

Four Best Manila Newspaper December Editorials

A University Selection: Also the Best Among the Four

A REGRETTABLE OVERSIGHT

(Bulletin: December 28)

During the absence of the intrepid Ben Wright, the insular auditor's office has faced an admittedly difficult problem. It seems that jewelry entering the Philippines is subject to duty. In the case at bar, a jewel did enter but the duty has remained unpaid.

A well known senator, it is said, imported the diamond, and the question thus resolves itself into which well known senator.

The Hon. Juan B. Alegre, who is both a senator and well known, wrote recently to the Bulletin to point out that he was not the one. As far as we can remember, nobody said he was, and the public remains at a loss as to why Mr. Alegre should have taken up the cudgels in his own behalf before he had been accused. There are plenty of senators in whose bright lexicon the word "duty" does not appear.

After profound thought, the only reason we can see is that the senate list is alphabetically arranged, and Mr. Alegre, with characteristic impetuosity, did not read it through to determine which of his colleagues might be, more logically, the culprit. Having got as far as "A", he neglected to look at the B's, C's, D's, and so on.

It is regrettable that he was not named Zimbalist. Then this little contretemps need never have arisen.

—Best among the four.

HIGHER MORALITY

(Times: December 4)

Higher morality is one of the prerequisites of success. This is true of individuals but particularly of nations. History records the downfall of great soldiers and empires as a result of the moral breakdown coming closely in the wake of conquests and victories. Moral decadence is chiefly responsible for the crumbling of "the splendor that was Rome and the glory that was Greece."

The Filipino people, by and large, are moral and law-abiding and God-fearing. But they need a higher morality if they ever wish to succeed. Just now there is a tendency of looseness and laxity. Men who have been convicted by their own acts or by public opinion, men known to have been guilty of shady acts and transactions, are allowed to cut a figure in the community and its activities, to pose as leaders of thought, or politics or some other human enterprise when they should be lackeys, heroes when they should be helots, idols when they should be mere icons.

When things like this happen in any country it is time to pause and ponder. The Filipino people, especially their youths, should wake up from their lethargy and with scrutiny look into the kind of men who would preach to them, who would lead them or shape their acts and their very thought. They should extricate themselves from this mental slavery, beware of the ignis fatuus, and decide to think for themselves rather than let others do the thinking for them.

THE QUEZON SPEECH IN CHICAGO

(Tribune: December 3)

The Chicago speech of Senate President Quezon is not merely the reiteration of an old plea, nor the phrasing of an old ideal for its possible effects on political developments in these Islands. When the recognized leader of our people says that only freedom will satisfy the Filipinos, the declaration has a familiar ring to it, but to us, a people in subjugation, the hope of the whole nation that motivates every pronouncement for our emancipation, gives to the stand of President Quezon still the significance of a national demand.

There has been no recession in the attitude either of our people or of our leaders on the question of independence. There has been no unanimity only in the methods leading to the realization of the ideal. What President Que-

zon said in Chicago, to the very last and insignificant detail, the Filipinos, to a man, would say, and say them in all sincerity and even in flaming demand of their just due. If it be asserted that the immediate future holds no prospect of an immediate settlement of the Philippine problem as we would have it finally decided, if it be concluded that the independence movement has turned the corner to become a tepid theme for the hollow tirades of leaders discouraged by nearly a generation of fruitless campaign, the situation, thus desperately painted to our nationals, need not undermine their faith in themselves and in their leaders. America and Americans know only too well that there is no substitute for the independence movement except the actuality of independence.

President Quezon's offer of naval and coaling stations and preferential trade relations, is proof of the willingness of our people to approach the question of their independence as a question involving also the interest of the American people. Our leaders are willing, and our people support them in their concession, to recognize America's right to protect her welfare, as it might be affected by the severance of political ties between the two countries.

If, despite this practical demonstration of our desire to concede ground, so that at last the Philippine problem be resolved to illustrate the unique case of "a nation owning a colony and deliberately setting it free," the failure to effect final settlement of the issue, should be attributed

not to our leaders, but to the leaders of America.

President Quezon gives emphasis to a human phase of the problem, and the Tribune agrees with him, that, in refusing to let our people choose their own leader, America has placed an indictment against us, which we shall always resent. We have gone through experiences such as have made other peoples fully the masters of their own affairs. The limitations to our selection of who among us should guide our own government, impose a moral punishment at the same time that they withhold a political right. This we resent, not in hate of American rule but in protection of our self-respect.

Our people make theirs the protest of President Quezon that, although the definite policy of the United States government in these Islands since the first day of occupancy during the McKinley administration is to grant the Filipinos their independence, "we are no nearer to the execution of that announced policy than when it was first enunciated."

PRETENSE AND HYPOCRISY

(Herald: December 17)

With the appointment of Colonel Stimson as Governor General of the Philippines, the New York Evening World cannot discern the slightest change in American policy in the Islands. It says, "We own the Islands and their people, having bought them, and we intend to keep them as long as it pays any portion of our people for us to do so. That is our policy stripped of all pretense and hypocrisy." We want to felicitate the New York Evening World for its frankness in expressing what it believes to be the mind of the American people with regard to the Philippines and the Filipinos. We will not discuss the question whether this country and its people are a mere chattel or a common ordinary piece of property of the United States. What concerns us is what the United States intends to do with this Far Eastern "property." If there has been so much misunderstanding in the past between the Washington administration and the Filipinos, it is precisely because of that "pretense and hypocrisy" on the part of the Washington administration in dealing with the Filipinos. Should it come out openly and squarely in an official way, and lay down a permanent policy "stripped of pretense and hypocrisy," as the New York Evening World has done, the Philippine question would be settled now, the Filipinos' will to the contrary notwithstanding. After all, the New York publication is right when it avers that this country and the Filipinos are the property of the United States. The human rights which we vociferously claim to be ours and which we invoke, in protesting against any reaffirmation that we are the property of another nation, are either granted by a physically superior power or won.

As long as the United States refuses to say with finality whether the Philippines will ever become independent or not, the best colonial administrator that America can ever produce will never solve the Philippine problem. And the problem is—the Filipinos want independence, but America refuses to grant it. The gradual concession of autonomy offers nothing but temporary relief. Seeing the advancement of the free and independent nations of the earth, the Filipinos cannot and will not lie supine and be left by the roadside in the race toward human progress. Every concession of autonomy serves to whet their desire to work out their destiny as a people. It may satisfy them for a while, but the will to attain their freedom will reassert with greater vigor; for it is the experience of all peoples of the world, that are conscious of their own capacity and potential resources, that the greater the degree of freedom, the faster and greater their national progress. The Harrison régime, so much combated by Filipino detractors, is a case in point. With all the relative defects of that administration attendant upon all changes and readjustments, the Filipinos have progressed in all aspects of national life, in the art of self-rule, in economic ventures in prosperity. No nation has ever grown to full stature when reared under unsettled conditions, suspicion or pretense. The country is prepared to hear the truth, as we have indicated in one of our previous utterances. What does America intend to do about this—its Far Eastern "property?"

UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES

College of Liberal Arts

MANILA

Department of English

January 7, 1928

Mr. Walter Robb,
Editor, Chamber of Commerce
Journal,
American Chamber of Commerce,
Manila, P. I.

Dear Mr. Robb:

I am transmitting herewith the editorials selected by the English Department Committee of the University of the Philippines as the best for the month of December. The selections are as follows:

Bulletin, December 28, "A Regrettable Oversight," selected by Prof. Vicente M. Hilario.

Times, December 4, "Higher Morality," selected by Professor Cristino Jamias.

Tribune, December 3, "The Quezon Speech in Chicago," selected by Mr. Jesus Valenzuela.

Herald, December 17, "Pretense and Hypocrisy," selected by Mr. Marcial Lichauco.

The undersigned and the members above named have selected, as the best of the four, the editorial in the Bulletin of December 28, "A Regrettable Oversight."

In making selections, each member of the committee has judged according to his own standards of what an editorial should be; there has been no attempt to agree upon rules or principles of selection. The selections, therefore, represent merely the personal preferences of the judges.

Assuring you of our pleasure in cooperating with you in this feature of the Journal, I am

Sincerely yours,

G. P. SHANNON,
Head.