UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
LIBRARY

PANORAMA

THE PHILIPPINE MAGAZINE OF GOOD READING

SEPTEMBER, 195[illegible]

Friends and fellow Filipinos:

PANORAMA needs intelligent readers of:

1. Informative materials
2. Interesting ideas
3. Enlightening opinions
4. Broadening views
5. Controversial thoughts
6. Critical comments
7. Idealistic suggestions
8. Humorous remarks
9. Serious statements
10. Meditations on life and work.

All these are either original productions or selective adaptions and condensations from Philippine and foreign publications.

Usually brief and compact, lasting from two to ten minutes to read, each article offers a rewarding experience in one's moments of leisure.

Relax with Panorama. We say this to the busy student and the teacher, the lawyer and the physician, the dentist and the engineer, the executive and the farmer, the politician and the preacher, the employer and the employee.

PANORAMA is specially designed for Filipinos — young, middle-aged, and old, male and female, housekeeper and houselizard.

Special rates for new and renewal subscriptions to begin on November 1, 1966:

1 copy	50 centavos
1 year	₱5.00
2 years	₱9.00
Foreign rate:	$3.00 (U. S.)

For one year's subscription of 5 pesos, a person receives the equivalent of 12 compact pocketbooks of lasting value and and varied interest.

COMMUNITY PUBLISHERS, INC.

Inverness, (M. Carreon) St., Sta. Ana, Manila, Philippines

THE PHILIPPINE MAGAZINE OF GOOD READING
Entered as second class mail matter at the Manila Post Office on Dec. 7, 1955

Vol. XX MANILA, PHILIPPINES No. 9

THE EVIL OF COMPROMISE

Acts of compromise are sometimes necessary when circumstances require adjustment for the solution of problems involving conflicting questions. They may be defended as expedient measures. But a compromise is an evil when it involves the yielding of a moral principle to secure a personal advantage or to avoid a difficult commitment. A decision that clearly violates an accepted ethical rule is an evil. An action that ignores an existing law is equally an evil. In each case, it makes no difference who the author may be, what motives he might have, or what prompts him to commit it. In all these cases it is an evil; and compromising with evil is never justifiable and never excusable. No amount of rationalization suffices to relieve the party of the guilt he has committed regardless of his status or the position he occupies, be that of a public official, a friend, a father, a son, or a daughter. There is a moral basis in the legal declaration which says that ignorance of the law excuses no one from complying therewith.

Compromises that involve a breach of moral standards, or a violation of a legal rule, or an infringement of a solemn contractual commitment indicate a pitiful paucity of a high sense of values. To the author they are likely to produce a feeling of degradation when they

(*Continued on page 47*)

IMPROVING GRADUATE EDUCATION IN THE PHILIPPINES

The college population of the Philippines today is one of the largest to be found in any country in the world. It has been rapidly increasing from year to year. As of the year 1965, our college enrollment has reached approximately one per cent (1%) of the total population of the whole country or about 300,000 men and women students.

About 90% of this number is in private institutions operating under what is practically a uniform system established by rules and regulations of our Government. This fact has two general results: First, it has helped in discouraging the maintenance of schools unable to meet certain formal and mechanical requirements and, second, it has prevented the development of diversity in academic institutions and the cultivation of a variety of educational programs and procedures, features which have characterized the American system of higher education and which most perceptive observers consider as one of the chief causes of its vitality and dynamic nature. Incidentally, the famous Monroe Report had noted, as far back as 1925, the deadening uniformity and rigid standardization in our educational system when it expressly mentioned with disapproval "the characteristic feature of the methods of teaching from Abra to Jolo as being *uniformity*, the *absence of variety*." (page 385). That criticism was particularly directed against the public schools below the college level which were expected to be standardized in several ways. It is certainly more relevant and could be more logically stretched to include not only teaching

methods but also the rigid limitations in the curricula of private institutions of higher learning which specially cover college education of undergraduate and graduate level.

At the outset it might not be amiss to refer even very briefly to the history of college education in this part of the Orient. As a Western idea, college education in the Philippines may be said to have started over three hundred years ago. During the Spanish rule of the country, however, it was confined to a small group of students from families of wealth and high social position. Its main purpose in the earlier years was not so much intellectual advancement or professional competence as it was social refinement and distinction. But with the advancing years of the 19th Century, the existing colleges and universities expanded their program to include professional or vocational fields which accordingly resulted in the production of Filipino lawyers, doctors, accountants, pharmacists, surveyors, and a few other skilled occupations. In the University of Santo Tomas, even before these professional studies were introduced, courses in philosophy, theology, and the humanities in one form or another had already been introduced. All the courses then offered were naturally patterned after those given in the universities and colleges in Spain. Incidentally, it should be mentioned here that this state of things accounted for the readiness of the Philippines at the close of the last Century to create an independent republic with leaders sufficiently qualified to organize and maintain a Western-style government.

The establishment of the American rule at the opening of this century brought into this country a different system of education modelled after that of the United States. Elementary and secondary schools were soon organized and developed all over the country. The liberal arts college for undergraduate work was then opened and maintained for students who have completed the secondary education program. As established in the University of the Philippines, it was at first a two-year program leading to the de-

gree of Bachelor of Arts after the pattern of the French lycee, which grants the *baccalaureate*, or of the German gymnasium. This, however, was soon changed to a four-year study to follow the American college system.

Way back in its early history, the University of the Philippines already began its graduate education program leading to the degree of Master in the arts and science disciplines. This was considered necessary as far back as 45 years ago in this country; and that institution even then was already recognized as adequately prepared to offer the program. On the need for its organization and development, the *Monroe Report* had this to say: "The opportunities for productive research in the Philippines and particularly in fields removed from the sphere of the average American and European scholar are most numerous. In the botany, zoology, anthropology, linguistics, and history of the Philippines and neighboring countries, there is an almost inexhaustible mine. The University offers post-graduate work in these and other fields leading to the degree of master of science. It has several gifted scholars in its faculty who are peculiarly qualified to engage in research themselves and to direct the research of students. By a reduction in their hours of teaching and by supplying them with adequate resources, opportunity should be given to such teachers to make their contributions to knowledge and to add to the prestige of the University."

The entire enrollment of the University of the Philippines at the time it started its graduate program was just about 3,000 students. Its library had no more than 12,000 volumes "including those in all colleges and schools." The Monroe Survey Commission suggested that the University should confine its attention to the master's course alone. Conscious of its standing as the standard bearer in our system of higher education, the University observed the maximum care in the admission and instruction of students for advanced education and training from the beginning, for it realized that a graduate degree symbolizes honor and prestige. Hence, the M.A. of the University of

the Philippines represented and continues to represent achievement in the academic or professional field attained through solid work. It is said that our State University's requirements for the acquisition of the Master's degree are in some ways more stringent than those demanded in many colleges or universities in the United States. Its master's program in this respect is, in the opinion of objective observers, as demanding and as difficult as certain doctoral programs offered in other local institutions.

The graduate courses in that institution leading to the Ph.D. degree were more recently established. The University has always insisted in rigorous work and high technical skill in research. This is one reason why over the years only two persons have so far succeeded in receiving the Ph.D. degree. The student who concentrated on biological science and to whom the Ph.D. degree in that field was awarded has produced since her graduation researches of such excellence and high value that they have received commendation, praise, and recognition in European and American scientific societies.

Turning now to the conditions which should justify the emergence of well-established graduate schools in our country, it is quite pertinent to repeat here that the number of secondary and college students enrolled in all educational institutions in this country in relation to our population size is the largest in Southeast Asia. As far back as 1960-1961, in the secondary schools, both public and private, the enrollment reached a total of 663,496, of which there were 114,882 in the 4th year. In 1961, there were 69,490 secondary graduates from the private schools alone; and in 1960, the number of secondary graduates from the public schools, both academic and vocational, was 48,061 students.

The number of collegiate students in both public and private colleges and universities in the academic year 1961-1962 total 283,394. About one-half of this number of students were enrolled in professional courses or preparatory courses for professional studies, thereby lea-

ving some 140,000 students in general education, arts and sciences, and teacher education. Since then, the number has considerably increased. To take a minor example, in Foundation College of Dumaguete, the enrollment in its school of education and its school of arts and science has jumped in five years from about 500 to over 2,000 students.

One does not have to go deeper in an analysis and interpretation of statistics on this particular subject to realize that with the increasing number of secondary school graduates pressing on the colleges and the corresponding increase of students completing their collegiate studies, the importance and urgency of graduate programs first for the master's degree and then after a few more years for the doctor's should no longer be ignored. Then, there is another factor to consider — the vast increase of knowledge. To ignore the need for further studies after the baccalaureate degree is to remain blind to the new discoveries of science and scholarship which are now rapidly taking place. Right at this moment in our country advanced education and training is needed to handle the mounting tide of both secondary and collegiate students demanding a more adequate and up-to-date preparation not only for teaching jobs in schools and colleges but also for industry, business, agriculture, and other occupations calling for research ability and special expertise in different lines of work. Moreover, higher education is also needed for a better understanding and appreciation of modern life, of possibilities for creative energy, of the implication and significance of democracy and its adversaries, and of the changing values of the present civilization.

For these and perhaps other reasons, the Department of Education has made the right decision in encouraging the opening of graduate programs in institutions considered qualified to do this work. As of today, the records of the Bureau of Private Schools show that there are 87 private institutions authorized to offer graduate courses. Of this number and on the basis of 1965 statistics, 25 are universities and 62 are colleges.

These are geographically distributed as follows: 59 are in Luzon, 17 in the Visayas, and 11 in Mindanao.

It is interesting to note the growing enrollment in these graduate institutions. In the academic year 1959-1960, the total number of students registered in private institutions for graduate study was 2,104. Five years later, or in the academic year 1963-1964, the number jumped to 6,532 students. This number, of course, represents only about 2.2 per cent of the total undergraduate enrollment in all our colleges and universities. But this rate in itself shows an increasing appreciation for advanced studies. This fact, however, does not necessarily indicate a qualitative improvement of the graduate courses offered and of the value of the graduate degrees awarded.

But before discussing the particular problems and qualitative aspects of graduate education in our country, there is need to clarify in our minds the nature and purpose of graduate studies. Inasmuch as we have taken the American graduate program as a general pattern for our own system, it is practically imperative for us to examine its character and broad features regardless of any plan we might later adopt to modify that system for the purpose of adjusting it to the requirements of our country's manpower.

Graduate education should be primarily directed towards specialization. Properly organized, it must presuppose a foundation of a sound liberal education to give breadth to the mental scope and the intellectual horizon of the student. This should be acquired principally during the undergraduate life of a person first in the high school and then in the college of arts and sciences. This condition precedent is indispensable. The aim is the development of the individual's basic knowledge of man *qua* man and the cultivation of his sense of values.

In the graduate school, the chief objective should be the intensive study of a specific subject in a definite area of learning. It is a study in depth. To be adequately accomplished, it has to be sufficiently restricted in scope. In other words, in

graduate work attention and energy should be concentrated on a particular subject to enable the mind to penetrate into its very pith and core as well as to learn how this process of inquiry and investigation may be accomplished. Graduate work has, therefore, a double purpose: One is to give the student a deeper knowledge of a specific subject and the other is to enable him to learn the needed skill and technique to do research work in order that he could be an investigator and discoverer of new knowledge or an explorer in the regions of science or scholarship.

The chief subjects of the undergraduate curriculum — English, physical sciences, economics, philosophy, history, mathematics, psychology, etc. — constitute the vast field out of which the graduate program carves a specific unit to be intensively investigated and learned. There have been, however, some attempts to broaden the scope of graduate education in spite of the fact that this objective is supposed to have been accomplished in the undergraduate program. But these attempts have failed to materialize for several reasons: One is the necessity of avoiding the lengthening of an already long graduate program; and another reason is the rapid expansion taking place within every discipline which makes it difficult to acquire some mastery over it if graduate education should be directed towards a broader field of studies.

But the idea of giving some breadth in doctoral studies has not been entirely ignored. It is being carried out in a sense by the introduction of interdepartmental programs or by a process of integrating into one subject of concentration certain phases of other allied subjects within one particular discipline.

An important goal of graduate studies has given rise to another question, the question which may be described as pedagogical training. For a graduate program is usually, though not always, designed for teaching, specially college teaching. But except in the case of M.A. in education, graduate schools as a rule do not provide nor do they favor any formal training in teaching methods.

cators, however, believe that it is advantageous and desirable to have some knowledge about the organization of courses, the philosophy of education, the interests of young people, the learning process, the structuring of examinations, and a few other matters which may improve the instructional or classroom performance of new college teachers.

But in the United States these days the prevailing view on the subject of graduate training for college teaching is in favor of using graduate students as *teaching assistants* in sections into which large classes are divided or in laboratory sessions. The purpose is to give them a measure of training through actual teaching experience. This idea has been put into practice in many colleges and universities and has proved to be an effective system of teacher training. In fact, it is now being developed into a systematized plan which classifies student teachers into ranks from teaching *assistants* to teaching fellows. It is said that this development has resulted partly from the need for more teachers to help handle the increasing college enrollments. Thus in Florida, ranks have been established within this category as follows: a teaching assistant who does good work in his assignment not only receives a good mark as a student but is also raised to the rank of teaching associate. In California and other universities where the student population is specially large this system of teaching assistantships is now generally followed. Among the advantages claimed for it is the commonly accepted idea that a person learns more of the subject he is studying by teaching it. It is said that since 1960, the great majority of all graduate school deans, faculties, and college presidents in the United States have been in favor of requiring all graduate students to do undergraduate teaching under supervision.

In the June 4, 1965, issue of *Time* magazine, there is an interesting report on the satisfactory results of the employment of graduate students as teaching assistants or fellows in prestige universities in the United States including Harvard, Michigan, California, Chicago, and

One group of American edu- other institutions. These universities are turning over to teaching assistants a large share of the work of handling the instruction in freshman and sophomore classes. Time says: "Frantically pursuing their own Ph.D.'s while they carry a substantial share of the university teaching, TAs (Teaching Assistants) are generally the most enthusiastic, under-paid and overworked members of a university teaching staff. They are getting more numerous all the time. Of Harvard's 1,816 teachers, 893 are teaching fellows. The University of California's Berkeley campus has 1,303 TA's of 3,460 teachers. The University of Michigan had only four teaching fellows in its Literary College in 1933, has 579 today."

How they are employed in their assignments is described as follows: The teaching assistant is made to handle sections of 15 to 30 students in introductory courses. "He lectures, answers questions, conducts laboratory sessions, grades the students. He is supervised by a professor, who usually also delivers mass lectures in the course. The TA rarely gets much formal instruction in teaching." He may be only a few years older than his students but he has to handle heavy subjects, a task which gives him valuable experience. "When we get to talking about our classes," says a Michigan teaching assistant, age 27, who teaches psychology, "it makes me wish I had had teachers like us. I was introduced to psychology by one of the highest names in the field — and it was the lousiest course I ever took."

Time magazine says: "Harvard Philosophy Chairman Rogers Albritton believes that 'teaching fellows are often better teachers than the senior men. They have more energy and interest.' Michigan's Vice President Roger Heyns boasts: 'Some of our teaching fellows would be instructors or assistant professors at other schools.' Time's report goes on to say: "Dean Elberg defends the TA system on grounds that 'it allows the university to break up large classes into smaller units and then give individual instruction — it begins to humanize the institution."

From the views expressed by responsible college heads as incorporated in the work of Prof. Bernard Berelson on Graduate Education in the United States, we may draw the following suggestions on the work and position of teaching assistants: (1) To be academically effective and beneficial to the teaching assistant and the students under him, the program should place the assistants under the supervision of the senior professor; (2) there should be regular seminar discussions on the problems of teaching the subject at undergraduate level; (3) a range of teaching activities should be entrusted to the teaching assistant rather than just a small and mere routine part of the senior teacher's function, such as merely correcting themes, doing clerical chores for the head teacher, or cleaning the laboratory apparatus, etc. The teaching assistant should be required to prepare course outlines, lead small discussion groups, and actually perform the tasks of the regular head or senior teacher.

There is another method and practice suggested for the training of graduate students for teaching work. In order that the study of the graduate student of his subjects and his research training may have his full attention, a system of *internship* for those attending the higher courses should be established in the same manner as that provided by medical schools before their new graduates may be certified as regular physicians. The teaching internship should be spent in the undergraduate college, It is there where the new graduate trains on *how* to teach after the graduate school has taught him what to teach.

The system of teaching assistantship or the internship could be adopted, with proper adjustments, in the M.A. program in our country for the purpose of training graduate students for teaching secondary classes or the first two years of undergraduate college classes. The assistants should be chosen from the superior type of graduate students and should receive the necessary direction, counsel, and suggestion from the senior teachers.

Properly guided and supervised, the system could produce a more effective teaching work for the col-

lege and a better disciplined staff of young instructors, for as advanced or as graduate students they may be expected to follow readily and willingly instructions and suggestions to improve their effectiveness in their tasks. Unlike the regular teacher who expects to be left alone and to be indifferent at times to his work and to his students' progress, the student assistant has to show much interest in his subject, his students, and their performance, in order to earn the necessary mark and credit in his own course.

Coming back to the condition of the graduate studies in the United States as compared to what is done in the Philippines, the greater interest shown in the Ph.D. program by the more talented American students seem to have lessen the enthusiasm of most American educators in the M.A. program. In fact the M.A. degree in America today stands on such a variable position that most of the older prestige universities seem to give it less and less attention. It is the newer institutions where the M.A. program receives some importance. According to Professor Berelson, Pennsylvania State University gives more M.A.'s than Harvard, Temple more than Yale, Louisiana State more than Chicago, and Oklahoma State more than Cornell. It is in the colleges rather than in larger universities where the M.A. program is more extensively promoted. And it is the M.A. degree in education which attracts more students than any other M.A. degree. In fact more than one-half of all M.A. diplomas are awarded in education. In this field Columbia Teachers College is the leader. In the academic year 1957-1958 alone, this college granted 2,757 M.A. in education; and in the same year and field of study New York University granted 2,133, Michigan 2,081, and Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana have awarded each over 1,000 M.A. degrees all in education.

This rapid popularity of the M.A. in education may be caused by several factors. One of them is the gradual elimination of undergraduate degree in education for secondary school teaching such as the B.S.E., and the adoption of complete liberal arts

courses for teachers, with majors in content subjects, during the last 15 or 20 years. This shift is obviously a renewed recognition of importance for the teacher to have a greater mastery of the content of the subject he expects to handle in school. Obviously it is an evidence of the realization of the lesser significance of formal methods courses as against better acquaintance with academic disciplines in the preparation of teachers. Hence to save what may still be formally useful to the teaching profession, it is deemed advisable to move upward to the graduate school such things as school administration, supervision, and some sophisticated methods courses for school administrators and supervisors. The effectiveness of the system of teaching assistantships further reduces the need for many formal undergraduate education courses.

In 1959, the University of the Philippines attempted to abolish the undergraduate course of education leading to the B.S.E. degree and to replace it with a graduate education course for all prospective secondary school teachers after they have successfully completed the liberal arts studies. Leadership in the College of Education, however, was not sufficiently active and persuasive to overcome the few but vocal defenders of the *status quo*. But in the near future the sensible examples of Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and other prestigious universities in the United States, which have no undergraduate but only graduate education schools, will undoubtedly prevail to the improvement of the preparation of our teachers.

We are told that the top master's institutions are not the same ones that are known as the top doctoral institutions. This is a fact "which emphasizes a break between the two degrees." This break incidentally shows that the M.A., contrary to what an official of the Bureau of Private Schools stated, is still a terminal degree. It is not necessarily a step towards the Ph.D. degree, this degree being actually attainable directly by a student who does not care to work for an M.A. The top universities, however, are doubtless concentrating on the doctoral pro-

gram because of their high prestige and, therefore, great drawing power on the men and women of talent who are really preferred for higher graduate studies. This they can do best and with great advantage considering that the Ph.D. training is intended not merely for academic but also for professional work and for which industry and public service are always willing to pay an attractive compensation.

We have to admit that on the whole Philippine universities are not yet sufficiently equipped both as to service, facilities, and personnel, to give a Ph.D. program with academically satisfying results. The University of the Philippines is an exception; and as we stated before, it has been handling this work so carefully and strictly that so far (1968) it has awarded only two Ph.D. degrees, one in biological science and another in education. The University of Sto. Tomas has been conducting a doctoral program which covers much wider scope than that of the state University. It includes both academic and professional graduate work. It has turned out quite a number who have completed its doctoral program in different disciplines and professions.

The Ed.D. program, being primarily a teaching course, does not usually require an intensive research training. Consequently, it does not involve a heavy investment in scientific equipment, library, and laboratory facilities as does the Ph.D. course. It could be undertaken by colleges or universities which have moderate but high class library facilities and a faculty of knowledgeable teachers who have a deep interest in subjects pertaining to the field of education.

But for the present, it is preferable for Philippine universities and colleges to concentrate their attention on the master's program. Facilities for this purpose are more easily organized or improved for effective work. But the plan should include not only the M.A. in Education but also the M.A. in some disciplines in the social sciences, mathematics, the natural sciences, or the humanities. In order to make the M.A. in Education more than just a professional degree, its curricu-

lum should give sufficient weight to arts and science subjects to increase its usefulness for college teaching and for a broader comprehension of the objectives of administration in elementary and secondary schools. A step in this direction should raise its prestige to the higher level of the purely academic M.A. as a scholarly degree. This suggestion is obviously a departure from the curriculum of the Philippine Normal College which provides a total of 31 units of which 12 are education and methods, 9 minors, and 10 thesis.

The majority of holders of graduate degrees prefer to stay in Manila and nearby places. This situation makes it difficult for provincial colleges to secure properly qualified teachers for collegiate work. Consequently, academically enterprising provincial colleges or universities need to organize some graduate program and to strengthen their faculty. This will enable such institutions to supply colleges outside of the national capital with the teachers they should have. This is in addition to the fact that as more Masters are available, the teaching force as well as the administrative staff for our elementary and secondary schools is likely to be upgraded. This is happening in the United States these days where completion of M.A. degree is required not only for collegiate but also for high school teaching.

In the Philippines, the practice of employing teachers with M.A. degrees should receive even much more encouragement than in America for in several ways many of our holders of the B.S.E. and A.B. degrees do not have sufficient mastery of the subjects they teach and may not always be expected, therefore, to improve the educational fitness of the majority of young men and women who seek admission into our colleges or universities or who look for those better paid jobs that call for some mastery of English or mathematics or a particular social science discipline. The Philippine law which provides higher salaries for public school teachers with graduate degrees and for teachers who have completed a certain amount of graduate work tends to encour-

age teachers to improve their academic or professional qualifications.

The establishment of centers for graduate studies should be encouraged only when they can offer a graduate program of substantial quality. For this purpose a graduate school should meet certain indispensable conditions. One is a college administration that thoroughly understands the aims of graduate education and willingly adopts adequate standards of academic excellence. The administrative head should never be satisfied with mediocre academic performance on the part of the students.

The library of the college should receive preferential attention for no graduate education could be effectively carried out without a good working library. It is not enough that the library merely complies with the numerical requirement of the present law that a university must have 10,000 volumes. It has to be a library of up-to-date and authoritative books and reference works as well as a sufficient number of general, professional, technical, and specialized magazines and journals on different subjects related to arts and sciences, education, and cultural and higher professional studies. That library should be regularly and carefully replenished from year to year. Its subscriptions to the leading periodicals should not be allowed to lapse. We need to remember that it is in current publications of high quality, even more than in bound books, where the latest advances of science and scholarship may often be found. The quality of a college and university library depends upon the excellent quality of its books and authoritative publications than upon the mere quantity of the materials it indiscriminately keeps in its shelves.

If the graduate program embraces science studies and aims at concentration or specialization in specific areas in the physical or biological sciences, the college should possess and develop a well-stocked library of science books as well as a well-equipped science laboratory and workshop. Research and research training are emphatically stressed in advanced or graduate science studies

even more than in education, humanities, and social disciplines.

Having these physical facilities, an effective graduate program requires dedicated teachers and well-qualified students. To be a well-qualified student it is not enough that one should have a good mind or an active brain. It is essential that he should have a strong personal interest in higher learning and a consuming desire to pursue his subject of specialization with something akin to a fanatical fervor. A smart or witty young person who is indifferent to steady work and systematic reading is not necessarily the preferred type for graduate studies. We should be aware of the warning of experienced educators and scholars that fluency in speech does not mean depth. As Philosopher Henry David Aiken of Harvard described an important U. S. official: "His mind is more rapid than accurate, more facile than profound."[2] By having these observations well in mind, we may be able to avoid any misunderstanding or misinterpretation of one very important qualification every graduate student should possess which is a certain degree of mastery of the English language, specially written English. According to a Yale report quoted by Berelson, writing is a tool and is part of the basic methodology of graduate education. In the study of the humanities and social sciences, writing is analogous to problem drilling in mathematics or laboratory work in the natural sciences. It is, therefore, suggested that there should be "more writing practice early in the graduate training program and reliance on a larger number of shorter papers." This suggestion is of much greater value to us, considering that English is not our native tongue.

The faculty for graduate studies is as important as the faculty for undergraduate work[1] if not more so in some respects. In the latter, a teacher's task is wholly course work involving frequent class meetings, lectures, and discussions. While in graduate study, he has to do course and seminar work together with research and research training. Of course, research is less rigorous in M.A. than in

Ph.D. courses. It is not quite fair to expect a master's thesis to equal a doctoral dissertation in depth; but it should discuss its subject with some degree of freshness and thoroughness of approach.

The so-called "independent work" which students in graduate schools are supposed to do is a characteristic feature of higher studies in European universities. To some extent it is expected in American institutions. But more observant graduate professors and deans have come to the conclusion that independent work by students is irrelevant and dubious in value and seriousness. One professor of the University of Chicago has this to say: "The students as a group are not ready for it (and probably never were for that matter). Properly administered, independent work does not save faculty time; if anything, it costs more of it. Finally, the more 'independent work' we have, the farther we go from a major strength of the American system of doctoral education as compared with most foreign versions, namely *course and seminar work.* I believe that from sheer standpoint of learning the subject, there is a certain wastage in the system that is now disguised as 'independent work and that their symbol is probably not worth its cost. After all, the graduate faculty is (or should be) the 'source of doctoral training." It is quite apparent that these words addressed to American students pursuing a doctoral training are clearly not applicable to the M.A. program for Filipino students.

What is suggested in place of the so-called "independent work" is a clearer, more compact, and more specific programs of study, with more supervision and direction by the faculty. The Filipino student acquires a much deeper acquaintance with his subject of concentration and allied subjects and a better training in research work when the professor gives him the necessary direction and guidance and demands from him strict observance of the lines laid down for his activity. In my visits during a period of about 8 years with scholars and professors of British universities, I have been impressed by their

admiration and respect for graduate education in several American universities. This attitude strikes me as an implied recognition of the effect of the American procedure in graduate education which principally consists in *course and seminar work.*

It has been previously stated that the faculty of a graduate school should be dedicated teachers. This term is used advisedly to emphasize not so much that every member of the graduate faculty should be a genius or a person of consummate learning or the possessor of a doctoral or a postdoctoral degree. It is rather used to underline the need for a teacher who is intensely interested in his work and in that of his students and is industrious and keenly interested in the discipline of his choice. In a word, he should be a dedicated scholar.

On the competence and personal traits and nature of professors, the sociologist Charles Cooley made this statement: "It is strange that we have so few men of genius on our faculties, we have always been trying to get them. Of course, they must have undergone the regular academic training and be gentlemanly, dependable, pleasant to live with, and not apt to make trouble by urging eccentric ideas. Institutions and genius are in the nature of things antithetical and if a man of genius is found living contentedly in the university, it is peculiarly creditable to both. As a rule, professors like successful lawyers or doctors, are *just hardworking men of some talent.*"

These words remind us of the reported rule adopted by our Education authorities that every graduate program for M.A. should have in its faculty one or more teachers with a doctor's degree. This rule is, of course, subject to exceptions, otherwise it may deprive an institution of the opportunity of securing some teachers without doctor's degrees but with high competence, academic experience, and demonstrated learning. There are M.A.'s who have more talent and more devotion to self-advancement than some Ph.D.'s or Ed.D.'s. They naturally would make better teachers for M.A. training.

In the second place, if a person with a higher degree than that for which he prepares his students is necessarily needed and unavoidably required, then logically all graduate programs for Ph.D. should not be handled by professors with only Ph.D. degrees but by those who have had some post-doctoral studies. This is not, however, the case in American universities and much less is it true in our own universities with doctoral programs. In my own case, when I took graduate work for my LL.M. degree in the University of the Philippines, not one of my professors was the possessor of even an LL.M. But they know their subjects from serious self-study and from actual professional experience, and they demanded strict compliance with the rules on graduate study which consisted principally in written reports, seminars, thesis writing, and rigorous tests.

In the United States, the Ph.D. degree depends for its value upon the rank and standing of the graduate school among institutions of higher education. It is said that there are 12 universities considered top centers of graduate work. Their reputation is based not simply on the ability and dedication of their teachers but also on the quality of the work they demand from their students, their sound student admission requirements, and the excellent record of their graduates. These factors affecting faculty competence, student selection, faithful and strict observance of academic duties backed up by an administrative leadership that understands the value of higher education would undoubtedly contribute to the strengthening of any of the graduate schools in our country. Much depends upon the determination of the administrators and faculty members in reaching the goal of excellence in our program for higher education.

One further point should be emphatically mentioned in this brief discussion. As previously stated, graduate education is mainly concerned with specialization. As a general proposition, excellence in scholarly or scientific pursuits and leadership of a high order in specific field of work these days require persons who are tho-

roughly prepared in their respective lines of activity. The effective teacher should know the content of the subject he teaches as much as could be expected of an expert. The same expertise and deep learning should be demonstrated in the work of the scientist or the technologist to enable them to take their place in the vanguard of their respective occupations. In a word, the leadership we need for the advancement of man and society is hardly possible without specialization. This is precisely the chief purpose of graduate education. The final questions, therefore, are: Is our graduate program geared to this purpose? Is not our curriculum for the Master of Education so full of such subjects as methods and supervision that it leaves but little room for the study of content subjects? To teach a college subject as history, economics, or biology, one should have a knowledge of it in depth.

It is in line with this idea of adequate specialization in the subject one has to teach that Foundation College has adopted its system of faculty improvement. The College selects two or more of its well-qualified younger teachers and teaching assistants for a concentrated course of at least twenty-four units in one and only subject in the University of the Philippines such as mathematics, speech, or biology. Foundation College gives them full support under scholarship grants. They are not expected to complete the M.A. course in U.P. or to work for any particular graduate degree. They are sent in that institution to specialize in one subject which is to be used as their major in the Master's course which they eventually take in the Graduate School in Foundation College.

The increasing number of students enrolled in the colleges of this country year after year and the constant changes and advances of science and scholarship justify, and even require, the organization of graduate schools which could answer the need for Filipino workers, teachers, and professionals trained to perform those tasks that could accelerate national and social progress. Our graduate program should be hitched to at least three

vehicles of development. They are: first, specialization in higher knowledge for industrial, agricultural, economic, and other technical activities of the country; second, specialization in subjects or disciplines to prepare teachers for effective instructional work in colleges and universities; and third, sufficient training in research techniques that could help in the discovery or invention of new objects and better instruments for the realization of man's hopes and dreams.

The countries today which have considerably improved the conditions and living standards of their people have directed their program for higher education toward these three important objectives. In proportion to the degree of thoroughness with which these tasks are carried out, the degree of the success to be attained in promoting the welfare of nation depends.

One additional consideration should not be overlooked, and it is this: The kind and quality of graduate education that our country needs have to be seriously considered in terms of our conditions and our needs. We need experts and specialists to widen our program of graduate work. We may have to import many of them from other countries to produce excellent results but sooner or later they have to be our own men and women who have been brought up in our native environment and who personally feel the urge for individual change and social improvement in accordance with their personal knowledge and their views. The question in this regard is: What incentives should we offer now and in the near future to attract our own scholars and potential experts to work in the graduate areas we need to establish? — *Dr. V. G. Sinco, Foundation College, Dumaguete, June* 18, 1965 (*Revised, August,* 1968)

■ The people of Sabah, not the Sultan of Jolo nor the Philippines have the right of sovereignty over their country.

SABAH AND SABAHANS

When the Philippines subscribed to the United Nations Charter in 1945, we became duty-bound to "respect the principle of self-determination of peoples" (Par. 2, Art. I, Chap. I, UN Charter). The said Charter has a "Declaration Regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories" (Chapter XI). It provides that the relations of colonial ruler and subject people shall be that of trustee and ward, not that of master and servant; and colonial rulers were enjoined to enter into trust agreements with the United Nations so that the administration and supervision of the territories ruled by them, to be known as trust territories, may be placed under the international trusteeship system to be established under the authority of the United Nations (Art. 75, Ch. XII, UN Charter); that one of the basic objectives of the international trusteeship system is "to promote the political, ecnomic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely-expressed wishes of the peoples concerned" (Par. b. Ch. XII, UN Charter).

Under the above provisions of the UN Charter which were subscribed to by most, if not all, the countries of the world, a new principle of international law became consecrated, the principle of self-determination, by virtue of which the sovereignty of the Sultan of Sulu over Sabah was transferred to the people themselves. This is the implication of the right of self-determination, for only a sovereign people has the right of self-determination and self-government. If a person can declare himself of age, it is because he is actual-

ly of age. If a people can declare themselves independent, it is because they have sovereign powers.

As Senator Sumulong has said, "at this time and age, it is the political status which a people want for themselves which matters, not the disposition made by a sultan centuries ago."

Gone is the age where countries became united, not by the consent of the people, but because the dynasty of the two kings that ruled the two countries became consolidated in the person of one king. Because the Charter of the United Nations acknowledged in the people of Sabah their right to self-determination, and because the existence of such a right is in consonance with our tradition and our own demands for independence, when we were a colony, first of Spain, later of America, and later on occupied by Japan, the official position of the Philippines had to acknowledge that right in the people of Sabah in several declarations of our leaders.

But it has been argued that sovereignty rights and independence are synonymous and that a country cannot have sovereignty rights if she is not independent at the same time.

Those who offer this argument do not seem to realize that this very argument could also be applied against the alleged sovereignty rights of the Sultan of Sulu over Sabah, in view of the undisputed fact that Sabah admittedly was not an independent country in 1945 when it came under the trusteeship of the United Nations. If sovereignty rights do not exist without independence, then neither the Sultan of Sulu or the people of Sabah had sovereignty rights over Sabah, but the United Nations.

We take the view that sovereignty rights, as qualified by the last word, is a *right,* while independence is a *status,* a *condition,* the actual full *exercise* of the sovereignty right. No Filipino can argue otherwise, for we Filipinos maintain that the Filipino people *vindicated* our sovereignty rights and became independent upon the proclamation of the first Philippine Republic by General Aguinaldo in 1898; that we did not lose

these sovereignty rights by the American Occupation and for this reason, we have been demanding constantly our independence; that this fact of sovereignty was confirmed in the Philippine Constitution of 1934-1935 in preparation to our Commonwealth status; that they were finally recognized by America by the approval of President Roosevelt of our Constitution; and that during our Commonwealth status, our sovereignty rights were recognized as actually existing during the whole period of American domination. But we were only able to *exercise* those sovereignty rights (although still with some significant limitations due to the Bell Trade Act) once we became independent, which only took place about ten years later.

Actually, we can say that our sovereignty rights existed even prior to the Declaration of Philippine Independence by General Aguinaldo in 1898, for our sovereignty rights existed and gradually recognized with the development of a new concept of sovereignty rights in modern international law, when gradually, the doctrine of self-determination of peoples and the doctrine that sovereignty rights reside in the people and not in the king or the ruler of the state became developed. So the Filipino people, and not the king of Spain, had sovereignty rights in this country once the medieval concept of sovereignty rights residing in the king or the ruler was changed with the progress of public international law and by the conscience of the people and world public opinion transferring those sovereignty rights from the king to the people themselves. Our assertion of independence by General Aguinaldo and our people in 1898 was only a *vindication* of the sovereignty rights of the Filipino people.

It is important to distinguish that while the repository of sovereignty rights is in and remains with the people, the *exercise* of those rights may be temporarily suspended and even questioned by a superior power. And this is what happened when the Spanish government continued to resist our demands for autonomy which, later on, culminated in a demand for independence;

and this is what happened when later on, America occupied the Philippines.

But even during the American occupation, with the enactment of the Jones Law in 1916, America came to recognize the sovereignty rights of the Filipino people with the promise of a grant of independence as soon as we acquired a so-called "stable government," a recognition which became more formal and definite with the enactment of the Tydings-MacDuffie Law promising us the grant of independence on a definite date, namely, on July 4, 1946.

Similarly, in the case of the sovereignty over Sabah, those rights were actually transferred from the Sultan of Sulu to the people themselves with the above-mentioned evolution of public international law transferring sovereignty rights from the ruler to the people. The United Nations Charter, in granting all colonized people the right of self-determination, is the Jones Law of all colonized territories, a definite acknowledgment of the right of colonized peoples to self-determination.

In the same way that the United States Congress, after the enactment of the Jones Law could not have validly transferred American sovereignty over the Philippines to another country, by the same token after the enactment of the United Nations Charter, the Sultan of Sulu had no right to transfer the sovereignty of Sabah to the Philippines, say to Japan, or any other country for that matter. What position the Philippines would have taken if the Sultan of Sulu had transferred his sovereignty rights not to the Philippines but to Japan?

It is for this reason that I take the position as expressed in my recent speech before the Philconsa on October 5, 1968, that we should not base our claim on Sabah on medieval concepts of sovereignty over people who at present do not have any sympathy or liking for us but instead, we should capture their love and admiration for us because we have made ourselves worthy of that love, not with claims, but with an extended hand of dignity, support and friendship, a hand that could be extended not only to Sabah but to

other Malayan states who, in the future, maybe in the far distant future, might join with us in a Pan Malayan Federation! — *Salvador Araneta, President, Araneta University, Manila Times, Oct. 15, 1968.*

THE FORCE OF PERSEVERANCE

All the performances of human art, at which we look with praise or wonder, are instances of the resistless force of perseverance: it is by this that the quarry becomes a pyramid, and that distant countries are united with canals. If a man was to compare the effect of a single stroke of the pick-ax, or of one impression of the spade with the general design and last result, he would be overwhelmed by the sense of their disproportion; yet those petty operations, incessantly continued, in time surmount the greatest difficulties, and mountains are levelled, and oceans bounded, by the slender force of human beings. — *Johnson.*

■ To develop democracy in a country, we need to avoid the spirit of anarchy and the spirit of fanaticism, says Bertrand Russell.

EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY

It is clear that you need a fair amount of education before democracy becomes at all possible. To start at the extreme point, if your population is illiterate, the machinery required for democracy does not work. But I am not concerned with this elementary portion of the matter. I am concerned rather with the kind of education that is necessary if one is to avoid the pitfalls into which many democracies have fallen and which have led in many cases to dictatorships.

There is a curiously difficult line to be drawn psychologically if democracy is to succeed, because it needs two things that tend in different directions. On the one hand, every man needs to have a certain degree of self-reliance and self-confidence, a willingness to back his own judgment; on the other hand, he must be willing to submit to the authority of the majority when that authority goes against him. One or the other of these two things is very apt to fail. Either men become too subservient and follow some vigorous leader into dictatorship; or they are too self-assertive, they do not submit to the majority, and lead their country into anarchy. The business of education in relation to democracy is to produce the type of character which is willing to advocate its own opinion as vigorously as may be, but is also willing to submit to the majority when it finds the majority going against it.

There are two different parts of what education has to do in this matter — on the one hand the relation to character and the emotions, and on the other hand the intellectual part. I should like to say something about the part that has to do with character and the emotions, although it is, in the main,

much more a matter for the home than the schools. It is so important that we can not pass it over, but in this respect schools for parents are as much needed as schools for children.

If democracy is to be workable, the population must be relatively free from the fiercer emotions of hate and destructiveness and also from the emotions of fear and subservience. Now, these are emotions which are inculcated in early childhood. A parent of average ferocity attempts to teach his child complete obedience, and makes him either a slave or a rebel. What is wanted in a democracy is neither a slave nor a rebel, but a citizen; but you cannot get the proper emotions for a citizen out of an autocratic type of parent, nor, of course, out of an autocratic school.

It is clear that too much discipline is not a good thing if you want to produce a population capable of democracy. If you want to get people into the habit of initiative, of thinking for themselves, you must get them into attitudes of neither subservience to, nor rebellion against, authority.

This brings us to a source of trouble to a great many democrats, namely, what is called "principle." It is wise to scan rather skeptically most talk about principle, self-sacrifice, devotion to a cause, and so on. If you apply a little psychoanalysis to it, you find that it is not what it appears to be; it is really people's pride, or hatred, or desire for revenge, that has got itself idealized and collectivised and personified in the nation as a noble form of idealism. For example, the particular sort of idealism which consists in joining together to kill people in large numbers and is called patriotism, belongs with a certain type of cruelty, of unhappiness, of unsatisfied needs, and would tend to disappear if early education were emotionally what it ought to be.

The whole modern technique of government in all its worst aspects is derived from advertising. Advertisers are the practical psychologists of our day and discovered long ago that what makes you believe a propo-

sition is not the fact that there is some reason to think it true. Someone puts up a simple statement mentioning somebody's soap or pills beside a railway line, and the mere fact that the name is there in the long run causes you to think that it is good soap or those are good pills. The modern dictators do the same thing. You see their pictures everywhere, hear their names everywhere, and it has much the same effect on you as the advertisements of the pills and soap. In all countries which have autocratic government there is combined with that a creed, a set of beliefs to be instilled into the minds of the young while they are too young to think. And the beliefs are instilled, not by giving reasons for supposing that they are true; the mechanism is purely one of parrot-like repetition, insistence, mass hysteria, mass suggestion.

This is not the sort of thing to be aimed at in a democracy. Opposing beliefs, taught in this hypnotic fashion, produce two crowds of people who clash, and there is no means by which you can mitigate that clash. Each hypnotized automation feels that everything most sacred is bound up with the victory of his side. Such fanatical factions are quite incapable of meeting together and saying, "Let us see which has the majority." That would seem altogether too pedestrian, because each of them stands for a sacred cause.

I do not mean to say that there are no sacred causes, but I do say that you want to be very careful before you claim that your particular nostrum is sacred and the other man's something devilish. We have to have a kind of tolerance toward one another, and that tolerance is much easier to have if you think, "Human beings are fallible, and I am a human being. It is just conceivable that I may be wrong." Dogmatic certainty is extraordinarily dangerous. If you are quite certain you are right, you will infer that you have a right to stick a bayonet into anybody who does not agree with you, and even to asphyxiate his children with poison gas.

The advertisers led the way; they discovered the technique of producing irra-

tional belief. What the person who cares about democracy has got to do, I think, is deliberately to construct an education designed to counteract the natural credulity and incredulity of the uneducated man. I should start very young. If I had to run a children's school I should have two sorts of sweets — one very nice and the other very nasty. The very nasty one should be advertised with all the skill of the most able advertisers. On the other hand, the nice ones should have a coldly scientific statement, setting forth their ingredients and consequent excellence. I should let the children choose which they would have, varying the assortment from day to day. After a week or two they would probably choose the ones with the coldly scientific statement. That would be one up.

Suppose there was a question of an excursion to the country. I should have on the one hand marvelous advertisements with colored posters about some very unpleasant spot, and about another very pleasant place I should have just maps and contour lines and statements as to the amount of timber in the neighborhood, put in the driest language conceivable.

In history I should take them through the great controversies of the past, and let them read the most eloquent statements in favor of positions that no one now holds. For example, before the American Civil War, Southern orators — who were magnificent orators — made the most moving speeches in defense of slavery. Reading them now, you almost begin to think that slavery must have been a good thing. I should read children all kinds of eloquent defenses of views that nobody now holds at all, such as the importance of burning witches.

When they had grown a little impervious in that way, I should give them rhetoric in the present dealing with current controversial questions. I should give it to them always on opposite sides. I should read them every day, for example, what is said about Spain, first by the *New York Times* and then by the *Daily Worker*. In time, perhaps, they would

learn to infer the truth from these opposite statements.

The art of finding out from the newspapers what it was that happened is a very difficult one indeed, and one that every democrat should be taught. There is a great deal to be done in this direction if people are to be capable of understanding how to judge a political question. I do not want to teach people one opinion or another; it is not the business of education to do that. The business of education is to teach pupils to form opinions for themselves, and they need for that purpose to be rather impervious to eloquence and propaganda, to be on the lookout for the things that are intended to mislead, and to be able to pick out what really is argument and base themselves on that.

I do not know whether any of you have had occasion to look up a newspaper of Great War days. If you had, you would be astonished. Because as you read it a sort of hot blast of insanity comes out of the page at you. You cannot believe that we were really all collectively in a state of excitement in which one cannot see things right. Part of the business of education for democracy is to prevent people from getting too excited. It is a difficult art, because you do not want, on the other hand, that people should be without emotion. You cannot get any improvement in the world, or any kind of good life, without a basis in the emotions. But you have to be sure that basis is the right one.

I think the only emotional basis is what I should call kindly feeling — a wish, not only in regard to people you know but in regard to mankind at large, that as far as possible they should be happy, enlightened, able to live a decent sort of life. When you find other ideals, as you often do, strongly recommended in terms that sound like lofty morality, the victory of this or that cause, or any kind of thing that involves the suffering, the destruction, of some large group of mankind, then say, "That is not an ideal that any democrat can care for, because it is of the essence of democracy that we think every human being counts alike." We are not

content with a purpose that suits one group at the expense of another. The emotion that must inspire our purposes is an emotion of pain in the suffering of others, and happiness in their happiness. That is the only emotional basis that is any good. — *Bertrand Russell in The Education Digest, April,* 1939.

LEARNING AND POWER

From the time when the exercise of the intellect became the source of strength and wealth, every addition to science, every fresh truth, and every new idea became a germ of power place within reach of the people. — *De Tocqueville.*

■ This note discusses one reason that may explain the slower process of the educational growth of most Filipino students.

AN EDUCATIONAL HANDICAP OF FILIPINOS

The physical component of the Filipino brain is not likely to be different from that of the American or European or Japanese. Physiologically the brains of all of them as individuals, except perhaps those of their geniuses, are similar in size and appearance. Their potentialities are initially of about the same strength and degree. But our school children and students spend more time and effort to learn the same courses or subjects prescribed for American students. The reason is not really hard to find. It is not in the superiority of American brain power. It may be obviously explained by the fact that English, which the language our students have to use in our system of instruction, is not familiar to them.

The length of 40 minutes of a class session in high school and one hour in college may be sufficient for one whose native tongue is English. In fact, this is the measure originally established in American schools. But it is too short for a Filipino who has to spend more time to understand a lesson, a question, or a discussion in English and who requires more time still to think, to formulate, to articulate, and to vocalize his ideas for his answer or participation in a class session in the same foreign language.

The same thing happens when the non-Tagalog child or student is obliged to use Pilipino. It is not his native tongue. He was born with it. It may be a bit easier for him to learn and to use it than English but the disadvantage is still something to surmount; and it is a greater disadvantage in the sense that learning it gives the student no power to read and study the available

books of great scholars, scientists, and writers who almost always express themselves in English and European languages.

More than 300 years ago, the great works of the intellectual world were largely written in Latin. The modern European languages were not yet developed. So all students in the civilized countries had to learn and use Latin. English today in a way really serves the same service as did Latin in the ancient world of learning. Most of the great masterpieces of this modern age are either written in English or translated into this tongue from the other languages in which they might have been originally written.

But basic education given in schools could be more quickly and more effectively acquired when taught in the native tongue of the young student. The use of any other language often retards his ability to acquire basic learning. It handicaps the student in the initial process of education. English should remain our preferred foreign language for many reasons. But this is better acquired through the use of the native tongue as the main vehicle of learning it. — *V. G. Sinco, Sept.* 1968.

BREED

What people are depends not a little on who and what their progenitors were. — Ascribe what influences you please to education, examples, habits, etc., and after all a great deal depends upon the breed. — *Mills.*

■ This article is a strong presentation of the worsening condition of the Philippines.

THE COMING COLLAPSE OF FILIPINO SOCIETY

It has become necessary to ask questions. The reason is not that there are no more subjects to write on or that there are no more happenings worthy of comment: the reason is that Philippine society has so deteriorated that the tranquilizing answers are no longer availing.

The situation that I speak of involves not only the fragmentation of once accepted values but also the all but total destruction of many of our cherished institutions. That pristine time when everything dirty used to be associated only with such agencies as the customs and the internal revenue is no more.

For today, dirt is found everywhere. Indeed, it has become so that the readers of newspapers have long ceased to look at the professional criminals for the authorship of murders and robberies but to the policemen, the members of the uninformed gentry, who are paid by the people to uphold the law and maintain the peace.

If those whose duty is to provide the rest of the population with security have become the enemies of the people, where will the people find the protection they needs must have to survive?

On the surface, Philippine society has all the instruments and all the means with which to carve out order and security. It is supposed to be governed by laws not by men; it has law-enforcing agencies and prosecutors whose duty is to mobilize the resources of the state for the protection of the man in the street; it has judges who know the law and who can derive from it the legal justification for meting out such penalties as the guilty deserve; and above all, it is blessed with a free press which has always been

raising its collective voice against venality and the abuses of power.

But the vital question still is: why is it that the Filipinos are in a worse situation today than they were, say, 10 years ago? Why is it that despite all the unrestrained revelations in the columns of the press and all the denunciations disseminated through radio and television, no cause-and-effect relationship can be established between what has been exposed and a consequent action?

Why is it that the untramelled exercise of so sacred and so necessary a right as freedom of speech and press has not produced the salutary results that it has produced in democratic societies? Is it because the various forms of mass media have been so affected by the general decay that they have become ineffectual? Is it because, to use the language of mass communications, intelligent Filipinos have also become the victims of a dysfunctional press and television?

This question is important for the reason that a dysfunctional press and television — dysfunctional in the sense that having been burdened by reports of corrupt acts and practices, from thievery to embezzlement, they have produced in the Filipino a feeling of surfeit which amounts to a feeling of senseless indifference — are worse than useless.

What might have happened is that the reader of the newspaper which is bursting with news of official and private corruption develops his own alienation from the unpleasant scenery and seeks an illusory refuge either in his cynicism or in his supposed moral rectitude.

What is worse is that the urgent need of the rest of the population which is composed of common people and whose one consuming ambition is to have three meals a day and a little something for the uplift of offsprings has rendered them inert.

It is no wonder, then, that political leaders and government officials have learned to feel safe in their periodic raids on the public till. For they know that whatever animosity they arouse among the masses is more the re-

sult of envy than of moral outrage.

And so, the people go to the polls to vote for a change in administration, not for a change in the structure of society, in the forlorn hope that sooner or later the chaos will produce a leader capable of providing a direction to their drab lives.

But what will happen when the leader fails to appear? What will happen when, in the alternation of administrations, the incidence of venality increases and the refinements of accumulating unearned profits rather than the refinements of the governmental process develop? Finally, what will happen when the Filipino in the mass, his patience of a carabao exhausted, loses hope but retains his will to survive?

The only warning I can serve is that there might not be time enough to go to the airport for that sanctuary in the States or in Switzerland where the stashed dollars can be enjoyed. — *I. P. Soliongco, Manila Chronicle September* 19, 1968

CLARITY

Make a point never so clear, and it is great odds that a man whose habits, and the bent of whose mind lie a contrary way shall be unable to comprehend it; — so weak a thing is reason in competition with inclination. — *Bp. Berkeley.*

■ The Chief Justice of our Supreme Court now echoes the popular criticisms against reelections.

THE EVILS OF ELECTIONS AND REELECTIONS

It seems conceded that the practice of lavish electoral spending of rival candidates or political parties is inimical to democracy. The shortening of the period of time open for election campaigns, as provided in a recent legislation, is a step in the right direction; but, it is far from sufficient. More effective measures should be taken to curb election expenses. Such measures would not only insulate the voters from the corrupting influence of money. They would, also, assure that all candidates, regardless of their financial condition, shall have an equal opportunity to be elected on the basis of their personal qualifications and capacity for public service. Thus, ours would truly be a government of the people — and, hence, by and for the people — as it should be, if we are to have a strong democracy. It has become all too common to regard lavish electoral spending as something we cannot do anything about. This defeatist attitude is manifestly ominous. If it persists, our republican system will be doomed to dismal failure.

As for the Commission of Elections, recent developments would seem to indicate the need for a constitutional amendment ensuring bipartisan representation in the composition of that body. What I mean is that one of its members should always be a nominee of the minority party. The present Constitution does not guarantee minority representation in the Commission. Indeed, not long ago, that body was composed entirely of nominees of the majority party. The result was that, in many instances, the intention and motives of the Commission were regarded by the other party with suspicion, even in

connection with measures adopted by said body which, otherwise, could have been taken on their face value. Such suspicion is not conducive to peaceful and orderly elections. Moreover, it tends to hamper the work of the Commission.

In connection with "re-elections," there is no denying the fact that we are having an overdose of politics everywhere, not only in most activities of the government, but, also, in the field of business, commerce, and industry, and even in civic or charitable institutions and student organizations.

One of the most practical means to minimize the corroding effects of too much politics is, admittedly, to prohibit or limit re-elections. I venture to make this statement because there has been and there seems to be a consensus on the advisability of amending the Constitution to prohibit immediate re-election of the President. This proposal is mainly based upon the belief that a public officer who seeks second term is under a terrific handicap in the performance of his functions. Indeed, a re-electionist is likely to be under the suspicion that he has used the powers and influence of his office for the advancement of his candidacy, instead of, primarily, for the promotion of the commonwealth. Moreover, the danger of alienating much needed votes may be an obstacle to the proper and impartial performance of his duties.

Although the prohibition of immediate re-election may have certain disadvantages, I believe that the same are far outweighed by the benefits resulting from said prohibition. There is, to be sure, a consensus, if not unanimity, on the evils of immediate re-election. What defies logic, from a purely academic viewpoint, is that the ban on re-election is sought to be applied to the Office of the President only. Why not extend it to all elective offices? — *Portions of the Speech of Chief Justice Roberto Concepcion on September* 16, 1968.

ON GETTING INTO RUTS

Almost everyone who hears of it is amused at the rigid routine of daily activity that was prescribed for himself and exactly carried out by Immanuel Kant. Winter and summer, he rose at five o'clock every morning, studied two hours, lectured two, and spent the rest of the time until noon at writing. He then took his only meal of the day at a restaurant, walked for exactly an hour by the watch with his man-servant following twenty paces behind, umbrella in hand, and returned home to read until bedtime. This regimen he maintained for more than half a century. He never traveled more than 40 miles from his native Konigsberg. During nearly all of his 80 years he walked a beaten round. He wore a rut, and he stayed in it. He seemed to enjoy ruts.

To most people the maintenance of this exacting routine seems at best an amiable oddity. Most of us would feel that knowledge is increased almost exclusively by stirring about, by seeing new faces and places, or, in short, by keeping out of ruts. Our sympathies are all with the sort of character exemplified by Tennyson's Ulysses, whose wisdom and knowledge had grown in constant travel, in personal observation of "manners, climates, councils, governments." Like Ulysses, we "cannot rest from travel," and we have no notion whatever of the advantages to be gained by sitting still and letting the world come to us. Consequently, it seems to us simply inexplicable that the little man who never left Konigsberg, a second-rate Prussian town, and who never varied for half a century the even jog trot of his routine, should have been one of the best-informed men in history, and one of the two or three most influential thinkers of modern times.

But perhaps we have not been quite fair to ruts. The

example of Immanuel Kant is by no means unique. for everyone will think at once of Henry Thoreau who was as singly devoted to his native region so long and philosopher to his little town. "I cannot but regard it as a kindness in those that have the steering of me," he writes, "that I have been nailed down to this my native Concord as the German steadily, and made to study and love this spot of earth more and more. What would signify in comparison a thin and diffused love and knowledge of the whole world instead, got by wandering?"

Thoreau and Kant would have understood and approved the remark of Hamlet that he could confine himself in a nutshell and yet count himself a king of infinite space, for they both realized that freedom, far from being lessened, is positively and often greatly increased when we lay certain external restrictions upon it.

Something of this sort is probably the explanation of the large amount of work often done by persons who are obliged to give the greater amount of their time and strength to some prescribed activity. The success of George Grote as an historian may have been won not in spite of the fact that much of his time had to be given to banking but in some degree because of that fact, and we may possibly attribute the brilliant writing of Walter Bagehot to a similar cause. These were business men. Chaucer was also a business man. All three were men of routine. It is more than possible that they did so much for literature because they had something else to do, because they were following ruts of daily routine which gave regularity to all their efforts.

Kant brought the knowledge and intelligence of the world into sharp focus at Konigsberg and Thoreau's thought traveled abroad from Concord to ancient Greece and Rome, but the opportunities of one who sits quietly at home today are vastly greater than those that these two men enjoyed and used. In addition to the written and the printed page which was their chief means of communication with the outer world we

have the telephone, the telegraph, the radio, the cinematograph, modern journalism, photography, the airplane, and many other such devices for making ruts glorious. One who lives in a hermit's hut in the midst of a wilderness today may know much more of what is going on in the world, may hear more music and see more people and think more world-wide thoughts, than the citizen of a metropolis did a century ago. The rewards of sitting still and waiting have always been great, but they have never been so obvious as they are today.

And this is only a small part of what may be said in favor of ruts. Who gets the most solid and enduring happiness out of reading? Clearly, the reader who returns again and again to one author, one book, one passage. To whom does friendship mean most? Probably to the person who has few friends but those of long standing and intimately known.

If the truth of this be granted, then certain practical consequences follow. Almost all of us, today, are bound in some sense of the word to a fixed routine; in some degree we are obliged to move in ruts. But why should we not look at the definite advantages of the situation?

The place that we cannot get away from sets us free when we cheerfully decide that we would not leave it even if we were able, and it becomes a watch tower from which we look out over a wide surrounding country. The routine to which we have seemed tied becomes a source of strength and gives a liberty such as purposeless drifters can never know when we accept it as our own.

Why is it that we are continually warning one another not to "get into ruts"? The reason for all this is apparently, that ruts are frequently misused. People sometimes get into them, it would almost seem, with the primary intention of hiding themselves and of shutting away all the prospect of the outer world together with as much as possible of the light that streams in from above. — *Excerpt from The Christian Science Monitor* (*Nov* 1929).

■ The kind of education persons must have to be intelligent and responsible and effective leaders. A criticism of student demonstrations.

A REBEL'S VIEW OF THE YOUNG REVOLUTIONARIES

These activists are showing all the signs of an uneducated mind. Not that they hold incorrect opinions, though I don't judge other people's education by whether their opinions check with my opinions, but how they defend their opinions and how well they listen. And I must say that intellectually most of them are pretty trivial. Practically none of them showed the slightest interest in the problem that I naively supposed was foremost in their minds. That is, "what's wrong with the university as a teaching institution?"

Most of them want to use the campus — or misuse it — to organize a revolution. It's that simple. And they want complete sexual rights. They want the rest of us to pay taxes to put up the facilities so they can have this house party and hatch the revolution.

I tried to get their minds on the problem of getting an education. I thought they were, and some students are, concerned with the fact that with the publish or perish policy and so on they're not getting a break educationally. Nobody gives a damn whether they are really educated. They're tolerated.

A great number of professors in our leading institutions don't want to teach undergraduates. They do it under duress and do it, of course, pretty badly — as most of us do under duress.

My own interest, not just at St. John's but before that, has always been undergraduate education because it seemed to me the Achilles' heel in American education. We are not in the position to do graduate work or professional work because the

B.A.s and B.S.s we teach are not up to it. They just haven't got enough grounding.

I wanted people to read and write. I think it is that simple. Of course, a lot of people teaching in colleges are not so high falutin'. They say "my students read and write." I don't want their opinions. I want the opinion of the professors of law, the professors of medicine, the professors who teach graduate students. They say that the students don't know how to read and write, and I would add unkindly that a hell of a lot of people teaching them don't know how to read or write either.

If they were really able to read and listen and speak and think clearly, they could do this graduate and professional training in quite another manner. We are trying to teach the liberal arts and the best way to do it, I think, is the way little children learn to talk — by listening to somebody who already knows how. When I read Shakespeare, I'm always jolted by how damned badly I write and talk and think and it's such trivial crap compared to this man.

You can do it with Shakespeare, you can do it with Newton, you can do it with any of the minds that have operated superbly. You soak them in first-class minds for four years. These kids for the first year or two would say with all candor, "I don't know what in the hell he's talking about," and you say "stick with it."

I'm talking about people who do what has been done centuries of time: read only first-class stuff so they get off their tails, intellectually, and come to grips with ideas. I think this may happen in some colleges, particularly in those that have no graduate or professional work. The professors can't very well say that don't take undergraduate teaching seriously; it's the only teaching they do. So they can't hide in the graduate school.

The awful thing is that liberal education has been so punk in my lifetime. The faculty and administration are behaving so stupidly, they can't do anything about it — nor can the students. Until something is done

about the quality of education, you can't answer the question of who ought to run it, where the students are to be fed, what kind of housing they need.

Now these activists are not talking about the problems of education. They're talking about secession. They're through. They've had it. They don't believe in the system. They we're all a pack of liars and hypocrites—and we're pretty good at lying and hypocrisy. It doesn't occur to them that they're liable to do a little lying themselves before they are really through.

They want power and they want change. If you ask why they want change, I think the popular word is alienated. They don't like this society. They believe they can remold it to their heart's desire. They're saying, "I want to get rid of this system because it is a bad system. And in order to do this, I want power."

This is the nearest they come to talking about education. They want to dictate what courses would train men best to be revolutionary. They aren't ashamed of this or embarrassed by this.

I don't mind them being revolutionaries. I think revolutionaries have a real social function. I object to people who are as ignorant as they obviously were deciding what courses they ought to have, even to be a revolutionary. If one of them had said, "I want to be a revolutionary, What's your advice?" I would have said "get a decent education" — the same advice I'd give to people who want to go into law or medicine. And you'll find out four years from now that you understand. You'll be a better revolutionary. You might abandon the idea of being a revolutionary, just as you might abandon the idea of going into medicine, but that's the risk of education.

I don't feel we are anywhere near a solution. After all, if these kids are not interested in education, but in revolution, it can also be said that the faculty is not much interested in education either. They're interested in their subjects. If you have ever seen people who really cared for undergraduates and who were exciting intellectually, it's not remotely

like what we're looking at now.

Whether or not these little rebels can actually bring the university to a grinding halt, as they put it, they have already created such a mess that many campuses are frantic. It's possible that the faculty will be forced to get jobs as plumbers or sit down with the students and really do a job of educating them. — *By Stringfellow Barr, in College and University.*

THE EVIL OF . . .

(*Continued from page* 1)

have been repeatedly performed with apparent impunity. The depressing consequences may be hidden from third parties for a time; but sooner or later the evil doer, the compromiser of an evil, may himself suffer from a sense of guilt or a sense of inward inferiority despite any defensive pretension and any self-serving rationalization he might offer to justify his misdeed.

When one finds himself in this predicament, there is only one way of escape open to him: To gather enough courage to admit in all frankness and honesty the moral lapses or the illegal omissions he has committed and then to turn over a new leaf and to follow the high ideal of integrity with patience and humility.

These are not idle words of self-righteousness. They should not even be taken as counsel of perfection. They are practical suggestions for a peaceful way of extricating oneself from a painful human situation that could become a heavy burden more and more difficult to bear with the passage of time. — *V. G. Sinco, August* 20, 1968.

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Public Works and Communication
BUREAU OF POSTS
M a n i l a

SWORN STATEMENT
(Required by Act 2580)

The undersigned, APOL B. DE LA PEÑA, Managing editor, of PANORAMA, published Once a Month, in English, at Community Publishers, Inc., after having been duly sworn in accordance with law, hereby submits the following statement of ownership, management, circulation, etc., which is required by Act 2580, as amended by Commonwealth Act No. 201.

N a m e	*A d d r e s s*
Editor: ARTURO G. SINCO	2131 Dr. M. Carreon St. Sta. Ana, Manila
Managing Editor: APOL B. DE LA PEÑA	2105 Suter Street Sta. Ana, Manila
Business Manager: ARTURO G. SINCO	2131 Dr. M. Carreon St. Sta. Ana, Manila
Owner: COMMUNITY PUBLISHERS, INC.	2131 Dr. M. Carreon St. Sta. Ana, Manila
Publisher: — do —	—do—
Printer: — do —	—do—
Office of Publication: — do —	—do—

If publication is owned by a corporation, stockholders owning one percent or more of the total amount of stocks: V. G. SINCO, SOFIA S. SINCO, ARTURO G. SINCO, LEANDRO G. SINCO & SYLVIA SINCO-DICHOSO, 2131 Dr. M. Carreon, Sta. Ana, Manila

In case of publication other than daily, total number of copies printed and circulated of the last issue dated August, 1968.

1. Sent to paid subscribers	3,000
2. Sent to others than paid subscribers	1,000
T o t a l	4,000

(Sgd.) APOL B. DE LA PEÑA
Managing Editor

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 3rd day of October, 1968, at Manila, the affiant exhibiting his Residence Certificate No. A-209131 issued at Manila on January 12, 1968.

(Sgd.) ANASTACIO C. RAMOS
Postal Inspector

Panorama Reading Association

PANORAMA invites the educated public to join its Association of Readers.

PANORAMA READING ASSOCIATION is dedicated to men and women who appreciate the variety and quality of its articles as sources of liberal ideas.

PANORAMA READING ASSOCIATION includes students, businessmen, professionals, proprietors, employers, and employees. It is also open to clubs, schools, and other accredited organizations.

PANORAMA has been in existence for over *Thirty Years.*

PANORAMA provides excellent material for classes in history, government, economics, political and social studies, literature, and science. It may be adopted for secondary and college use.

PANORAMA is not a fly-by-night publication. *It was born in March,* 1936.

COMMUNITY PUBLISHERS, INC.
Inverness, (M. Carreon) St., Sta. Ana, Manila, Philippines

Contents

The Evil of Compromise 1

Improving Graduate Education in the Philippines ... 2

Sabah and Sabahans 23

Education for Democracy 20

An Educational Handicap of Filipinos 34

The Coming Collapse of Filipino Society 36

The Evils of Elections and Reelections 39

On Getting into Ruts 41

A Rebel's View of the Young Revolutionaries 44

THE COVER — The worsening condition of Philippine society may be likened to a diseased coconut tree, like the one shown in photo. Tranquilizing answers to its problems might no longer be availing.