

The President suggested that American capital was not deterred from developing the American West because of the risks, the hardships and dangers of frontier life, including the menace of the savage Indian tribes, and said that he could not believe that American capital has lost its pioneering spirit and will fail to come to the Philippines because conditions here are believed to be "not attractive, not easy, not secure."

If we may quote:

"I like to believe that American capital, as a potent instrument of industrial progress for the advancement of democratic liberties and social amelioration wherever it has taken root, is still true to the spirit of Americanism which makes America the leader of the world today. I like to believe that being morally strong by tradition and inheritance it does not have to rely solely on special privilege for itself, that it is not easily intimidated into retreat by mere challenges to its genius for adjustment in a new setting to justify its leadership of free nations."

This prompts the thought that the Indians, at first, at least, had only bows and arrows, knives, clubs, spears, and tomahawks, later some guns; they never had the mace of governmental authority;— executive, legislative, and judicial. And shooting members of Congress, judges, and department and bureau directors and other government officials, or putting them on reservations, can't be done!

American capital here asks for no "special privilege," but only for equal opportunity and freedom from arbitrary governmental intervention in the processes of production, investment, and trade.

The President bracketed "planning" and "nationalization" together when he said:

"Planning and nationalization are a dynamic political and social reality, spelling resistance to unregulated free enterprise and possibly keeping its rewards within humane and civilized sanctions."

We are sure that American capital is not looking for anything outside such sanctions as the President mentioned, and there is no objection to national planning. "Nationalization," however, is another thing. One certainly can not expect foreign capital to come into a country where the general trend is toward a rapid "nationalization,"— that is, where legislation is deliberately being framed to discriminate against such capital and to impair the capitalist's control over it.

"It is to be observed," said the President, "that the systematic nationalization going on in England has not discouraged the billions of dollars that America is pouring in there."

May we observe that these billions constitute government loans and not private capital investments? And that these loans are being made as a part of the Marshall Plan for all of Europe chiefly for political and strategic and to some extent for humanitarian reasons, and certainly not for profit in the business sense?

The President said that he did not want an assignment as an undertaker, a mortician, for the Republic. If he and other leaders would only realize that the country has already had to bury some of its high hopes,— among them that during the past three years or so following the liberation American investment capital would come in in volume. That it has not is largely due to the fact that conditions have been more or less deliberately rendered less favorable and less propitious than they might have been. However, the very fact that Philippine leaders are showing signs of sensing this, is an important step in the di-

rection of the ultimate correction we still hope for.

The general aim of present government policy is natural enough. As the President said:

"We want our own people to have a proportionate share in the enjoyment of our economic opportunities."

American capital would not question this as anything but commendable. But when the means adopted become frankly discriminatory, there can be but one result.

Putting the matter in the simplest language:

American, or any other, capital will accept natural risks as a part of all capitalistic enterprise, but it does not choose to operate under a deliberately discriminatory sovereign government.

President Quirino pointed to a distinction which is important in a democracy,— that between leaders

and bosses, in his address at the commencement exercises last month of the Leaders and Bosses Philippine Women's University.

He said, in part:

"Bossism is not real leadership. It is a corruption of leadership... If we are loyal to our democracy we must assess our leadership in terms other than those of bossism... We must believe in the common man's right and capacity to think... The idea that the common people are gulls, useful pawns in the political game... belongs to the past... The people do not need anyone to whip them into line... Their will becomes clear... It is a sound government that recognizes and accepts its authority... A real democracy is where the people create the leaders..."

In United States political slang, a boss (from the Dutch *baas*, master) is a "professional politician who controls a large number of votes in a party organization, or who dictates, unofficially, appointments and legislative measures".

A boss heads a political "machine". The dictionary defines this word in that sense:

"The committees or other working bodies, often under the power of a boss, especially in a political party, through which its policies and activities are directed and its nominations and patronage are often largely controlled, for private rather than for party or public end."

Lincoln Steffens, author of the book, "The Shame of the Cities", has told that when at the turn of the century he was visiting the various big cities whose corrupt governments he exposed, his first effort always was to discover not who was the mayor or the chief of police or who any of the other important officials were, but who the boss was. Sometimes this man held office, but often he did not and skulked in the background.

There have also been such state machines, but, city or state, when they became too openly corrupt, the people revolted, "turned the rascals out" at the elections, and often sent the bosses to jail.

Leaders of the American federal government have rarely been charged with graft, and the national party organization in the United States has, indeed, always been loose and without the compactness required for a regime of corruption.

A distinction must be made between legitimate party organization anywhere, and the political machine of a boss or "ring" of public grafters. Political parties are natural to a democracy. They are broad divisions of the electorate, standing for certain differences in ideals and policies of government. They naturally seek to influence the voters and to get their own candidates elected. But they do not resort to

bribery and blackmail and violence to get votes, or to fraud in the conduct of elections. Corrupt machines are parasitic upon the legitimate political parties, as they are upon the whole community.

This parasitism is, of course, natural under certain conditions, just as it is natural for a dog to have worms and fleas. That we have criminals in the world is something that we must accept. But to put them over us, is not necessary. We do not have to choose them to run our public affairs.

It is necessary, in a democracy, for the people to accept the responsibilities as well as the advantages of self-government. There must be general devotion to the common interest and determined will to pursue the high aim of establishing and maintaining a sound nation.

In the Philippines, the national political organization has, for a number of reasons, long had the compactness that lends itself to one-man control. That, during the greater part of this time, the successive supreme leaders were good men, true patriots, who might have abused their power, but did not, was largely a matter of the country's good luck. The people trusted them and followed them more or less blindly.

Death or retirement has ended their great careers. The people have now to choose leaders from among the present group of office holders or to project new leaders from among themselves. Blind faith is no longer wise. The people must be alert and on their guard, or the democratic system here will fail.

What is probably the worst about the decision of the Philippine Chamber of Commerce to express itself as favoring a revision of the Bell Act, is its poor timing,—a timing which might perhaps

Tinkering with become dangerous. The Chamber the Bell Act; only declared that it favored revision the Taylor Bill looking toward "selective free trade both ways", as advocated by Mr. Salvador Araneta, but its meetings and discussions and the final resolution, all played-up in the press, closely followed the introduction by the Wallace-ite Senator Glen Taylor of Bill No. 694 which would repeal the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 (the Bell Act) outright while "an investigation by the Congress and the enactment of legislation governing the economic relations between the United States and the Republic" would still be "pending". We would suddenly find ourselves entirely outside of the American tariff wall and the protection which it gives the Philippines. Repeat first; "investigation" later. And then what, if anything?

Section F of the Taylor Bill declares that the Bell Act is "inconsistent with the sovereignty of the Republic of the Philippines" as it limits Philippine control over the country's resources, tariffs, foreign trade, and currency. The Section further declares that the Bell Act is "incompatible with American democratic principles" and is a "contributing cause to growing unrest in the Philippines"; "detrimental to American trade and the raising of the living standards of the American people and beneficial only to a small group of American monopolist interests"; and "prejudicial to the good neighborly relations between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, and con-

tributing to friction and the unsettling of peaceful relations in the Pacific".

This is a malignant indictment, and the full text, which was abbreviated in the preceding paragraph for the sake of clarity, is even more so. For instance, it is declared that free trade is continued "in varying degrees until 1974 so that the Philippines will remain dependent on the American market and fail to industrialize and become self-sustaining." Senator Taylor charges the United States Government with having that deliberate purpose! Also: the Bell Act is incompatible with American democratic principles because it imposes "onerous controls on the war-ravaged Philippine economy as the price of assisting in its rehabilitation and development."

However, in making this charge, the Senator unintentionally and illogically admits that this nefarious Bell Act does, after all, assist in the rehabilitation and development of the Philippines!

We found cause for a satirical chuckle in the fact that at Havana, during the conference of the United Nations International Trade Organization (November, 1947—March, 1948) all this "exploitation" of the Philippines was considered "preferential treatment" by the other nations represented at the meeting. Some of them made objections, and it being feared both in the Philippines and the United States, that decisions might be taken which would alter the Philippines' preferential position, the Philippine Government was quick to protest against any change.

The then President of the Philippines, Manuel Roxas, issued a statement from Malacañan which read:

"The President expressed great satisfaction this afternoon when he read the statement made by President Truman at a press conference in Washington yesterday, giving assurances that the preferential trade agreement (Bell Act) between the Philippines and the United States would not in any way be altered by any decision which might be made at the ITO conference in Havana. It will be recalled that President Roxas protested vigorously against attempts in connection with the ITO Charter to modify the trade preferences between the Philippines and the United States for the duration of the trade agreement, and that he instructed Secretary Abello, who is now head of the Philippine delegation in Havana, not to sign any agreement which might in any way disturb our preferential trade with the United States or prejudice the interests of the Philippines..."

The communist-fringe of rattle-brains in the United States may not know what it is doing in giving backing to aspersions cast on United States policy, and to schemes to wreck rehabilitation and recovery in all parts of the world outside the Russian sphere, including the Philippines. But we may be sure that the Cuban sugar lobby, which keeps a covetous eye on the Philippine sugar quota, will be a most zealous supporter of the Taylor Bill and of the Philippine Chamber in any clamor in connection with securing possible changes in the Bell Act.

In all the recent discussion of the Act, as reported in the Philippine press, we have noted not a single reference to those sections which convey the most vital advantages to the Philippines,—such as sections 211 and 212, which establish absolute Philippine quotas for sugar and cordage.

As to our sugar industry, one of the three mainstays of our economy, we can think of no more unsuitable time to weaken in any way the present security of the industry under the Bell Act. A few years ago there might have been some excuse for "econo-