

An Outline of a Tonybeeian Approach to Philippine History During the American Regime

To understand the history of the Philippines during the American regime, perhaps it is best to start with President McKingley's own account of how he came to decide to retain the Philippines.

"When next I realized that the Philippines had dropped into our lap, I confess I did not know what to do with them. And one late night it came to me this way... I don't know how, but it came (1) that we could not give them back to Spain. That would be cowardly and dishonorable. (2) that we could not turn them over to France or Germany, our commercial rivals in the Orient. That would be bad business and discreditable. (3) that we could not leave them to themselves — they were unfit for self-government and they would have anarchy and misrule over there worse than Spain's was and (4) that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to EDUCATE the Filipinos, and UPLIFT and CIVILIZE and CHRISTIANIZE them and by God's grace do the very best we could do for them as our fellowmen for whom Christ also died."¹

From the foregoing we see what in President McKingley's view were the main challenges that had to be faced by the American regime in the Philippines: the challenge to educate, to civilize, to

¹ De la Costa, Horacio S.J., *Readings in Philippine History*, Bookmark 1965 p. 250.

Christianize the Filipinos and to fit them for self-government. Although not explicitly stated, the mention of bad business in connection with the commercial rivalry between the U.S. and France and Germany, tends to show that the American occupation should turn out to be also profitable to the U.S. as well as to the Philippines.

(1) CHALLENGE: "Christianizing" the Filipinos.

RESPONSE: Separation of Church and State.

If we take up the challenge of Christianizing first, it is because as we have seen the primary motive of Spain in coming to our shores was to convert the natives to the Catholic Faith. And that by the end of the sixteenth century, the major part of Luzon and the Visayas had been already Christianized. The Filipinos then would have been surprised, to say the least, at President McKingley's notion (which would appear to them as a contradiction-in-terms) of Christianizing a people who were already Christians.

I understood however what might have been in President McKingley's mind, when as late as 1980, while attending a conference of BRAC in Baguio City, I heard a Protestant minister describing Catholics as non-Christians. We need not point out the fallacy of considering as non-Christian a religion that could trace its lineage back to Christ and His apostles. Anyhow, for this minister as for President McKingley, it was clear that Christianity was limited to Protestantism. And so our first problem is to find out what characterizes Protestant Christianity or better still American Protestant Christianity.

Protestantism as everybody knows is divided into so many sects such that to find out what they hold in common would be a task next to impossible. But the following excerpt from the great German (Protestant) theologian, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, might prove helpful. Analyzing American Protestantism, he notes the following:

"The history of the church of Jesus Christ in America is distinct from the histories of all other churches on earth by virtue of the fact that from the beginning, America had been a refuge for persecuted Christians from the European continent. Since the 17th C.

America has been the sanctuary of victims of religious intolerance, for those who wished to live in freedom for their worship. At the same time, America is a consciously 'Protestant' land. Americans have always been taken with the idea of a special Providence which postponed the discovery of America until the rise of Protestantism. Thus, America is the only country in which the concept of Protestantism has gained significance and reality in Church history; for America means not the land of the Lutheran or Reformed church, but the country of 'Protestantism' in all its denominational broadness. One might say that the American Lutherans are the least representative of American Protestantism. America, the sanctuary of Protestant, that is the peculiarity of the church history of America and the historical understanding of itself which is still vividly possessed by American Christianity".²

In contrast then to the Spanish regime in which there was only one official religion: Catholic Christianity, the American regime in the Philippines would be characterized by the absence of any established church. Stated succinctly, with the coming of the United States one could expect "freedom of religion' to obtain in the Philippines.

Freedom of Religion! *Not* freedom from Religion, which is a different matter altogether. Freedom from religion considers religion as having a little, not to say a retrograde influence on the progress of the State. But freedom of Religion as envisioned by Thomas Jefferson who first worked for the disestablishment of the Anglican church in Virginia realizes the indispensable importance of Religion for Society. For as Jefferson pointed out in a speech at the University of Virginia on October 7, 1822:

"It (freedom of Religion) was not, however to be understood that instruction in religious opinion and duties was meant to be precluded by the public authorities as indifferent *to the interest of society*. On the contrary, the relations which exist between man and his Maker, and the duties resulting therefrom, are the most interesting and *most important to every human being* and the most incumbent on his study and investigation".³

² Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, *No Rusty Swords*, Fontana Library 1971, p. 97.

³ O'Neill, J., *Religion and Education under the Constitution*, New York, Harper Bros. 1949 p. 6

One thing to note about the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution is that the Founding Fathers of the American Republic considered it a natural right: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof". But the American Declaration of Independence explicitly admits natural rights to be God-given, not conferred by the State. Admission of natural rights amounts to admitting the existence of Natural Law which the great jurist Blackstone called LEGUM LEGES, the Law of Laws because it is the standard by which we can judge human laws to be just or unjust. All the Founding Fathers emphasized the Natural Law. Thus Washington: "We ought to be no less persuaded that the propitious smiles of Heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right which Heaven itself had ordained". While Alexander Hamilton wrote more eloquently: "The sacred rights of Mankind are written, as with a sunbeam, in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of Divinity itself, and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power"⁴. If the clause on Religious Freedom implied a recognition of the Natural Law and the limits of human authority, then we can understand why Bonhoeffer says:

"the religionlessness of the State was from this point of view not a triumph of secular authority over Christianity but quite the reverse, the victory of the Church over any unbounded claim by the State"⁵.

Stated otherwise, the formulators of the First Amendment intended it to be a bulwark against Totalitarianism.

In this indeed the Founding Fathers were only following in the footsteps of Christ who had said: "Give unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." Some interpret this to mean the independence of the secular from the spiritual power, but the reverse is exactly the truth. What many forget is the historical context in which Christ's words were spoken. For it was the age of the Emperor-gods when the Roman emperor claimed not only to be Pontifex Maximus but also to be a god. Augustus e.g. wanted Virgil to trace his lineage

⁴ Le Buffe, Francis P. S. J. and Hayes, James V., *The American Philosophy of Law*, Crusader Press Inc. New York 1947 p. 84.

⁵ Bonhoeffer, Dietrich *op. cit.*, p. 102.

to Venus. Christ's answer regarding the payment of the tribute to Caesar (had its subtle implication been understood) would have been considered by the Roman authorities an unpardonable crime. For "Give unto Caesar . . . Give unto God!". Great Moses! The implication was that Caesar was not God. Hence properly understood, Christ's dictum was a plow for religious freedom, a blow against the Totalitarianism of the Roman Empire. Nor did Christ's answer imply that the civil is entirely free from the ecclesiastical power. For undoubtedly Jesus believed that the things of Caesar also belong to God. And as the Russian philosopher Soloviev used to point out: When Jesus said: "All authority is given to me in Heaven and on Earth" Caesar was not only deprived of his divinity but also of his autocracy. In short, Christ was against both the complete identification and the complete separation of Church and State.

In much the same way that Christ's dictum has been given a secularist interpretation, so the First Amendment has suffered a similar fate. True enough that Jefferson talked of 'a wall of separation between Church and State' but he never meant this to be without gates of communication between the two. Such an interpretation would have been inconsistent with his view of the importance of Religion for Society. But with the rise and dissemination of the *positivistic* conception of law, views have been advanced that regard Church and State as two spheres hermetically sealed from each other. Thus in the case of the People of the State of Illinois ex. rel. Vashti McCollum vs. Board of Education, 68 Sup. Ct. 461 (1948), 333 U.S. the decision read as follows: "Religion (even if meant religion as an institution or as a system or morals) and the American government have *nothing in common*, and that both must henceforth operate in *unrelated spheres* behind an *impregnable wall of separation*". Jefferson would have turned in his grave at this misinterpretation of the First Amendment which sought a 'State without any *established* religion' to a 'State without any religion at all'".

Aside from the spread of the positivistic conception with its denial of Natural Law, one other reason for "American secularization derives precisely from the *imperfect* distinction of the kingdoms and offices of Church and State and from the enthusiastic claim of the Church (i.e. the American denominations) to uni-

versal influence on the world". What Bonhoeffer means by the foregoing statement is that the Protestant sects 'claimed the right to speak and *act in all matters of public life*' for only then can the *kingdom of God be established on earth* publicly and visibly! Stated otherwise, there is 'hardly any public event in which the denominations would not have to raise its voice and state its views'. This is evidenced by the report of the Council of Presbyterian churches which not only rightly disputed the right of the State to limit religious freedom and demanded a new marriage and divorce law but even asked for vaccination legislation and female suffrage. Not only did it take a stand against lynch justice but also against games of chance, lotteries and horse racing. It even asked for the recognition of Liberia as an independent republic. For American Protestant Christianity indeed "the interplay of Church and State becomes a relation of subordination in which the state is merely the executive of the Church. The church (i.e. the denominations) proclaims the principles of the social and political order, the state merely provides the technical means of putting them into effect."⁶ It is not surprising that the reaction of the State to this unbounded claim of the denominations would be the claim to total independence from religion which is the essence of secularization.

The proper relation between Church and State is to be found in the Catholic doctrine of the *indirect* power of the Church over the State. Catholicism admits that there is a sphere which belongs exclusively to the State and with which the Church should not interfere. To give a trivial example, the Church has no right to enact laws regulating traffic. And there is a sphere which belongs exclusively to the Church. To give another trivial example. One should be surprised if the civil authorities were to pass laws regarding fasting and abstinence. Where conflict may creep in is in the so-called *mixed* sphere, matters like education, morality, natural rights, justice etc. in which both State and Church are interested. In this sphere, Catholic doctrine holds that the Church had indirect power over the State, and this because the aim of the Church which is the *eternal* welfare of peoples is superior to, that is, transcends the aim of the state which is the *temporal* welfare of the citizens.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 103 and 104.

In other words, the power of the Church is purely spiritual, but it may extend to the temporal sphere, in so far as these 'help open the kingdom of God to the faithful or are a hindrance and an obstacle to its being opened unto them'. In technical terms, the Church has indirect power over the State IN RATIONE PECCATI.

If we have gone into some detail regarding the American doctrine of the Separation of Church and State, it is because there is no doubt that this American concept has influenced the Philippines. True enough that the Malolos Constitution also adopted the principle of Separation, but the fact that it did so by the slim majority of one vote is evidence that the Convention delegates were not sure whether Separation was downright preferable to Union. But the 'free exercise of religion' or 'the free, equal, and undisturbed enjoyment of religious worship' has been embodied in all the various Acts later passed by the U.S. Congress for the government of the Philippines, thus leaving no doubt that the American regime here was committed to the Principle of Separation of Church and State.

Unfortunately it is the secularist rather than the traditional American concept of Separation that tends to be adopted in the Islands. Thus Malcolm and Laurel in 1936 opined that 'one can worship God according to the dictates of his conscience even *not to worship at all*'. Strange that the freedom to worship should include the freedom not to worship, and the freedom of religion should include the freedom of irreligion.⁷ And President Quezon in a speech in 1938 opined that "The State has *nothing to do* with the Church and the Church with the State!" While the Supreme Court of the Philippines in the case U.S. vs. Smith said that the change of sovereignty from that of Spain to the U.S. caused a *complete separation* of Church and State.

The implication of the above decision is that during the Spanish regime there was *complete union* of Church and State in the Philippines. But this is far from the truth. The error stems from the fact that many who discuss the principle of Separation

⁷ Coquia, Jorge R. (Judge), *Legal Status of the Church in the Philippines*, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington D.C. 1950 pp. 24 and 25.

of Church and State do not remember that historically the word 'union' has had several meanings. 'Union' could mean identification of Church and State, i.e. the religious and secular spheres, as in the Hebrew theocracy and the Roman Empire, with the religious absorbing the secular as in the case of the former and the secular absorbing the religious as in the latter. 'Union' could also mean a Church established by the State as in Britain after Henry VIII proclaimed himself Head of the Church as well as of the State in England. Lastly it could mean coordination and cooperation between Church and State as in the Holy Roman Empire during the Middle Ages. Considering that Philip II of Spain was the heir of Charles V who was Holy Roman Emperor it must have been the third type of union that characterized the Spanish regime in the Islands. Now such a union recognizes the existence of two separate entities, each sovereign in their respective spheres. Of course in the mixed sphere of morality, education etc., the Church is considered superior to the State, for the reason we have already mentioned: the purpose of the Church being the eternal welfare of persons transcend the end of the State which is the temporal welfare of its citizens. The superiority of the Church over the State in the religious and moral spheres is precisely the significance of the Emperor being anointed by the Pope.

As far as we can see it, the third type of Union is not violative of the principle of Separation of Church and State if the latter is understood in the traditional Jeffersonian sense. It may be violative of the same amendment if understood in a secularistic sense. But is the secular interpretation of the First Amendment faithful to the ideals of the founding Fathers of the American republic? Far was it from the minds of the Founding Fathers to foster religious indifferentism, or that the State should ignore religion or favor irreligion. Indeed indifference to Religion is well-nigh impossible especially for countries that have come under the influence of Christianity. For in such countries there is a legal maxim that Christianity is a part of the law of the land. In the words of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court:

"The declaration that Christianity is a part of the law of the land is a summary description of an existing and very obvious condition of our institutions. We are a *Christian people*, in so far as we have entered into the

spirit of Christian institutions and have become imbued with the sentiments and principles of Christianity; and we cannot be imbued with them and yet prevent them from entering into and influencing more or less *all* our social institutions, customs, relations, as well as our individual modes of thinking and acting. It is involved in our social nature, that even those amongst us who reject Christianity, cannot possibly get clear of its influence or reject those sentiments, customs and principles, which it has spread among the people, so that like the air we breathe, they have become the common stock of the whole country and essential elements of its very life." (Mohney vs. Cook 26 P 342 Am. Dec. 419)

Or as the Supreme Court of the U.S. said:

"Christianity is a part of the common law in this qualified sense that its divine origin and truth are admitted and therefore it is not to be maliciously and openly reviled and blasphemed to the annoyance of believers or the injury of the public" (Vidal v. Girard 43 U.S. 127, 198 II. L. ed. 205).

In short, American civilization was a religious civilization. Not only because as Fulton Sheen aptly pointed out: The Declaration of Independence was a Declaration of dependence — on the Almighty, but because as Bonhoeffer makes clear: "American democracy (unlike French democracy) is founded not on humanity or the dignity of man, but on the kingdom of God and the limitation of all earthly power. It is significant that notable American historians can say that the Federal constitution was written by men who knew about original sin... In its protest against any unbounded claim by the State lies the key to the understanding of the original significance of the American separation of Church and State and of the American constitution".⁸

CHALLENGE: "Civilizing" the Filipinos.

RESPONSE: Fostering Science & Industry

According to Pres. McKingley, aside from Christianizing, the U.S. was called upon to civilize the Filipinos. President McKingley could not have been so unversed in history as to believe

⁸ Bonhoeffer, Dietrich *op. cit.*, p. 102.

the Filipinos were uncivilized considering that they had been influenced by Spanish civilization for more than 300 years, not to say by Muslim and Hindu civilization before that, having been part of the Shri-Vishaya and Madjapahit empires. But as Toynbee observes: "the uniformity which these separate civilizations (Chinese, Muslim, Japanese, Western European and one may add American) display in their cultural character and their social structure extends to their historical outlook as well... Every one of them was convinced that it was the *only* civilized society in the world and that the rest of mankind were barbarians, untouchables or infidel."⁹ In other words, it is easy enough for civilizations to succumb to the 'Chosen People' myth.

Perhaps this was less excusable for the U.S. for she must have realized that she was the child of Western Europe and that it was Spain that colonized her western part as shown by names like Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Diego etc. What then was the probable reason that she would look down on the Philippines as 'uncivilized' and on Spain as 'less civilized' than herself? As far as we can see, it was because her criterion for judging other nations in this regard was her own industrial-technological civilization.

But in the first place, what is Civilization? For Toynbee

"each of these civilizations is, while in action, a distinctive attempt at a single great common *human* enterprise, or when it is seen in retrospect, after the action is over, it is a distinctive instance of a single great common human experience. This enterprise or experience is an effort to perform an act of *creation*. In each of these civilizations, mankind, I think, is trying to rise above mere humanity — above primitive humanity that is — towards some higher kind of *spiritual life*. Civilization, as we know it, is a movement and not a condition, a voyage and not a harbor. No known civilization has ever reached the goal of civilization yet. There has never been a *communion of saints* on earth."¹⁰

⁹ Toynbee, Arnold J., *Civilization on Trial*, Oxford University Press, New York 1948 p. 71.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

In short, Civilization is a human, *creative* spiritual enterprise having as its goal a community of *religiously transfigured* men and women.

Everyone admits that American civilization is the offshoot of Western European civilization. And according to Dawson the two main strands that have formed Western European civilization are Christianity and Graeco-Roman civilization best described as Greek Philosophy (which for the Greeks meant *human science*) and Roman Law. Or as Toynbee prefers to describe it: Western European civilization has both a religious core and a technological rind.

For Toynbee a civilization comes to birth and grows due to successful responses to various challenges. As far as we can see it, the main challenge the successful response to which has shaped a *distinctively* American civilization was IMMIGRATION. As we read in "AN OUTLINE OF AMERICAN HISTORY":

"Today, the United States is the product of two principal forces — the immigration of European peoples with their varied ideas, customs, and national characteristics and the impact of a new country which modified these European cultural traits. Of necessity, colonial America was a projection of Europe . . . But, inevitably, the force of geographic conditions peculiar to America, the interplay of varied national groups (English, French, German, Scot, Irish, Dutch, Swede etc.) upon one another, and the sheer difficulty of maintaining old-world ways in a raw, new continent caused significant changes. These changes were gradual and at first scarcely visible. But the result was a new social pattern which, although it resembled European society in many ways, had a character that was *distinctly American*."¹¹

Indeed both the religious core and technological rind of American civilization was shaped by the fact of 'immigration'. Since the majority of the immigrants to the U.S. were fleeing from the religious persecution in Europe and belonged to various denominations, it was inevitable that, sooner or later, American civilization would opt for the separation of church and state and consider toleration as the primary Christian virtue. As Bon-

¹¹ *An Outline of American History*, U.S.I.S. Booklet p. 5.

hoeffer notes "Thus for American Christianity the concept of tolerance becomes the basic principle of everything Christian. Any intolerance is itself unchristian". The shortcoming of this attitude as the great theologian notes, is that it sacrifices truth to toleration of diverse beliefs.

"They (American Christians) therefore muster understanding and concern not for a confessional struggle as such, but for the victims of such a struggle. This must remain unsatisfactory for the victims themselves, who are not primarily concerned with their personal fate, but with the *truth* of their cause. To abstain from the final settlement of the *question of truth* remains the hardest task for the Christian fugitive all his life . . . His longing for a *decision for truth* against its distortion remains, and must remain unfulfilled. It is in the last resort faithfulness to its own church history which is expressed in this peculiar *relativism of the question of truth* in the thought and action of American Christianity".¹²

From the relativity of religious truth it is but a step to religious indifferentism and from religious indifferentism a mere step to secularism. Need we wonder that American civilization would sooner or later become secularized.

The American secularization of culture of course was but a particular instance of the secularization of Western European culture as a whole. If we are to believe Toynbee one of the causes of European secularization was "the Jesuits' failure to convert the Hindu and Chinese to the Roman Catholic form of Western Christianity and the simultaneous success of the Royal Society . . . In the same generation, these tragically frustrated Jesuit missionaries' fellow-Western Catholics and Protestants at home came to the hazardous conclusion that a religion in whose now divided and contentious name they had been fighting an inconclusive fratricidal hundred years' war was an inopportune element in their cultural heritage. Why not tacitly cut out the wars of religion by cutting out religion itself and concentrate on the application of physical science to practical affairs — a pursuit which involved no controversy and promised to be lucrative? This seventeenth century turning in the road of Western progress was big with consequences, for the Western civilization that since run like wildfire round the

¹² Bonhoeffer, Dietrich *op. cit.*, p. 99.

world has not been the whole of the seamless web; it has been a flare of cottonwaste: a technological salvage with the religious centre-piece torn out".¹³

It is unfortunate according to Toynbee that what the world as a whole has inherited from Western civilization is merely Technology by which alone man cannot live, and not also "Religion which after all is the serious business of the human race".

Western Secularization with its emphasis on Science at the expense of Religion considered by itself alone does not explain why the U.S. should be at the vanguard of industrio-technological civilization. The other factor is still the fact that the U.S. was populated by immigrants. For if we analyze the characteristics of the immigrant, we find first of all that he is a man who looks forward rather than backward, to the future rather than the past. Of necessity too the immigrant has to be inventive, devise new ways and means to cope with his new environment if he is to survive. Also he is one who is ready to take risks, for nothing ventured, nothing gained. And his thought tends to be practical rather than speculative. He is not interested in knowledge for its own sake, but knowledge that he may put into immediate practical use. It is no wonder that the U.S. which has been shaped by immigrants should have as its philosophy: PRAGMATISM. The three most famous pragmatic philosophers: Charles Pierce, William James and John Dewey are all Americans. It was Pierce who first advanced the pragmatic theory of truth: that the truth of a conception or belief lies in the practical consequences it entails. Dewey believed that thinking is not purely contemplative but is always for the sake of some end and provoked by some practical problem of life and experience. Beliefs have therefore to be judged by their effects. As for James, he too held the doctrine that truth does not consist in some logical or intellectual abstraction but in its effectiveness for practical needs and purposes.

It is no wonder that pragmatic philosophy should emphasize the method of modern Science. For modern Science in contrast to Greek and medieval Science does not aim at the understanding of but rather the conquest of Nature. This attitude of modern Science is embodied in the dictum of Auguste Comte: *Savoir pour prévoir a fin de pouvoir*. That is, knowledge for predic-

¹³ Toynbee, Arnold J. *op. cit.*, p. 86.

tion and prediction for power. Modern scientists like the immigrants aim at the conquest of Nature — only they do it in the laboratory instead of the farm or the jungle.

But just as there is a similarity in attitude towards life between the immigrant and the modern scientist, or more precisely, the technologist, so there is close correspondence between the immigrant and the industrialist, which goes far in explaining why the U.S., the land of immigrants, would soon become the land of entrepreneurs. For the entrepreneur also takes risks in investing in new enterprises. He sacrifices consumption to production at the present to the future. He relies more on practical experience than on theories. His project studies are geared towards getting practical results. In short, the industrial entrepreneur has a pragmatic view of things.

From the foregoing it is clear why although England, France and Germany antedated the U.S. in the Industrial Revolution, the U.S. would soon be at the vanguard of this movement. Indeed the industrial growth of the U.S. after the Civil War was phenomenal. As we read in the "OUTLINE OF AMERICAN HISTORY":

"Between the two great wars — the Civil and the First World War — the United States had come of age. In a period of less than 50 years, it was transformed from a rural republic to an urban state. The frontier had vanished. Great factories and steel mills, transcontinental railroad lines, flourishing cities, vast agricultural holdings marked the land . . . War needs had enormously stimulated manufacturing and had speeded up an economic process whose fundamental factors were the exploitation of iron, steam and electric power and the forward march of science and invention".¹⁴

Science and Invention — or to use the term which includes them both: Technology — had an unprecedented rise in the U.S. before the end of the nineteenth Century. Before 1860 there were only 36,000 patents. From 1860 to 1890 this had risen to 440,000 patents. And in the first quarter of the 20th Century, nearly a million had been issued. That technology is the basis of industrial progress is borne out by the fact that the tempo of business was quickened by the invention of the typewriter in 1867, the

¹⁴ *An Outline of American History*, p. 102.

adding machine in 1888, and the cash register in 1897. Before the turn of the century, in the application of Science to practical ends we can say that the U.S. was without a peer. One has only to recall Edison's incandescent lamp, Alexander Graham Bell's telephone, B. F. Morse's telegraph. No wonder that President McKingley in 1901 believed America to be at the vanguard of civilization.

Technology being one of the main characteristics of American civilization at the advent of the 20th Century, it is not surprising that among the first institutions established by the American administrators in the Philippines was the Bureau of Science. The following report of the activities of this Bureau under its first director, Dr. Paul Freer, was addressed to Dean C. Worcester, who as a zoologist had visited the Philippines before the outbreak of the Spanish-American war and as Secretary of the Interior was mainly responsible for establishing this Bureau.

"The Bureau of Science Biological Laboratory... diagnosed specimens of all kinds. Four hundred rats were examined for plague bacilli. Routine examination made of all cholera carriers. When a cure for any disease was announced the laboratory would test its value... usually on volunteer prisoners from Bilibid... All vaccines (especially that against smallpox) and serums developed in any part of the world were manufactured in the laboratory. Diphtheria antitoxin and the Pasteur treatment for hydrophobia were kept in readiness. In addition to routine work there was independent research. Extensive studies were made on eradicating locusts... and developing a rinderpest serum...

The entomologists studied methods of exterminating mosquitoes, flies and termites... The ornithologists collected the common forest birds and showed which ones were injurious and which not...

The chemical laboratory tested samples of cement and paints to see which would best stand tropical quakes, downpours and sun. Soils were analyzed, copra production improved, gums, essential oils and perfumes tested. Experiments were made to extract sugar from nipa palm. The Philippine Journal of Science became one of the leading publications of the world in its field. The central scientific library, the largest east of Suez, was accessible to anybody...¹⁵

¹⁵ De la Costa, Horacio S.J. *op. cit.*, p. 255.

From the fact that the Americans emphasized Technology by establishing the Bureau of Science, one must not deduce that Science was ignored completely during the Spanish regime. That would be historically untrue. Spain was always preoccupied with giving her colonies the best she had — and this included Science. Way back in 1780, the Spanish monarch decreed the establishment of the 'Economic Society of Friends of the Country'. This Society had in mind the encouraging of Agriculture — the basis of the livelihood of most of the Filipinos at the time.

"For the fostering of agriculture, the Royal Order established a Botanical Garden, whose first objective was the cultivation of plants, native and foreign, that will serve, for medicine, arts and commerce. When there is no way of obtaining funds the greatest effort should be exerted to obtain whatever is necessary to establish at least a School of Agriculture."¹⁶

Because of the perennial bankruptcy of the Philippine government during the years of turmoil in Europe in general and in Spain in particular, it was only in 1858 that Governor Norzagaray actually created the School of Botany and Agriculture. The principal undertakings initiated in the Botanical Garden included the distribution of plants according to their natural families, the establishment of an orchard of fruit trees with their nursery and a special garden for the study of the cultivation of native and foreign flowers and that of a vegetable garden.

Lest one get the impression that the Spanish scientists and their Filipino counterparts limited themselves to plans without implementing these and therefore could boast of no achievements at all, suffice it to say that Fr. Manuel Blanco is famous for the *FLORA OF THE PHILIPPINES* while Dr. Jose Sainz y Baranda, a Filipino engineer wrote an interesting report about Philippine mountains. Without peer however in his love of plants was Dr. Sebastian Vidal y Soler who as Inspector of Forestry and Director of the Botanical Garden stimulated the scientific endeavors of his colleagues and subordinates. His studies on systematic botany perished in the fire in Intramuros on Sept. 27, 1897. But re-

¹⁶ Rodriguez, Lorenzo O.P., *The Botanical Garden of Manila and Sebastian Vidal Soler*, *Unitas* Vol. 35 No. 2 June 1962, pp. 258-277. Reprinted in *Unitas Reader* Vol. 50 Nos. 2 & 3, 1977 p. 6.

ferences show that he published at least 8 major works which included 'Synopsis de Familias y Generos de Plantas Leñosas de Filipinas' 'Phanerogamae Cumingiane Philippinarum' and 'Re-seña de la Flora del Archipiélago Filipino' and these despite his early death at age 47. A younger colleague of Don Sebastian Vidal was D. Leon Ma. Guerrero, a Professor of Botany of the Faculty of Pharmacy of U.S.T. and the greatest Filipino botanist up to the present. Also outstanding as a chemist was Don Anacleto del Rosario. It is therefore false to say as a reporter did to highlight the achievements of the Bureau of Science that 'the botanists combed the Islands, and *for the first time* classified the flowers and plants and studied the insect pests and the fungi, the forest products, fibers, seeds, 'dyes and tans'. Indeed way back in the 18th century Fray Matias Octavio could not only theorize about indigo, but actually knew how to produce it.

It is true however that the Bureau of Science engaged in more diversified research. One of the greatest beneficiaries of the biological discoveries of the Bureau of Science was the Bureau of Health which among other things carried on a vigorous campaign of health education.

"Simple rules of hygiene were placed in the newspapers and on handbills in English, Spanish, Tagalog, Ilocano, Visayan and various other dialect... To get the best results one subject was concentrated on at a time... beriberi; cholera, tuberculosis, or whatever was most important at the moment... We would gather the people together whenever we could and illustrated our points with lantern slides..."¹⁷

If the campaign of the Bureau of Health was successful it was partly due to the cooperation of the Bureau of Education which circulated the rules of hygiene to every schoolteacher in the Islands so that the children having learned them could repeat them verbatim to their parents. In short, it was chiefly through the public schools that the epidemic diseases that had taken their toll of Filipino lives for centuries were brought under control.

The mention of public schools leads up to our next topic: the education of the Filipinos under the American regime.

¹⁷ De la Costa, Horacio *op. cit.*, p. 254 and 253.

III. CHALLENGE: "Educating" the Filipinos.

RESPONSE: The Public School System.

A third paradox in Pres. McKingley's speech aside from Christianizing a people already Christian and civilizing a nation already civilized was that of educating the Filipinos. The paradoxical character of this aim of the American regime in the Philippines is the fact that the University of Santo Tomas (founded in 1611) is 25 years older than Harvard. In what sense then did the Americans understand educating so that Pres. McKingley's assertion would not be meaningless?

Most of our historians hold that the greatest thing that the Americans did for the Filipinos was the establishment of the public school system.

"The establishment of an adequate secularized and free public school system during the first decade of American rule has the greatest and probably the most lasting effect in the political and cultural development of the Filipinos than any of the military and political innovations introduced by the Americans. It is probably because of this reason that the anti-American feeling generated by so much destruction and misery during the Filipino-American war and the era of suppressed nationalism was completely eradicated from the Filipino mind and the Filipinos immediately regarded the Americans as their guides and benefactors."¹⁸

Were the Americans the first to establish a national public school system in the Philippines? In 1863 the Spanish government enacted an educational decree which required the Philippine government to establish *in each town* at least one primary school for boys and another for girls. Like the American enactment later on, this decree also provided for the establishment of a normal school for male teachers under the supervision of the Jesuits. The Jesuits it must be remembered had been for centuries renowned in the field of education because of their *ratio studiorum*. But it

¹⁸ Agoncillo, Teodoro and Guerrero, Milagros C., *History of the Filipino People*, R. P. Garcia Publishing Co. 1976 p. 338.

might be asked: Why did it take so long for Spain to establish a national public school system in the Islands? The simple reason is that it was only in the second half of the 19th Century that public schools on a national scale were established in most countries of Europe and the United States was no exception. If we are to believe the Junior Encyclopedia Britannica the 1860 state systems of free public schools had been more or less successfully established in nearly every northern state and real but lesser progress had been made in the South. So it was only in the 1860's that the Public School system began in the U.S. and that not even in all the states.¹⁹

Is it true as Agoncillo claims that "the system of education introduced by the Americans was a radical departure from the highly limited, defective and religious-oriented system of education perpetuated by the Spaniards"? Let us first take the accusation of the Spanish system being defective. Even if we take nationalism as a criterion for judging the worth of an educational system, we have the following thought-provoking excerpt from Pardo de Tavera's "THE FILIPINO SOUL". "The Filipinos educated in Spanish schools, under a strictly Spanish system, were the individuals who brought about the Revolution which ended Spanish sovereignty in the Islands". If, as is claimed, our Nationalism burst into full flower in our Revolution against Spain and it was in Spanish school under a strictly Spanish system that our revolutionary heroes were educated, can one find fault with an educational system that taught nationalism?

Perhaps it will be said that on the contrary, Graciano Lopez Jaena calls attention to the "*pointless* education which the *natives* receive in schools. They acquire the ability to read and write, and even to write with elegance. But they never learn anything practical, because they are not taught anything practical. They are taught to pray and not to work. In all these schools Spanish grammar is notable by its absence; there are certain vested interests, you see, which are opposed to the Indian learning Spanish. Absent too are the rudiments of physics, chemistry, geography, agronomy, studies which would certainly promote the improvement of the individual and the welfare of the community.

¹⁹ Britannica, Junior Encyclopedia Vol. 5 Under *Education*, 1966 p. 235.

Thus do we nourish the souls, while stunting the minds of little children".²⁰

With all due respect to Lopez Jaena, one can note certain inconsistencies in the above. If Spanish grammar was notable by its absence in the schools, how was it that the natives acquired the ability to read and write and even to write with elegance? Where did Lopez Jaena himself acquire the command of the Spanish language which drew the admiration of even Spaniards in the mother country? Probably, not to say certainly, in the Seminary of Jaro operated by the Paulists where he studied as a youth. Then again why expect little children to study the rudiments of physics, chemistry, geography and agronomy? Were these subjects taught to little children anywhere in the world at the time? If little children were taught the three R's well as presumably they were they had the foundation for learning everything else besides.

As for Jaena's sweeping condemnation of the kind of instruction dispensed in the royal and pontifical university, the seminaries and colleges, all that can be said is that our great propagandist tends to ignore the fact that the courses in the universities in the Islands followed the European pattern. Corresponding to the present high school and first two years of college was 'grammar' school which centered on the humanities and covered literature, history, government, economics, sociology and even good manners. The next stage was 'arts' also called philosophy since Aristotelean and Thomistic philosophies constituted the principal texts. But 'philosophy' then included the natural sciences and mathematics. Only after such a *liberal education* did one enter the professional courses of Medicine, law and divinity.²¹

If such a European pattern of education was pointless, then so was all the education in the U.S. up to the twentieth century. What we tend to forget is that the U.S. is the child of Western Europe and was influenced by the latter in all fields including education. If we are not to read history backwards we should compare events that take place contemporaneously. Take the *J'Accuse* of the Spanish educational system being religion-oriented.

²⁰ De la Costa, Horacio S.J. *op. cit.*, p. 226.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

For Spain whose primary aim in the Islands was the conversion of the natives and keeping them steadfast in the Faith, it would have been inconsistent for it to impart to the Filipinos an education that was not religious in essence. But our main point is that education was religion-oriented until the secularization of the U.S. reached its height in the 20th century. Thus notes the same encyclopedia already quoted:

“During this early period of American education three different ideas about schools developed. In Massachusetts there were schools out of which grew our public schools of today. In Pennsylvania and New Jersey arose what came to be parochial schools. In Virginia a type of school developed that has spread throughout the country today as the private school. One way in which these three was similar was in the emphasis on religious and Bible teaching, similar to that of European schools.”²²

Agoncillo makes much of the idea that “the Commission safeguarded the separation of Church and State in the Philippines and saw to it that the *secular* outlook of education was preserved” forgetting that Jefferson who was mainly responsible for the first Amendment to the U.S. constitution was for a religious-oriented education since he opined in an excerpt already quoted: “It (freedom of religion) was not however to be understood that *instruction in religious opinion and duties* was meant to be precluded by the *public authorities* as indifferent to the interests of Society...” And where can instruction in religious opinion and duties be best imparted by the public authorities except in the public schools? Indeed the secular, not to say secularistic, University of the Philippines can take a leaf from the most prestigious universities of the States like Harvard, Yale, Princeton which started as religious schools and up to the present have professional courses in divinity, that is, theology.

But the main gripe of our anti-Spanish historian becomes evident in the following: “In contrast to the Spanish system of allowing only the children of the privileged classes to enjoy the educational facilities of the colony, the Americans allowed the children of the masses to take advantage of the free public school

²² Britannica, Junior Encyclopedia Vol. 5 p. 235.

system".²³ What our historians tend to ignore, not to say, are ignorant of, is that free and universal instruction is a characteristic of the U.S. only in the last decades of the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. Unless we are reading history backwards we must not compare what obtains in the U.S. and the Philippines in the 20th Century with what obtained in Spanish Philippines in previous epochs. Even in the U.S. proper, up to the middle of the 19th century, elementary instruction only was given to children of the lower classes with Latin schools and the University open only to the higher classes. Thus we read:

"The class system of education — reading and writing schools for the *children of the common people* and Latin schools for those of the *higher social classes* — was brought to American during the first years of English colonization. Massachusetts in 1647, and Connecticut in 1650, required under certain conditions the establishment of both elementary and Latin schools. *As in Europe the way to the university was open only to those boys who completed the Latin course.* Probably more than half of the lower social classes received only home instruction, the remainder attended the elementary school for only a few months."²⁴

It is true enough that

"a liberal movement during the 18th century swept both Europe and America. This movement stressed democracy and the value of education in improving man and his conditions. Nowhere did these ideas have greater influence than in America. Universal education was advocated, tuition charges were condemned and all practices which tended to continue distinctions between children of the rich and poor were advocated".²⁵

Yet this tendency towards a universal education met with resistance even in the U.S., so much so that it was only by the 1860's that, as we have seen, a more or less universal free education was established in the northern states and the southern states much later, dates not so different from the 1863 which marked

²³ Agoncillo, Teodoro A. et. al, *op. cit.*, p. 340.

²⁴ Britannica, Junior Encyclopedia Vol. 5 pp. 234 and 235.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 235.

the establishment of the public school system in the Philippines under the Spanish regime.

Let me not give the impression that there was no difference at all between the educational systems that obtained in our Islands under the Spanish and American regimes. Some will say that Spanish education *emphasized Christianity while American education emphasized Democracy*. What is often forgotten in this regard is that Christianity lies at the foundation of our democratic ideals. Take the ideals of the French Revolution: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. Fraternity — understood as the brotherhood of men has no rational basis unless all men have a common Father — who can this be but the Father in Heaven? As to equality we have this thought-provoking observation of Chesterton: "All men are equal as pennies are equal because the only value in them is that they bear the image of the King". Which means that the equality of men stems from the fact that all are made to the image and likeness of God. As to Liberty, what does this connote but that all men have natural rights which even according to the American Declaration of Independence are not State-given but God-given and must not be trampled upon by the State?

Anyhow American education did emphasize education for Democracy. This is precisely why President McKingley instructed the Taft Commission 'to promote and extend a system of free primary instruction that would train the people for citizenship and for the ordinary avocations of a civilized life'. Training the people for citizenship in modern times means training them in the democratic way of life, for as Montesquieu had already noted 'a modern democracy calls all men to citizenship'.

Education for democracy however has two aspects. Quantitatively it means a system of education as universal as the franchise. To this the United States is committed for she was the first among Western countries to insist on universal, free, compulsory education. Qualitatively, education for democracy means a liberal education rather than vocational training. For only a liberal education fits a man for responsible democratic citizenship. Mere vocational training prepares a man to be an artisan, not a citizen. Aristotle realized this long ago when he

²⁶ Agoncillo, Teodoro A. *op. cit.*, p. 340.

excluded artisans from citizenship in the Greek city-state. American education in the twentieth century in contrast to the education during the time of the Founding Fathers of the American republic has not accepted the proposition that the democratic ideal demands *liberal education for all*. The prevailing opinion is that the demands of the democratic ideal is met by universal schooling rather than by universal liberal education. At the best there is more emphasis on vocational and professional courses rather than the 'humanities'. To the credit of the Spanish system it might be said that while it may have been lacking in the quantitative aspect of democratic education, it met the qualitative requirement by its emphasis on the liberal arts.

To the objection that an underdeveloped country like the Philippines should stress more vocational and professional courses i.e. technical training rather than the liberal arts, we have the answer of Robert M. Hutchins, erstwhile President of the University of Chicago and editor-in-chief of the Great Books of the Western World: "No one can question the desirability of technical training in underdeveloped countries. (But) no one can be satisfied with technical training as an ideal. The ideal is liberal education and technical training can be justified only because it may help to supply the economic base that will make universal liberal education possible".²⁷

CHALLENGE: Self-Government

RESPONSE: Filipinization and Independence.

Aside from 'Christianizing' and 'civilizing' and 'educating' the Filipinos, one of the aims of the American regime was to fit the Filipinos for self-government. One would be blind to historical truth if he were to deduce from the foregoing that the Filipinos during the Spanish regime did not enjoy any self-government at all. What the philosopher Salvador de Madariaga said about the Latin-American countries was equally true, if not more so, of the Philippines.

"It is a commonplace that the Spanish American communities suffer to this day from the fact that they were not trained and practised in the art of self-govern-

²⁷ Great Books of the Western World, Vol. I., *The Great Conversation* 1952, Encyclopedia Britannica Inc. p. 20.

ment. As if, in one way or another, countries as far away from the motherland as the Indies were from Spain in the days of the mule and the sail could be governed otherwise than by themselves. Those who write from this standpoint refer their readers, tacitly or expressly, to the superior political wisdom of England, who from her earliest days, it is suggested accustomed her little ones to walk on the true path of parliamentary institutions...

When the Spanish rule in the Indies is described as *centralistic*, what is meant is that there were no representative institutions. But even this is only true in the light of Anglo-Saxon habits and should be carefully qualified. There were in the Indies two representative institutions: the *cabildos* and the *consulados*. The *cabildos* were to a considerable extent aristocratic bodies in that a number of their magistrates purchased their mandate from the Crown, or held them as a privilege granted to a family... In *every country in those days* a considerable number of so-called representative mandates were also infeudated in certain families. Even to this day, the son succeeds the father and the wife the husband in not a few British constituencies. The second point is that this patrimonial aspect did not make the *cabildos* any less representative. Precisely because of it, the *cabildos* reflected better the actual structure of the society they were meant to govern, a structure founded on aristocracy and ownership of land. The chief point is that the *cabildos*, powerful as they were, almost independent in law and practically independent in fact embodied the local spirit and were manned by local men with local roots and interests...²⁸

We have seen that at the suggestion of the Synod of Manila under Bishop Salazar way back in the sixteenth century the *cabildos* in the Philippines were manned by the natives. And as we have seen in the 19th century, the natives performed the tasks of the *gobernadorcillo*. Indeed, so trained in self-government were the Filipinos by the time of the coming of the American that an American war correspondent made this observation in 1899.

"There is one point which I think is not generally known to the American people, but which is very strong factor in the *question of Filipino self-government*, both

²⁸ Rothchild, John Editor, *Latin America*, Bantam Book 1973 p. 93.

now and in any future position. In the West Indies the greater number of offices and official positions were filled by Spaniards, either native-born or from the Peninsula. In the Philippines the percentage of available Spaniards for minor position was vastly less than that shown in the West Indian colonies. The result was that while the more prominent and more profitable offices in the Philippines were filled by Spaniards, many of the minor offices were filled by the Filipinos. Therefore when the Filipino party assumed the government for those districts which the Spaniards evacuated, the Filipinos had a system of government in which the Filipinos held most of the positions, already established for their purposes. It was but necessary to change its head and its name. Instead of being dominated by the agents of Alfonso XIII, por la gracia de Dios Rey Catolico de España, the same machinery was set in motion and controlled first by the dictatorial government and then by the Philippines revolutionary government under the constitution proclaimed on June 23, 1898."²⁹

To the objection that the Filipinos had only intermittent representation in the Spanish Cortes, one might say that the Americans had no representation at all in the House of Commons in England up to the time of American independence. Else how justify their cry of 'No taxation without representation'? And the inhabitants of the colonies were in the main Englishmen at that. But that the Spaniards gave more self-government to the natives than other colonizing powers is best seen in comparing the situation in the Philippines with that in India. In comparison with the Spanish system which gave the natives participation in the administration of local and later on, provincial affairs, in British India if we are to believe Nehru, "All the high officials in British India were British, except towards the end of the century when a few Indians crept in... Even so all power and all authority of course, remained, and still remains with the British. These high officials, apart from the military, were members of what is called the Indian civil service... (I.C.S.). Such a government by officials who appoint each other and are *not responsible* for what they do to the people, is called a bureaucracy, from the word bureau, an office. (One is reminded here of the *residencia* wherein the governor-general had to give an account of

²⁹ De la Costa, Horacio S.J. *op. cit.*, pp. 244 and 245.

his conduct in office)... The British people filled all the high offices, but obviously they could not fill the smaller offices and the clerkships. Clerks were wanted and it was to produce clerks that schools and colleges were first started by the British. Ever since, this has been the main purpose of education in India and most of its products are only capable of being clerks".³⁰

Lest it be objected that Nehru was extremely biased against the British rule in India we have this statement of Jacob Gould Schurman: "To give them a good government from above — as England has done for the people of India — is to sap and atrophy their own capacity for self-government."³¹ What then was the philosophy behind the granting of autonomy — and the sooner the better — to the Filipino people? This was spelled out by Schurman in his position paper thus:

"...I am anxious to see Congress grant the Filipinos *representative institutions at once*. It is no argument against this policy that even educated Filipinos do not possess our conception of civil liberty or of official responsibility. With such powers, ideas and sentiments as they have, get them in harness quickly and let them tug and seat under the burden of national affairs. This is the way men are trained in government. ... And if you do not at once take the educated Filipinos into active partnership in the government of the Philippines, your monopoly of power, if it does not alienate and embitter them, may have the still worse effect of tending to discourage and emasculate them. If the Filipinos are to learn to govern themselves in the manner of really free nations, the sooner they get at it, the better. Passive acquiescence, without partnership, in American government of the Philippines will atrophy their own native capacity for self-government. In that way their dependence would mean their servitude. The beginning of all national, as of all personal freedom is this: "Son of Man, stand upon thy feet!"³¹

Why this emphasis on representative government? Because according to the *FEDERALIST*, representation becomes indispensable when the people is too large and too dispersed for con-

³⁰ Nehru, Jawaharlal, *Glimpses of World History*, The John Day Co., New York pp. 433 and 434.

³¹ De la Costa, Horacio S.J. *op. cit.*, pp. 258 and 259.

tinuous as well as *direct* participation in national affairs. Under such conditions *representative* government or a "republic" is preferable to *pure* democracy. And the Federalists had another reason for espousing representative government. In their view the mortal disease of popular government is the violence of faction and as this is rooted in the very nature of social man, the evil can be cured not by removing its causes but by controlling its effects. According to Madison the principle of representation promises this cure.

In line with the views of its head, the Schurman Commission recommended in 1900 to President McKingley that the United States Congress enact a law creating a bicameral legislature for the Philippines. In July 2, 1902, the Philippine Bill of 1902 otherwise known as the Cooper Act from its sponsor was signed into law by President Theodore Roosevelt. Five years later, the Philippine Assembly was inaugurated with Sergio Osmeña as Speaker and Manuel Quezon as majority floor leader. The Philippine Commission continued as the upper chamber, and since the majority of its members were Americans oftentimes clashed with the Assembly which represented the Filipino participation in legislation. The conflict continued until the passing of the Jones Law in 1916 with its creation of the Senate whose members were all Filipinos. In the preamble to the Jones Law we find the first official commitment of the U.S. to grant eventual independence to the Philippines.

"Whereas it was never the intention of the people of the United States in the incipency of the war with Spain to make it a war of conquest or for territorial aggrandizement; and

Whereas it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a *stable* government can be established therein... and... Therefore...³²

The key and what would later prove a very controversial word in the foregoing preamble was 'stable government'. Governor-General Francis Burton Harrison (1911-1921) increased Filipino participation in the civil service and took Osmeña and

³² Preamble to the Jones Law.

Quezon into almost equal partnership with him in the government of the Islands. In 1920 the Republicans returned to power in the U.S. Accordingly, President Harding sent General Leonard Wood and W. Cameron Forbes to assess the results of the policy of Filipinization. Among the highlights of this report were:

"We find that the Government is not reasonably free from those underlying causes which result in the destruction of government.

We find that a reasonable proportion of officials and employees are men of good character and ability... but that the efficiency of the public services has fallen off... due to lack of inspection and... too rapid transfer of control to officials who have not had the necessary time for proper training...

We find that many Filipinos have shown marked capacity for government service... but there is marked deterioration due to the injection of politics...

We find there is a disquieting lack of confidence in the administration of justice, to an extent which constitutes a menace to the stability of the government.

We find that the people are not organized economically nor from the standpoint of national defense to maintain an independent government...³³

The foregoing interpretation of stable government drew a sharp rejoinder from Harrison thus:

What, then, are the tests of a 'stable' government? Must it be a government which under any circumstances can withstand aggression from without and at all times be able to preserve its independence? If so, has there ever been a stable government in history, and is there one upon the face of the earth today? Must it be perfect in all its details? If so, has the human race ever set up a stable government?... Must it be financially solvent beyond criticism and its credit beyond reproach? If so, how many of the great nations of the world today could answer that requirement? Finally, must the Filipinos be judged by a committee or by persons known to be resolutely opposed to their independence, or is not the faith of our country involved in the preamble to the Jones Act."³⁴

³³ De la Costa, Horacio S.J. *op. cit.* p. 260.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 261.

Both Governors Harrison and Wood may be said to have been working for the welfare of the Filipinos. Perhaps one had a more 'romantic' and the other a more 'realistic' view of Philippine independence. Anyhow even a nationalist like Agoncillo credits Governor Wood with outstanding achievements like the rehabilitation of the Philippine National Bank, of putting the government on its feet financially and reviving the educational, sanitary and public works system which had suffered retrogression under Harrison. Furthermore 'he was the only one among high American and Filipino officials to call attention to the necessity of establishing an adequate defense system for the Philippines, if the Philippines were to be really prepared for self-government and independence'.³⁵

Because of the setback that Filipinization seems to have suffered during the administration of Governor Wood, independence missions were sent to the United States, one in 1921 headed by Senate President Quezon to protest the recommendations of the Wood-Forbes mission and another in 1923 headed by Speaker Roxas asking for the installation of a Filipino Governor-General. On January 1924 a memorial was sent to Pres. Coolidge which expressed the Filipino leaders' conviction that in view of the Wood controversies, independence seemed to be the only solution to the Philippine problem.

Accordingly in 1926, President Coolidge sent Col. Carmi Thompson to survey once more Philippine conditions. The report was against the grant of independence since this would work both against American and Filipino interests.

"From the standpoint of American commercial interests in the Far East it would be unwise to relinquish control of the Philippines at the present time... We need the Philippines as a commercial base and the retention of the Philippines will otherwise be of great benefit to our Eastern situation... The granting of complete and immediate independence would end the *free-trade relationship* between the United States and the Philippines. This and other resulting conditions would bring about *economic disaster* for the Philippines."³⁶

³⁵ Agoncillo, Teodoro A. *op. cit.*, p. 369.

³⁶ De la Costa, Horacio S.J. *op. cit.*, p. 264.

Why this emphasis on Free Trade? Because more than the technology that led to increased agro-industrial production in the Islands, it was Free Trade that led to the economic prosperity of the Philippines. The U.S. could not but emphasize Free Trade since Capitalism was characterized not only by industrialism but the ideal of Free Trade, an indispensable component of the Laissez Faire system envisioned by Adam Smith.

Whether Smith's argument for Laissez-Faire were valid for all conditions or not, the fact is that it was accepted by all capitalist countries and so was applied by the U.S. to the Philippines. True enough that Free Trade obtained also during the Spanish regime since the 1840's but the volume of trade was increased enormously under the Americans because of a more intensive exploitation of the country's natural resources.

The phenomenal growth of Philippine-American trade can be seen in the following statistics: In 1908, the last year before Free Trade American exports to the Philippines was valued at around \$5,000,000. By 1929, after 21 years of Free Trade it had reached \$92,592,959. On the other hand the value of Philippine exports to the U.S. was \$32,000,000 in 1908 but was already \$164,496,843 in 1929. Unfortunately this Phil-American trade was not without its darker aspect. For American importers took 79% of all Philippine exports in 1930 and even 87% in 1933, showing our total dependence on the American market, aside from the fact that our export trade was limited to sugar, coconut products, tobacco and hemp, these 4 items accounting for more than 90% of all our exports. Economic dislocation was sure to ensue should the preferential treatment given to our exports in the U.S. be ever stopped. Indeed the Philippine Assembly had already foreseen the prejudicial effect of Free Trade when it declared as far back as 1913 that "the duty-free exchange of products between the U.S. and the P.I. in the long run would be highly prejudicial to the economic interests of the Filipino people and would create a situation which might *delay* the obtaining of its independence".³⁷

But Free Trade instead of delaying, accelerated the granting of Philippine Independence. For in 1934, the U.S. Congress set

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 263

a definite date for the granting of Philippine Independence. It would seem that this was due less to the independence missions sent to the U.S. but due more to the worsening economic conditions in the U.S. which culminated in the Great Depression of 1929. There was great pressure from American agricultural interests for the non-continuance of Philippine exports entering the U.S. free of duty. Typical of Americans who were for the immediate granting of Philippine Independence was Senator Hueg Long who did not even care to hide the self-regarding, not to say, selfish motive that should impel the U.S. to grant what the Philippines were clamoring for.

"We do not need to worry about the Filipinos... We have an American industry here (sugar) which is growing, and we need to lift the Americans engaged in that industry to the standards enjoyed by others of the American people... I am concerned about getting rid of these people, on a fair basis, but I am also concerned about taking care of the American people. *We need to protect our own sugar industry.* That is why we need to get them out of the way. We have no business being looked up with them".³⁸

One cannot but compare this selfish attitude on the part of some U.S. leaders with that of Philip II who despite the fact that the Philippines were proving a drain on the Spanish treasury selflessly decided to retain the Islands because he felt it a duty to confirm the Filipino converts in their newly acquired Christian faith.

The Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934 which was almost a word-for-word restatement of the Hare-Hawes Cutting Act of 1932-1933, except for the elimination of the provision for military bases and the inclusion of the provision for a final settlement on **naval** bases and fueling stations on terms mutually satisfactory to both the U.S. and the Philippines authorized the Filipino people to elect a constitutional convention empowered to frame a constitution for the future Philippine Republic. The Constitution was to take effect in its entirety only with the attainment of complete independence in 1946. During the transition period the Philippines was to be a self-government Commonwealth with the

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 265.

U.S. duty-bound to *defend the Islands against external aggression. To adjust the Philippine economy to that of an independent nation* without preferential treatment in the American market, duties were to be imposed on goods entering the U.S. on a graduated scale. On the 15th of November 1935 the Commonwealth was inaugurated with Manuel Quezon as President and Sergio Osmeña as Vice-President.

The Commonwealth Government had to face three main problems: 1) national security; 2) the underdeveloped economy; and 3) the social problem. In order to meet foreign aggression especially that of Japan which was beginning to make a southward penetration of Asia, President Quezon obtained the services of General Douglas MacArthur as Military Adviser of the Commonwealth. MacArthur's defense plan envisioned the organization of a citizen army, the establishment of a modest Philippine navy and an Army Air Corps. The General was optimistic that after his 10-year plan had been completed 'no Chancellery in the World, if it accepts the opinions of its military and naval staffs, will ever willingly make an effort to wilfully attack the Philippines'. Some military experts disagreed with MacArthur's optimism and indeed on the eve of the U.S. — Japan war, what had been achieved was far short of MacArthur's goal. The chief obstacle was the lack of funds since MacArthur's plan required a total appropriation of \$80,000,000 which the economically hard-pressed Commonwealth could ill provide.

To stabilize the economy of the Islands the Commonwealth Government adopted several measures. The National Assembly created a National Economic Council to advise the government on economic and financial questions, a National Development Company to supervise and manage government-owned corporations. The Commonwealth also adopted a program for the diversification of export crops. To reduce the alien control, especially by Chinese and Japanese of the economy, the Commonwealth enacted an Anti-Dummy Law which punished Filipinos allowing themselves to be used as dummies by alien businessmen. Also an immigration law to reduce the number of aliens coming to the Islands. The Government established credit facilities to lend money to Filipinos willing to also engage in retail trade which was controlled by the Chinese. To check the further advance of the

Japanese who had transformed Davao into a Davao-kuo, the Commonwealth initiated a program for the development of Mindanao especially by establishing colonization sites therein.

A greater problem however, than that of increasing the gross national product of the country as a whole was the maldistribution of wealth. The owners of vast agricultural lands which produced the main export crops like sugar, coconut and abaca had become enormously wealthy while their tenants remained very poor, not to say, saddled with debts. Social discontent was a seething volcano which could erupt anytime. Indeed there had been some bloody uprisings like that of the Sakdalistas in 1935. Right from the start of the Commonwealth regime, Pres. Quezon devoted himself therefore to this problem by enunciating a program of social justice defined as 'justice to the common tao... the improvement of his lot by emancipating him from the social injustices from which he has been suffering and by giving him and seeing to it that he gets what is rightly due him'. Special social legislations therefore were passed by the National Assembly including laws establishing Court of Industrial Relations, a minimum Wage Law, etc. To alleviate peasant discontent attempts were made by Government to purchase vast haciendas and promote land ownership.

Because of these problems which faced the Commonwealth Government, there were not wanting people in favor of a "realistic reexamination of the momentous decision made, all too lightly, perhaps in 1934".

"Today the Philippines is the only bright, prosperous spot in the Orient. Its people enjoy.. the best standard of living in the Far East. The deadly tropical diseases... have been decimated. The budget is balanced. Taxes are the lowest in the world... Our work is a monument to American idealism and enterprise, a living monument of 15,000,000 rescued from tyranny, rebellion, ignorance, poverty and disease and set upon the path of free government, peace, education, prosperity and health...

But a problem has arisen. Politically we brought the Islands to the verge of independence. Economically we brought them to almost complete dependence on our markets.

In the meantime the problem has broadened. Treaties concerning the Orient have been violated. Our open door policy has been more than once seriously challenged.

The events of the last year have given many thoughtful Filipinos food for thought... Many have come to realize that independence, however attractive from a spiritual viewpoint may mean a mere trade of sovereignties... The Philippines are sparsely populated and it is surrounded with nations whose teeming millions are spilling over their national boundaries. An independent Philippines thus faces a very real threat of racial extinction. Add to this the question of its ability to defend itself from foreign military aggression and the economic disaster attendant upon sudden loss of the American market, and you have the picture.

From the American viewpoint the picture is equally gloomy. We will leave a barrier reef of islands which will intervene between the U.S. and the continent of Asia. In foreign hands, this barrier will block our trade and intercourse with China. It will solve the claim of freedom of the seas and of the air unfavorably for us...

Without too great a loss of time and with the cooperation of leaders among the Filipinos, we should proceed to a realistic reexamination of the needs of these people and the long-range interests of ourselves... The enduring welfare and safety of both countries should be the paramount consideration.

It is my conviction that they are not far apart and that they can be harmonized — harmonized for the salvation of the Philippines, for the larger interests of America and for the *peace of the Pacific*.³⁹

But the peace of the Pacific was soon broken when at dawn on Sunday, the 7th of December 1941, the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. A few hours later Japanese planes bombed Clark Field destroying numerous American aircraft. A few days later Japanese troops landed in Aparri in the North and Legaspi in Southern Luzon. The American and Filipino forces were soon in full retreat to Bataan and Corregidor where MacArthur decided to make a last stand. On the 26th of December Manila was declared an open city and the Japanese occupied it on January 2, 1942. On the 11th of February Gen. McArthur left Corregidor

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 271.

for Australia; on the 20th of February President Quezon left the same place for the U.S. On the 9th of April General King had to surrender Bataan. On the 6th of May 1942, General Wainwright had to surrender his men unconditionally in order, to use his own words 'to put a stop to future useless sacrifice of human lives'.

Chief Justice Abad Santos who left Corregidor with President Quezon refused to go to the U.S. with the latter. Captured by the Japanese in Cebu he was sentenced to die on May 7th 1942. As his son began to sob, Abad Santos said: "Do not cry. Show these people you are brave. This is a rare opportunity for me to die for my country. Not everybody is given the chance'.

Other Government officials organized resistance units to harass the Japanese and transmit intelligence of their movements to General MacArthur in Australia. One of these, Governor Tomas Confesor of Iloilo on being asked to surrender to the Occupation Forces made the following reply:

"You may not agree with me, but the truth is that the present war is a blessing in disguise to our people... for it has placed us in the crucible to assay the metal of our being... For as a people during the last forty years we have come to enjoy personal privileges and civil liberties without much struggle,... they were practically a gift from a generous and magnanimous people — the People of the United States of America. Now that Japan is attempting to destroy these liberties, should we not exert any effort to defend them? Should we not be willing to suffer for their defense?"⁴⁰

Even the Communists organized a guerilla movement known as HUKBO NG BAYAN LABAN SA HAPON or HUKBALAHAP for short. Considering itself as a revolutionary army which should not only love and protect the people but also represent them, it forbade all actions that may encroach upon or harm the people, such actions as coercion, insulting or beating the people and criminal acts like robbery and rape.

The war had disrupted agricultural production and the added heavy demands for foodstuffs of the Japanese army could not but cause a food shortage which by 1944 had become acute. Over

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 276.

200,000 people in Manila were on relief, the government struggling to take care of around half of them and private charity of the rest. But this help was inadequate and people were dying of starvation and malnutrition by the hundreds.

On the 20th of October 1944, the American forces landed in Leyte and thus began the liberation of the Philippines. Three days later Gen. MacArthur broadcasted the following message to the Filipino people.

“I have returned! By the grace of Almighty God our forces stand again on Philippine soil — soil consecrated in the blood of our two peoples. At my side is your President Sergio Osmeña, worthy successor of that great patriot Manuel Quezon... The seat of your government is now therefore firmly established on Philippine soil.

The hour of your redemption is here... Rally to me! Let the indomitable spirit of Bataan and Corregidor lead on. As the lines of battle roll forward to bring you within the zone of operations, rise and strike. Strike at every favorable opportunity. For your homes and hearths, strike! For future generations of your sons and daughters, strike! In the name of your sacred dead, strike! Let no heart be faint. Let every heart be steeled. The guidance of divine God points the way. Follow in His Name to the Holy Grail of righteous victory!⁴¹

The Filipino people responded enthusiastically to MacArthur's call and helped the liberation armies everywhere. MacArthur's forces landed on the southwest coast of Mindoro in mid-December 1944; in Lingayen Gulf on January 9, 1945. Central Luzon was soon taken without much resistance. Those in Manila however prepared for a last-ditch battle, where Japanese marines committed atrocities which led to the death of thousands of its inhabitants for not collaborating with the Japanese. Between 5:30 and 6:00 P.M. of February 3, 1945, the advanced units of the American forces liberated the University of Sto. Tomas where thousands of American and Allied prisoners were interned. On February 27, 1945, General MacArthur turned over the reins of civil Government to President Osmeña. Osmeña in response said:

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 278 and 279.

"Let us pledge ourselves to continue the fight with every ounce of our strength..." MacArthur did continue the fight with the help of the Filipinos. On July 4, 1945, MacArthur proclaimed the liberation of the entire Philippines from Japanese domination.⁴²

MacArthur then proposed to carry the war right to Japan's door. Important Japanese ports and cities were bombed day and night. On July 26th the Allies called upon Japan to surrender unconditionally or face 'prompt and utter destruction'. But Japan strengthened by her bushido spirit still refused to surrender. It was only after the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima on August 6th and then on Nagasaki on August 9th that Japan realized that further struggle was useless, and forthwith accepted the Allies' demand to surrender. On September 2 aboard the battleship Missouri Japan signed formally the terms of surrender in Tokyo Bay. The Pacific aspect of World War II was over.⁴³

The end of the war saw the Philippines economically in shambles. True enough that the United States gave material and financial aid to relieve the Islands. It passed e.g. the War Damage Act. And then there was the Bell Trade Act which provided for an 8-year extension of the free trade relation between the U.S. and the Philippines. But this law had a provision giving 'parity' rights to Americans, that is, Americans would have the right to dispose, exploit and develop all agricultural, timber and mineral lands of the Philippines. This required amending the Constitution.

Another problem that faced the Commonwealth Government in its last days was the collaboration issue. Even before liberation President Osmeña had promised that this problem would be solved in a statesmanlike way. While praising the guerillas, Pres. Osmeña called attention to the *loyal* civilian population that was left behind to face the ire of the invader. Then talking in particular of collaboration he added:

"Not all public officials could take to the hills to carry on the heroic struggle. Some had to remain in in their posts to maintain a semblance of government,

⁴² Agoncillo, Teodoro A. et. al., *op. cit.*, pp. 483.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 484.

to protect the population from the oppressor to the extent possible by human ingenuity and to comfort the people in their misery.

Hence, the problem must be solved with justice and dignity. Persons holding public office during enemy occupation... fall within three categories: those prompted by a desire to protect the people, those actuated by fear of enemy reprisals and those motivated by disloyalty to our government and cause. The motives... then will be the criteria upon which such persons will be judged".⁴⁴

The statesmanship of President Osmeña was manifested also in another way. Inspired most probably by Henry Clay's dictum that 'he would be rather right than President' he refused to promise back pay to all government employees realizing that the government would be bankrupt for quite a time. Also to insure unity within his own party, he declared that he would step aside to give way to Roxas if the latter wanted to run for the Presidency. And even when his followers made him a candidate, he refused to campaign. No wonder that in the election held on April 23, 1946, he lost to then Senate President Roxas.

A little more than two months after the election for the first President of the Republic, Philippine Independence was proclaimed, on July 4, 1946. With the raising of the Filipino flag *alone* at the Luneta on that eventful day, the Philippines became an independent sovereign state, and what Toynbee calls the North American chapter in the history of the Filipino people came to a close.

APPRAISAL

Our aim in this short Outline was to find out whether Toynbee was justified in saying that the Philippines were lucky in having a North American as well as a Spanish chapter in their history. We have seen that in the light of the challenges Spain had to meet in the Philippines, her responses were satisfactory, not to say the best, under the existing circumstances. Can the same be said of the American regime in the Islands?

But what was the main reason of Toynbee for asserting that we were fortunate in having been both under Spain and the United

⁴⁴ De la Costa, Horacio S.J. *op. cit.*, pp. 279 and 280.

States? According to the renowned British historian because these two nations represent *complementary* aspects of Western Christian civilization. Can this claim be substantiated in the light of the four challenges President McKingley presented to his American countrymen: that of 'Christianizing', 'civilizing', and 'educating' the Filipinos and fitting us for 'self-government'?

Regarding the task of Christianizing, we know that Spain gave us Catholicism. Was the U.S. able to impart Protestantism to us as a people, considering that the majority of us have remained Catholics? And in what sense can Catholicism and Protestantism be said to be complementary? But as our essay has shown, the main characteristic of American Protestantism was its emphasis on Toleration. The American interpretation of toleration according to Bonhoeffer has the shortcoming of emphasizing toleration at the expense of truth, forgetful of the fact that true Toleration regards persons, not truth, as embodied in St. Augustine's dictum: "Hate the error, but love the erring; hate the sin, but love the sinner". But there is something to be said for practising toleration even if one's religion is the true one, for history is fraught with lessons that Society cannot be dragooned into either orthodoxy or piety. To cite but one instance: Louis XIV's revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which granted toleration to the Huguenots in France. As the great historian Belloc notes:

"As the young King (Louis XIV) increased in power... the greater and lesser Protestant nobles began to waver. Their religious feelings had never been so strong as their political, and indifference or conversion became commoner and commoner among them... But at a critical moment about halfway through the reign, a grave *error* was committed. The King thought he could hasten the *process of unity* and proceeded to outlaw the Calvinist religion in his dominions... A considerable number of the French Protestants emigrated. Those who remained behind, many of them wealthy men holding disproportionate number of posts in the finance and commerce of the country, were roused to a tradition of hatred against the monarchy and of course to still stronger hatred of the traditional Catholic Religion. It was from this that, later on, the opposition to the prin-

ciple of monarchy in France and the fashionable anti-clericalism of the eighteenth century proceeded".⁴⁵

For a State to practice intolerance is thus a remedy worse than the disease.

Religious toleration finds its political expression in the doctrine of the Separation of Church and State. But as our paper has shown, Jefferson who was mainly responsible for the 'freedom of religion' clause in the U.S. Constitution never intended it to mean freedom from religion. Later interpretations of the First Amendment have tended to be secularistic and unfortunately it is this secularistic interpretation that has found a stronger echo in the Philippines.

From the aspect of 'Civilization' we have seen that the two main ingredients of Western European civilization are Christianity which it inherited from Hebrews and its Graeco-Roman inheritance, Greek Philosophy and Roman Law. The importance of Christianity is underscored by Christopher Dawson when he says that:

"The European tradition is a much wider thing than that of nationalism or liberalism or socialism; it is the tradition of Christian civilization. All those ideals which we regard as typically Western — the supremacy of Law, the recognition of the rights of the individual and the duty of Society toward the poor and the oppressed — are not the invention of Modern Democracy. They are ultimately products of the Christian tradition and find their only true justification in Christian principles".⁴⁶

Considering that the European tradition also includes Science since the Greeks understood by Philosophy HUMAN science and this included Mathematics and the Natural Sciences, we may say that Science and its progeny Technology has been the legacy of American civilization to us. There is no gainsaying the fact that Science and Technology have contributed enormously to the economic and material progress of the Filipino people.

⁴⁵ Belloc, Helaire, *Characters of the Reformation*, Sheed and Ward 1938 pp. 338 and 339.

⁴⁶ Dawson, Christopher, *Religion and the Modern State*, London Sheed and Ward 1938 p. 140

However important Technology is, it is definitely inferior to Religion in advancing human progress. Indeed as Toynbee puts it:

“The main strand of our modern Western history is the progressive erection, by Western hands, of a scaffolding within which all the once separate societies have built themselves into one. From the beginning, mankind has been partitioned; in our days we have at last become united... The most obvious ingredient in it (i.e. the scaffolding) is technology and man cannot live by technology alone... In the fulness of time, when the oecumenical house of many mansions stand firmly on its own foundations and the temporary Western scaffolding falls away — as I have no doubt it will — I believe it will become manifest that the foundations are firm at last because they have been carried down to the bed-rock of Religion”.⁸⁷

If Toynbee is right that Religion is the core and Technology the rind of Civilization, then we can see in that way Spain and the U.S. have complementary contribution to Filipino civilization. For the former has given us Religion while the latter has given us Technology.

Furthermore if Toynbee has amply proven from his study of Civilizations that ‘Religion is the serious business of the human race’ it is foolhardy on anyone’s part to decry Spanish education for being religion-oriented. Even if Spain had limited education to Religion, that would be more than enough contribution to any people. For as we read in a facade in a South American University: “Physics and Chemistry are useful; but Religion is necessary”. While Mortimer Adler, an Associate Editor of the Great Books of the Western World and erstwhile Professor in the Graduate School of the University of Chicago in discussing the relative importance of Science, Philosophy and Religion opines that: Philosophy which deals with the essences of things is superior to Science which treats only of phenomena. While Philosophy in turn is inferior to Religion which is the supreme discipline because it is God’s own discipline of Man.

But Spanish education in the Philippines did not limit itself to religious education. For it emphasized the liberal arts and

⁸⁷ Toynbee, Arnold J. *op. cit.* p. 91.

liberal education. The relation of the liberal arts and liberal education to democracy has been pointed out by Robert M. Hutchins thus:

"This Western devotion to the liberal arts and liberal education must have been largely responsible for the emergence of democracy as an ideal. The democratic ideal is equal opportunity for full human development, and, since the liberal arts are the basic means of such development, devotion to democracy naturally results from devotion to them. On the other hand, if acquisition of the liberal arts is an intrinsic part of human dignity, then the democratic ideal demands that we should strive to see to it that all have the opportunity to attain to the fullest measure of the liberal arts that is possible to each".⁴⁸

The shortcoming of Spanish education in the Philippines was that it was the education of an elite, the prospective leaders of the nation, a shortcoming shared by all the nations including the U.S. in those times. The debt we owe the U.S. in the field of education is the extension of education to the widest extent possible. In short, free, universal, compulsory education as embodied in the public school system. The Spanish and American education in the Philippines are thus complementary, the former contributing what the Great Books call the qualities aspect, and the latter the quantitative aspect of education for democracy.

Regarding self-government, our paper has shown that Spain gave us a measure of self-government in the institutions of the CABILDO and CONSULADO. These institutions gave such autonomy to the natives that they have been compared to the New England town meetings and like the latter became the foci of opposition to government from or by the mother country.

What the U.S. did give us was representative institutions on a *national* scale: the Philippine Assembly in 1907 and the Philippine Senate in 1916. In short, the U.S. gave us parliamentary democracy which could not be otherwise since this was the poli-

⁴⁸ Great Books of the Western World Vol. I, *The Great Conversation* p. 5.

tical aspect of the economic system known as Capitalism and the U.S. is admittedly a capitalist country. The philosophy behind both Capitalism and Parliamentary democracy is of course liberal individualism which was the 'religion' of the 19th Century.

That Parliamentary democracy was not without disadvantages came to the fore in the 20th Century. As Christopher Dawson pointed out in analyzing the new political forces emerging in the 2nd and 3rd decades of our century,

"the chief weakness of democratic government is that it allows the *mechanical* element as represented by the party machine and the bureaucratic system to overpower the *personal* element as represented by the political leaders on the one hand and the ordinary party member on the other... For it is only by personal leadership that democratic institutions can be vivified and raised from the level of political machinery to become the organs of a truly free society. Left to themselves, modern democratic institutions are apt to become the tools of sordid and selfish interests. In fact the more elaborate is the machinery designed to safeguard the rights of the electorate, the more opportunities are afforded to the astute and unscrupulous party manager to manipulate the system for his own ends. This is what has done so much to discredit parliamentary government on the Continent, while in the U.S. the absence of political leadership has been responsible for the reign of the political boss and the immunity of the professional criminal".⁴⁹

The foregoing makes pretty clear the reason why so many countries turned to some form or other of authoritarianism after World War II. Of course the authoritarian ideal is against the Liberal doctrine of the divine right of majorities, where the government more often than not becomes simply the representative of a shifting combination of political interests and under control usually of a caucus of party politicians. Incidentally authoritarianism must not be confused with Totalitarianism. For the essence of Totalitarianism is that the State is not only a policeman (to prevent one citizen from trampling on the rights of another citizen which was the Liberal concept) but also a 'nurse, and a schoolmaster and an employer and an officer — in short an

⁴⁹ Dawson, Christopher *op. cit.*, p. 40

earthly providence, an all-powerful, omnipotent human god — and a very jealous god at that⁵⁰, while Authoritarianism in the strict sense only maintain that the ruler is not simply the representative of the people but has an independent authority and a direct responsibility to God. His primary duty is not to fulfill the wishes of the people (which obviously is not infallible) but to govern justly and well. But to do this the ruler must acknowledge the existence of a Law higher than the human — the Natural Law, whose Author is God. The Natural Law e.g. prohibits abortion. Should the majority of the population opt for a law permitting, not to say, fostering abortion; the ruler has the duty not to yield to the wishes of the people. For he must obey God rather than man.

The importance of the Natural Law cannot be gainsaid. As Dawson says:

“This conception of the sovereignty and transcendence of Law is the basis of that tradition of liberty which has played so great a part in our history and which distinguishes the societies of Western Europe from those of Russia and the Orient. But the modern world has lost its faith in this higher law, and consequently its ideals of liberty and the Rights of Man have become hollow abstractions that grow emptier and more unreal, the more they are talked about. Democracy has swelled itself out with hot air and high phrases until it has burst like the frog in the fable”.⁵¹

The trouble is of course not with Democracy itself but its being uprooted from Christianity which is its natural soil. The same thing has happened to other ideals like Nationalism and Socialism. Indeed

“either these elements must be salvaged from the wreck of Liberal idealism by being brought back to their natural basis in the *Christian tradition* or they will be eliminated by the reconstitution of society on purely materialistic foundations as a closed order in which human nature is entirely subordinated to the needs of the state machine”.⁵²

⁵⁰ Dawson, Christopher, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 140.

Indeed whatever is good in the social ideals being offered to modern Man ultimately derives from Christianity. For as Toynbee so eloquently puts it:

"Communism, which is another of our latter-day religions, is, I think, a leaf taken from the book of Christianity — a leaf torn out and misread. *Democracy* is another leaf from the book of *Christianity*, which has also, I fear, been torn out and, while perhaps not misread been *half emptied of meaning by being divorced from its Christian context and secularized*, and we have obviously, for a number of generations past, been living on spiritual capital, I mean clinging to Christian practice without possessing the Christian belief — and practice unsupported by belief is a wasting asset, as we have suddenly discovered, to our dismay in this generation".⁵³

For those historians who tend to undervalue the role of Religion in general and Christianity in particular in the progress of the Philippines can take a leaf from Toynbee's study of the rise and fall of civilization. He says:

"Our present view of modern history focuses attention on the rise of our modern Western *secular civilization* as the *great new event* in the world. As we follow that rise, from the first premonition of it in the genius of Frederick II Hohenstaufen, through the Renaissance to the eruption of democracy and science and modern scientific technique, we think of all this as being the great new event in the world which demands our attention and commands our admiration. If we can bring ourselves to think of it, instead, as one of the *vain repetitions* and of something that the Greeks and Romans did before us and did supremely well—then the *greatest new event in the history of mankind will be seen to be a very different one*. The *greatest new event* will then not be the monotonous rise of yet another secular civilization out of the bosom of the Christian Church in the course of these latter centuries; *it will still be the Crucifixion and its spiritual consequences*."⁵⁴

DR. PEDRO GABRIEL
University of Santo Tomas
Manila

⁵³ Toynbee, Arnold J. *op. cit.*, p. 236.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 237.