PANORAMA

THE PHILIPPINE MAGAZINE OF GOOD READING

MARCH, 1966
75 Centavos

Senator Juan M. Liwag delivered a privileged speech opposing the aid-to-Vietnam bill. He said the Philippines would only be aiding American aggression in Vietnam.

Tell Your Friends

about the *Panorama*,

the Philippines' most

versatile, most significant

magazine today.

Give them

a year's subscription — NOW!

they will appreciate it.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

..... **1 year for ₱8.50** ..... **2 years for ₱16.00**

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

Name .....

Street .....

City or Town ..... *Province* .....

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

Please address all checks or money orders in favor of:

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

PANORAMA

THE PHILIPPINE MAGAZINE OF GOOD READING

Vol. XVIII MANILA, PHILIPPINES No. 3

THE POISON OF IMPORTED CIVILIZATION

Any "civilization" which is received from the outside may easily be fatal to the recipient. For "civilization," as distinguished from culture, is a blending of mechanized techniques, of artificial stimulants, of luxuries — all of which are, as it were, distilled from the life of a people. Injected into another social organism, this distillation is always poisonous, and in large doses is fatal. For example, alcohol is a luxury which appeared among civilizations of the white race; they suffer from its use but are able to stand it. But when it was taken to Africa and the South Seas it blotted out whole races.

The Roman influence was the alcohol of the German Visigoths, a decadent people who came stumbling down across space and time until they reached Spain, the farthest corner of Europe, where they found rest. The Franks, on the other hand, burst into the gentle land of the Gauls intact, and flooded it with the irresistible torrent of their vitality.

There are people who, when they hear of vitality, picture a human figure covered with enormous muscles, capable of eating a bear whole and washing it down with a keg of wine. To them, vitality is synonymous with brutality. I hope my readers understand that I mean by vitality simply that power of creation which is life itself. Vitality is the power which a healthy cell has of begetting another cell, and vitality is likewise the secret force which creates a great historic power. Vitality, or the power of organic creation, takes a different form in every species and kind of living thing. — *Jose Ortega y Gasset in Invertebrate Spain.*

INTEGRITY AND ANONYMITY

In his address to the graduates of the Baguio Military Academy President Marcos brought up two points which are not given enough value and significance in the social life of our people today. One is *integrity* and the other is *anonymity*.

Integrity is often given a lower priority in the selection of persons for critical positions in the government and in private enterprises. Ability, forwardness, social qualities are considered sufficient factors for the choice of men and women for places of power and responsibility. These are indeed desirable qualifications; but by themselves we have known from experience that in the long run they cannot provide strength against the influences of corruption and official malfeasance. What the nation needs today more than mere smart and clever men, more than fine orators and highly sophisticated arm-twisters, are men and women of integrity. Unless we have them in positions of influence and responsibility, the Philippines will remain a jungle of crime, confusion, and mendacity.

When President Marcos mentioned anonymity as an attribute of superior value to a public servant he struck a chord that had never been heard by our people nor given the slightest significance by our leaders not only in politics and business but also in education and civic life. In urging graduates to perform their duties well without any thought of being awarded medals, decorations, and honorary citizens, President Marcos gave a heavy blow to the common practice of many who for any movement they do they would have their pictures taken and published in the newspapers. It is this kind of men who cannot stand the atmosphere of anonymity and so they sally forth to secure honorary de-

grees and go to the extent of telling lies and delivering ghost-written speeches in order to appear great among people who consider newspaper publicity as Biblical truth. Self-advertising is a common practice among many of our so-called leaders. Public relations blow up the image of petty personalities; and because they rise high up with nothing really solid within them, they accomplish nothing of great value, they serve only as soap bubbles for child-like minds to admire.

In holding up anonymity as a great virtue President Marcos should suit his action to his word. — *V. G. S.*

TO HELL WITH YALE

There is the story of a Harvard man who spent some days in Egypt, and enjoyed during that time the services of a French-speaking native guide and courier. As they parted, the guide requested, "Sire, teach me words of English, with which I may attract your countrymen." The Harvard man did so.

Some time later, he returned to Egypt, looked up his guide, and said, "How did you make out with the English I taught you?"

"Sire," said the guide, "some there were who smiled and came with me, others there were who were angered and turned away."

NO SIMPLE PROBLEM – PHILIPPINE EDUCATION

The state of education in this country is not a piecemeal problem one can dissect. Legislators have tried to solve our problems in education by passing laws with confusing results. And how often have educators talked about the neglect of science or the need for buildings and textbooks, all in vain? The state of education is impossible to discuss apart from the entire milieu of Filipino society. We have to view the nation as a whole, and then look at the sad state of education to arrive at a more accurate autopsy. One cannot segregate the influence of politics, of business interests, of communications media, of student concept of education, of the character of teachers in this country, and of the power elite that molds, and holds sway over the shape of education in the Philippines.

A look at the pattern of various disturbances in the field of education show that it is just not possible to consider the problems purely as one of education. There has been, for example, much talk about diploma mills but this is related to the student-population explosion, the failure of the government and existing authentic private institutions to respond to this phenomenon, and the distorted social concept of what education is in terms of diplomas. Education being the only channel available for social mobility, the social class structure has to be considered in the problem of diploma mills. Similarly, the scandals on cheating at government exams are inextricable from government graft and misconception of education; and when is a school an educational institution, and when a business establishment?

Let us take the case of teachers forming unions and of their going on strike, as has been the case in the past and is a problem right now in one institution. Could one segregate this conflict and call it a labor-management problem, stripping it completely of educational aspects? And how does one even discuss the educational significance, when the forces that will ultimately determine the conflict will be the various power influences of our society — whether political leaders, the courts of justice, the press, the educators, or public opinion? In the case of the strike going on at FEU, for example, should not education have a voice through highly respectable and objective and impartial mediators? This is not the case, and so we have instead lawyers and labor bosses, while newsmen are strangely silent, more concerned it seems with a sex scandal in the CIS.

* * *

Within our present society, when principles are challenged in a specific crisis at a specific time and place, the reason for action will invariably turn out to be that one rallied to the call of a relative or to acknowledge *utang-na-loob* to a powerful patron without looking at the issues and judging the case on its merits. The real struggle going on in the Filipino society is that of the individualist who stands on his own merits, his work and his talents, versus those who have to cling to one another to protect their own incompetence and their own fear in the old feudal type society. — *Alfredo R. Roces, Manila Times, March* 20, 1966.

■ The statistics in this article are old and need upgrading but the varied uses of coconut are as tangible now as it was 30 years ago.

THE VERSATILE COCONUT

The story of the coconut is the story of the economic progress of the Philippines, to which it has contributed more than any other product. Few plants, if any, are as serviceable to primitive man as is the coconut. The nut meat is eaten as food; the oil is useful in making edible fats and soap, and is also used for illumination; the tree roots provide a dye, and the trunks, building material; the leaves are employed for thatching roofs; the midrib of the leaf is used for making baskets, brooms, and brushes; the fiber from the nut husk is woven into ropes and mats; and the nut shells, in addition to providing fuel, are shaped into cups, ladles, spoons, and other utensils.

Under primitive conditions, the production of coconuts, copra, and coconut oil was confined to groves of wild palms. These uncultivated trees still constitute a considerable source of supply when the market price is sufficiently attractive to natives. The coco palm, however, is now cultivated like any other staple agricultural product, and large plantations are to be found throughout the tropics.

In domestic cultivation, it is customary to set out the trees in rows, about 30 feet apart, giving room for about 48 to the acre. Crops of abaca, or Manila hemp, and other quickly growing plants, are usually grown between the rows. During the fifth or sixth year, the trees begin to bear, and after the seventh year the planter can reap an annual harvest of 15 or more nuts from each tree. The trees reach maturity at the age of ten years, when about 70 nuts per tree are collected annually. In rare instances, as many as 500 nuts have been harvested in a year from a single tree, and trees have been known to

continue to produce after reaching an age of 150 years.

The natives crack open the nuts with a bolo. The broken nut meats are then placed in the sun to dry. Sometimes the broken pieces are placed on drying racks under which coconut husks are burned to speed the drying process. The resulting smoke-colored copra is called "smoke-dried" to distinguish it from that which has been sun-dried. The firedrying method is used in regions where excessive rain makes natural drying impossible. Mechanical driers are employed on some of the larger plantation, but the practice has not become prevalent.

The natives have various ways of disposing of their crop. In some districts they sell their copra direct to the dealers at trading stations operated by the exporters. Chinese merchants in the small towns also acquire much of the local copra stocks, usually giving merchandise in exchange. The coconuts are frequently made into "rafts," and are floated down the rivers to market.

Some years ago it was the practice to ship almost all of the copra overseas for crushing and conversion into coconut oil, but a few mills have been established in the Philippines, in India, and in the Dutch East Indies. These local mills have become important factors in the copra market, exerting a balancing influence on the market price of copra and oil.

Copra first became an important item in world commerce in 1886 although a French sailing vessel had carried a load of coconuts to Marseilles as early as 1750. Marseilles soon became a manufacturing center for copra products, and is still one of the most important copra importing ports in the world. It was in France that the first butter substitute, consisting of coconut oil and peanut oil, was produced.

The phenomenal growth of the copra industry in the United States is shown by the fact that imports in 1920 amounted to 218,521,916 pounds, of which only seven percent came from the Philippines. By 1927, our copra imports had increased to 450,-994,519 pounds, of which 72 percent came from the Philippines. About two-thirds of

the American copra imports were consigned to the major Pacific Coasts ports – San Francisco, Los Angeles, Portland, and Seattle.

Originally coconut oil extracted from copra the source was shipped to San Francisco and other ports in five-gallon cases, barrels, and drums. Then a system was perfected whereby the oil was shipped in tank steamers and in deep tanks on passenger and cargo vessels operating between American and the Orient. This practice immediately revolutionized the transportation situation; for years the great ocean steamers had been carrying petroleum from this country to the Orient and returning in ballast, until someone thought out a practical scheme of carrying the coconut oil on the return voyage. A number of tank steamers are now engaged in transporting petroleum from Pacific Coast points to the Orient, returning with a capacity cargo of coconut oil in the same tanks.

Of course, it was necessary to devise a very effective system of cleaning the tanks of the ships before filling them with edible oil. After the petroleum cargo has been removed, a charge of live steam is forced into the tanks. This is continued for a period of 12 to 24 hours. After pumping out the bilges, and waiting a sufficient length of time for the interiors to cool, men are sent down into the tanks to clean them as thoroughly as possible. Later, upon arrival at the port where the coconut oil is taken on, the tanks are given a final cleaning.

The most important factor in handling coconut oil is temperature, for in order to keep the oil in a liquid state, the temperature must be more than 70 degrees, Fahrenheit. Under cooler conditions, it hardens into a dense material resembling butter or lard. Consequently it is necessary to provide heating pipes in the tanks of the steamers, in storage tanks, and in the tank cars used for distributing the oil in the United States. In many cases, the delivery hoses have a small heating tube running down the center, carrying steam or hot water.

In making coconut oil the copra is first but through expellers which force out

about 25 percent of the oil content. The residue is then ground into meal, and the remaining oil is squeezed out by hydraulic presses. Most of the oil is then filtered, and used for the manufacturing soap, shaving cream, shampoo solutions, and a long list of cosmetics. Some of the coconut oil is used for edible products, and must be refined several times to remove free fatty acids, color, and odor.

Besides being used in making margarine, the oil is employed in manufacturing thin sugar wafers, cookies, candies, and for shortening in cakes and pies. About 63 percent of the copra is converted into coconut oil, and the remaining 37 percent is used as coconut meal, which has high food value and is used as a feed for stock and poultry. About three-fifths of the coconut oil consumed in this country is used in the soap industry; one-fifth is used in the production of margarine, and practically all of the remainder is consumed in the manufacture of candy and biscuits. — *Based on an article by Charles W. Geiger and Ruth Sabichi in Scientific American.*

POLITICS

The following is a statement attributed to the late G. K. Chesterton:

"The mere proposal to set the politician to watch the capitalist has been disturbed by the rather disconcerting discovery that they are both the same man. We are past the point where being a capitalist is the only way of becoming a politician, and we are dangerously near the point where being a politician is much the quickest way of becoming a capitalist."

■ A discussion of values and verities of knowledge.

THE FILIPINO STUDENT AND CULTURAL VALUES

There is nothing "sacred" or "natural" about cultural values that they cannot be questioned, examined, or intelligently tampered with. On the contrary, once they are encrusted with a sanctity, a reality, sui generis, all their own there is the danger that cultural values, rightly or wrongly, will begin to control and condition thoroughly the individual. A Filipina student, for example, ill and handicapped, after a serious operation, refused to ask help from and to be helped by other Filipinos because to do so would expose her physically to them. And this was against the cultural value of modesty, the sacredness of which could not be violated, even in near – death! Here, man was made for cultural values not cultural values for man! Man becomes a subject, a subordinate to his creation. That such thinking could be countenanced by teachers involved in the situation and justified on the basis of Filipino culture makes one doubt the efficacy of knowledge to penetrate into the lives of people, causing a changed behavior marked with rationality and intelligibility. (The non-integration of k n o w l e d g e with actual practice was previously noted.)

This is not to say that one must not respect his cultural values and heedlessly throw them all away in the name of scientific knowledge! As it is, the world is "over-debunked," as Romain Gary puts it, and its brokenness, fragmentedness, and emptiness is felt everywhere. Surely, one cannot help empty it anymore! Rather, the idea I covet with Philippine educators is to examine our cultural values lest they have a crippling influence and paralyzing effect upon us, making us all impotent to act upon an idea, a suggestion, a notion which is practical,

rational, humanistic, and from the point of view of scientific knowledge, indeed, desirable. Societal values, unless they are to wither away and lost their potency and vibrancy, through years of imbreeding and lack of empirical justifiability, must be continuously analyzed, assessed, and criticized. This is the task of an educator.

If, as found out, cultural discontinuities are necessary factors for the development of original and critical thinking, independent and self-reliant traits, then, perhaps, imaginative educators can find out effective ways and means to introduce discontinuities in society through the schools so that the youth may profit from them. As of now, the foreign values in the educational system have not been manifestly successful in inducing discontinuity patters in society. As already stated, the societal life in the Philippines has basically remained indifferent to the concerns and professes values of the educational system. As in other cultural practices, changes with regard the rearing of the young can be effectively introduced in a society. If the schools believe that the individual who is truly a human being can think, decide, for himself, and is responsible for his decision, then, perhaps, some inquiry into the Filipino family system may be made. Its strengths and weaknesses must be located and suggestions for possibilities toward restructing it may be studied. The idea is not to disintegrate or destroy the family concept thus inviting societal and personal problems related to the Western atomic family system. Rather, the idea is to develop the individual and to allow him a life of his own at the same time to maintain group solidarity. It is a relation that neither exploits one nor the other, but allows both to draw support from each other. The Filipino family, perhaps, may be taught that it needs to be cruel, sometimes, in order to be kind, so Shakespeare counselled.

In terms of learning, critical mindedness, not simple memory work, must be stressed. Grounds on which claims to knowledge, or to a type of knowledge, are made must be analyzed and assessed. Or

else, biased opinions or interpretations of facts can be mistaken for knowledge and presented as truths. This can be a dangerous indulgence! Empirical facts, often obscured by a welter of interpretational theories and ideas, must be located, isolated, and presented in their purity to the students. Facts and judgements of facts must be differentiated. In this way, opinion, information, belief, and knowledge are distinguished from one another. The student then becomes acquainted with the ways in which knowledge is formed. And more important, he learns whether or not to trust the prevailing ideas of his time and, if he does, how far he may trust them. This involves a comprehension of the present limitations of knowledge as discrepancies and inadequacies in different types of assertions are discerned.

This, of course, does not mean that opinion, information, and belief be altogether adjured in favor of knowledge. There is little of knowledge, if it is defined in a rigorous and exacting manner, such that one can know only when one knows why or on what grounds and evidences. If everyone were forbidden to say anything or to act on any proposition that could not be proved or verified empirically or through the rules and language of logic and mathematics, very few things indeed would be done and most of life stopped. Moreover, to the important problems of life, for example, religion, even politics, certainty of conclusions is hard to come by. It does not begin to compare with certainty of knowledge that "my umbrella is on the desk." Even so, the student must be taught to reach sound conclusions, to distinguish between well-grounded and ungrounded assertions by a close regard for evidence and proof. This cannot result when learning is construed as primarily one of memory work. — *By Evelina M. Orteza, From The Education Quarterly, Oct.* 1965.

■ **All kinds of tricks have been used to make money fast and easy but they have only hurt the gullible.**

EASY MONEY

Most people not only want to get rich — they have a passion for getting rich quickly. People want easy money, unearned money, a fortune picked up on the street. The lottery is the simplest type of gambling by which this appetite for unearned riches has in the past been satisfied. But other speculations are so fantastic, so mad, that they show up the underlying motive much more clearly.

In 1935, for instance, a mania for tulip bulbs seized the Dutch. Up to that time people had paid fancy prices for bulbs in order to enjoy the flowering. But suddenly a fury of buying for investment began, and by 1636 Royal Tulip Exchanges were established in 19 Dutch cities. The narratives of the time read like a primer of Wall Street. People who hadn't a tulip bulb in the world went to the Exchange and sold ten Semper Augustus bulbs short, promising delivery in three days of $2000 each. Then they tried to buy at $1900.

So furious was the mania that the "perit" was invented — an imaginary weight so tiny that it would take 8000 to make a pound. A tulip root might be subdivided, by weight, and the buyer could purchase five or ten perits, holding a legal claim to that much tulip. At the height of the speculation one bulb sold in Haarlem for 12 acres of building lots. When the bottom suddenly dropped out of the tulip market the country became so poor that it took a generation for business to recover.

John Law, the Scot who later created the Mississippi Bubble, learned from this tulip mania that people would speculate in anything. He gave the French people an opportunity to speculate in *everything*.

Law capitalized the world: The India company, Senegal, China, the Mississippi basin, the beaver trade in Canada.

He collected the taxes of France and coined its money and created its bank and, perhaps the greatest single stroke ever accomplished by a speculator, he at one time managed to make gold illegal in a country which was using the gold standard. He made France use paper money backed by his stock.

The Mississippi speculation was based on the idea that America was a large country the soil of which rested on solid gold. Law's financial operations were enormously complicated. But whenever things looked dark, he issued a decree promising 20 percent interest, allowing people to turn in worthless money for good money, or banknotes for stock. He became the most powerful individual in Europe. At night when Law closed his subscription books, cavalry cleared away the crowds. A duchess managed to have her coachman upset her carriage as Law drove by, and as Law stopped to help her, she begged for a few Mississippi shares.

The end came when powerful financiers saw the inevitable, and steadily sold. At last Law set two days a week for the bank to redeem paper. The deflation was rapid and tragic. In one night 12 people were crushed or suffocated or trapled to death in the gardens outside the bank.

One day at the market a fishwife threw a ten-livre note in the mud, trampled and spat upon it. The Mississippi Bubble was done.

Later the South Seas appeared in a speculation. Before Japan was opened to commerce the price of silk was very high and the cultivation of silk worms a great industry. A certain Samuel Whitmarsh announced the discovery that the South Sea Island mulberry was by all odds the best food for these producers of silk and in the late 1830's, in America, farmers uprooted their crops to plant the mulberry and in Pennsylvania and young plants were bought and sold with such fury that $300,000 changed hands in a few days' sale. But by 1839 no one wanted mulberries.

There have been many other smaller schemes which never created national manias. The Electrolitic Ma-

rine Salts Company sent a stream of sea water through a machine and took out gold and silver at the other end. Only one or two bricks of gold were necessary to keep up the illusion. Other companies offered, and actually paid, an income of $150 every two weeks on a subscription of $1000. But that could survive only as long as the sucker list — for they were naturally using the money sent them by new patrons.

These sudden gusts of excitement about mysterious sources of wealth do not compare with the steady popularity of lotteries. The lottery was in use even in Roman days. The Romans used it as a form of entertainment at their banquets. Nero gave such prizes as a house or a slave. In more modern times Benjamin Franklin promoted a lottery to buy a battery of guns and advertised another to build a church. Schools, street paving, bridges, lighthouses and the like, were the earliest beneficiaries of the lotteries and soldiers' pay in the Revolution often came from the same source. At the beginning of the century, two of the buildings on the Yard, at Harvard, were provided by the same means.

It was not until after the Civil War that the lotteries became both illegal and universal. Only one state, Louisiana, seems to have countenanced them, but with headquarters in New Orleans the lottery spread throughout the country. Paying only $40,000 a year for its exclusive charter, it made money enough to buy legislatures, restore levees when the Mississippi swept them away, establish newspapers, and engage Generals Early and Beauregard to conduct the drawing of prizes. At one time the entire mail received at the New Orleans Post Office was two-thirds legitimate and one-third lottery. The profits of the company were variously estimated at from five to thirteen million dollars a year. The monthly drawings, in a gold and red plush theater, were scenes of pomp and splendor, the dignified generals presiding over the draw.

This lottery finally came to an end when John Wanamaker, postmaster general of

the United States, issued an order closing the mails to the literature and the business letters of the company.

The blood of the present day however may still tingle or despair to the tune of winning a sudden cool million. Some of the greatest lotteries the world has known have been staged of late years in Great Britain and have drawn their income from every corner of the globe. The Calcutta Sweepstakes, operated by the Calcutta Club in India, handles more than $10,000,000 a year, with prizes totaling around $4,000,000. It is possible for the first prize, which earns close to $2,000,000, to be won by an initial outlay of not more than five dollars.

Second only to the Calcutta Sweep is that of the London Stock Exchange Sweep which runs into approximately $3,000,000 with the winner receiving about three-quarters of a million dollars.

Spain also finds the lottery a successful money-getter, the government on occasion using this means to obtain funds for charitable and educational purposes.

As for the satisfaction of our own spirit of chance here on this side of the Atlantic, those who wish to speculate must turn to such minor interests as gold mines without gold, oil fields without wells — and Wall Street. — *By Gilbert Seldes, Condensed from the Mentor-World Traveler (November, '30).*

■ **A famous student of law and society points out the undesirable effects of fast scientific discoveries and inventions during the last 100 years.**

THE DANGERS OF SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS

The question that confronts our generation is whether or not our shifting physical environment has outrun our capacity for adaptation. Is human society being gorged with innovations too great for its powers of assimilation? It is not the *fact* of change; it is the rate of change that constitutes the danger. The over-rapid alteration of artificial environment may annihilate mankind no less certainly than the over-rapid modification of natural environment wiped out saver-toothed tiger and mastodon.

The advance of the last three generations has been almost exclusively along the line of the natural sciences — physics, chemistry and biology. In spite of his new weapons and increased powers, man himself remains as he always has been — irrational, impulsive, emotional, bound by customs which he will not analyze, the victim of age-old conventions and prejudices — probably not far removed from his paleolithic ancestors. The social sciences have advanced scarcely at all. This divergence between the natural sciences and the social sciences, between machinery and control, between the kingdom of this world and the kingdom of the spirit — this is where the hazard lies. Science has given man power and weapons which the utmost wisdom could scarcely be trusted to use aright.

Unless we can marshal behind such studies as economics, political science and sociology the same enthusiasm and something of the same technique that characterize our treatment of physics and chemistry; unless the results of this research can be applied to human life as boldly as we apply the natural sciences to modify our

methods of living; unless we can free ourselves of stale custom and harness intelligence to the task of straightening out the relations of man with his fellow men — then pessimism has the better of the argument.

Face the extraordinary contrast between our willingness to make any change whatever in physical environment and our obstinate determination to leave unaltered our relations to the world and to each other. For example, physics gives us the internal combustion engine or the principles of communication by electricity. With that feverish activity we seize upon these ideas! With a thousand m i n d s working upon them, they are brought to such completion that we soon soar through the air and talk to friends a thousand miles away. Nobody stops to ask what Isaac Newton, two hundred years ago, would have thought of these innovations. Nobody questions their propriety because they do not follow the theories of Michael Faraday. Nobody tries to impede their development by attacking the character of the inventors.

But let economics and political science develop the principle that the world we live in is an economic unit and that interrelationship has developed to a point where some international machinery is necessary to handle the common interests of mankind — what happens? We ask what George Washington would have thought of it 120 years ago. We summon tradition to bear witness that the thing has never been done before. We impugn the character of the chief inventor, and fight over the matter in political campaigns. For the detachment of the laboratory we substitute the emotion of the torchlight procession.

It makes no difference how essential the change may be to the social order. Whether it be in eugenics, or in economics in an effort to distribute more fairly the rewards of industry, or in law through the establishment of a new international court, the response is invariably the same. We condemn the man who dares preach a new method of salvation. "He perverteth the people," we cry. "Crucify him!"

Of course, 300 years ago this same Calvary awaited the prophets of the natural sciences. Galileo, Giordano Bruno, Francis Bacon, Descartes — these were the early saints of the Kingdom of Truth, by whose integrity we are free. Bruno was burned at the stake; Descartes in terror suppressed his own books; and Galileo, under duress, knelt before ten scarlet-clad cardinals to amend the solar system which he had disarranged. For 300 years was waged the war for intellectual freedom in relation to the natural sciences. Only by dint of sacrificial devotion was the war won. Harvey, Newton, Darwin, Huxley — these were the gallant souls who dared to break with the past, who faced the invective invariably leveled against proponents of new ideas.

But as far as the freedom of the social sciences is concerned, the war has just begun. Any attempt to bring to bear on human affairs the same critical analysis that we apply to electrons or glands or the stellar spaces is met with angry opposition. Innovations in social institutions and economic ideas frighten us. Much of our education is directed toward this same traditionalism: instilling belief that our laws and institutions necessarily contain permanent qualities of reality. As for the prophets of new ideas in the social and economic field, our inclination is to classify them as enemies of society. They are radicals, Reds, dangerous men, tampering with the foundations of order; they dare to subject to scrutiny the customs we have received as a sacred trust from the past.

Yet we are living in a world utterly different from any existing before. Science has suddenly compressed the planet we occupy. On top of this, science has scattered weapons of destruction far more deadly than man ever possessed; so that, suddenly armed to the teeth, he is asked to live in peace crowded together with neighbors whom he never knew before and for whom he has no particular liking. All this has happened in 100 years — so quickly that it finds the race utterly unprepared in reli-

gion, ethics, law, economics and government to meet the innumerable exigencies that have arisen.

This is the challenge we face in our generation. It requires a public opinion eager to encourage creative work in the sphere of human relationships. Derangement of human affairs is so extensive that bewildering opportunities await on every hand. Our views of property, our conceptions of government, our systems of education, our churches, laws, notions of right and wrong — these are legitimate laboratory materials of the new inquiry. No longer can the world build sanctuaries for the protection of ideas. We are not called upon to adopt all the ideas. Many will ultimately be proved wrong. We are asked rather for a sympathetic attitude toward the creative purposes out of which the ideas come.

But if we are to develop real ability to face the truth with fearless eyes, then we must be prepared as new light comes to free ourselves from the old forms that have narrowed our thinking. We need not fear that we shall progress too fast. The overwhelming danger is that we shall not be able to progress fast enough. There is plenty of conservatism in the world. What we need in our time is not a brake for the chariot of progress but motive power. Our business is not to look behind but to look ahead along the road over which mankind is moving. The past cannot be altered, the future is plastic. For the past we have no moral concern, for the future we are responsible. "We are still the heirs of all the ages that have gone, but we are no less truly the ancestors of all the ages that are to come." — *By Raymond Blaine Fosdick, Condensed from the Golden Book Magazine (November, '30).*

■ The first Filipino Republic and the makers of its constitution.

THE MALOLOS REPUBLIC

President Emilio Aguinaldo after having been sworn into office at the basilica of the Barasoain Church on January 23, 1899, realized more than ever the tremendous challenge of his office. With fervor he said: "Great is this day, glorious this date and forever memorable in which our beloved people is raised to the apotheosis of Independence."

This significant event in the annals of our political history was the culmination of a long painful, most frustrating process lasting more than three hundred years. To commemorate the momentous event, people in different parts of the country rejoiced with jubilation. Those who managed to go to the rustic town of Malolos, the thousands who came from Manila and the surrounding provinces, took part in the parades and rejoicings in their gala attires.

The streets of the town lined with beautiful bamboo arches decorated with palm leaves accentuated the festive air. The homes were decorated with the Filipino flag indicative of the patriotic fervor that prevailed. The brass bands which provided martial music in their multicolored uniforms lent color and life to the festive mood. The countless number of Filipino troops in their blue-striped rayadillo uniforms were also in high spirit, positive indications of their high morale and their indifference to the severe and harsh conditions of the times.

The inauguration of the Malolos Republic better known as the First Philippine Republic was indeed the very realization of the aspirations and ideals of our forebears. Two days earlier, an equally significant event came to being when the Malolos Constitution, the precursor of our present constitution was promulgated, the enforcement of which was immediately effected and was a fitting expression of the sovereign will of the people.

The constitution of the First Philippine Republic consisted of a Preamble with 101 Articles and an additional article. The Preamble clearly worded runs thus: "We, the Representative of the Filipino People, lawfully convened, in order to establish justice, provide for common defense, promote the general welfare and insure the benefits of liberty, imploring the aid of the Sovereign Legislator of the Universe for the attainment of these ends, have voted, decreed, and sanctioned the following: . . ."

The Malolos Constitution provided a free and sovereign Republic of the Philippines. The Republic was "popular, representative, alternative and responsible." It contained a Bill of Rights to safeguard the rights of the citizens as well as the aliens. The executive power was vested in the President of the Republic who was elected by the members of the assembly. He was assisted by his cabinet composed of all the department secretaries. The legislative power was vested in the Unicameral Assembly of Representatives duly elected by the people for a term of four years. The judicial power was vested in the Supreme Court and in other courts of justice.

All department secretaries were presidential appointees but were responsible not to the President but to the Assembly. The appointment of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court was left to Assembly with the approval of the Council of Government composed of all the department secretaries.

The term of office of the chief executive was for four years and may be reelected. In the event that the Chief Executive died in office, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court temporarily took over the prerogatives of his office. When the Assembly is not in session a Permanent Commission was created to discharge the legislative functions.

The Constitution in the opinion of Justice Malcolm conformed "to many tests of a good written constitution and did faithfully portray the aspirations and political ideas of the people." The same view was expressed by the late Dr. Joseph R. Hayden as he wrote:

"This organic law was a free expression of the type of

state to which the articulate Filipinos aspired at the end of the Spanish regime. The state was democratic and liberal and was pledged to a careful regard for the protection and development of the masses of its citizens. In these important matters there is a remarkable consistency between the Malolos Constitution and the organic law of the Philippines adopted in Manila thirty-six years later."

President Aguinaldo did rightfully well when he considered it as "the most glorious token of the noble aspiration of the Philippine Revolution and an irrefutable proof before the civilized world of the culture and capacity of the Filipino people for self-government."

The framers of the Constitution of the First Philippine Republic came from all walks of life from the different parts of the Philippines among whom were the following: Pedro A. Paterno, President of the Malolos Congress; Gregorio Araneta, Secretary; Pablo Ocampo, Secretary. The members were Mariano Abella y Isaac, a lawyer from Naga City; Gregorio Aglipay, a priest from Batac, Ilocos Norte; Gregorio Aguilera, newspaper publisher from Lipa, Batangas; Sofio Alandi, lawyer from Tayabas or Quezon Province; Jose Albert y Mayoralgo, physician from Manila; Jose Alejandrino, engineer from Arayat, Pampanga; Raymundo Alindada, lawyer from Nueva Viscaya; Leon Apacible, lawyer from Balayan, Batangas; Tomas Arejola, lawyer from Ambos Camarines; Patricio Bailon, lawyer appointed to represent Burias; Santiago Barcelona, physician from Pulilan, Bulacan; Ariston Bautista Lim, physician from Sta. Cruz, Manila; Alberto Barretto, lawyer from Zambales; and Jose Basa y Enriquez, a lawyer from Cavite.

The group also included: Felix Bautista, a doctor from Malolos, Bulacan; Higinio Benitez, lawyer from Manila; Vito Belarmino, a military officer from Silang, Cavite; Felipe Buencamino, lawyer from Bulacan; Felipe Calderon, a lawyer from Tanza, Cavite; Marcial Calleja, lawyer from Malinao, Albay; Fernando Canon, engineer from Biñan, Laguna; Telesforo Antonio Chuidian, a businessman from Manila; Graciano Cordero, a physi-

cian from Pagsanjan, Laguna; Jose Coronel of Indang, Cavite; Mena Crisologo, writer from Vigan, Ilocos Sur; Mariano Crisostomo y Lugo, lawyer from Atlag, Malolos, Bulacan.

Sebastian de Castro, physician appointed to represent Pangasinan; Arsenio Cruz Herrera, lawyer from Tondo, Manila; Antonio Feliciano, another representative from Pangasinan; Jose Florentino Fernandez of San Miguel, Manila; Felix Ferrer Pascual of Manila; Melencio Figueroa, engraver from Areval, Iloilo; Vicente Foz, lawyer of Vigan, Ilocos Sur; Perfecto Gabriel, lawyer from Mindoro; Martin Garcia of Ilocos Norte; Ariston Gella, pharmacist from Antique; Manuel Gomez Martinez, physician from Manila; Salvador Gonzales of Samar.

The Philippine Republic unfortunately did not live long. A few days after its inauguration it faced the grim and cruel reality of survival. The so-called American Friends of General Aguinaldo and the Filipino people finally showed their true color. On February 5, Filipino soldiers had to fight the Americans in defense of their honor, dignity and freedom. — *By Pedro A. Gagelonia, in Variety, January,* 1966.

TRAINS

One time Winston Churchill almost missed a train and Mrs. Churchill was alarmed. Sir Edward Marsh, Churchill's private secretary, tried to calm her by saying, "Winston is such a sportsman, he always gives the train a chance to get away."

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF AN ENGINEER

I once wrote a book and ended it with these lines: "Prosperity in any deeper sense awaits the liberation of the engineer. If the owners will not get off his back I, for one, would not be sorry to see him combine with the wayfaring man to lift them off. A complicated technical structure should be run by engineers, not hucksters. But the engineer is the modern Prometheus in chains."

I have been asked to be more explicit. It is good to end a book with a ringing climax, but not quite so good to be forced to explain all its implications. I recognize, however, my duty to state my reasons.

Since James Watt tinkered with Newcomen's engine, the technician has been increasingly interfering with our economic structure. Before Watt, the majority of men and women everywhere were capable of providing their own food, shelter, clothing and entertainment in whatever locality they found themselves. They were steeped in the traditions of wresting their own necessities from the soil, the waters, the forests about them. They may have done it with deplorable inefficiency, but they did it. Shipwreck a group of them on an uninhabited but fertile island, and they knew how to carry on.

Year by year since 1765, the mass of mankind has been losing the ability to carry on. Shipwreck an assorted crew of bookkeepers, truck drivers, machinists and advertising men on an island, and I would not give them two months' survival. Today the millions live in total and sublime ignorance of the forces which feed, shelter and clothe them. For all they know, switches produce light, and chain stores food. The functioning of the economic process rests in the heads of

a few thousand experts. Is it too much to say that if 100 key technicians left their posts they could seriously cripple a great city like New York? To make matters even more potentially precarious, each expert is so highly specialized that he has little if any conception of the work of the others. There is no General Staff, understanding the whole process, and correlating the vital nerves of transportation, communication, power, water, food supply, which furnish the community's economic substratum.

Specialization makes for economies, as the Progress Boys are tireless in pointing out. I am enough of a Progress Boy myself to admit that we stand to gain more than we lose by the emergence of the technical arts and the economic specialization which they have created. But this should not blind us to the chances taken and the risks involved. Some four million unemployed last winter must be back in the handicraft age when unemployment was virtually unknown.

In brief, you engineers have been raising considerable hell, along, with your not altogether heavenly improvements in economic life. And the point I wish to stress is this: you have been doing the horse work while letting somebody else — chiefly the business man — take the responsibility. It seems to me that the responsibility should be squarely yours. You have remade Western civilization, and created at the same time certain malignant evils — actual, like technological unemployment; potential, like a smash-up due to over-specialization. You s h o u l d shoulder the burden of mitigating these evils. Statesmen, philosophers, generals, poets, may lead self-supporting communities, but only engineers may lead a great, interlocked economic structure.

In a sense the modern world is not led at all. It simply flounders. In the United States, for instance, the real action of the Republic is provided by business men affiliated with large corporate enterprises. The great majority of these business men neither know nor care where the ship of state is headed.

At the heels of the business man follows the engineer. The former says: Let there be light, and the latter provides it . . . Let there be 1000 oil wells (in a pool where wasteless exploitation requires but 100) and they are obediently drilled. . . Let there be the highest building in the world (to choke an already throttled Grand Central station) and it is built . . . Let there be an almost ulra-violet lamp (to sell to the millions who believe in advertising) and, brave in nickel and aluminum, it is properly constructed. . . .

You get the point. The engineer has built the modern world, but only at the bidding of his master's voice. The master knows not a crank shaft from a piston rod, but he knows what will sell. The world is not planned by the business man, for he has no plan. It is not planned by the engineer, for hitherto that has never been his function. He has constructed endless detail — but always as directed. So far as I know, the little town of Radburn in suburban New York, designed specifically for the motor age, is the biggest single project involving a social-economic goal ever permitted to the engineering mind in this country. It will probably be the most convenient, comfortable, the safest, and perhaps the most sightly suburban town to live in that the nation has ever known. The business man has stepped aside — taking a modest six percent — to let the engineer run the show.

It is my conviction that the engineer can run far bigger shows than the town of Radburn to the satisfaction of (1) the people who are to use them or work in them, (2) the investor, (3) himself, and (4) the technical requirements of the country's future development. Suppose, for instance, that broad-visioned engineers had had the past century in charge as directors — or co-directors if you will. Would they have permitted:

The depletion of our forests at a rate four times annual growth?

The violation of all laws of geology in the exploitation of petroleum pools?

The criss-cross and dupli-

cation in the transportation system?

The neglect of cheaper waterways for the profitable exploitation of high cost railways?

The exhaustion and erosion of soils and the floods which follow?

The bottle necks and traffic tangles of metropolitan districts?

The building of skyscrapers faster than the means to empty and fill them?

The desecration of every highway in the country with millions of square feet of cigarette, cosmetic, and soap appeals?

That a century of the engineering mind controlling, or helping to control, economic forces, would have made a wasteless world is, of course, highly problematical. Mistakes would have been made; loss and leakage taken their toll. But I am inclined to believe that a good half of the man-power which now runs to waste might have been salvaged, with the result that poverty would have been quite finally abolished, unemployment enormously diminished, the accident rate drastically reduced, and a cleaner, safer, more comfortable, more sightly, more integrated nation have been our heritage.

When I speak of the *engineering mind,* I mean a mind that is professional, not commercial; dedicated to building, not to profit-making; that is done with false modesty and has the courage to accept the job of taming the billion wild horses which Watt let loose; that thinks straight and hard; hates waste and confusion, dirt and despair; that never stoops to the adulterated.

Plato once called for philosopher kings. Today the greatest need in all the bewildered world is for philosopher engineers. — *By Stuart Chase, Condensed from the Technology Review (November,* '30)

■ A great American President discusses the evil of money in politics and the need for honesty and sound law for the citizen.

FACTORS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT

I believe in shaping the ends of government to protect property as well as human welfare. Normally, and in the long run, the ends are the same; but whenever the alternative must be faced, I am for men and not for property. . . .

I am far from underestimating the importance of dividends; but I rank dividends below human character. Again, I do not have any sympathy with the reformer who says he does not care for dividends. Of course, economic welfare is necessary for a man must pull his own weight and be able to support his family. I know well that the reformers must not bring upon the people economic ruin, or the reforms themselves will go down in the ruin. But we must be ready to face temporary disaster, whether or not brought on by those who will war against us to the knife. Those who oppose all reform will do well to remember that ruin in its worst form is inevitable if our national life brings us nothing better than swollen fortunes for the few and the triumph in both politics and business of a sordid and selfish materialism.

If our political institutions were perfect, they would absolutely prevent the political domination of money in any part of our affairs. We need to make our political representatives more quickly and sensitively responsible to the people whose servants they are. More direct action by the people in their own affairs under proper safeguards is vitally necessary. The direct primary is a step in this direction, if it is associated with a corrupt practices act effective to prevent the advantage of the man willing recklessly and unscrupulously to spend money over his more honest competitor. It is particularly important that all money received or expended for campaign purposes should be publicly accounted

for, not only after election, but before election as well. Political action must be made simpler, easier, and freer from confusion for every citizen. I believe that the prompt removal of unfaithful or incompetent public servants should be made easy and sure in whatever may experience shall show to be most expedient in any given class of cases.

One of the fundamental necessities in a representative government such as ours is to make certain that the men to whom the people delegate their power shall serve the people by whom they are elected, and not the special interests. I believe that every national officer, elected or appointed, should be forbidden to perform any service or receive any compensation, directly or indirectly, from interstate corporations; and a similar provision could not fail to be useful within the states.

The object of government is the welfare of the people. The material progress and prosperity of a nation are desirable chiefly so far as they lead to the moral and material welfare of all citizens. Just in proportion as the average man and woman are honest, capable of sound judgment and high ideals, active in public affairs — but, first of all, sound in their home life, and the father and mother of healthy children whom they bring out well — just so far, and no further, we may count our civilization a success. We must have — I believe we have already — a genuine and permanent moral awakening, without which no wisdom of legislation or administration really means anything; and, on the other hand, we must try to secure the social and economic legislation without which any improvement due to purely moral agitation is necessarily evanescent. . . No matter how honest and decent we are in our private lives, if we do not have the right kind of law and the right kind of administration of the law we cannot go forward as a nation. That is imperative; but it must be an addition to, and not a substitution for, the qualities that make up good citizens. In the last analysis the most important elements in any man's career must be the sum of those qualities which, in the aggregate, we speak

of as character. If he has not got it, then no law that the wit of man can devise, no administration of the law by the boldest and strongest executive, will avail to help him. We must have the right kind of character — character that makes a man, first of all, a good man in the home, a good father, a good husband — that makes a man a good neighbor. You must have that, and then, in addition, you must have the kind of law and the kind of administration of the law which will give to those qualities in the private citizen the best possible chance for development. The prime problem of our nation is to get the right type of good citizenship, and, to get it, we must have progress, and our public men must be genuinely progressive. — *By Theodore Roosevelt.*

LONGEVITY

Fontenelle was continually being told by his doctors that what he liked to eat was bad for him. Toward the end of his life, one warned him that he must give up coffee, explaining at great length in the most appalling medical terms, that it was slow poison and would eventually ruin his system. In a tone of deep conviction the nonagenarian replied, "Doctor, I am inclined to agree with you that it is a slow poison — very slow, for I have been drinking it for the past 80 years." Coffee-lovers may derive some comfort from the fact that Fontenelle came within a month of living to be a hundred years old.

■ Here are arguments in favor of English for use as a world language.

ENGLISH OVER THE WORLD

Very often you may see in the papers signs of the progress of English toward world-wide use. These forecasts are accompanied by emotional outbursts ranging from hisses to hurrahs, for there is nothing which arouses the stronger intellectual passions as much as the question of how we shall speak.

Frequently these bits of news take the form of reports, written in the quaint journalese of our day, that Mexico or Persia or Chile has banned or will ban our English talkies for fear its native children will come to think our tongue more agreeable than their own. Now and then the items merely inform the public that English has been adopted as the official language of another international gathering. One and all they point to the world-domination of English, like it or not as you may.

The four-word peace plan, "Make Everybody Speak English," which Henry Ford formulated some years since, is not logically a reason for the universal use of our tongue. Any language, if spoken everywhere, would make for world peace. It is not numbers, nor politics, nor trade, nor the talkies — the four reasons most frequently given — which make English a good language for the world use. These are merely the accidents of a beneficent fate. They do not penetrate the true inwardness of the matter.

First, numbers. We are told that 220,000,000 people either use or understand English, as compared to only about 120,000,000 for French and 110,000,000 for German, and these numbers are advanced as if they really meant anything. But unless English is in itself a good and worthy language for the world to use, all the numbers in the world won't make so.

Second, politics. The World War unquestionably

enhanced in tremendous measure the prestige of the two great English-speaking commonwealths. Our local boys have been financially advising most of the governments there are, and they have made good, too. Hand in hand with American advisers have gone British diplomats, and together they have done much toward bringing about world peace according to the Ford recipe. But — is English a good language for everybody to speak?

Third, trade. The American dollar has swept the money markets of the world, and the pound sterling is not far behind it. Did you follow the stock reports in the late crash — of, didn't you! — and did you notice how securities all over the glove were affected? It was a touching tribute to our financial leadership. But if "dollar" is not a better word than "franc" or "lira," what do these facts matter?

Finally, talkies. Talkies made in Hollywood are riding triumphant over all the foreign bans, propagandizing the English language, American edition, wherever the sun shines. They may well prove the most effective instrument yet invented for spreading English.

But ought English to be spread? It is intrinsically a better language than French or German or even Chinese? This is the moral question which lurks behind the facts, and this is the question which we must now consider. Back in 300 B.C., to take a parallel instance, Hellenic Greek became a world language. It supplanted to a large extent many local tongues, among them the Hebrew and Aramaic of Palestine. Yet either was incomparably a better language, than Greek, simpler, more effective, easier to learn and to use. Fate is playing on the nations today no such shabby trick as when she compelled the Jews of Palestine to learn Greek.

It is a curious fact that language as we now know it develops not from the simple to the complicated, but the other way round — from the complicated to the simple. Whenever we can trace more than one stage in a language's history we find that the earlier speech is more difficult, more unwieldly. Latin is complication

personified compared to three of its modern children, French, Spanish and Italian. So far as modern Greek has changed from Classic Greek, it has simplified. Coptic Greek has lost many of the complications present in the tongue of the hieroglyphs.

To be sure, we have never met a language a-borning, and so we can only guess that somewhere a stage of simplicity must have preceded those complications upon which our earliest gaze rests. But that is a matter of speculation. What we do know as a present linguistic law is this: time simplifies a tongue. Gradually the language begins to forsake its numerous declensions and conjugations, its optative, cohortative, predicative moods, and all the other flummeries of primitive speech. Gradually there begins to emerge a lean, efficient dialect.

This simplification has not always been considered a linguistic virtue. The proper adjective to use in describing antigue languages was *rich,* and for more recent developments, *degenerate* or *decadent.* What was the Greek verb if not rich, with the hundred varying dresses it might wear? And does not the modern English verb display a decadence verging upon shamelessness with only two?

It was in 1892 that a Danish scholar, Otto Jespersen, punctured this legend with a book called *Progress in Language;* and since then "decadence" has had things all its own way. And after all, why not? Can you picture yourself selecting among the 12 possible forms of *bonus* when you might be using the single word *good?*

So the first reason why English is the best world language is that it has carried this simplication of forms farther than has any other modern language. In German *good* still has six dresses to wear, and in French four. The German verb still counts its forms by the trunkful, and the French verb is not much better. Danish alone of modern languages has approached English in its formlessness.

A second qualification, scarcely less important, is impurity. English is probably more impure than any

other tongue, ancient or modern. English picks up words from any language at all, and by the process it has succeeded in making itself international. Scarcely any foreigner learns English without finding many old friends in the new vocabulary. Impurity is a good characteristic for a world language. English deserves universal use because it is formless, impure and wordy. Wordiness is not usually considered a virtue any more than impurity is; but words are the wealth of the English, and the riches of its word-hoard are only paralleled by the riches of the Anglo-American nations. No user of our tongue need be repetitious; he can vary his words with synonyms or near-synonyms in almost endless variety. *The New Oxford Dictionary* contains almost half a million words.

Has English no defects, to set against this formidable array of virtues? Yes, indeed. We have a bad alphabet, a tough pair of articles, *a* and *the*, and a difficult idiom in prepositions. But on the other hand, we have a natural gender, an easy sentence order, and a splendid tolerance of almost any accent or grammar so long as the idea it expresses be good. Balancing defects against virtues, we may reasonably conclude that the applauders of World English have a sound linguistic justification for their choice, unrecognized as this fact may be in their eyes. — *By Fanet Rankin Aiken, condensed from Sept.* 1930 *Bookman.*

THE FEVER

Demetrius would at times tarry from business to attend to pleasure. On such occasions, he usually feigned indisposition. His father, coming to visit him, saw a beautiful young lady retire from his chamber. On his entering, Demetrius said, "Sir, the fever" has left me."

"I met it at the door," replied the father.

■ An up-to-date description of Russian conditions.

RED STARS AND REGIMENTATION

Towering ornate skyscrapers, like giant candelabra topped by glowing red stars, rising above a skyline of contrasting rather low buildings and golden bulbous domes — that is one of the visitor's first impressions of Moscow, political and cultural center of the U.S.S.R.

This fantastic city, built on seven low hills, has a population of over six million. Much construction is in progress. Miles of almost identical, gray, rectangular buildings line the streets. In the outskirts new residential areas are being developed near industrial centers. Here apartment buildings of huge prefabricated cement blocks provide housing of two or three rooms for workers and their families.

The Moscow River, winding through the city, provides transportation for the residents of this far-flung city and affords the visitor with superb views of the modern buildings, turreted Kremlin walls, and sixteenth century monuments. One of the most unusual sights in Moscow is the Metro, or subway. Each station has its own architectural style combining marble, mosaics, sculpture, and crystal chandeliers. Every day three million persons ride the swift, clean trains, which are reached by a series of steep escalators.

All avenues lead to the Kremlin, a walled city within a city. Despite architectural contrasts, it is a place of unforgettable b e a u t y. Within its crenelated red brick walls are various palaces, medieval cathedrals, and office buildings. One of the most impressive buildings is the Palace of Congresses, where meetings of the Supreme Soviet are held. This ultra-modern building of white Ural marble seats six thousand persons and has a communication system that provides for simultaneous translation in fourteen languages. The Mausoleum of

Lenin is the center of attraction for thousands of visitors who arrive daily from every part of the Republics. They stand for hours as the long line inches its way toward the granite monument.

Just outside the Kremlin in Red Square is the magnificent St. Basil's Cathedral, built by Ivan the Terrible in the sixteenth century. With its brilliant colors and ornate domes of varied shapes and design, it appears like something from a fairy tale. The church is now a museum, as are all the churches in the Kremlin. There are few active churches in Moscow today. Although religious freedom is said to exist, it is not expedient to practice religion openly because of social, economic, and political sanctions.

Representatives from Intourist Organization served as our guides and interpreters. Our feelings of apprehension were soon allayed as we were given complete freedom of movement within the city and permission to take pictures.

A well-planned program included conferences with Soviet educators and visits to the University of Moscow, Friendship University, a Pioneer Camp, a nursery school, and a secondary school sponsored by a trade union in an industrial area. Among our cultural activities were visits to art galleries, a trip to the Tolstoy museum, attendance at an opera and a ballet presented in the Kremlin.

One evening we were guests in the homes of teachers living in Moscow. This was an especially pleasant event because we had an opportunity to visit informally with a Russian family, to enjoy their gracious hospitality, and to build a bridge of friendship for better understanding.

We drove through the beautiful birch and pine forests and rural areas surrounding Moscow to observe work being done with young people at a Pioneer Camp. Trade unions sponsor camps which take care of six million children. In some ways vacation at camp is a continuation of school work. The program is planned for all-around development of the child, and the leaders are young teachers from the Institute. The camp we visited had 550 children of workers in the Academy of Scientists.

The many talented youngsters in the group, varying in ages from seven to fifteen, presented a program of dancing and music. It was a surprise when one small girl sang in English, "I come from Alabama. . . ."

Our first seminar was with representatives of the Central Committee of the Trade Unions. Mme. Tamara Yanushkovskay, president of the Educational and Scientific Workers Union welcomed us and explained the purposes of the union. Of the teachers, 98 per cent are members. She said that educators are held in high esteem. Children write poems about teaching and teachers. There are five Hero Teachers in the country.

Educators we met were friendly and interested in discussing common problems in improving education. At Secondary School #729 in an industrial area, Mme. Demmina, physicist and a deputy to the Supreme Soviet, greeted us, "My dear colleagues, allow me to express my appreciation of your visit to our school. Educators are the most desirable guests." She explained the role of women in her country by saying, "It was the great wish of Lenin that women play a great part in the governing of the state. A society can be judged by the number of women participating in the governing body."

Russian women work hard and want to be thought of on the same terms as men. There is no discrimination in pay for women. Retirement age is fifty-five. They are granted 120 days for maternity leave with pay, and mothers of large families are held in great respect and awarded medals of honor.

At the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Prof. Marchushevich described some experiments in education and curriculum changes taking place. Schools are trying to improve content in mathematics and make the program more modern by getting away from theory and paying more attention to functions and calculus in the upper grades. Algebraic symbols and equations are being introduced in the elementary grades. Attention is also being given to improvement in the teaching of foreign languages. In the past too much emphasis was placed on grammar and not

enough on practice. The result was that pupils knew rules but could not converse with foreigners. Study of one foreign language is compulsory beginning with the fifth grade.

Education of youth is one of the chief concerns of the government. About forty-three million children are studying. Many adults attend evening classes. Russians are avid readers, and books are inexpensive. Education on all levels is free, and many students at the university receive stipends as well as discounts on rooms. Education is also obligatory.

Much attention is being paid to children with unusual ability. Special schools are provided for those who show talent in the arts, in mathematics, in science. Schools have been established, also, for the mentally retarded and the physically handicapped.

Teachers go to the homes, at government expense, to teach children who are not able to attend school. Children whose parents work are cared for in nursery schools. The director told us that most parents prefer sending their children to the nursery school because they know the children will be brought up the proper way. There are twenty-two hundred of these schools in Moscow alone.

Soviet education is predicated on the Marxist-Leninist philosophy. One educator stated, "The principle of the school is to teach the child how to work and to love to work. . . . A man is friend and brother to another. One is for all, and all is for one." Schools are to arrange the behavior of every child correctly, and at each period of the child's growth certain skills and attitudes should be developed. Students are expected to do two years of practical work before admission to establishments of higher education.

Everything in Moscow seemed to be on a massive scale. Answers to questions were usually lengthy and followed the Party program. The people seemed to enjoy statistics and were intent on conformity. They were eager to display their achievements. Although we might not agree on basic philosophy, we were impressed by the friendliness of the educators who made our seminar enjoyable and

informative. Our hope is that this spirit will prevail and that teachers, who hold the destiny of the future in their hands, may continue to extend a hand of friendship in a world of peace. — *By Edith Bauerlein in D. K. Gamma Bulletin, Winter,* 1965.

RECREATION

When Maxim Gorky visited America he was taken to Coney Island by friends who wanted him to behold this huge playground swarming with holiday throngs. They took him through the crowded concessions, where he saw one dizzy contraption after another, swinging people through the air, swirling them in eccentric curves, shooting them down breathtaking inclines. They took him underground and overground, into bewildering mazes, museums of freaks, palaces of jugglers, theatres of dancing ladies and living statuary. They were giving Maxim Gorky the time of his life! Finally, at the end of what may have seemed to them a perfect day, they asked him how he had liked it. He was silent for a moment. Then he said, very simply, "What a sad people you must be!"

■ She has the capacity and willingness to stand by her husband at all times.

THE IDEAL WIFE

Who invented marriage? I do not know; if I did, I should place his name above the greatest inventors of merely scientific contraptions. I say "his" advisedly, because I am certain it was a man. No woman would have thought of such a thing, and if she had, she would have thought twice before mentioning it. Almost any woman can get along fairly well without a husband; she is in her inmost mind as independent and self-sufficient as a cat. A bachelor is like a lost dog. Even if he has so much money that he can furnish his apartment luxuriously, it is only a glorified kennel. As a rule, he never goes there so long as anything else is open.

Among all novelists, the most consummate artist was the Russian, Ivan Turgenef. He had the satisfaction of knowing, while he was yet alive on earth, that he had written immortal books, that his works would never be forgotten. What did he think of all that? He was a bachelor. He said that he would give all his art, all his books, all his fame, if there were one woman in the world who cared whether he came home late to dinner.

The paradox of wives is that they are at once more idealistic and more practical than their husbands. They are an inspiration and a leveler. They are believers in the church, in the symphony concert, in the art gallery, and in poetry. They allure to brighter worlds and lead the way. At the same time, they bring their men back from futile rages over trivialities. They are practical.

If we relied on contemporary novels for our information concerning the success of marriage as an "institution," we should be pessimists. Happy the nation that has no history. Happy the marriage which has no news.

An unhappy marriage is still "news," which is why it is featured in sensational papers and made the foundation of novels. If we used reading instead of observation, we might easily be led to believe that the first year of married life is the happiest; that passion, then aflame, is soon extinct; that husband and wife regard each other with an indifference that sinks into contempt. The facts are quite otherwise.

When I was a young man, a college friend of mine was married to a charming girl; on the wedding trip he was smitten with illness, and in a few days was dead. Talking about that to a much older man, I exclaimed, "Is there anything more tragic than that?" To my surprise, he replied, "Oh, yes — they had been married only a few days. It would have been more tragic if they had been married twenty-five years. Real tragedy is the loss of a lifelong mate." He was right.

The deep meaning of love is not found in passionate exclamations of frenzied adoration; it is seen in casual remarks such as, "Now don't go out without your rubbers on," and in real concern for the mate when he sneezes. For a man to live in solid contentment, there must be some one with whom he comes *first*. When he loses her, there is no one to take her place.

The capacity of women to *stand by* their men, their husbands, their sons, and their brothers, is one of their sublimest characteristics. The innumerable number of men over whom hangs that constant tragic fear, the fear of losing their job — for men need, even more than higher wages, security of tenure — know that the most tragic element in (when it comes) will be telling the woman waiting at home. Yet how many thousand men who have been told their "services are no longer needed," going home in despair to tell the woman dependent on the bread-winner, find from her lips, instead of taunts, or what is worse, silent acquiescence in a husband who is a failure, the words of comfort, of support, and of reassuring faith.

The greatest literary artist in American history, our fore-

most novelist, Nathaniel Hawthorne, not only owed his success to the daily inspiration of his wife, but his only opportunity to compose first his mind, and then his masterpiece. If it had not been for Sophia, perhaps we should not now remember Nathaniel. He lost his job in the Custom House. A broken-hearted man, he went home to tell his wife that he was a failure. To his amazement, she beamed with joy, and said, "Now you can write your book!" To his bitter rejoinder, "Yes and what shall we live on while I am writing it?" the astounding woman opened a drawer and took out an unsuspected hoard of cash. "Where on earth did you get that?" "My husband, I have always known that you were a man of genius. I knew that someday you would write an immortal masterpiece. So every week, out of the money you have given me for housekeeping, I have saved something; here is enough to last us one whole year." Hawthorne sat down and wrote the finest book ever written in the western hemisphere — "The Scarlet Letter." — *By William Lyon Phelps, Professor of English Literature at Yale University, condensed from Apr. '30, Delineator.*

THE UNEXPECTED FRIEND

Thousands of appeals for pardon came to Lincoln from soldiers involved in military discipline. Each appeal was as a rule supported by letters from influential people. One day a single sheet came before him, an appeal from a soldier without any supporting documents.

"What!" exclaimed the President, "has this man no friends?"

"No, sir, not one," said the adjutant.

"Then," said Lincoln, "I will be his friend."

■ This was a speech delivered by Senator Sergio Osmeña Jr. in the Philippine Senate session, March 14, 1966. It represents the views of only one sector of the Filipinos.

THE VIETNAM WAR IN RELATION TO THE PHILIPPINES

The Filipino people today are deeply engrossed in the vital issue of whether or not to send a Filipino engineering battalion with adequate security to South Vietnam.

A brief background of the events leading to the decision to send an engineering battalion to assist the beleaguered people of South Vietnam is appropriate.

Vietnam was formerly French Indo-China and one of the many colonies under French domination before World War II. In 1940 the Imperial Japanese Forces subjugated French Indo-China. Just as what happened in the Philippines, guerrilla forces sprouted in French Indo-China fighting against the Japanese invaders. These guerrilla forces consisted of many elements among them, patriotic and nationalistic Vietnamese, together with an aggrupation of forces under communist leadership just as we had the Huks. When the Imperial Japanese Forces were finally driven out of French Indo-China in 1945 by British and Chinese soldiers of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, the British government turned the country over to France.

But the freedom-loving Vietnamese continued their fight for freedom to throw off the yoke of French domination. The Vietnamese people were fighting a true nationalist revolution against the French, but the communists among them stole their revolution from them.

Largely because of the loss of support among the French people at home, as well as the massive Chinese communist assistance diverted to French Indo-China from Korea after the Korean War, France was defeated at Dienbienphu.

As a result, the Geneva Agreements of 1954 were ar-

rived at, which provided for the partitioning of Vietnam at the 17th Parallel under international supervision through the International Control Commission, composed of India, Canada and Poland. The agreement also provided for free elections in 1956 leading to the reunification of the country. North Vietnam was under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh and his communist cohorts; while South Vietnam was governed by Emperor Bao Dai with Ngo Dinh Diem as prime minister. Subsequently, following a national plebiscite, Ngo Dinh Diem was installed as President of the Republic of South Vietnam.

However, the communists of North Vietnam, supported by the communists of Red China, never intended to comply with the provisions of the Geneva Agreements of 1954. The North Vietnamese regime rendered the International Control Commission absolutely impotent from the outset, refusing even to permit the International Control Commission to supervise the exodus of those who wanted to flee terror in the North and seek refuge in South Vietnam. Almost a million Vietnamese who had already seen the true face of communism in the North fled to South Vietnam. If the communists had permitted proper functioning of the International Control Commission, the total number of refugees would have been much greater.

Another evidence of the communist North Vietnamese regime's nefarious intent was its retention within South Vietnamese territories of large military forces, which it instructed to go underground, hide their weapons, and await instructions for future subversion.

In view of this obvious communist duplicity, it is no small wonder that President Ngo Dinh Diem refused to permit nationwide elections in 1956. Mr. Diem felt that South Vietnam's only hope lay in free elections under international supervision. He knew that communist North Vietnam with a larger population than that of South Vietnam, could inevitably win an unsupervised election by simply delivering a 100

per cent vote in the northern sector of the partitioned nation — and nobody questions the communists' ability to deliver a 100 per cent vote in areas under their complete control.

What happened in the two zones in the years immediately following the partitioning of Vietnam? In the communist zone of the North, there was economic stagnation, hardship and privation — all made even worse by the ruthlessness of communist methods, ruthlessness that led in 1956 to a peasant uprising in Nghe An province, which reportedly cost the lives of 50,000 peasants.

North Vietnam's gross national product decreased steadily. Meanwhile, in South Vietnam, there was dramatic progress. In ten years school enrolment increased from 300,000 to 1,500,000. More than 12,000 dispensaries and clinics were established. Under a land reform program beginning in 1957, some 600,000 acres of farm lands were distributed to 115,000 farmers. South Vietnam became once again a major rice exporting nation.

This was the contrast between North and South Vietnam — dramatically illustrated by only one set of comparative statistics: while per capita food production between 1955-60 dropped 10 per cent in North Vietnam, it rose by 20 per cent in the South. What happened was simply this: the life of the people in South Vietnam improved so much that the communist regime in the North realized that it must abandon all hope of a political takeover in the South; Ho Chi Minh and his colleagues realized that they must instead move for a military takeover of South Vietnam.

The North Vietnamese communists, following guidelines set down by Mao Tse Tung, decided to launch in South Vietnam what the communists call a "war of national liberation."

Before 1959, the Viet Cong guerrillas in the South — that is, the forces left behind after the Geneva agreements, together with such recruits as they could gather through indoctrination, coercion and terror — were not a serious threat to the security of

South Vietnam. To be sure, they conducted a small-scale campaign of terror; in the period 1957 to 1959 they murdered or kidnaped more than 1,000 civilians. However, during that period the threat could be contained by South Vietnam's own armed forces.

However, when the communists decided to launch their "war of national liberation," they greatly accelerated their terroristic activities in South Vietnam. This was followed by political organization. As early as 1959 Ho Chi Minh declared that the "communist revolution" must be brought to the South. Early in 1960 Ho Chi Minh's military commander Vo Nguyen Giap, described Hanoi as "the revolutionary base for the whole country." A September 1960 congress of the Lao Dong, the North Vietnamese communist party, decided to establish the "National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam." The first the outside world knew of the establishment of the Front was a Radio Hanoi broadcast on January 29, 1961.

The communists then proceeded to form a South Vietnamese branch of North Vietnam's communist party, they named it the People's Revolutionary Party. It was during this period that supplies, arms and men began pouring from the North into South Vietnam in increasing numbers. For a long time the North Vietnamese infiltrators into S. Vietnam were military personnel of Southern origin — men who could blend into the surroundings of the areas from which they came and who could speak with the accents of their home regions. Ultimately, however, the supply of Southerners in the North dried up and North Vietnam began infiltrating into the South entire regiments of the North Vietnamese Army.

The purpose of the communists' "war of national liberation" and "National Liberation Front" was to take over a large enough area of South Vietnam to enable them to set up the "Front" as the legitimate government" of South Vietnam.

Indicative of the phony nature of North Vietnam's "Liberation Front" is that

not a single leading political or intellectual figure in the South, whatever his differences with the government in Saigon, has joined the Viet Cong on its "Liberation Front" apparatus. Nor has a single one of the many religious, political, labor or student groups in the South rallied to the banner of the Front.

The reason for this is simple: informed people in South Vietnam know that the "National Liberation Front" originated in the North, is controlled by Hanoi, and is completely subservient to its communist masters. It is also worth noting that whenever communist North Vietnam has sent "Liberation Front" representatives abroad, they have always travelled under North Vietnamese passports.

As a result of the flagrant violations of the Geneva Agreements by the North Vietnamese, which resulted in the invasion of South Vietnam by communist forces armed by Red China and directed by Peking, the United States of America upon request by the legally constituted South Vietnam government decided to lend its military assistance to South Vietnam.

There were no US combat forces in South Vietnam at the time the communists began to increase their aggression in 1960. However, in the words of President Johnson, "unchecked aggression against free and helpless people would be a great threat to our freedom and an offense to our own conscience." Hence the United States fulfilled its commitment by sending combat troops not for purposes of aggression but to fight side by side with the 500,000 Vietnamese troops in defense of the territorial integrity of the free peoples of South Vietnam.

This painful decision the United States had to make if only to show to the peoples of the free world that she was ever ready to comply with her solemn commitments not only in South Vietnam but in any part of the globe.

For it is abundantly clear that should the United States renege from its commitments, it would be encouraging additional communist subversion and aggression through-

out the globe. If the aggression against South Vietnam were permitted to succeed, in the words of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, "the forces of militant communism everywhere would be vastly heartened and we could expect to see a series of so-called wars of liberation in Asia, Latin America and Africa."

The United States is more than ever determined to stop communist aggression in South Vietnam just as it did in Berlin, Greece, Korea and Cuba, to mention a few.

Historians will still remember that in these countries the communist forces of aggression were stopped in their tracks because of a firm determination of the United States of America to stop communist aggression wherever it may be found.

As President Johnson and his predecessors have repeatedly emphasized, the American objective in Southeast Asia is peace — a peace in which the various peoples of the areas can manage their own ways. America does not seek to destroy or overturn the communist regimes in Hanoi and Peking. All America wants is that the communists cease their aggressions: that they leave their neighbors alone. The United States had sought to achieve a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam but the communists had inevitably slammed the door. The communists would not discuss at a conference table unless the United States armed forces would be withdrawn from South Vietnam, something totally unacceptable to America.

Because of the precarious situation obtaining in South Vietnam, the prime minister of the government of the Republic of Vietnam has sent a plea to our government for an engineering battalion with adequate security cover. The first request was made on April 14, 1965 when Dr. Phan Huy Quat, prime minister of the Republic of Vietnam, addressed a letter to then President Macapagal. President Macapagal in response to the South Vietnamese request recommended the approval of House Bill No. 17828 in 1965. In that year the Liberal-controlled House of Representatives approved the bill but the Nacionalista-

controlled Senate headed by then Senate President Marcos failed to act on the same.

The second request was made on Feb. 2, 1966 when the Ambassador of South Vietnam to the Philippines sent a similar letter to President Marcos.

To the credit of President Marcos, a Nacionalista, after having been apprised of all the facts surrounding the Vietnamese problem, he recommended to Congress the approval of a bill appropriating money for the sending of a Philippine engineering battalion with the necessary security to South Vietnam.

The issue, therefore, transcends partisan politics. Both President Macapagal, a Liberal, and President Marcos a Nacionalista, have agreed to send Filipino troops to Vietnam, just as in the United States three American Presidents, namely, Eisenhower, a Republican, Kennedy, a Democrat, and Johnson, another Democrat, had seen fit to come to the military aid of the Republic of South Vietnam.

Brushing aside all technicalities, the main questions boil down to these: Is it to the best interests of the Philippines and the Filipino people to assist a beleaguered friendly neighbor who has asked for assistance in fighting a common enemy? Is it moral and proper for the Philippines, a democratic country, to listen to the advice of an ally and benefactor, the United States, so that we may heed the South Vietnamese supplication?

The globe is divided into two camps of contradicting and conflicting ideologies: the democratic camp which stands for freedom and the communist bloc which stands for slavery.

Everyone realizes the fact that the leader of the free world is the United States and that we, just like South Vietnam, belong to the democratic camp. The issue before us is the expansion of our nation's commitment in South Vietnam. I wish to make it clear that the issue is expansion of a commitment which already exists. There are almost 70 Filipino personnel in South Vietnam today engaged in medical, civic action and psychological warfare work. What is asked of us is to send engineering forces

so that the South Vietnamese government will be able to free more of its armed forces to bear the brunt of the fighting, as indeed they do.

Would it not be more prudent and advisable to help a friendly neighbor fighting for its very life against a common enemy, the communists, so that should we be placed under the same predicament we would likewise be able to request similar assistance?

For let there be no mistake about it, the North Vietnamese are merely following instructions of Mao Tse Tung whose Defense Minister Lin Piao, who is also Vice-Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee and a Vice Premier has stated "the seizure of power by armed force, the settling of the issue by war, is the central task and highest form of revolution." Lin Piao has stated the objectives of the Chinese communists and that was to "establish rural base areas and the use of the countryside to encircle the cities and finally capture them" — to shape the army first and foremost on a political basis to seize the power of a state "by revolutionary violence" for, as Mao Tse Tung says, "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

Stake in Vietnam

For what is at stake in South Vietnam? The United States, to be sure considers that its security, its vital interests are at stake in South Vietnam. By the same token, the fundamental security of the Republic of the Philippines is also at stake in South Vietnam.

Let us analyze this.

There has been a lot of talk about the immense importance of South Vietnam; the unpleasant reality is that it is all true. By a whim of history that small and tortured country has become pivotal both politically and psychologically, like Poland at the outset of World War II. Its loss to the communists could lead eventually to the loss of the entire Southeast Asian Peninsula, an area of more than two million square miles, with a population of more than 250 million.

The Southeast Asian Peninsula has obvious economic importance. It is a trade gateway almost as important as the Suez Canal. If it were barred to the major trading nations of the free world, air and shipping lines would be forced to shift round-the-world routes to places like Darwin in northern Australia 2,000 miles south of the present route through Manila.

South East Asia is underpopulated and contains vast natural resources such as oil, rubber and tin — and most important of all, major surpluses of rice. Its rice has been the goal of Chinese imperialism for centuries, just as it was for the Japanese in World War II. Today, Southeast Asia is Peking's main hope for solving the Communist China's massive food problem.

Capture of Southeast Asia would tip the balance of world resources toward the communist bloc, dramatically reinforcing its limited economic power — and thus its military power, with a corresponding loss of strength to the free world. In effect, communist control of Southeast Asia would amount to collapse of the tenuous stability, the precarious balance of power between the world's two major power blocs, with incalculably dangerous consequences.

Communist objectives in Southeast Asia have long been clear to anyone who cared to examine the facts.

From the foregoing enumeration of facts, it is patently clear that loss of South Vietnam to the free world would eventually be a loss of Southeast Asia to the communists, thereby causing a most serious threat to our national security. Viewed from the light of cold reasoning, is not our country fully justified in sending additional assistance to South Vietnam as requested by her leaders?

Certainly, it is to our national interest to defend and protect our democratic ideals, lest someday we lose all we treasure and enjoy. Lose to whom? No less than to a godless, ruthless, and autocratic foreign power whose doctrine we abhor because it runs counter to every principle of democracy, justice and liberty that we have imbibed

and cherished, and whose system of government we thoroughly detest because it is a government of a murderous clique whose god is naked power and whose law is murder and rape.

Thirty-one nations belonging to the free world have seen fit to send assistance to South Vietnam. They are: Australia, Republic of China, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaysia, New Zealand, Thailand, Greece, Turkey, Pakistan, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, West Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Argentina, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Uruguay, Venezuela and Canada. If countries ten thousand miles away from South Vietnam have extended their assistance to an ally, certainly we, who are only two hours' flight away from Saigon should be more deeply concerned in putting out the flames of communism that would seek to encompass the free nations of Southeast Asia, of which we are one.

As often stated, we are a small nation. The basic philosophy of our national defense is collective security. This we have done by entering into treaties of collective defense with many countries in the world with whom we have mutuality of interests and with whom we share the same fundamental beliefs and ideologies.

But let me present a more potent argument why we should send an engineering battalion to South Vietnam.

It is an undeniable fact which all ultra-nationalists or super-nationalists will admit, that by ourselves we could never defend our country against Red Chinese aggression. Our annual budget for defense purposes during the last fiscal year was ₱284 million, 92 per cent of which was for pay, allowances and retirement benefits of our Armed Forces and only 8 per cent was expended for training, operations and other purposes.

Our armed forces consist of roughly 43,000 troops; 16,000 in the PC, 13,000 in the Army, 5,200 in the Navy and 8,000 in the Air Force.

We have only 50 aircraft, and our Navy consists of only 50 ships, hopelessly in-

adequate even to curb smuggling.

Even if we were to spend our entire Philippine government annual budget for defense purposes alone, it would not be sufficient to maintain the US Carrier "Enterprise" on combat station in the South China Sea for one year.

We have, therefore, to depend almost entirely upon the United States for our external protection. Remove the United States 7th Fleet and 13th Air Force and I should like to ask the ultra-nationalists: where would we be? Red China could occupy the Philippines in 24 hours.

Why did we enter into a military assistance agreement with the United States? Let me for a moment recall the circumstances.

In 1933, my late father, then Senator Osmeña, returned from the United States as head of the Osrox Mission to Washington and brought back with him the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Independence Act. It was necessary for the Independence Act to become operative that the Philippine Legislature accept the same.

In that year, however, then Senate President Manuel Quezon raised strong objections to the H-H-C Law. His reason was that the law granted the United States the right to establish military and naval bases in the Philippines even after independence. Mr. Quezon said it was incongruous for the Philippines, after having obtained her independent status, to have a part of her territory under a foreign power. He raised the same issues that the opponents of the Vietnam bill are now raising — national dignity, sovereignty, nationalism. As a result, the H-H-C law was rejected by the Philippine Legislature, which was then under the control of then Senate President Quezon.

MLQ to US

The following year, Mr. Quezon journeyed to Washington. He was able to obtain approval of the Tydings-McDuffie Act. This law contained the same provisions as the H-H-C Law with the exception that under the T-M Law the United

States would no longer have any right to maintain military and naval bases in the Philippines after the grant of independence — only refuelling stations.

What happened afterwards is now part of history. When Japanese bombs fell on Philippine soil on Dec. 8, 1941, we were caught literally with our pants down. We were unprepared. As a result we were invaded and occupied by the Japanese hordes.

Had we accepted the H-H-C Law instead of raising the hue and cry of nationalism, America would have been assured that she could maintain military and naval bases in the Philippines. Such assurances would have compelled her to fortify to the utmost her naval and military bases in our country, knowing as she did then that Japan was feverishly preparing to embark on a plan of establishing the so-called Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere.

Had America done so, our country could have been spared the utter humiliation of being invaded and occupied. It could have been impossible for Japan to conquer the Philippines just as she found it impossible to invade Hawaii. That I take it, was the reason why my father was willing to give the United States all the bases it needed for the protection, not only of its interests in the Philippines but also for the protection of the Philippines and the preservation of the independence that the United States had promised her.

History has proven the wisdom of my father's attitude. Had America fortified all her bases here to the extent that she would have, if the H-H-C Law had been accepted by the Philippine Legislature there would have been, I dare say no tragic surrender in Bataan, no death march and no humiliating surrender of Corregidor.

But the bugbear of nationalism prevented America's plan to fortify our country and as a result we suffered subjugation.

Due to the bitter lessons we learned from World War II, we, the Filipino people, apprehensive as we all were then of our future, speaking through our duly elected re-

presentatives, authorized the President of the United States for the establishment of bases military and naval in our country. That was on July 28, 1945 or one year before the establishment of Philippine independence. What were our immediate objectives? First and foremost was to insure the territorial integrity of the Philippines, our country. Second was to guarantee the mutual protection of the Philippines and the United States. The third was to insure the maintenance of peace in the Pacific.

After months of full and mature deliberation by our leaders the military bases agreement was signed by Manuel Roxas who was then President of the Philippines, and Paul V. McNutt, first American Ambassador to our Republic. The formal signing took place right in Malacañang on March 21, 1947.

If, as it must be admitted, the Philippine defense is almost entirely dependent upon the United States and since we fully recognize that America is the leader of the free world in our fight against the forces of aggression, would it not be in keeping with our national pride and dignity if when requested by Uncle Sam, we should send a token force to South Vietnam in order to contribute our share in the efforts to stop the enemy?

I am heartily in accord with those who insist that we should maintain our national dignity and sovereignty but not at the expense of our welfare and security. And what are we going to do with dignity and sovereignty once we are in the grip of the communists, once we have utterly lost freedom, even the freedom to advance stupid and ridiculous suggestions? If we as a nation have to depend primarily upon America for our external defense, would it not be in keeping with our national dignity and sovereignty if we were to accept America to do what she thinks should be done in the interests of our own security?

On Feb. 2, 1966, I was privileged to listen to the brilliant speech of the distinguished gentleman from Batangas, a Nacionalista, who spoke against the Vietnam bill. On March 1, 1966, I

was again privileged to listen to the inspiring remarks of our distinguished colleague from Bulacan, a Liberal, who spoke in favor of the Vietnam bill.

Here, indeed, was democracy in action — a way of life that we have learned to love, but which we may not be privileged to continue enjoying should the cause for which our allies are fighting in Vietnam fail.

Is it not correct to state that what is advantageous militarily to the United States in this part of the globe would also be advantageous to the Philippines? All over the world, in Europe, in Africa, in South America, in Asia, the forces of democracy are locked in mortal combat with the forces of communism. Here in our little corner of the earth, in Southeast Asia, North Vietnamese soldiers equipped with communist guns have invaded South Vietnam in an effort to communize all of Vietnam and eventually all of Southeast Asia.

The United States, as the leader of the democratic bloc of free nations, in keeping with her solemn commitments, has sent troops to South Vietnam in order to protect the territorial integrity of that country. The United States has no designs to proceed to North Vietnam, but only to contain subversion and aggression in South Vietnam. Unless the free nations of the world, particularly the Philippines, will rally behind the democratic allies in containing communist aggression in South Vietnam, we will some day wake up to find all of Southeast Asia, including Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, Malaysia, Singapore and even the Philippines firmly in the grip of communism.

The argument has been advanced that by sending an engineering battalion with adequate security cover to South Vietnam, the Philippines would be involved in war. Such being the case, it has been said that we would be subject to retaliation. It is my confirmed opinion that in the global conflict between the forces of communism and the forces of democracy, there can be no neutralism. The communists will attempt to invade

the Philippines if it suits them regardless of whether or not we are involved.

Past experience in this country with the Huks is a matter of historical record. And it may be added that, although the major threat of the Huks was reduced in President Magsaysay's time, the Huks are still very much in existence in this country. And today's newspapers quote our Secretary of Justice, Jose Yulo, as stating that some prominent members of the local Chinese community are active in communist subversive activities in this country in support of Peking.

The revered names of President Magsaysay and President Laurel have been mentioned as having opposed the sending of troops to Southeast Asia in April of 1954. For this reason, it has been argued that were they alive today, they would continue to maintain the same stand.

In April 1954, both Presidents Magsaysay and Laurel opposed sending troops to Vietnam because they expressed opposition to the dispatch of Filipino military forces to fight on the side of a colonial power that was attempting to maintain its hold over a colony. In those days, the Vietminh, though they were certainly led and dominated by communists, were composed largely of Vietnamese who were fighting for the independence of their homeland from France. Today, the situation is entirely different. The government in South Vietnam, an independent and sovereign government, has called for our assistance in repelling a communist aggressive movement which seeks to destroy South Vietnam's independence.

It is the intention of the democratic allies to prevent the spread of communists that they will be met with resistance wherever they attempt aggression, to convince the communists that they must stay within their territorial limits. The communists should have learned those lessons in Korea, Greece, Berlin, Malaysia, in the Philippines and Cuba, where free nations reacted with firmness and determination. It is clear that the lesson must be taught again today in Vietnam.

In order to fulfill properly its role as co-chairman, the United Kingdom cannot be placed in a position of making too obvious a commitment on either side. However, the United Kingdom has provided a British advisory mission in South Vietnam for about five years.

This mission, composed of veterans who participated in putting down the communist insurgency in Malaya, has provided valuable advice and assistance to the South Vietnamese, and has worked in cooperation with the Malaysian government in arranging training for more than 2,000 Vietnamese military officers in Malaysia.

The United Kingdom has also provided considerable economic support to South Vietnam, including laboratory equipment for Saigon University, typesetting equipment for the government printing office, a cobalt deep-ray therapy unit for the National Cancer Institute and much equipment for the faculties of medicine, science and pharmacy at Saigon University, the Meteorological Service and the Agricultural School at Saigon, the Atomic Research Establishment at Da-Slat, and the Faculty of Education at Hue. The United Kingdom has also agreed to provide 50,000 British pounds sterling worth of diesel fishing boat engines.

It is said that Thailand has provided no troop in South Vietnam, but the Thais have supplied a military air detachment with C-47 pilots, navigators and maintenance men. They are now on duty flying operational transport missions for the Vietnamese forces. In addition, they have provided cement and zinc roofing materials and have provided jet training for Vietnamese pilots in Thailand. Thailand has an incipient communist insurgency movement of its own to contend with in Northeast Thailand. It is making a valuable contribution to the anti-communist struggle in Southeast Asia by committing its armed forces and police to internal defense. Moreover, Thailand's distinguished prime minister said during his visit to these country two weeks ago that Thailand is prepared to do more in Vietnam if necessary.

The size of Australian and New Zealand troop commitments in Vietnam is small but both Australia and New Zealand are deeply committed to the defense of the Malaysia-Singapore area, and maintain large forces there. No one can doubt the importance of keeping those forces where they are. The stability of that area would be jeopardized if they were moved.

Australia, in proportion to its resources and population, has made a major contribution in Vietnam for the past several years. In addition to sending a crack infantry battalion, 100 specialists in jungle warfare and an air force unit which files daily logistical support missions for the Vietnamese forces, Australia has provided a million Vietnamese textbooks, 3,300 tons of corrugated roofing for Vietnamese military dependent housing, 15,570 sets of hand tools, 16,000 blankets, 14,000 cases of condensed milk and a 50-kilowatt radio broadcasting station. Hundreds of Vietnamese have been sent to Australia for training.

Australia has also provided surgical teams, civil engineers and dairy and agricultural experts. And furthermore, Australia announced that it is tripling the size of its combat forces in South Vietnam, bringing them up to a strength of approximately 4,500. Australia is a richer nation than the Philippines, but we overlook its small population — considerably less than half the population of this country.

New Zealand, a nation with only one-tenth the population of the Philippines, has not only sent engineers and artillerymen to South Vietnam, it has provided New Zealand pounds equivalent to $200,000 for a science building at the University of Saigon, equipment for a technical high school and is training 62 Vietnamese in New Zealand.

The South Vietnamese were wise to decline an offer of Chinese Nationalist volunteers. It is vital that Red China not be offered an excuse for sending "volunteers" into the Vietnam conflict as she did in Korea.

The response to communist aggression in Vietnam should

be a measured response, carefully calculated to convince North Vietnam that it must leave its neighbors alone, and not a response that would trigger Red China intervention. I feel that Red China would view Nationalist China volunteers in South Vietnam as a fulfillment of Chiang Kai-Shek's threat to "retake the mainland", and would enter the war openly and not just clandestinely.

As it is, Nationalist China has provided to South Vietnam far more than we have. They have sent an agricultural team composed of more than 80 men, a military psychological warfare team, a surgical team, and an electrical power mission. They have provided half a million mathematics textbooks, electrical power substations, prefabricated warehouses, agricultural tools, seeds and fertilizers, as well as providing training for more than 200 Vietnam in Taiwan.

Mr. President, what I deplore far more than the inaccurate allegations about the relative contributions of other countries to the defense of communist aggression is the clear implication on the part of those who make such charges that since they feel that some other nations have failed to fulfill their obligations, they believe that this country is thereby, exonerated, absolved of all responsibilities, to fulfill our obligations.

One can just imagine the impact among the members of the free world, and particularly the United States, should the Philippines fail to extend the assistance requested by our South Vietnamese ally. The last thing that we want the United States not to do is to back down on her commitments. Can we afford to back down on our own commitments?

Numerous attempts have been made to use the good offices and the power of the United Nations to move the Vietnam conflict from the battlefield to the conference table. To date, all such efforts have failed. On Jan. 31, 1966, the United States formally requested the United Nations Security Council to consider the situation in Vietnam and to recommend steps toward a peaceful solution. However, the communists reacted as they always have in the past. The very

next day following the United States request for action by the United Nations Security Council the North Vietnamese regime reiterated its stand that the UN has no right to deal with the Vietnam question and that any UN Security Council resolution on the Vietnam question would be null and void.

In order for the UN to take collective action in Vietnam under United Nations auspices, it would be necessary to have Security Council approval. As everyone knows, this would require a unanimous vote in the Security Council which would obviously be impossible, since it would be vetoed by the Soviet Union.

Individual members of the SEATO can assist and are assisting in South Vietnam in response to individual requests from the government of South Vietnam. As we all know, South Vietnam, as one of the protocol states of the SEATO Treaty, can call for SEATO assistance to repel aggression. However, the SEATO Treaty also provides that collective action by the eight SEATO members must be based upon a unanimous vote. Here again, as in the United Nations Security Council, we cannot expect a unanimous vote. France, one of the eight SEATO powers, has already taken the position that the Vietnam problem can be solved only by "neutralization" of the area.

In South Vietnam help must be based upon the individual decision of free nations in response to South Vietnam's request and not upon collective action under the provisions of either the United Nations charter or the SEATO Treaty.

The questions has been asked, can we afford to send an engineering battalion with security cover to South Vietnam?

I feel that the question should be: "Can we afford not to afford it?" For certainly, we cannot put a price tag on liberty and freedom.

It has been said that the 2,000 Filipino troops that will be sent to Vietnam will not be sufficient to tilt the balance in favor of the free world. Would it not be better to contribute our share, no matter how little, in putting out the fire in the neighborhood?

LITERACY MOVEMENTS

The community house may serve as a classroom for adult literacy classes. India, by official figures, has some 87 per cent illiteracy among her 440 million people. Here, in literacy classes, is where a woman takes on a new world, for when she can read a simple book after six months in the class, she enters a new existence. One young woman said, "At first those scratches on the black chart frightened me. How could they talk to me? Now I cannot put the book down and whether I am ginning cotton, spinning, or pounding the corn, the book is always with me."

I shall never forget the woman with the baby on her back kneeling beside a bench as she was learning to write the names of her children. All at once she looked up, shouting with delight, "Look, here is my baby's name. She has a name. I have never seen the names of my children before. They have names. Now I have a name." The thumb print had been her only signature.

As many of you know, I am connected with Literacy Village in Lucknow, India. It is Welthy Honsinger Fisher, the founder of this village and the leading spirit in planning and program, whom you have made an international honorary member today. Literacy Village is a campus with offices, classrooms, dormitories, simple staff houses, and a production and writing center. Here teachers are trained to teach adult illiterates, to write and prepare materials for the new literates; and here many social welfare groups in India come for training in various fields.

Literacy Village also has an exciting tin trunk library project. The Tin Trunk is a library of seventy-five p a p e r-b a c k, easy-to-read books for the new literates. They are on such subjects as hygiene, f a m i l y planning,

and farming; and there are many story books. These link literacy with the real concerns of India's 300 million illiterates. The Tin Trunk libraries travel by jeeps and bicycles to villages and markets. The mother who has learned to read can sign a card and take a book straight to her mud-walled home for all of two weeks. Of the many thousands of books loaned, practically none have been lost.

In Africa I was asked to speak many times on the topic of literacy. In one of the United States Information Centers, scores of young men in the audience kept on for hours, asking many questions as to what they could do with their illiterates. "Forty-three per cent of our population is under fifteen years of age. How can we let them go the rest of their lives without reading and writing if we expect to build a strong nation?" "What are you doing in Literacy Village?" "What did you find on this trip that other African nations were doing about this problem?" These were some of their questions.

Christian missions have been helping on literacy in both Asia and Africa with few exceptions the leaders of today in all fields had their primary education, at least, in a church mission school. The missionary was the keystone of all education in Central Africa until the last few years. One African said, "Every hospital today in this part of Africa began with the first aid kit on the veranda of a missionary's home."

There are few nationals to fill teaching positions in Africa's new secondary schools, teacher training institutes, and technical schools, or in expanded college curriculums. Vast numbers of Americans in the last two years have been called in to fill such posts. Peace Corps Volunteers are a part of this new teaching army. Sometimes I wonder, when seeing them at work, which one is the pupil and which one the teacher. One Peace Corps Volunteer said, "Back home in America you think we are doing something for these people. Don't you worry, they are doing something for us much greater than anything we can do for them."

Attention: All organization heads and members!

Help your club raise funds painlessly . . .

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Contents