

United States, the cultural and industrial center of the world, that would be a loss from which civilization possibly could never recover.

The protection of Europe need not mean that Japan and the great island defense ring around the Pacific will be left wholly undefended or abandoned, but Japan lies too far from the center of Russia and too close to the Russian air-bases in Siberia to be converted into a primary staging area for a possible attack on the Kremlin world-destroyers.

The natural direction for an American attack is not from Japan nor from or over Alaska, but across the North Atlantic, Greenland, and Iceland. As for the Siberian bases, with our present long-range bombers, no near-by base, such as Japan, is necessary to render them vulnerable. Attacks on Russia in Asia from Japan, other parts of the Far East (especially Guam and Okinawa), and from Alaska, would be secondary in importance, but that is, of course, not to say that such points should be or would be entirely neglected.

Our belief is that the Moscow plotters of democracy's downfall will not at all have like the reports which came out of Tokyo nor the implications to which, even though the reports were denied, they have given rise. They serve as another and very stern warning of deadly intent: We would attack the center along the shortest, most direct route.

AFTER the foregoing editorial was written, the official denials referred to resulted in the disclosure by Tokyo correspondents that the reports were based on statements made by Secretary Royall in a press interview given just before he left Japan.

Certain of the Secretary's statements were now directly quoted, and one of them was:

"I am not certain that we could hold Japan, nor am I certain that it would be worth while as long as we have Okinawa and the Philippines which are relatively safer and from which we would be able to mount strategic air-attacks without [the necessity of] undertaking the task of feeding 80,000,000 civilians."

This led the *Manila Times* to ask:

"We don't know much about Okinawa. But as far as the Philippines is concerned, if it is Mr. Royall's design to use the Philippines as an attack-base, what are his plans for the defense of this attack-base?"

"Does he contemplate using a tiny portion of the Philippines, the Clark Field-Stotsenburg area, as the launching site of an air-offensive against a possible foe on the Asian land mass?"

"Does he realize that this alone will expose the whole Philippines to counter-attack?"

The *Times* pointed out in conclusion:

"Large as the question of the defensibility of Japan may loom in the overall picture, the question of the defense of the Philippines looms larger here."

There can be no question that as long as the United States maintains military bases in the Philippines as it has a treaty-right to do, it is committed to the defense of the Philippines.

In this connection we ask for enlightenment on something that has long puzzled us.

Why are the Philippine Scouts being disbanded?

Certainly this would seem to be most untimely in view of world conditions; also most unwise, both from the political and military viewpoints, so long as the United States maintains military bases here.

One of the most remarkable events in all history is the re-establishment after two millennia of the Jewish nation, signalized in Jerusalem last month by the swearing in of Dr. Chaim Weizmann as the first President of Israel.

Meaning of the Re-born Israel.

This inauguration was followed a week later by the signing of an armistice with Egypt, negotiated under the auspices of the United Nations, to date one of its most notable achievements. With six other Arab nations joining the movement for peace, armed Arab opposition, which should never have developed,* to the Israel resurgence, has been brought to a virtual end.

This is the realization not only of the Zionist movement, which had its inception around a hundred years ago though it hardly got under way until the years just preceding the first World War, but of the dream to which the Jewish people have clung with unshakeable loyalty and faith during the whole of the eighteen centuries of dispersion which followed the destruction of their Temple in Jerusalem by the Romans.

It is a fine thing that two Christian nations have led in the advocacy of the re-establishment of the Jewish Homeland, — England and America. Among the great proponents of the policy were Lloyd George, Woodrow Wilson, Arthur James Balfour, Jan Smuts, Lord Milner, Henry Cabot Lodge, Lord Robert Cecil, Winston Churchill, Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman.

The persecution of the Jews in Poland gave Zionism its first impetus, but the hideous mass murders of the Jews in Germany under Hitler served in large part to give the movement its final strength after the second World War.

The Jewish determination was not to be broken even by the dualism which developed in the British attitude, beginning with the Chamberlain appeasement policy toward Hitler and Mussolini, who were stirring up the Arabs, and carried on even after the war by certain British civil servants.

The return to Palestine has been a largely spiritual, idealistic, and democratic enterprise. It was the Jews who gave modern civilization the basic concepts of its religion. It may well be that the Jews will now set the world a new example of an ethical modern national and social life. At any rate, their form of colonization on a collectivist basis, constituting a virtual revolution through cooperation and construction under the ideal of highly dedicated labor, will serve as a valuable foil to the capitalistic democracy of the United States and the socialism of England, — not to mention the "communism" of Russia.

Though the storm of charges and counter-charges in the Philippines Senate broke so tardily that it appears to have been precipitated chiefly by clashing presidential ambitions, the exposure of the rank corruption in the high government circles is all to the good.

The present conflict may not be one in which (as yet) all the forces of righteousness are on the one side and all the forces of evil on the other, and still it is all to the good.

If they could not be otherwise exposed, it is well that the crooks fell out among themselves and now in some instances expose each other.

The corruption has long been a more or less open secret, and it is healthy to have it opened to the full view, just as it is salutary that a suppurating abscess breaks even without the use of a knife.

The rest is up to the people, and to the Government in so far as it remains honest.

* See editorial in the November, 1947, Journal.

In connection with the exposures in Manila, there has been talk, defensive talk, of the shocking Teapot-Dome scandal in Washington during the Harding Administration. But let it not be overlooked how the people reacted in that matter and what measures the Government took. The criminals went to prison, rich and highly placed as they were, and some say that Harding wished to die, and died, because of what had happened.

In any government there are always individuals who would take criminal advantage of their power if they had opportunity. That is to be expected. That is one reason why we have auditing and investigating bodies, prosecutors, judges, police, and prison-wardens. No people can rightly be blamed for the discovery of criminals in high official positions, but they are to blame if they keep them there.

Some Filipinos have said that the country is disgraced before the world, but a clean-up, the more complete, the better, would do more to impress other nations with the reality of Philippine competence in the ways of democratic government than has the past dubious party "unity" which, it has been plain for some time, enabled a clique of malefactors to maintain themselves in positions of power and honor.

The real test will come when it is seen whether masses of voters too easily misled or bought out-right, will still rally to them and keep them in power.

In a letter which some time ago the Chamber of Commerce of the Philippines sent to Secretary of Commerce and Industry Cornelio Balmaceda (the letter was signed by President Gil J. Puyat) protesting against the undue competition offered by the People's Homesite Corporation to private concrete-block manufacturers, — which letter no doubt had its weight in finally deciding the Government to call a halt to this competition, we have noted with satisfaction one sentence which read:

"It has been the consistent policy of the Chamber to oppose, as a general proposition, government in business, and countenance government investments in business only to pioneer in such lines where private capital is indifferent until such time as private capital is ready to take over, and where private enterprise cannot supply the demand or it indulges in practices detrimental to the welfare of the general public."

This statement outlines what we believe is a very sound policy. However, it also appears to us that the total record of the Philippine Chamber does not bear out that it has consistently opposed government in business, even as a general proposition.

The Chamber has, indeed, done much to encourage government interference and government competition with private business here, apparently in the belief that this interference and competition would affect foreign-owned business enterprises only or chiefly, and would in the end be to the advantage of Filipino-owned private business enterprise.

We have always believed that Filipino business, as time went on, would come to realize the fact that whatever is harmful to foreign business is also harmful to Filipino business, as well as to the people of the Philippines as a whole.

There is much to be said for cooperation between business and government and much can be achieved by such cooperation. But neither government nor business should lose sight of the fact that under the forms and processes of our capitalistic democracy,

government and business, respectively, must function as checks upon each other.

There is a natural tendency of government everywhere to become dictatorial and totalitarian, and this tendency is checked only by the people as a whole and their various other social institutions, among which industry and business are probably the strongest.

If business had its own way entirely, we would develop what has come to be known as fascism. If government had its way entirely, we would have totalitarianism, and the one is as bad as the other, with free private enterprise and all other freedoms ultimately suppressed under both.

Of late years, government here has gone much too far in the totalitarian direction in its interference with and control over the economic life of the people, and if the Philippine Chamber comes to realize this, a very important gain will have been made toward offsetting this very alarming trend, — alarming economically, politically, and culturally.

The American Chamber of Commerce has stood virtually alone in its opposition to this trend. It heartily welcomes any sign of conversion on the part of the Philippine Chamber to what should be its general function in assisting in the maintaining of a dynamic and progressive balance between the various social forces in this country.

When one of the highest officials of the Department of Justice, — God save the mark, officially urges a course of action upon the Government on the basis of a line of reasoning which would not have occurred even to an eighteenth century Borneo pirate, isn't it time we stop and consider? The more so as this course of action would seem to be in line with a decision of the highest court of justice of the land?

There must be no confusion here between the course proposed and the exercise of the power of eminent domain, one of the most majestic of all governmental powers and never used by any civilized government except under circumstances of great public necessity and then only with the greatest restraint. The power has been defined as —

"that superior dominion of the sovereign power over property within the state which authorizes it to appropriate all or any part of a property to a necessary public use, reasonable compensation being made."

No, this course urged upon the Government is one of outright confiscation, as of stolen goods, under the warrant of a decision of the Supreme Court of the Philippines, the notorious "Krivenko Case" decision, which purported to be an interpretation of the Constitution with respect to landownership and denied to aliens to right to hold any land whatever.

* Read It And Weep!
Suits Against Alien Landholders To Recover Property Urged On President

Solicitor General Felix Bautista Angelo urged the President yesterday to authorize his office to institute court action against alien-owned properties acquired in violation of the Constitution as interpreted by the supreme court in the celebrated Krivenko case.

The solicitor general told the President in a letter that "two alternative court actions are open to the government with respect to the land transferred to aliens in violation of the Constitution and existing law," namely:

1. Action for reversion and forfeiture or escheat to the state; and
 2. Action for the annulment of the prohibited transfers.
- The solicitor general urged the chief executive to define the government's policy in this regard. He pointed out that "further delay in instituting court proceedings is inadvisable."

(Continued at the bottom of page 100)