, useful as a counterweight in partisan struggle, while, to his warm and generous heart, the same movement appealed as a sincere demand for relief from feudal injustices. His lack of political philosophy blinded him to the irreconcilable differences between the ideology of representative democracy and that of totalitarian communism, which cannot

stop at the mere reform of the social structure, but is pushed relentlessly by its own inner logic to the seizure of complete power in order to subvert the entire social order, recognizing in the pursuit of this supreme objective neither human rights nor human liberties.

I do not think that either Quezon, or after his death his widow, the beloved Doña Aurora, ever fully realized this. They felt that no Filipino would ever do them harm, least of all the dispossessed and the humble for whom they had shown such constant solicitude. But ruthless and fanatical descendants and disciples of the very men whom Quezon had flattered, pampered, and encouraged in Pampanga, waited one fateful day beside the lonely road to Baler, Quezon's own town, and there, in pursuance of what appears to have been a cruel little plot to dramatize their cause, they butchered the widow and the eldest daughter of the former friend and protector of their political forbears and mentors.

The **Bongabong** massacre was the tragic epilogue to

the life history of a master politician, an epilogue which brought to a grievous and sanguinary close the Quezonian era of political pragmatism. Quezon, the man who best of all could read the human heart, the matchless interpreter of popular feelings, the superb strategist of political war, did not foresee that a new force, a militant political philosophy had arisen in the land, which would be met and defeated, not with the skillful combinations and alliances of which he was so fond and which is so thoroughly mastered, but only with an equally vigorous, integrated, political program inspired by a profound and all-pervasive political faith.

Thus, in paying tribute to the political genius of Manuel L. Quezon, we should not forget that, with our emergence as an independent nation into a world of divided loyalties and mortally conflicting ideologies, we have entered a new age and we must face it by casting off habits of personal enrichment and vain-glory, factional convenience, and lust for power, by dedicating ourselves wholly and without reserve to the supreme national interest that we may realize our ideals of freedom and happiness under the sustaining care of the God of Nations. — *From Manila Chronicle, August 20, 1953.*

Attention: All organization heads and members!

Help your club raise funds painlessly . . .

Join the *Panorama* "Fund-Raising by Subscriptions"
plan today!

The PANORAMA FUND-RAISING BY SUBSCRIPTIONS PLAN will get you, your friends, and your relatives a year's subscription to *Panorama*.

The *Panorama* is easy to sell. It practically sells itself, which means more money for your organization.

The terms of the PANORAMA FUND-RAISING BY SUBSCRIPTIONS PLAN are as follows:

(1) Any accredited organization in the Philippines can take advantage of the PLAN.

(2) The organization will use its facilities to sell subscriptions to *Panorama*.

(3) For every subscription sold the organization will get ₱1.00. The more subscriptions the organization sells, the more money it gets.

Contents

The Need For A Constitutional Convention	2
Political Indicator	9
The Fall Of Malolos	11
Tradition And Efficiency In Parliament	17
Filipino Nationalism And The Americans	24
Literary Parasite	27
Teodoro Kalaw	31
Introducing The Montessori School In The Philippines ..	33
The Leader In The Magsoysey Award	36
Pioneer In Cooperatives	41
Of Forests, Floods, And The Timber Industry	43
English And Filipino	50
The Political Philosophy Of Manuel L. Quezon	51