



# governmentattic.org

*"Rummaging in the government's attic"*

Description of document:	<b>US Department of State Self Study Guide for The Philippines, September 30, 2001</b>
Requested date:	11-March-2007
Released date:	25-Mar-2010
Posted date:	19-April-2010
Source of document:	Freedom of Information Act Office of Information Programs and Services A/GIS/IPS/RL U. S. Department of State Washington, D. C. 20522-8100 Fax: 202-261-8579
Note:	This is one of a series of self-study guides for a country or area, prepared for the use of USAID staff assigned to temporary duty in those countries. The guides are designed to allow individuals to familiarize themselves with the country or area in which they will be posted.

The governmentattic.org web site ("the site") is noncommercial and free to the public. The site and materials made available on the site, such as this file, are for reference only. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals have made every effort to make this information as complete and as accurate as possible, however, there may be mistakes and omissions, both typographical and in content. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals shall have neither liability nor responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damage caused, or alleged to have been caused, directly or indirectly, by the information provided on the governmentattic.org web site or in this file. The public records published on the site were obtained from government agencies using proper legal channels. Each document is identified as to the source. Any concerns about the contents of the site should be directed to the agency originating the document in question. GovernmentAttic.org is not responsible for the contents of documents published on the website.



United States Department of State

*Washington, D.C. 20520*

Case No.: 200701753

**MAR 25 2010**

I refer to your letter dated March 11, 2007 regarding the release of certain Department of State material under the Freedom of Information Act (Title 5 USC Section 552).

We searched for and reviewed the self study guides that you requested and have determined that all except one of them may be released. They are on the enclosed disc. One of the guides is being released with excisions.

An enclosure provides information on Freedom of Information Act exemptions and other grounds for withholding material. Where we have made excisions, the applicable exemptions are marked on each document. With respect to material withheld by the Department of State, you have the right to appeal our determination within 60 days. A copy of the appeals procedures is enclosed.

We have now completed the processing of your case. If you have any questions, you may write to the Office of Information Programs and Services, SA-2, Department of State, Washington, DC 20522-8100, or telephone us at (202) 261-8484. Please be sure to refer to the case number shown above in all correspondence about this case.

We hope that the Department has been of service to you in this matter.

Sincerely,



*for* Margaret P. Grafeld, Director  
Office of Information Programs and Services

Enclosures:  
As stated.

**63934 Federal Register/Vol. 69, No. 212**  
**Rules and Regulations**

Subpart F – Appeal Procedures

§171.52 Appeal of denial of access to, declassification of, amendment of, accounting of disclosures of, or challenge to classification of records.

- (a) *Right of administrative appeal.* Except for records that have been reviewed and withheld within the past two years or are the subject of litigation, any requester whose request for access to records, declassification of records, amendment of records, accounting of disclosure of records, or any authorized holder of classified information whose classification challenge has been denied, has a right to appeal the denial to the Department's Appeals Review Panel. This appeal right includes the right to appeal the determination by the Department that no records responsive to an access request exist in Department files. Privacy Act appeals may be made only by the individual to whom the records pertain.
- (b) *Form of appeal.* There is no required form for an appeal. However, it is essential that the appeal contain a clear statement of the decision or determination by the Department being appealed. When possible, the appeal should include argumentation and documentation to support the appeal and to contest the bases for denial cited by the Department. The appeal should be sent to: Chairman, Appeals Review Panel, c/o Appeals Officer, A/GIS/IPS/PP/LC, U.S. Department of State, SA-2, Room 8100, Washington, DC 20522-8100.
- (c) *Time limits.* The appeal should be received within 60 days of the date of receipt by the requester of the Department's denial. The time limit for response to an appeal begins to run on the day that the appeal is received. The time limit (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) for agency decision on an administrative appeal is 20 days under the FOIA (which may be extended for up to an additional 10 days in unusual circumstances) and 30 days under the Privacy Act (which the Panel may extend an additional 30 days for good cause shown). The Panel shall decide mandatory declassification review appeals as promptly as possible.
- (d) *Notification to appellant.* The Chairman of the Appeals Review Panel shall notify the appellant in writing of the Panel's decision on the appeal. When the decision is to uphold the denial, the Chairman shall include in his notification the reasons therefore. The appellant shall be advised that the decision of the Panel represents the final decision of the Department and of the right to seek judicial review of the Panel's decision, when applicable. In mandatory declassification review appeals, the Panel shall advise the requester of the right to appeal the decision to the Interagency Security Classification Appeals Panel under §3.5(d) of E.O. 12958.

## The Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552)

### FOIA Exemptions

- (b)(1) Withholding specifically authorized under an Executive Order in the interest of national defense or foreign policy, and properly classified. E.O. 12958, as amended, includes the following classification categories:
  - 1.4(a) Military plans, systems, or operations
  - 1.4(b) Foreign government information
  - 1.4(c) Intelligence activities, sources or methods, or cryptology
  - 1.4(d) Foreign relations or foreign activities of the US, including confidential sources
  - 1.4(e) Scientific, technological, or economic matters relating to national security, including defense against transnational terrorism
  - 1.4(f) U.S. Government programs for safeguarding nuclear materials or facilities
  - 1.4(g) Vulnerabilities or capabilities of systems, installations, infrastructures, projects, plans, or protection services relating to US national security, including defense against transnational terrorism
  - 1.4(h) Information on weapons of mass destruction
- (b)(2) Related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency
- (b)(3) Specifically exempted from disclosure by statute (other than 5 USC 552), for example:
  - ARMEX Arms Export Control Act, 22 USC 2778(e)
  - CIA Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, 50 USC 403(g)
  - EXPORT Export Administration Act of 1979, 50 App. USC 2411(c)(1)
  - FSA Foreign Service Act of 1980, 22 USC 4003 & 4004
  - INA Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 USC 1202(f)
  - IRAN Iran Claims Settlement Act, Sec 505, 50 USC 1701, note
- (b)(4) Privileged/confidential trade secrets, commercial or financial information from a person
- (b)(5) Interagency or intra-agency communications forming part of the deliberative process, attorney-client privilege, or attorney work product
- (b)(6) Information that would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy
- (b)(7) Information compiled for law enforcement purposes that would:
  - (A) interfere with enforcement proceedings
  - (B) deprive a person of a fair trial
  - (C) constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy
  - (D) disclose confidential sources
  - (E) disclose investigation techniques
  - (F) endanger life or physical safety of an individual
- (b)(8) Prepared by or for a government agency regulating or supervising financial institutions
- (b)(9) Geological and geophysical information and data, including maps, concerning wells

### Other Grounds for Withholding

- NR Material not responsive to a FOIA request, excised with the agreement of the requester

# PHILIPPINES SELF STUDY GUIDE



NATIONAL FOREIGN AFFAIRS TRAINING CENTER  
School of Professional and Area Studies Foreign Service Institute  
U.S. Department of State

**The Self-Study Guide: The Philippines** is intended to provide U.S. Government personnel in the foreign affairs community with an overview of important Philippine issues related to history, geography, politics, religion, culture, economics, and international relations. The guide merely serves as an introduction and should be used as a self-study resource. The Philippines is far too complex and diverse a society to be covered in any depth using only the text in this guide. Therefore, the reader is encouraged to explore the

questions and issues introduced using the Internet site guide and articles and books listed in the bibliography. Most of the bibliographic material can be found either on the Internet or in Foreign Service Institute or Main State libraries.

Benjamin N. Muego, Professor of Political Science and Asian Studies at Bowling Green State University prepared this Guide. The views expressed in this guide are those of the author and attributable sources and do not necessarily reflect official policy or position of the Department of State or the National Foreign Affairs Training Center.

This publication is for official educational and nonprofit use only.

First Edition  
September 30, 2001

---

## Table of Contents

### [Chronology](#)

### [Part I—The Environment and People](#)

The Land  
The People  
Natural Resources  
Lingo-Cultural Groups  
Cultural and Political Identity  
Religion and the Indigenous Culture

### [Part II—History and Its Legacies](#)

The Philippines Under Spain  
The Philippines Under American Rule  
The Japanese Interregnum  
The Second Philippine Republic: Roxas to Marcos  
The Third Philippine Republic: Aquino to Arroyo

### [Part III—The Philippines Today](#)

The Governmental System  
Key Actors in Philippine Politics  
The Traditional Political-Economic Elite  
The Armed Forces of the Philippines  
The Roman Catholic Church  
The Technocratic Elite



Communist Party of the Philippines—New People’s Army  
 The Moderate Political Opposition  
 The Economy  
 Philippine Foreign Policy  
 Contemporary Problems and Prospects for the Future

Selected Bibliography

## Chronology of Important Historical Events

1521	On March 15, Ferdinand Magellan discovered the Philippines and attempted to subdue Lapu-Lapu, a native chieftain in today’s Cebu province in the central Visayan region; Magellan was killed in a skirmish with Lapu-Lapu’s warriors on April 24, 1521.
1543	Spanish conquistador Ruy Lopez de Villalobos was forced out of the Philippines by the natives a year after discovering the rest of the islands and naming the archipelago after King Philip II of Spain.p
1564	Miguel Lopez de Legazpileft New Spain with four ships to colonize the Philippines.p
1565	Miguel Lopez de Legazpi established the first Spanish colony in the Philippines at Cebu in the central Visayan region, designating it as the colony’s Capital.p
1571	On May 19, Manila was founded by Miguel Lopez de Legazpi; soon afterwards, Legazpi relocated the capital to Manila in the southern Tagalog region (from Cebu, in the central Visayan region) and used the newly designated colonial Capital as a base for the further colonization of the islands.
1896	On August 26, the <i>Kamahalmala’t Kagalangalang na Katipunan ng mga Anak ng Bayan</i> (KKK), a secret society under the leadership of Andres Bonifacio committed to total separation from Spain, launched the Revolution of 1896, which eventually ended Spanish colonial rule over the Philippines.  On December 30, Jose P. Rizal, a co-founder of the non-separatist <i>La Liga Filipina</i> and author of <i>Noli Me Tangere</i> and <i>El Filibusterismo</i> (two powerful political satires that exposed Spanish atrocities in the Philippines) was executed by the Spanish authorities after a sham trial on trumped-up charges.



	<p>On January 23, the Philippine Revolutionary Army (PRA) of General Emilio F. Aguinaldo signed a truce with the Spaniards (the Pact of Biak na Bato) during which time Aguinaldo headed a delegation to Hong Kong to procure arms and ammunition for the PRA’s expected final offensive against the Spaniards holed up in the Walled City (Intramuros) of Manila.</p> <p>On February 25, Commodore George Dewey received a secret cable from Theodore Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, ordering the former to steam toward Hong Kong and await further orders for possible engagement with elements of the Spanish Armada, stationed in the Philippines, under the command of Admiral Patricio Montojo.</p> <p>On May 1, the Battle of Manila Bay which pitted the U.S. Navy’s modern steel-clad battleships against the antiquated and wooden-hulled ships of the Spanish Armada took place; not surprisingly, all 10 Spanish ships were sunk and 381 Spanish sailors lost their lives while Commodore Dewey’s fleet, led by the <i>USS Monocay</i> (Dewey’s flagship) sustained only 8 casualties (mainly from heat prostration) with none killed; 11 days after his “great naval victory,” Dewey was promoted to the rank of Rear Admiral.</p> <p>On June 12, General Emilio F. Aguinaldo proclaimed the short-lived First Philippine Republic, also known as the Malolos Republic (1898–1901), and sought recognition of the new government by the international community, including the United States.</p> <p>On August 12, a peace protocol was signed between Spain and the United States, allowing the latter to occupy Manila pending the conclusion of a peace treaty between them; 4 months later, on December 10, 1898, the Treaty of Paris formally ended the Spanish-American War; in accordance with the Treaty of Paris, Spain withdrew from Cuba and ceded Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines to the United States; the United States paid Spain \$20 million for the Philippines.</p> <p>On December 21, President William McKinley issued a proclamation extending “American sovereignty over the entire archipelago.”</p>
<p><b>1899</b></p>	<p>On February 4, the “Philippine Insurrection” (cf., “Filipino-American War,” the term preferred by Filipinos) broke out.</p> <p>On February 6, the United States Senate narrowly ratified the Treaty of Paris; the final vote tally was 57 to 27, one over the required two-thirds vote.</p>
<p><b>1900</b></p>	<p>On March 6, General Emilio F. Aguinaldo, president of the First Philippine Republic (1898–1902), was captured in Palanan, Isabela (in the northern Luzon region) by General Frederick Funston, effectively ending the Philippine Insurrection or Filipino-American War.</p>
<p><b>1902</b></p>	<p>On July 4, President Theodore Roosevelt, who succeeded William McKinley to the presidency, officially proclaimed the end of the “great insurrection” in the Philippines and commended the U.S. troops involved in the campaign for upholding America’s “lawful sovereignty over the islands.”</p>

<b>1934</b>	On March 24, the Tydings-McDuffie Act, which among other things, established the Philippine Commonwealth and set forth a 10-year timetable for Philippine Independence was enacted by the U.S. Congress and signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.
<b>1941</b>	On December 10, Japan invaded the Philippines, and the Imperial Japanese Army landed on the main island of Luzon.
<b>1942</b>	On January 2, the Imperial Japanese Army captured Manila, declared it as its Capital and became its principal headquarters and base of operations throughout Japan's 3-year occupation of the Philippines.  On April 9, USAFFE (United States Armed Forces in the Far East) troops on the Bataan peninsula surrendered to General Tomoyuki Yamashita, although a significant number of the 36,000 U.S. and Filipino soldiers who surrendered to the Japanese subsequently died during, and in the aftermath of, the infamous "death march" from the Bataan peninsula to Capas, Tarlac en route to internment camps in the metropolitan Manila area; thousands of others succumbed to disease, starvation and torture in the hands of their Japanese captors in the internment camps.
<b>1945</b>	On January 9, U.S. military forces under the command of General Douglas MacArthur began the campaign to liberate the Philippines from Japan; MacArthur entered Manila on February 4 and in spite of strong Japanese resistance, completed the recapture of the city within 3 weeks; Washington, D.C. announced the liberation of the Philippines on July 5.
<b>1946</b>	On July 4, the United States granted the Philippines its independence ( <u>cf.</u> , "restored" Philippine independence as Filipinos preferred to put it) under the terms of the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934; Manuel A. Roxas, a Japanese collaborator earlier exonerated by General MacArthur and a staunch U.S. loyalist, was elected president of the new republic; in a plebiscite simultaneously held with the presidential election, Roxas campaigned hard for the so-called Parity Amendment an "ordinance" appended to the 1935 Philippine Constitution, which accorded American nationals and corporations the same rights as Filipinos in the ownership of public lands and exploitation of natural and mineral resources; the amendment, which became a major irritant in post-war Filipino-American relations, expired on July 4, 1974.
<b>1947</b>	On March 14, the Military Bases Agreement between the Philippines and the United States was signed and subsequently ratified by the Philippine Senate.
<b>1950</b>	On August 30, the RP-U.S. Mutual Defense Pact, the first among a series of bilateral security agreements between the United States and a number of pro-western countries in East Asia, was signed by U.S. and Philippine authorities.
<b>1951</b>	Ramon F. Magsaysay, credited by the United States for "breaking the backbone of Philippine communism," was elected president of the Philippines; Magsaysay was the beneficiary of generous financial assistance from the United States Government and invaluable campaign advice from his CIA "handler," Colonel Edward Lansdale.
<b>1965</b>	Ferdinand E. Marcos, a much-decorated World War II hero was elected to the first of two 4-year terms as president of the Philippines, soundly defeating the incumbent president, Diosdado P. Macapagal; Marcos was elected to a second 4-year term in 1969, the first Philippine post-war president to be so honored.

<b>1966</b>	Along with Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, and Singapore, the Philippines co-founded the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), a regional cultural-economic-political organization, which has since expanded to include all 10 countries in Southeast Asia (e.g., Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Viet Nam).
<b>1972</b>	On September 21, Ferdinand E. Marcos declared martial law, suspended the 1935 Constitution and the writ of <i>habeas corpus</i> , shut down Congress, ordered the arrest and detention of his political opponents and other suspected dissidents and assumed plenary powers; Marcos justified his declaration of martial law as a legitimate and necessary response to an alleged Communist plot to overthrow the duly constituted government, subvert the rule of law and threaten the survival of the republic.
<b>1981</b>	On January 17, Ferdinand E. Marcos proclaimed as “duly ratified” the 1983 Constitution, which transformed the Philippines’ American-style unitary-presidential system of government into a nondescript hybrid “parliamentary-presidential” system purportedly modeled after the British’s parliamentary system and the French’s presidential system, particularly the latter’s strong chief executive feature.
<b>1982</b>	On August 21, exiled opposition leader and old Marcos nemesis Benigno S. Aquino, Jr., better known as “Ninoy Aquino,” returned to the Philippines from self-imposed exile in the United States and was shot to death, execution-style, by still unknown assailants as he disembarked from his plane at the Manila International Airport (the same airport facility that now bears his name); Aquino’s brutal assassination touched off a firestorm of protest and outrage both in the Philippines and abroad that eventually precipitated Marcos’ ouster and fall from power.
<b>1986</b>	On February 26, the entire Marcos family accompanied by an entourage of military and civilian aides and a handful of diehard supporters left Manila for Hickam Air Force Base in Honolulu, Hawaii (via Clark Air Force Base in Angeles, Pampanga); earlier in the day, Corazon C. Aquino, “Ninoy” Aquino’s widow and putative winner of the February 7, 1986 “snap election,” took her oath of office as president of the Philippines before Supreme Court Justice Claudio Teehankee.
<b>1989</b>	On September 28, Ferdinand E. Marcos died in Honolulu, Hawaii; in a controversial decision that would later haunt her presidency, Corazon C. Aquino refused to allow the return of Marcos’ remains to the Philippines for burial in spite of, among others, a “Sense of the Senate Resolution” to the contrary and the recommendation of other notable Philippine political and religious leaders; Marcos is currently buried in his hometown of Batac, Ilocos Norte, after former president Fidel V. Ramos, subsequently lifted his predecessor’s ban on Marcos’ burial on Philippine soil.
<b>1990</b>	On September 16, the Philippine Senate voted to terminate the RP-U.S. Military Bases Agreement (MBA); the decision to terminate the 40-year old basing agreement was undoubtedly affected by the eruption earlier in the year of Mount Pinatubo, a volcano that had been dormant for more than 6 centuries; the Mount Pinatubo eruption caused extensive damage to Clark Air Force Base and Subic Naval Base; in a bit of a paradox, two of the senators who voted for the termination of the MBA were Joseph Estrada and Orlando Mercado. They became strong supporters of the VFA (as president and defense secretary, respectively) that was ratified by the Philippine Senate in 2000.

1998	<p>On June 30, Joseph E. Estrada, former movie actor-matinee idol, city mayor (San Juan, Rizal), senator, vice-president and celebrated crime-fighter took his oath as the ninth president of the Philippines in the post-war period, after a spectacular election victory over Fidel V. Ramos’ “anointed” successor, Speaker Jose de Venecia, standard-bearer of the ruling <i>Lakas-NUCD</i> Coalition, and four other presidential hopefuls; among Estrada’s major challenges were how to cope with the consequences of the Asian economic debacle that started in Thailand in May 1997 and a daunting budget deficit inherited from the Ramos administration; Estrada’s political mettle would also be tested to the limit by the secessionist Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF), which resumed hostilities against the Philippine Government and defiantly demanded an independent “Moro Islamic Republic.”</p>
1998	<p>On January 12, the Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) was signed by U.S. Ambassador Thomas Hubbard and Philippine Foreign Affairs Undersecretary Leonides Caday.</p>
1999	<p>On May 27, after protracted and often acrimonious debate, the Philippine Senate ratified the Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) by a vote of 18-5, paving the way for, among other things, the resumption of <i>Balikatan</i> (“shoulder to shoulder”) RP-U.S. joint military exercises, which had been on hiatus since September 16, 1991.</p>
1999	<p>On October 5, Senate Minority Leader Teofisto Guingona, Jr., accused President Joseph Ejercito Estrada of illegally taking P220 million in <i>jueteng</i> (an illegal numbers game popular among rural Filipinos) bribe money from Ilocos Sur Governor Luis “Chavit” Singson from November 1998–August 2,000 and P70 million in excise taxes on cigarettes intended for Ilocos Sur; Guingona’s charges were referred to the Senate Blue Ribbon Committee for investigation; the House Committee on Public Order and security conducted parallel investigations.</p> <p>From October 11–17, calls on President Joseph Ejercito Estrada to “step down from the presidency,” were made by: Jaime Cardinal Sin, putative leader of the country’s Catholics (October 11); the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines (October 13); former presidents Corazon C. Aquino and Fidel V. Ramos (October 17).</p> <p>On October 12, Vice President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo resigned as Secretary of the Department of Social Welfare and Services—although elected as vice president under the opposition <i>Lakas-NUCD</i> coalition, Macapagal-Arroyo was invited by Estrada to serve in the latter’s cabinet and Macapagal-Arroyo obliged—and joined the call for Estrada’s resignation.</p> <p>On November 13, the 218-member House of Representatives adopted a four-point “Articles of Impeachment” against President Joseph Ejercito Estrada; although no formal vote was ever taken, 115 representatives led by former Estrada ally Speaker Manuel Villar, signed a letter forwarding the articles of impeachment to the 24-member Senate (because of Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo’s election to the vice presidency and the death of Marcelo Fernan earlier, however, the Senate membership had been pared down to only 22).</p> <p>On December 7, the trial-sentencing phase of the impeachment proceedings against Joseph Ejercito Estrada formally began in the Senate, with Hilario G. Davide, Jr., Chief Justice of the Philippine</p>

Supreme presiding; the task of prosecuting Estrada fell on the shoulders of 11 House prosecutors elected by their colleagues and a “battery of private prosecutors.”

On January 16, the prosecution lost a key “test vote” in the Senate when 11 pro-Estrada senators voted not to admit into evidence a sealed envelope that supposedly contained incriminating evidence against Estrada.

On January 17, accusing the Senate of having pre-judged the case and the 11 pro-Estrada senators of rigging the proceedings to exonerate Estrada, the prosecution team tendered their collective resignation with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and filed a “Manifestation of Withdrawal of Appearance” with the impeachment tribunal; Chief Justice Hilario G. Davide, Jr., suspended the impeachment proceedings indefinitely “until the House of Representatives shall have resolved the issue of the resignation of the public prosecutors.”

On January 19, the Secretary of National Defense, AFP Chief of Staff, the Chief of the Philippine National Police, all erstwhile Estrada supporters, and other ranking military and police officials joined the anti-Estrada forces at the so called “EDSA Shrine” and openly called for Estrada’s resignation.

On January 20, at 12:00 noon, Chief Justice Hilario G. Davide, Jr., administered the oath of office to Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo as president of the Philippines; at 2:30 p.m., Estrada and his family left Malacanang Palace, the official presidential residence.

On April 3, the Supreme Court of the Philippines in *Estrada v. Macapagal Arroyo et al*, G.R. No. 146738, held *inter alia*, that Gloria Macapagal Arroyo is the *de facto* and *de jure* president of the Republic of the Philippines.

On April 16, Joseph Ejercito Estrada surrendered to the *Sandiganbayan* (a special Constitutional court that has jurisdiction over criminal cases brought up against public officials) and posted bail for six criminal charges filed against him by the Office of the Ombudsman.

2000 On April 25, Joseph Ejercito Estrada was arrested at his residence for alleged “plunder,” a non-bailable capital offense; the scene at the arrest site was tense and chaotic as tens of thousands of Estrada’s loyal supporters camped out in front of the latter’s residence, battled a large contingent of heavily armed police and soldiers and attempted to prevent Estrada’s arrest.

On May 1, hundreds of thousands of Estrada supporters who had been holding nonstop anti-regime demonstrations at the so-called EDSA Shrine, marched toward Malacanang Palace (the official presidential residence) demanding that Macapagal-Arroyo step down from the presidency; the pro-Estrada demonstrators clashed with police and military personnel who were called in to beef up security at the presidential palace, resulting in three fatalities and at least 113 people injured; Macapagal-Arroyo declared a “state of rebellion” in the entire Metro Manila area and ordered the arrest and detention of the “rebellion” leaders.



On May 11, general elections were held throughout the archipelago; up for grabs were all 218 seats in the House of Representatives, 13 Senate seats, 73 provincial governorships and thousands of other provincial, municipal and city offices; the two main election protagonists were the People Power Coalition (PPC) of Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo and the opposition *Pwersa ng Masa* (PM) Coalition identified with deposed president Joseph Ejercito Estrada; in the hotly contested Senate elections, the PPC won eight seats while PM won five seats (one of the senatorial seats was won by Estrada's spouse, in spite of the fact that she had never before run for any elective office).

On October 1, the long-awaited "plunder" trial of Joseph Ejercito Estrada and his son "Jinggoy" Estrada at the *Sandiganbayan* got off to a rocky start; both defendants appeared in court in their house clothes, under heavy police escort and without counsel; in spite of the Estradas' refusal to accept court-appointed counsel (the "appointments" were made in open court by the presiding judge), the trial proceeded.

On November 19, the Supreme Court, on a 10-4-1 vote, upheld the constitutionality of the "plunder law" (Republic Act 7080); the constitutionality of the statute was challenged by Joseph Ejercito Estrada and Jinggoy Estrada earlier in the year for, among other things, alleged over-breadth, vagueness, and ambiguity.

# Part I

## The Environment and People

### The Land

The Philippines is an archipelago located between the Philippine Sea and the South China Sea in Southeast Asia with a total area of 300,000 square kilometers (115,831 square miles). Of the country's 7,300 islands, the largest are Luzon, Mindanao and the Visayas (the Visayas is a chain of medium-to-large islands that straddle the country's mid-section) while several thousand "islands" are in reality reefs, visible only during low tide. Only about 19 percent of the Philippines' land area is arable; the rest is mostly rugged and mountainous terrain, now mostly denuded, inhabited by indigenous peoples and transplanted lowlanders who eke out a living by swidden agriculture. The inhabitants of the coastal lowlands (especially in Mindanao, Sulu and the Visayas) are mostly small-scale farmers, fishermen, fishpond tenders, etc., or live off the sea, gathering kelp, shells and an assortment of other marine or submarine materials. The Philippines has two distinct seasons—the dry and wet seasons—with the northeast monsoon occurring from November to April and the southwest monsoon that occurs from May to October.

### The People

The Philippines is a virtually homogenous society, with roughly 96 percent of the population being Malay (91.5 Christian Malay and 4 percent Muslim Malay). Today's Filipinos are the descendants of a seafaring group of people originating from mainland Southeast Asia, who settled in what is today called the Philippines, long before the advent of Western colonialism, in the early 16th century. The ethnic Chinese comprise about 1.5 percent of the population while the proverbial "other" category, which includes "non-Christian tribes" such as the Igorots, Ilongots, Gaddangs and Negritos (Aetas) of Luzon; and the Bagobos, Bilaans and Tasadays of Mindanao, account for roughly 3 percent of the population. Because Filipinos, unlike some of their east Asian brethren, have always favored interracial marriages, the Philippines has a significant mixed-race or *mestizo* population some of whose genealogy could be traced all the way back to the onset of Spanish rule in the early 16th century. Perhaps because of their lighter skin color and "Caucasian" looks, *mestizos* (male) are highly successful movie actors and actresses specifically, and in the performing arts, generally. Mixed-race females or *mestizas* are perennial beauty pageant winners. In addition to the Spaniards (1521–1898) and Americans (1898–1946), Filipinos also heavily intermarried with the Chinese over an extended period of time, accounting for a fairly significant Filipino-Chinese *mestizo* community that has been integrated into the overall population.

## Natural Resources

The Philippines is blessed with an abundance of natural and mineral resources, *e.g.*, rich farm lands, inland rivers and lakes, abundant fishery and marine resources, adequate rainfall and as a littoral state, one of the longest coastlines in the world. In addition, the Philippines has vast deposits of strategic minerals such as iron, cobalt, copper, gold, silver and nickel, to name only a few. In recent years, commercial quantities of petroleum and natural gas were discovered in locations west of the island-province of Palawan in the southwestern part of the country. In the 1950's, 1960's, and 1970's, the Philippines was also a major producer of unprocessed timber (mostly hardwood) and other wood products like plywood. Unfortunately, however, indiscriminate logging activities by politically well-connected corporate and individual concessionaires in the 1950's, 1960's, and 1970's, have virtually depleted these forest resources and turned once dense and impenetrable jungles into virtual wastelands. In certain areas of the country, for example, heavy silting and massive soil erosion caused by the destruction of natural watersheds is believed to have seriously jeopardized the lifespan of hydroelectric power plants such as those in Ambuklao, Mountain Province; Montalban, Rizal; and Maria Cristina Falls, Agusan, in Mindanao. In spite of a "total log ban" that has been in place since the late 1980's, illegal logging apparently continues to go on, especially in Luzon's Cagayan Valley and northern Mindanao.

As with other developing countries attempting to telescope their modernization timetable into a 20- to 30-year span (*cf.*, 100–200 years in the case of highly industrialized nations like the United States), the Philippines has tended to ignore or downplay potential environmental problems related to rapid industrialization. Major waterways like the Pasig River that traverses Metro Manila and its suburbs have been so badly polluted by toxic industrial wastes and raw sewage over the last several decades; so too have inland lakes like Laguna de Bay, perhaps one of the largest freshwater reservoirs in all of Southeast Asia. In the case of Laguna de Bay, the principal culprits are wealthy and influential commercial fishermen who have crisscrossed Laguna de Bay with giant fish traps, thereby impeding the movement of



large concentrations of water hyacinth and other aquatic plants. According to marine biologists who have studied the situation thoroughly, this has choked off the lake's oxygen supply, in turn resulting in massive fish kills and slow death to Laguna de Bay itself. Parenthetically, according to a non-governmental organization (NGO) opposed to further land reclamation in Manila Bay, upwards of 5,000,000 pounds of untreated sewage is released annually into Manila Bay, one of the best natural deepwater ports in the world.

## Lingo-Cultural Groups

The Philippines' various lingo-cultural groups and the respective geographic areas where these groups are concentrated are: (1) Bicolano (the southeastern tip of Luzon); (2) Bisaya or Cebuano (central and eastern Visayas and certain parts of Mindanao); (3) Hilagaynon or Ilongo (western Visayas and certain parts of Mindanao); (4) Ilocano (northern Luzon and Cagayan Valley, half of central Luzon and certain parts of Mindanao); (5) Pampangan (Pampanga); (6) Pangasinense (Pangasinan); (7) Tagalog (southern Luzon and the national capital region); and (8) Waray (eastern Visayas and Samar). The Muslim populations of North and South Cotabato, Sultan Kudarat, Lanao del Sur and Lanao del Norte, Sulu and Tawi-Tawi speak Maguindanao, Maranaw, and Tausug, respectively. In addition, according to language specialists who have studied the Philippines' various dialects, the country has over a hundred different "linguistic dialects" that do not lend themselves to phonetic transcription. By law, Tagalog is the principal base of Pilipino, one of two official languages in the Philippines (the other official language is English). Bicolano, Bisaya, Hilagaynon, Ilocano, Tagalog, etc., are so linguistically different from each other—except for some words of Spanish origin—that Filipinos versed only in one particular language, e.g., Ilocano are unable to communicate with other Filipinos who do not speak or read Ilocano. This is the reason why English remains the *lingua franca* in the Philippines especially among educated Filipinos. Parenthetically, each lingo-cultural group has its distinguishing stereotypical characteristics—both positive and negative—and putative strengths and weaknesses. For example, Ilocanos are stereotyped as dark-skinned (*maitim*), hard working, industrious and frugal to a fault, while Tagalogs are stereotyped as fair-skinned (*maputi*), well dressed, well spoken, street-wise, and given to excessive spending. Perhaps because of the Philippines' colonial past (*i.e.*, the lingering effects of *divide et impera*), archipelagic geographical configuration and the existence of natural communication barriers such as mountain ranges, rugged terrain, oceans, etc., Filipinos have always had a problem forging a distinct identity as a unified nation and one people. Internal divisions spawned by regionalism continue to hamper nation-building, more than 55 years after the Philippines regained her independence from the United States in 1946. The situation is exacerbated by a palpable state of fractiousness; a propensity towards the politics of *inggitan* (jealousy) and *lamangan*, an indigenized version of one-upmanship. Indeed, according to various commentators and students of Philippine history and social dynamics, fractiousness and the tendency of Filipinos to denigrate and downplay the achievements of others while conversely, puffing up and exaggerating their own achievements, has been one of the most difficult obstacles standing in the way of true nationhood and nation building.

## Cultural and Political Identity

According to David Joel Steinberg, the Philippines is a product of “355 years in the convent and 50 years of Hollywood.” As a group, Filipinos exhibit a highly ambivalent, if slightly confused cultural identity, that is part Hispanic, part indigenous and part American; a curious blend of conservative and modern values and idiosyncrasies. The conservative influence of the Catholic Church on institutions such as the family and social issues like birth control, divorce, etc., is all too pervasive and apparent. And so it is for example, that the Philippines is the only country in the world that continues to outlaw absolute divorce even as other predominantly Catholic countries like Italy, Ireland and Argentina, etc., have long ago legalized it. Yet for the most part, Filipinos are also steeped in the images and values of American “pop culture” as evidenced by an insatiable appetite for Western-style clothes, American music, cinema, television and fast food. Indeed, so dominant and influential has the American cultural influence been on younger Filipinos that American rock and roll and Hollywood icons like Gwyneth Paltrow, Janet Jackson, Jennifer Lopez, the Backstreet Boys, and Britney Spears, to name only a few, enjoy wide followings in the Philippines as they do in the United States and other Western societies.

Politically, Filipinos take great pride in their commitment to democracy and its underlying principles and values such as egalitarianism, fair play, due process of law, and the basic freedoms (speech, press, religion, association, etc.) and immunities and privileges of citizenship enshrined in the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution. Perhaps because the Philippines is a former colony of the United States, all of her three Constitutions—the 1935 Constitution that governed the Second Philippine Republic (1946–1972), the 1981 Constitution that governed Marcos’ so called “New Republic” (1981–1986) after the “lifting” of martial law in 1981, and the 1987 Constitution, the basic law of the Third Philippine Republic—have either been heavily influenced by or were methodically patterned after that of the United States, and except for a brief flirtation with authoritarian rule and a nondescript “parliamentary” system in the early 1970’s and early 1980’s, the Philippine political system has remained uncannily similar to the American system after which it was modeled. Like American democracy, the one over-arching value that underlies Philippine democracy is the enduring belief in the efficacy of the ballot box and free elections as the only right way to bring about change.

## Religion and the Indigenous Culture

Philippine culture is rooted in a strong and extended kinship system and a set of overlapping indigenous values, practices and beliefs, such as *utang na loob*, *hiya* and *pakkikisama*. Like most Asian societies, kinship of the extended variety, is a major element of Philippine culture. Under the Philippines’ extended kinship system, it is not unusual for two or three generations of a given family to live under one roof and “cousins,” several degrees removed, are considered “close” relatives. The three variants of the Philippines’ extended kinship system are (1) consanguinal or kinship based on blood; (2) affinal or kinship based on marriage; and, (3) *compadrazgo* or fictive kinship that results from religious or quasi-religious rites like baptism (*binyag*) or marriage (*kasal*). Fictive or *compadrazgo* kinship is established between and among the parents of a newly baptized child or a bride and groom, as the case may be, and the respective baptismal or wedding sponsors (*ninong* or *ninang*) become *compadres* and *comadres*. The newly baptized child and newly married couple becomes the *inaanak sa binyag* and *inaanak sa kasal*, respectively, of the baptismal and wedding sponsors.

A complex system of reciprocity in bilateral and multilateral relationships, *utang na loob* (debt of gratitude) is a value, which has a profound impact on all personal and business relationships. An *utang na loob* relationship is created when one party seeks, accepts and benefits from a favor, deed or deliberate act of another party. Filipinos expect the beneficiary of an *utang na loob* to acknowledge and repay the “debt” either as soon as it is incurred or at a later time. The beneficiary (*may utang na loob*) may ignore the debt at his own peril; risk social ostracism or being labeled as an ingrate (*walang utang na loob*). In certain situations, *hiya* (shame) trumps or neutralizes an *utang na loob* obligation if repayment of the debt has the potential of resulting in a *kahihiyaan* (scandal or outrage). Some common manifestations of *hiya* are: (1) the use of, and reliance on, intermediaries and go-betweens in bilateral and multilateral negotiations; (2) false modesty and self-effacing conduct; and (3) reluctance to express emotions in public. According to the late Frank Lynch, S.J., of the Ateneo De Manila University’s Institute of Philippine Culture, *pakikisama* or “smooth interpersonal relations” as Lynch put it, is the ability to get along with others. Filipinos put a high premium on *pakikisama* and a person who gets along with others (*marunong makisama*) is universally admired and well liked. Conversely, a person who is perceived as self-centered and egotistical (*mayabang*) and uppity (*suplad[a]*) is generally shunned and avoided. On occasion, laws and regulations are ignored, “bent” or even violated in the name of *pakikisama* and may be partly to blame for rampant graft and corruption. Among some of the common manifestations of *pakikisama* are: (1) a nearly obsessive search for consensus prior to the formulation of a policy decision; (2) avoidance of conflict or potential conflict situations; (3) respect for elders and authority-figures; and (4) avoidance of public displays of anger and displeasure.

According to most estimates, 94 percent of the Philippines’ estimated 83 million people are Christian, making the Philippines the only predominantly Christian country in all of Asia. Eighty-four percent of Filipinos are Roman Catholic, although it is believed that only about 50 percent are “serious practicing Catholics” who go to Mass regularly, observe holidays of obligation and participate in the church’s holy sacraments. Indeed, Philippine Catholicism has often been characterized by religious scholars like Fr. Rodolfo Bulatao, S. J., as of a “split-level” variety; an odd mixture of church-approved religious ritual and liturgy and neo-pagan rites like the crucifixion of penitents during Holy Week and the *ati-atihan* festival in Aklan during the Lenten season, which celebrates Jesus Christ’s passion and sacrifice. The latter practices are mostly driven by superstition and perhaps to a lesser extent, commercialism, and have their roots in the Philippines’ pre-Hispanic polytheistic belief system and religious rituals and practices.

The other 10 percent of Filipinos belong to various mainstream protestant religious denominations such as Episcopalian, Lutheran, Methodist, Church of Latter-day Saints, etc., although of late, the so called “charismatic evangelicals” (mainly from the United States) have begun to gain inroads into the country’s religious landscape. Two of these protestant denominations—the Filipino Independent Church or *Aglipayans* and the *Iglesia ni Kristo* or Church of Christ—are homegrown varieties and have come to signify, rightly or wrongly, the Filipino’s struggle for religious independence. Of these homegrown churches, the *Iglesia ni Kristo* (INK), a politically monolithic organization whose members vote as a solid bloc, has the higher profile of the two and wields a strong political clout. The Filipino Independent Church was founded at the beginning of the 20th century by Gregorio Aglipay, a defrocked priest, while the *Iglesia ni Kristo* was founded in the 1920’s by Felix Manalo.

Muslims account for about 4 percent of the population, and are primarily concentrated in Mindanao and the Sulu Archipelago, although with the erection of a mosque in the heart of downtown Manila in the 1970s, small Muslim communities have since sprouted up in the national capital region as well. Although Filipino Muslims are Sunni, not Shiite nor Wahabi, the Muslim population consists of three principal sub-groups, *e.g.*, the *Magindanaws* of Cotabato, South Cotabato, and Sultan Kudarat; the *Maranaws* of Agusan, Lanao del Norte and Lanao del Sur; and the *Tausugs* who are spread out in the provinces of Basilan, Sulu, and Tawi-Tawi (a much smaller but distinct sub-group, the sea-dwelling *Badjaos*, also live in the Sulu and Tawi-Tawi area). The Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF), which fought the Philippine Government for 24 years under the leadership of current ARRM (Autonomous Rural Region of Mindanao) governor Nurallaji Misuari was primarily a *Tausug* group as is the notorious kidnap for ransom and bandit group Abu Sayaff. In contrast, the leadership and rank and file of the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) whose armed struggle for an “Islamic homeland” is currently in hiatus are primarily of Magindanaw and Maranaw extraction. Be that as it may, the MILF is a splinter group of the MNLF and its leader, Hashim Salamat, was one Misuari’s former lieutenants. Hashim Salamat and the MILF split with Misuari over the latter’s decision to negotiate with, and eventually sign a peace treaty with the Philippine Government in 1996, under the auspices of the Government of Indonesia. In spite of losing Camp Abubakar—its political and military headquarters—to government forces in 2000, after a rather costly military campaign (in terms of the number of lives lost on both sides and destruction of private property) the MILF, appears determined to achieve its goal of creating an independent Islamic republic.

The proverbial “other” category, also denominated “non-Christian tribes” in the literature, encompasses all of the country’s “cultural minority” groups. These include the various Igorot sub-groups in Kalinga-Apayao and the Mountain Province (Apayao, Bontoc, Ifugao, Ibaloi and Kalinga, etc.); the Tinguians of Abra, in northern Luzon; and the Gaddangs, Ibanags and Ilongots of Nueva Vizcaya and Cagayan Valley; the Aetas (also called Negritos) of central Luzon; and the Bilaans, Bagobos, Manobos and Tasadays, etc., of Mindanao. Except for a short period of time in the afterglow of the alleged “discovery” of the Tasadays, a supposed pre-Stone Age tribe, during the martial law period, these cultural minority groups have been largely ignored by the central government in Manila, and as a result, live under deplorable conditions. If anything, the subsequent unmasking of the “Tasaday discovery” as a hoax perpetrated by no less than the head of the Presidential Assistant on National Minorities (PANAMIN), turned the spotlight away from the cultural minorities. One group in particular, the Aetas of Pampanga and Zambales in the central Luzon region who were forced out of their mountain homes and deprived of their only means of livelihood by the eruption of Mount Pinatubo in 1990–1991, have been especially hard-hit and so far, government-led efforts to resettle them in Dau and Mabalacat, all in Pampanga, have invariably failed. Hundreds of Negritos have since died or become ill as a result of their exposure to “lowland” diseases and infections they contracted while confined in crowded “tent cities” and hastily built relocation centers. Even more importantly, however, the Negritos who have always lived in the deep jungles of Mount Pinatubo and subsisting on *camote* (sweet potato), other root crops and a wide variety of game, have been permanently displaced from their natural habitat, because even today, 10 years after its original eruption, Mt. Pinatubo continues to discharge significant quantities of *lahar* (volcanic mud with the appearance and consistency of wet cement) rendering the mountain and surrounding foothills totally uninhabitable.

## Discussion Questions on “The Environment and People”

- What common cultural, idiosyncratic and physical characteristics, if any, do Filipinos share with the other Malay countries in Southeast Asia (e.g., Brunei, Indonesia, and Malaysia)?
- Has the fact of the Philippines being an archipelago had anything to do with rampant factionalism, regionalism and the Filipinos’ general inability to come together as a cohesive national entity?
- What role, if any, has the Roman Catholic Church played or continued to play vis-à-vis the Filipino’s cultural, ideological, and political ambivalence?
- Have indigenous Philippine values, beliefs and attitudes, such as *hiya*, *pakikisama*, *utang na loob*, *inggit*, *lamangan*, etc., militated against the full flowering of Western-style democracy in the Philippines, and if so, how and why?
- Is the Philippines’ *particularistic* political culture (cf., the United States’ *universalistic* political culture) an obstacle to political and economic growth and development?
- What are the short- and long-term effects of over-population on the country’s overall quality of life and what specific measures if any, could the government and the private sector undertake to alleviate the situation?

## Part II

### History and Its Legacies

#### The Philippines Under Spain

The Philippines, like all of Southeast Asia with the exception of Thailand, is a former colony; first European and then American. The first to colonize the Philippines was Spain, whose rule over the islands lasted approximately 355 years. The Spaniards took possession of the Philippines in the middle of the 16th century (the city of Manila, Philippines was established in June 1572, by Miguel Lopez de Legazpi). Earlier, in 1521, Ferdinand Magellan, a Portuguese explorer sailing under the Spanish crown, “discovered” the Philippines while looking for a new route to the East Indies in pursuit of the lucrative spice trade. Magellan was later slain by Lapu-Lapu, a native chieftain in what is today the province of Cebu, during a relatively obscure skirmish that is chronicled by a number of Filipino historians and nationalists as the first notable example of Filipino resistance to alien domination. Spanish rule over the Philippines, as in the rest of the colonial empire was, from inception to its denouement, exploitative, and oppressive.

The Filipinos were treated by the Spaniards as serfs, or in Jose P. Rizal's iteration of a classic phrase, "hewers of wood and drawers of water," and contemptuously referred to as *indios*. Filipinos were also denied participation in colonial government, except at the lowest levels and even then only in token form, for example as *gobernadorcillos* (petty governors) at the village level, whose real function was to assist the Spanish authorities in disseminating edicts from the crown and in collecting taxes. Administratively speaking, the Philippines was a dependency of the Viceroyalty of New Spain, governed through the Council of the Indies, the supreme governing body for all of the Spanish overseas empire.

A decisive element throughout Spanish colonial rule was the dominant role played by the ecclesiastical authorities in political and civil affairs. Because of the theocratic nature of the Spanish monarchy at that time, ecclesiastical authorities exerted a strong influence on political and administrative matters. The abuses and profligacy of the clergy went unchecked, for the most part, because the Archbishop of Manila enjoyed veto power over the selection of the colony's Governor General, the Philippines's highest secular official. Because of this veto power, the religious authorities were able to ensure that whoever was appointed Governor General either kept his peace or tacitly tolerated a wide variety of clerical excesses. In the Philippines, as elsewhere in the empire, the "royal patronage of the clergy" made the church the most important agency of the crown.

In fairness to the Spaniards, there were brief interludes, which proved beneficial to the Philippines, especially in the economic sphere. For example, it was during the administration of Jose Basco y Vargas (1778–1787) during the enlightened rule of Charles III (1759–1788), when a general economic plan for the development of the natural resources of the Philippines was put into effect. In accordance with the program, Basco also improved the schools and promoted the teaching of the Spanish language, a policy that was opposed by the clergy. In the political arena, the granting of Philippine representation in the Spanish *Cortes* (1810–1813, 1820–1823, and 1834–1837) even if "it did not accomplish anything for the Filipinos ... because the delegates themselves were not Filipinos but Spaniards and these Spanish delegates represented not Filipino but Spanish interests in the Philippines," proved in the long run to be meaningful in that it marked the beginning of the struggle between liberalism and constitutionalism on the one hand and conservatism and absolutism on the other. One of the more tangible results of the struggle as far as the Philippines was concerned, was the appointment of a liberal Governor General, Carlos Maria de la Torre, after the Spanish Revolution of 1858. Governor General de la Torre's Administration, albeit short lived, was one of the best liked by the Filipinos and later proved instrumental in stimulating Philippine nationalism.

Rule by the clergy or the so called "friarocracy" and its attendant evils and inequities triggered about 100 revolts that took place throughout the country beginning with the Rajah Lakandula and Rajah Sulayman revolts in 1574 and several others in the 17th and 18th centuries, such as the Diego Silang revolt in the Ilocos provinces (1762–1763), and the Cavite Mutiny of January 20, 1872, which resulted in the martyrdom of three Filipino priests: Jose Burgos, Mariano Gomez, and Jacinto Zamora. Because of the absence of a central leadership or a unifying element in these revolts, however, and because of the Spaniards' superior weaponry and organization, the Spanish colonial authorities succeeded in quelling these revolts.

In spite of the Spanish colonial government's policy of refusing the Filipinos any appreciable measure of education, there developed through the years a native *principalia* or *ilustrado* class. The members of this class, particularly the landed gentry, were native Filipinos or Filipino-Spanish *mestizos* who had attained some level of economic success. The children of the *principalia* or *ilustrado* class, who were the only ones able to avail of the opportunity for post-secondary education in the Philippines, were also fortunate enough to travel to, and study in, various European universities and locations. There, these *ilustrados* were exposed to liberal ideas, lived in a more enlightened political and social setting, and in 1889, launched an organized protest movement designed to expose Spanish abuses in the Philippines. The movement, known as the Propaganda Movement, also took on the task of educating and agitating Filipinos about their common plight and in fostering pride in their own race. This became necessary in order to counter one of the principal effects of Spanish colonialism: the near complete destruction of the Filipino's spirit and sense of dignity. As an upshot of their systematic denigration by the Spaniards, Filipinos started believing that they were an inherently inferior race relative to the Spaniards and for this reason, generally tolerated abuses perpetrated on them by their colonial masters. As an organization, the Propaganda Movement was reformist, not separatist, and it disseminated its ideas and philosophical positions both in Europe and in the Philippines primarily through *La Solidaridad* its official publication, under the editorship of Graciano Lopez Jaena.

Other notable members of the Propaganda Movement were the artist Juan Luna, who depicted conditions existing in the Philippines through highly acclaimed works like the *Spolarium*, and the polemicist Marcelo H. del Pilar whose main contribution to the movement was a strongly worded anti-friar volume entitled *La Soberania Monacal*. But perhaps the best known and most influential of them all was the physician, scientist, writer, artist and humanist Jose P. Rizal, who wrote hundreds of essays, letters, scientific tracts, and two major novels, *Noli Me Tangere* (Social Cancer) and *El Filibusterismo* (The Reign of Greed), two stirring social commentaries that exposed and satirized the abuses of the clergy in the colony, as well as the foibles and weaknesses of Philippine society—Spanish and Filipino—at that time. A recurrent theme in Rizal's writings was the thesis that the Filipino was just as good and able as the Spaniard, and if afforded the right opportunities, could excel in whatever endeavor he chose. Speaking through his principal character, Simoun, in *El Filibusterismo*, Rizal argued against complete separation from Spain by revolutionary means, because in his view, Filipinos were not yet ready for independence. In spite of his reformist stance and rejection of armed revolution as a method of effecting change, however, the Spaniards executed Rizal on December 30, 1896, after a mock trial on trumped-up charges of inciting to rebellion and plotting against the Spanish crown.

Although the intellectual foundation of the Revolution of 1896 was laid by the *ilustrado* class, the armed phase of the struggle was led by a man of the masses, Andres Bonifacio, founder and first *Supremo* of the *Katipunan*, a secret society that advocated complete separation from Spain. The first open armed clash between the *Katipuneros* and the Spanish *guardia civil* occurred on August 23, 1896, and from that point onward, the revolution spread through other parts of the country. After Bonifacio's untimely death, as a result of a factional struggle for power within the *Katipunan*, the leadership of the revolutionary movement was assumed by General Emilio F. Aguinaldo, Bonifacio's chief rival. On November 18, 1897, the first part of a truce, known as the Pact of Biyak na Bato, was signed between the Spanish Government and Aguinaldo's revolutionary forces, and Aguinaldo was exiled to Hong Kong. While in



Hong Kong, Aguinaldo procured arms and ammunition to replace the antiquated and outmoded weapons of the Filipino Revolutionary Army. When it appeared certain that the truce was headed for a total collapse, Aguinaldo returned to the Philippines and hostilities between the Spaniards and FRA resumed shortly thereafter. The remaining Spanish forces retreated to the heavily fortified walled city of Intramuros, their last remaining stronghold in the colony, as they awaited the final and decisive attack by Aguinaldo's forces. Low on supplies and ammunition and cut off from Spain by vast oceans, the Spaniards found themselves in an almost hopeless situation. It was at this juncture that the Americans arrived on the scene and decided to intervene, ostensibly at first, in behalf of the Filipinos, but as it turned out eventually, on their own behalf, when the United States decided to annex the Philippines and turn it into a colony. Ironically, the Spaniards and Filipinos were not the principal combatants in the last decisive battle of the Philippine Revolution. The protagonists were a flotilla of modern American warships led by George Dewey and the mostly wooden ships of the once "invincible" Spanish *armada* under the command of Patricio Montojo. The so called Battle of Manila Bay a "naval battle" that various historians—American and Filipino—have described as a "sham," "turkey shoot in the bay, etc.," took place on May 1, 1898, and was staged to salvage Spanish honor and provide the Spaniards with a face-saving device to abandon the Philippines and surrender to the Americans, whom they regarded as their "equals" instead of to the lowly Filipinos whom the Spaniards despised and loathed. On June 12, 1898, after successful completion of mopping up operations against remaining Spanish forces, Aguinaldo proclaimed the short-lived First Philippine Republic (also called the Malolos Republic) and as most new governments usually do under the circumstances, proceeded to seek recognition of the fledgling government by other countries.

## The Philippines Under American Rule

The United States gained sovereignty over the Philippines from Spain by virtue of the Treaty of Paris, which brought an end to the abbreviated Spanish-American War. The acquisition of the Philippines came at a time when the United States was emerging as a world power; the period of 1891–1918, characterized by Frank L. Klingberg as a period of "extroversion" in the cyclical interpretation of American involvement in world affairs. William McKinley's decision to acquire the Philippines was greatly influenced by, among others, Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Alfred Thayer Mahan. Although the anti-annexation forces waged a determined effort to foil the McKinley administration from acquiring the Philippines, those who favored annexation won out in the end, with the ratification of the Treaty of Paris by the United States Senate on February 6, 1899. Interestingly enough, however, the pro-ratification forces in the United States Senate barely managed to muster the two-thirds majority required to secure ratification.

Interestingly enough, Spain no longer had effective political control of her former colony when she ceded the Philippines to the United States. As previously mentioned, Aguinaldo's rag-tag revolutionary army had for all intents and purposes, defeated the Spaniards by the time the First Philippine Republic was proclaimed on June 12, 1898. Shortly thereafter, a relatively brief but brutal war, the Philippine-American War or Philippine Insurrection (depending on whose version of events one chooses to adopt) broke out between the Filipinos and Americans. The war ended in 1902, almost a year to the day from the time the United States established a civilian government in the Philippines, decided to teach Filipinos the

English language and made available to all Filipinos a system of free universal education. The latter two policies clearly set the Americans apart from their Spanish predecessors—who denied Filipinos access to education and refused to teach them the Spanish language—and to a large extent, hastened Filipino acquiescence to American rule. Soon, efforts were made to involve the Filipinos in political and governmental affairs as well.

Although the Republican Party was not as receptive to the idea of early Philippine independence as the Democratic Party, which had incorporated early Philippine independence into their party platforms for 12 years, both political parties favored eventual Philippine independence. The difference lay in the duration of the period of political tutelage necessary to prepare the Filipinos for self-government. The first proffer of political self-rule for the Philippines was formalized through the Jones Law during the Woodrow Wilson Administration in 1916. Although the Jones Law fell short of Filipino expectations, it gave impetus to the Filipinization of higher echelons of the civil service and the development of Filipino legislative leadership. This Filipino legislative leadership would later be pitted against a trenchant Governor General in the person of Leonard Wood, who took over from Francis Burton Harrison after the Republicans were returned to power in 1921. In fact, the controversy between Governor General Wood and President J. Calvin Coolidge on the one hand, and Manuel L. Quezon, Sergio Osmena, Sr., and Manuel A. Roxas, on the other, served to intensify, at least on the Philippine side of the picture, the Filipino demand for total independence from the United States.

Independent of the agitations of Filipino leaders, however, worsening economic conditions in the United States, which culminated in the Great Depression, worked to hasten the decoupling of the Philippines from the United States. A curious coalition of interest groups, such as organized labor, farm lobbies, genuine anti-imperialists and jingoist groups opposed to Filipino immigration to the United States, combined to pressure the United States Congress into enacting legislation that ultimately took the Philippines off American hands. At this time too, it had become clear to American political, industrial, economic and religious leaders, who lobbied hard for the acquisition of the Philippines earlier, that the Philippines had not lived up to expectations as a potential source of wealth, or as an *entrepot* of trade and commerce in the Far East. One area where expectations met with some degree of success was toward the goal—championed by Alfred Thayer Mahan—of making the Philippines into a naval “outpost” and “magazine” from which the United States could project her military power in the Pacific rim. All in all, however, to borrow a felicitous phrase from George F. Kennan, the Philippines had turned out to be a “minor inconvenience.”

In 1932, a Philippine Independence Mission led by Sergio Osmena, Sr. and Manuel A. Roxas succeeded in lobbying for the passage of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act, which set up a transitional period of 10 years (the commonwealth period) before the grant of total independence. Indicative of the American state of mind vis-à-vis Philippine independence at that particular point in time, Congress decisively overrode President Herbert Hoover’s veto of the measure. The implementation of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act, however, was aborted by a power struggle in the Philippines between and among Sergio Osmena, Sr., Manuel A. Roxas and Manuel L. Quezon, with Quezon ultimately emerging as the victor. Quezon denounced the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act as both weak and disadvantageous to the Philippines in the long-term. In retrospect, however, it appears that Quezon torpedoed the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act not for its

putative lack of merit, but because it was secured by his political rival, Sergio Osmena, Sr. Under Quezon's leadership, the Commonwealth Assembly rejected the Act and authorized Quezon to return to Washington, D.C. to negotiate a new independence bill.

Working on the assumption that the Democrats would give the Philippines a better independence bill (Republican Herbert Hoover was soundly defeated by Democrat Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the 1932 presidential elections), Quezon personally headed a second independence mission to the United States, only to find an unsympathetic United States Congress and an indifferent Roosevelt Administration, not so much because of opposition to Philippine independence as such, but because of the deteriorating economic conditions in the United States and understandable legislative-executive preoccupation with domestic affairs. In 1934, Quezon returned to the Philippines with a "new" independence law, the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act, legislation that was nearly identical to the much-maligned Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act. In February 1935, under the terms of the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act, the Philippines held a constitutional convention, which drafted a basic law for the Philippine commonwealth (the transition government from 1935–1945) and the future republic scheduled for establishment 10 years later. Predictably perhaps, the Filipino "founding fathers" established a governmental system meticulously modeled after that of the United States.'

## The Japanese Interregnum

The timetable for Philippine independence spelled out in the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act was set back by World War II and Japan's subsequent occupation of the Philippines. The reorganization of the commonwealth government was ordered by General Masaharu Homma, commander-in-chief of the Imperial Japanese Forces (IJF), in a proclamation signed on January 3, 1943, just 1 day after the IJF took control of Manila. In his proclamation, General Homma announced the end of the American colonization of the country and declared that the purpose of Japan's occupation of the Philippines was to help establish an "independent" Philippine republic; a "Philippines for Filipinos," as an integral part of Japan's Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.

The Japanese had evidently hoped that their declaration of Philippine independence would help convince Filipinos who remained loyal to the United States that it was not Japan's intention to occupy the Philippines permanently; that it was simply emancipating the country and the Filipino people from Western colonialism. Preparations for the organization of the war-time republic formally began on June 18, 1943, with the creation of a Preparatory Commission for Philippine Independence headed by Jose P. Laurel, Sr. as president and Benigno S. Aquino, Sr. and Ramon Avancena as co-vice presidents. The commission completed a draft Constitution on September 4, 1943, that was ratified in a "popular convention" 2 days later. The new Constitution established a unicameral National Assembly, whose entire membership was elected on September 20, 1943. Five days later, the National Assembly elected Jose P. Laurel, Sr., as president of the new republic, and was formally inducted into office on October 14, 1943.

The Japanese-sponsored republic never got off the ground because the Filipino people did not acknowledge the IJF as their emancipators, and, of course, because of the Filipinos' continued loyalty to

the United States. Indeed, after the fall of Bataan and Corregidor, thousands of Filipino regulars (officially known as the “Philippine Scouts,” these soldiers were an integral part of the United States Armed Forces in the Far East or USAFFE) fled to the hills from where they waged relentless guerrilla warfare against the Japanese. These same guerrilla forces provided vital intelligence and logistical support to General Douglas MacArthur, paving the way for the latter’s return to liberate the Philippines from the Japanese. The atrocities perpetrated by Japanese soldiers on the civilian population especially toward the end of the war such as impaling babies on bayonets, subjecting suspected guerrilla sympathizers to the dreaded “water torture,” mass rape, and razing entire communities to the ground, etc., in retaliation for guerrilla raids on Japanese troop garrisons or well executed ambushes of Japanese military forces in the field also alienated a large segment of the population.

## The Second Philippine Republic: Roxas to Marcos

As a result of the decision in Washington, D.C. to proceed with the grant of Philippine independence, President Sergio Osmeña Sr. reconvened the Commonwealth National Assembly, in early 1946. Elected president of the Senate was Manuel A. Roxas, a savvy politician from the western Visayas, and like the late Manuel L. Quezon and Sergio Osmeña, Sr., a member of the ruling *Nacionalista* Party. Later on, however, Roxas led a group of his *Nacionalista* party mates and a few “independents,” and formed a splinter group, which became the Liberal Party (Roxas won the presidency as the standard-bearer of the Liberal Party). But first, Roxas had to be cleared by General Douglas MacArthur of pending collaboration charges in order to become eligible to run for president. There is consensus among Philippine historians and other students of the Japanese collaboration issue that MacArthur’s exoneration and virtual endorsement of Roxas’ was instrumental in ensuring Roxas’ victory in the first post-war presidential election held on April 23, 1946. Roxas ran with Elpidio Quirino as his running mate, against the *Nacionalista* Party team of Sergio Osmeña, Sr. and Eulogio Rodriguez. Roxas and Quirino waged a long and effective campaign throughout the archipelago focusing largely on the issues of rehabilitation, democracy, and anticipated American economic assistance. In contrast, the Osmeña-Rodriguez team waged a low profile and limited campaign with President Osmeña refusing to debate Roxas on the issues.

As predicted, Roxas won the election handily. A year later, Roxas delivered on his campaign promise to secure “parity rights” for American citizens and corporations in the ownership of land, exploitation of natural and mineral resources and in the operation of vital public utilities. Under Roxas’ leadership, the Philippine Congress approved a constitutional amendment, which provided “parity rights” for American citizens and corporations (the constitutional amendment was later ratified by the Filipino people in a nation-wide plebiscite). The Roxas Administration primarily devoted itself to the task of rehabilitation and reconstruction and was greatly aided in this regard by massive financial assistance from the United States under Public Law 370 (the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946) as well as benefits that accrued to the Philippines from the Philippine Trade Act of 1946. It was generally believed that the financial assistance was a *quid pro quo* for the Philippines’ passage of the parity rights amendment referred to earlier. Roxas was also responsible for the negotiation and ratification (by the Philippine Senate) of other treaties with the United States, including the RP-US Mutual Defense Treaty and the Military Bases Agreement. In fact, Roxas was perhaps the United States’ strongest Filipino advocate and supporter during those formative years. It was, therefore, ironic that Roxas met his untimely death at Clark Air

Force Base, on April 15, 1948, after delivering a stirring speech affirming the Philippines' "undying loyalty" to the United States in the event of another war.

After Roxas' death, Vice President Elpidio Quirino was sworn in as president and served the remainder of Roxas' unexpired term. In addition to the daunting problems of reconstruction and rehabilitation, Quirino also faced a communist insurgency in the hands of the *Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon* (People's Army Against the Japanese), which transformed itself into the military arm of the *Partidong Komunista ng Pilipinas* (PKP) after World War II. Quirino suspended the writ of *habeas corpus* after the failure of a short-lived truce with the Communists. Although the suspension was only partial and temporary, the act was nevertheless roundly criticized by civil libertarians and various bar associations, as unnecessary, excessive, and unconstitutional. As with Marcos' suspension of *habeas corpus* in 1972, however, the constitutionality of Quirino's proclamation was declared lawful and constitutional by the Philippine Supreme Court in the landmark *Barcelon* case. The Quirino Administration defeated the Communist insurgency with a combined "mailed-fist" policy and a "land for the landless" program. The chief architect of the Quirino Administration's success in what Alvin Scaff described as "breaking the backbone of Philippine communism," was Secretary of National Defense Ramon F. Magsaysay. After Quirino announced his plan to run for reelection, Magsaysay was enticed by the opposition *Nacionalista* Party to become their party's "guest candidate" for president; Magsaysay went on to defeat Quirino in one of the most-lopsided election victories in the country's brief history. Ramon F. Magsaysay brought a genuine love of the common *tao* (common man) and a charismatic brand of leadership to the presidency, which enabled him to rally diverse individuals and groups behind his administration's pet projects and programs. In his resolve to eradicate poverty and ameliorate living conditions especially in the rural areas of the country, Magsaysay launched a three-pronged "community development" program, which called for, among other things, extensive land reform; the building of a network of "feeder roads" and related infrastructure; and the extension of much-needed financial assistance to farmers. Magsaysay created the Office of Presidential Assistant on Community Development (PACD) to coordinate the government's community development initiatives and recruited and trained a veritable army of workers and volunteers. Like the U.S. Peace Corps established by President John F. Kennedy some 8 years later, Magsaysay's PACD attracted thousands of idealistic young college students and recent college graduates who signed up to work in the rural areas for virtually nothing and under harsh and primitive working conditions.

Ramon F. Magsaysay was staunchly pro-American and as a populist, virtually peerless. He opened the doors of Malacanang Palace (the presidential office and residence) and for the first time ever, made government offices and the corridors of power accessible to the common people. As a political reformer, Magsaysay addressed the perennial problem of graft and corruption with remarkable zeal and to implement reforms in the area, tapped a cadre of active-duty and recently retired military officers who had worked with him at the Department of National Defense and were instrumental in ensuring the success of his (Magsaysay's) counter-insurgency campaign. Magsaysay's Jacksonian brand of populism and his charismatic personality, made him a shoo-in for reelection had he lived long enough to seek another term. After Magsaysay's tragic death in a March 1957, plane crash, various political commentators noted that Magsaysay was at the cusp of launching a nationwide grassroots-level coalition that would have challenged the stranglehold of the *Nacionalista* and Liberal parties on political power. It was widely believed that as he approached the end of his first presidential term, Magsaysay had become totally

disillusioned with “old guard” politics and the graft and corruption that the system spawned and promoted.

The death of Magsaysay thrust another vice-president, Carlos P. Garcia, a little known politician from central Visayas, into the presidency. Partly because he succeeded an immensely popular president and partly because of his own shortcomings and the greed of his relatives and friends, Garcia’s presidency turned out to be a mediocre one. Like Quirino who ascended to the presidency by the same route—the death of an incumbent president—Garcia sought and won the presidency on his own in 1957. Garcia’s victory was unconvincing however, as he only managed to poll 43 percent of the total votes cast. Indeed, Garcia could well have lost to his Liberal Party challenger, Jose A. Yulo, had it not been for the candidacy of Manuel P. Manahan, a Magsaysay look-alike and close political associate (Manahan was Magsaysay’s Customs Commissioner) and Elpidio Quirino’s younger brother Antonio, whose candidacy split the Liberal vote (especially in northern Luzon, Quirino’s political bailiwick).

The bulk of the Garcia Administration’s efforts were directed at solving the Philippines’ severe economic problems. A modest industrialization program was launched and the entry of foreign goods—especially “non-essential items” imported from the United States and Europe—was severely restricted by, among other things, the imposition of heavy tariffs and duties. Moreover, the Garcia Administration adopted a “Filipino First” policy, a throwback to the fierce nationalism of the 1930’s during the fight for Philippine independence. The resurgence of nationalism in the 1950’s no doubt inspired Garcia to play a key role in the organization of the Association of Southeast Asia (ASA), one of two unsuccessful efforts at a pan-Malayan union in the 1950’s and 1960’s, and a precursor of today’s Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). In 1961, Garcia was defeated in his bid for reelection by the incumbent vice-president, Diosdado P. Macapagal, father of Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, the Philippines’ current president. A president and vice-president from opposing political parties can serve together at the same time, because split ticket voting in Philippine presidential elections is the norm rather than the exception, a practice sanctioned by the 1935 and 1987 Constitutions.

Like Magsaysay, Diosdado P. Macapagal of central Luzon, was a man descended from the masses and born of very poor parents. Macapagal and Magsaysay were from Pampanga and Zambales, respectively, two adjacent provinces in central Luzon, the traditional hotbed of agrarian unrest in the country. Before his election as vice-president, Macapagal served multiple terms in the House of Representatives and in the Philippine Senate. As vice-president, however, he did practically nothing (Garcia broke a long-standing political tradition by refusing to appoint Macapagal to a cabinet post), except to tour the country at taxpayer expense, building or reinforcing political networks and where necessary, mending political fences, as it were. Although Macapagal campaigned hard on a platform of restoring the people’s faith in government and eliminating graft and corruption, Macapagal’s Administration, like that of his immediate predecessor Garcia, became mired in scandal and corruption. One of Macapagal’s legacies was the enactment of the Land Reform Code of 1963, a comprehensive, albeit watered-down, loophole-filled agrarian reform program. During the signing of the new law at Manila’s Rizal Park—amidst great ceremony and fanfare—with representatives of farm groups and peasant organizations in attendance, Macapagal declared the *kasama* form of land tenure (an oppressive and exploitative share-tenancy system heavily skewed in favor of the landlord) abolished and replaced with a leasehold system. Arguably the

new law's centerpiece was a provision calling for the expropriation of large-landed estates and their purchase by the government for resale to the tenants who tilled them, either at cost or in easy installment plans. Because of various loopholes and escape clauses in the law, however, and the shortage of government funds to pay for the program, the Land Reform Code of 1963 was never fully implemented.

It was also during Macapagal's presidency that the Philippines almost became involved in a shooting war over the Malaysian State of Sabah, claimed by the Philippines as an integral part of its sovereign territory. The dispute over Sabah notwithstanding, Macapagal was the second post-war Philippine president to steer the Philippines closer to her Asian identity and assume a leadership role in the region. Macapagal's involvement in the founding of *MAPHILINDO* along with Indonesia's Ahmed Soekarno and Malaysia's Tunku Abdul Rahman, after the collapse of ASA, was an attempt to revive the concept of *Malaya Irredenta* that would have united the Malay peoples of the region. Unfortunately, however, *MAPHILINDO* was doomed by the subsequent armed confrontation between Malaysia and Indonesia over the establishment of the Federation of Malaysia in 1963, which joined peninsular Malaysia, Sarawak (the upper half of Indonesia's Kalimantan) and Sabah into one nation. In 1965, Macapagal lost his bid for a second term to Ferdinand E. Marcos, who had been president of the Philippine Senate and of Macapagal's own ruling Liberal Party. The Macapagal-Marcos split was triggered by Macapagal's refusal to give way to Marcos for the Liberal Party nomination. After it became apparent to Marcos that Macapagal would handily win the ruling party's nomination, and in effect killing his own presidential ambitions, Marcos bolted the Liberal Party and became the standard bearer of the opposition *Nacionalista* Party, which just happened to be casting around for a candidate who had the stature to defeat Macapagal in a head-to-head contest. Jumping from one political party to another is quite common in the Philippines' particularistic political culture; a convoluted system where party labels mean virtually nothing and expediency, not ideology, determines whether one remains with his original political party or go somewhere else.

Ferdinand E. Marcos remained in office for 21 years, from 1965 when he was elected to his first of two terms, through 1986, when he was ousted in a "people power" uprising and forced to flee to Hawaii where he lived in exile until his death in 1989. Marcos' victory over Macapagal came largely as a result of the former's strong stance vis-à-vis graft and corruption and promises to weed out corrupt government officials and rebuild the faltering economy. Before 1965, Marcos had served two terms in the House of Representatives, and later, two terms in the Philippine Senate. Marcos was on his second term in the Philippine Senate and serving as that body's president, when he bolted the ruling Liberal Party to become the opposition *Nacionalista* Party's presidential standard bearer. Marcos was larger than life—legal luminary, decorated war hero, and spellbinding orator—whose life and exploits were celebrated in cinema and books. Convicted of killing his father's main political rival, Marcos prepared for the bar exams while in prison. In spite of the unusual circumstances, however, Marcos obtained the highest average score in the bar exams with record-breaking performances in political and constitutional law. Upon admission to the bar, Marcos argued his own case before the Philippine Supreme Court and won a reversal of his earlier conviction. He served as a United States Army Forces in the Far East (USAFFE) commissioned officer in World War II and emerged from the war as its "most decorated hero." His whirlwind courtship of, and subsequent marriage to, Imelda Romualdez, a former beauty queen and niece of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, no doubt added to the burgeoning Marcos mystique in the eyes of Filipinos. In 1967, Marcos succeeded where two of his predecessors (Garcia and Macapagal) had



failed, *i.e.*, successfully co-founding the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) along with the leaders of Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and the former “republic” of South Viet Nam. Today, ASEAN has doubled in size to include all 10 nations (from the original five or six, if the “republic” of South Viet Nam is included) in the region, and has become one of the most viable and effective regional inter-governmental organizations in the world.

Like all his predecessors, Marcos discovered early on that improving the state of the economy was not an easy task. By the end of Marcos’ first term, chronic problems, such as high unemployment, double-digit inflation and government corruption had deteriorated to a new low. It was at this juncture when public dissatisfaction with the Marcos Administration turned into massive street demonstrations and protest. By the time the 1969 presidential election rolled around, talk was rife about impending revolution. In so many ways, the 1969 presidential election, which Marcos easily won, resembled the infamous 1949 electoral contest between Elpidio Quirino and Jose P. Laurel, Sr., won by the former. Widespread fraud, vote buying, terrorism and other election irregularities marred the 1949 election. The candidate who lost to Marcos in the 1969 election, Sergio Osmena, Jr., filed a formal election protest with the House of Representatives and then went into self-exile in the United States before the declaration of martial law in 1972. In the ensuing 14-year period (1972–1986), Marcos and his *Kilusang Bagong Lipunan* (KBL) or “New Society Movement” ruled the Philippines with an iron hand; by executive fiat, especially during the first 9 years of martial rule (1972–1981).

In 1981, Marcos “lifted” martial law and launched a hybrid “presidential-parliamentary” system called the *New Republic* that appeared to be part British, part French, and part Mexican. In January 1981, Marcos declared as “duly ratified” and in full force, the 1981 Constitution that served as the basic law for the *New Republic* during its brief existence. Among others things, the Philippines’ twin insurgencies—the Communist insurgency waged nationwide by the Communist Party of the Philippines-New People’s Army (CPP-NPA) and the Muslim separatist movement in Mindanao and Sulu waged by the *Moro* National Liberation Front-*Moro Bangsa* Army (MNLFBMA)—grew dramatically during the last 9 years of Marcos’ authoritarian rule. So too did public opposition to the regime, especially in the aftermath of Benigno “Ninoy” Aquino, Jr.’s brutal assassination at the Manila International Airport on August 21, 1983, on the latter’s return to the Philippines after 3 years of self-imposed exile in the United States. The beginning of the end for Marcos’ 21-year grip on power came after a February 1986 “snap election” ironically called at Marcos’ behest, resulted in the apparent election victory of Corazon Cojuangco-Aquino, Ninoy Aquino’s widow. The Marcos’ regime’s subsequent attempt to tamper with the election results ignited a “people power” uprising commonly referred to as *EDSA Uno* (*EDSA* is acronym for Epifanio de los Santos Avenue, the north-south highway between Camp Aguinaldo, headquarters of the Armed Forces of the Philippines, and Camp Crame, headquarters of the now-defunct Philippine Constabulary) where hundreds of thousands of anti-Marcos demonstrators gathered to call for an end to the martial-law regime.

## The Third Philippine Republic: Aquino to Arroyo

Corazon Cojuangco-Aquino took over the presidency on February 26, 1986, on the crest of *EDSA Uno*, the first “people power” uprising. Aquino left office on June 30, 1992,

6 “Mexican model” of a 6-year, 1-term only presidency, and as a result, Aquino was precluded from seeking reelection), with little to show in the way of accomplishments especially vis-à-vis the ailing economy and in solving the country’s deteriorating law and order situation. Although supporters and critics alike suggest that Aquino could have done “a lot more” to address the country’s chronic problems, she is generally credited with three major accomplishments: (1) the restoration of American-style democracy to the Philippines; (2) the reinstatement of Congress and the Judiciary as co-equal branches of the Executive branch; and, (3) the drafting and ratification, in record time, of the 1987 Constitution, regarded by legal scholars and experts as a “progressive” Constitution. On the debit side of the ledger, the Aquino presidency was marred by, among other things, five abortive *coups* led by the same group of AFP officers and men who spearheaded the successful military mutiny against the Marcos regime.

According to most observers, the 1989 abortive *coup* may well have succeeded in toppling the Aquino Government, had it not been for the timely intervention of the United States. Although the United States did not actually get involved in the fighting, it is generally believed that the scrambling of US aircraft based at Clark Air Force Base to undertake what were euphemistically called “persuasion flights,” did scare off the inferior *Tora Tora* aircraft used by the rebels to strafe and bomb government positions, including Malacanang Palace. Aquino was succeeded by her handpicked successor, Fidel V. Ramos, a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy and co-leader of the *coup* that toppled Marcos (the other person was Juan Ponce Enrile, Minister of National Defense at that time). As Aquino’s AFP Chief of Staff and later Secretary of National Defense, Ramos was credited for “saving” the Aquino Government and the Aquino family from the five abortive anti-regime uprisings referred to earlier. In handpicking Ramos as her successor, Aquino turned her back to House of Representatives Speaker Ramon V. Mitra, the official standard-bearer of the ruling party, *Laban ng Demokratikong Pilipino* (LDP). Ramos won the presidency by the slimmest of margins; a mere 21 percent plurality of the total vote, thanks to an electoral system that does not require a run-off election in the event that no candidate polls a majority of the total vote.

Compared to his immediate predecessor, Ramos did meet with modest success in improving the country’s moribund economy. According to experts, this was primarily the result of a three-pronged economic strategy that revolved around: (1) the privatization of government-owned corporations and divestment of stocks in corporations (*e.g.*, in the communications, transportation, steel and petroleum industry) where the government had controlling interest; (2) the easing of currency restrictions on the repatriation of profits by multinational corporations to their respective home bases specifically, and the creation of a more favorable economic climate for individual and corporate foreign investments, generally; and, (3) the passage of enabling “build, operate and transfer” legislation that opened the door for foreign corporations to participate in the Philippine infrastructure program, with little or no financial risk to the Philippine Government. During Ramos’ tenure as president, aggregate and *per capita* GDP figures improved dramatically; so too did annual economic growth rates—in real terms—and the volume of foreign investments that flowed into the Philippines. In another front, Ramos successfully negotiated an end to the MNLFBMA insurgency with the assistance of the government of Indonesia and the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC), although an MNLFB splinter group, the separatist Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) continued to battle the government long after Ramos left office and remains committed to its principal goal of an independent Islamic republic.

Joseph Ejercito Estrada (also known as “Erap”), former vice-president, city mayor, senator, movie star, and matinee idol, succeeded to the presidency after winning the 1998 presidential election over Ramos’ “anointed” successor, Speaker Jose de Venecia of the House of Representatives. Estrada’s lopsided victory over de Venecia—by far the largest margin of victory in Philippine election history on a *per capita* basis—was made possible by a massive outpouring of support from the *masa* (the masses), the millions of poor and destitute Filipinos who comprise the overwhelming majority of the population. Estrada’s campaign slogan, *Si Erap Para Sa Mahirap* (Erap is for the Poor) and his political party, *Laban ng Masang Pilipino* (LAMP), a blend of Edgardo Angara’s *Laban ng Demokratikong Pilipino* (Angara was Estrada’s vice-presidential candidate) and Estrada’s original *Lapian ng Masang Pilipino* (LMP), resonated with the masses in a big way. Unfortunately for Estrada’s *masa* supporters, however, the latter was unceremoniously forced out of office on January 20, 2001, barely 32 months into his 6-year term, and replaced by Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, in the aftermath of *EDSA Dos*, an uncanny reprise of the “people power” uprising that toppled Marcos 15 years earlier. Interestingly enough, *EDSA Dos* was led and orchestrated by the same cast of characters behind *EDSA Uno*, e.g., the Archbishop of Manila, the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines, two former presidents and the civilian and military leadership of the Armed Forces of the Philippines, with two additional notable characteristics: (1) the active involvement of the print and broadcast media in creating the climate that eventually led to Estrada’s “voluntary” resignation; and, (2) the key role played by the Philippine Supreme Court in providing the legal authority and basis for Macapagal-Arroyo’s assumption of the presidency.

Less than 5 months after taking office, Macapagal-Arroyo presided over a national election that pitted her administration’s People Power Coalition (PPC), an amorphous combination of mainstream and fringe political parties (*Aksyon, Lakas, Reporma, Liberal, Promdi*, etc.) against the opposition’s *Puwersa ng Masa* (PM), an equally loose political grouping whose senatorial slate included three pro-Estrada reelectionists (two of whom, Ponce Enrile and Defensor-Santiago lost), the deposed president’s wife, Luisa “Loi” Ejercito, a medical doctor by profession, and Estrada’s controversial chief law enforcement officer, Panfilo Lacson. Both Macapagal-Arroyo and Estrada stumped for their respective candidates, although in the case of Estrada, this ended on April 25, 2001, when Estrada was arrested and taken into custody to await trial before the *Sandiganbayan*, a constitutional anti-graft court, for alleged “plunder,” a capital non-bailable offense. Although Macapagal-Arroyo and the People Power Coalition worked hard and expended a lot of resources to register a “13-0 sweep” of the senatorial contest, only eight PPC candidates won. Parenthetically, *Puwersa ng Masa* succeeded in electing four senators—five, if an independent candidate “adopted” by PM as one of its own is added to the list—including Estrada’s wife, who had never before run for elective public office. Estrada and his supporters were understandably buoyed by Loi Estrada’s clear-cut election victory and viewed it as a “vindication” for the Estrada Administration.

Because of the post-election defection to the ruling PPC of three former *Laban ng Masang Pilipino* (LAMP) senators—the first two are a former movie actor and his son-in-law, a retired professional basketball player while the third defector was one of Estrada’s fiercest defenders during the latter’s impeachment trial—the 2001 Philippine Senate is virtually split down the middle, with the PPC enjoying a four-person edge over the opposition. Because of the Philippines’ particularistic political culture and the relative ease in which political officeholders in Congress and elsewhere jump from one political party

to another, however, it would not at all be inconceivable if the current Senate balance of power changes in the near future, especially as potential presidential candidates who are members of the body gear up for the 2004 presidential election. Indeed, since taking office in June 2001, the Senate has devoted most of its time conducting open-ended hearings on a litany of criminal allegations against three or four senators (two with the majority and two with the opposition), all of whom are reportedly considering a run for the presidency in 2004. Meanwhile, the long-awaited trial of Estrada and his son has begun, under serio-comic circumstances—the former chief executive appeared at the *Sandiganbayan* under heavy police escort in his slippers and with none of his nine lawyers in attendance—even as the Philippine Supreme Court grappled with the legality of the “plunder” law, a statute of dubious constitutionality that Estrada helped enact, when he was one of only two oppositionists in the Philippine Senate between 1986 and 1992.

Ironies and contradictions like these make Philippine politics interesting to watch, yet deeply disturbing at the same time. Estrada’s fall from grace has all the tawdry elements of a typical Filipino action movie—a virtuous hero, a heartless villain, betrayal, revenge and then, Estrada and supporters could only hope, eventual vindication. Whether it is art imitating life or life imitating art, the “villain” who turned Estrada in was, “like in the movies,” one of his “close” friends and drinking “buddies;” an unabashed self-confessed “plunderer” who took his “cut” for every peso of bribe money that he allegedly funneled into Estrada’s ersatz foundations and phantom bank accounts. Yet while the fallen Estrada languishes in “jail” (actually an air-conditioned suite at the country’s premiere government medical facility) and stripped of the office he had dreamed of occupying all his life, his chief accuser is scot-free and enjoying his newly found celebrity status as one of the hottest commodities in the country’s after-dinner lecture circuit; a highly sought after guest at political fundraisers and shindigs. Equally disturbing and ironic was the recent arrest by U.S. Federal law enforcement agents of a former head of the Presidential Commission on Good Government (PCGG)—established in 1986 shortly after Aquino took office, and tasked with the recovery of Marcos’ alleged “hidden” wealth—for allegedly selling fake gold bullion certificates to Treasury and FBI agents engaged in a sting operation.

### Discussion Questions on “History and Its Legacies”

- What are Spain’s principal legacies to its former colony?
- Would the Filipinos have remained loyal to the Spaniards had the latter been “getter” colonizers, taught the Filipinos Spanish language and culture and provided them access to free universal education?
- How much of the American decision to provoke a war with Spain and the eventual acquisition of the Philippines was influenced by the evangelicals of the day whose unabashed commitment to “manifest destiny” and the “white man’s burden” was matched only by Alfred Thayer Mahan’s absolute belief in the maxim of “...whoever controls the oceans and vital sea lanes, controls the world...”
- Why did the American goal of making the Philippines an *entrepot* in the Far East not materialize nor pan out?

- How did the Japanese, after a spectacular start and a wonderful slogan, *i.e.*, “Aisa for the Asiatic.” Which resonated with a large number of the Filipino elite initially, lose support so quickly and conversely, why did the Filipinos return to the bosom of the Americans?
- What were the positive legacies, if any, of Roxas, Quirino, Magsaysay, Garcia, Macapagal, Marcos, Aquino, Ramos and Estrada?
- Is graft and corruption endemic in Philippine society; a “way of life” and a mindset that is beyond cure; does it make a difference at all who is at the helm?

## Part III

### The Philippines Today

#### The Governmental System

The Philippines is currently governed by the 1987 Constitution ratified by the people on February 2, 1987, in a nationwide plebiscite. Except for a few permutations, *e.g.*, term-limits for all elective officials, a single 6-year term for the president, the party-list method of choosing a specified number of House members, etc., the 1987 Constitution closely resembles the 1935 Constitution, which governed the republic from 1946 until the proclamation of martial law in 1972. Technically speaking, the Philippines is a unitary-presidential system, headed by a popularly elected chief executive who is also the chief of state. Like the American form of government after which it was patterned, the Philippine Government consists of three co-equal branches—the legislature, presidency and judiciary—each of which is supreme within its own sphere but with the ability to check and balance the other. Under the 1987 Constitution, the president and vice-president are elected on separate tickets by a plurality of the popular vote to 6-year terms, and are barred from seeking reelection. The bicameral legislature, on the other hand, consists of a 221-member (an additional 50 sectoral members may be appointed by the president) House of Representatives (*Kapulungan ng mga Kinatawan*) and a 24-member upper chamber called the Senate (*Senado*).

Because of term limits, members of the House of Representatives may only serve for a maximum of 9 years or three 3-year terms, and represent discrete congressional districts constituted on the basis of geographical balance and population. Members of the Senate, on the other hand, are elected nationally for no more than two consecutive 6-year terms, for a maximum of 12 years. The House of Representatives turns over every 3 years while the Philippine Senate, like its American counterpart, is a continuing body and senatorial terms are staggered in such a way that only one-half of the body is elected every 3 years. The judiciary is dual and hierarchical with the regional trial courts at the bottom of the national judicial pyramid, the Court of Appeal in the middle and the 15-member Supreme Court at its apex. Complementing the national constitutional courts are provincial and local courts of limited and

specialized jurisdiction located in various municipalities, towns, and cities throughout the country. National constitutional court judges are appointed by the president on the recommendation of the Judicial and Bar Council and serve until the mandatory retirement age of 70 years. In addition, a special anti-graft court called the *Sandiganbayan* was established by the 1987 Constitution and has jurisdiction over cases involving misfeasance or malfeasance in office by elective and appointive public officials. Prosecutorial responsibility for cases before the *Sandiganbayan* belongs to the Office of the Ombudsman, a constitutional entity independent of the legislative and executive branches of government.

A cabinet whose members are appointed by the president subject to the advice and consent of the Commission on Appointments (CA), a legislative bicameral and bipartisan body, compose the rest of the executive branch. Also needing CA confirmation before their appointments become final, are other “high government officials,” including foreign service officers with the rank of ambassador and above, various commissioners (such as the Customs Commissioner and commissioners in the Commission on Elections, the constitutional body that oversees and conducts the country’s triennial elections), bureau chiefs and flag-level officers in both the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) and the Philippine National Police (PNP). Law enforcement is the responsibility of the Philippine National Police, the organization that replaced the now-defunct Philippine Constabulary and the National Bureau of Investigation, the chief investigative arm of the Department of Justice. The day-to-day operations of government at the local and provincial levels are in the hands of elected governors, provincial boards, mayors, city councils, etc., in the country’s 73 provinces, 61 chartered cities and some 4,000 or so municipalities. Finally, the lowest grassroots-level administrative unit in the Philippine governmental system is the *barangay* (formerly called “barrio”), headed by an elected *barangay* captain, accountable to both the inhabitants of the *barangay*, as well as to municipal, provincial, and national officials.

## Key Actors in Philippine Politics

There are basic categories of actors in Philippine politics, *e.g.*: (1) those who favor and support the government; (2) those who are opposed to or strongly critical of it; and, (3) those who maintain a neutral position. Among the actors under the first category are the: (1) traditional political-economic elite; (2) Roman Catholic Church (RCC); and, (3) the Armed Forces of the Philippines; while the second category includes, although is not necessarily limited to, the: (1) Communist Party of the Philippines-New People’s Army; (2) Moro Islamic Liberation Front; (3) moderate political opposition; and, (4) so-called radical left-wing organizations. As in the United States, the political or ideological orientation of each key actor is not etched in steel and may shift from time to time, depending on the circumstances of the times. For example, while the Catholic Church was a staunch supporter of the Aquino regime from beginning to end (1986–1992), it was lukewarm to the Ramos Administration (1992–1998), perhaps because of the fact that Ramos—a Methodist—was not Catholic and the latter’s support of artificial contraception as a method of family planning and population control, policies vehemently opposed by the RCC. When Juan Flavio, former Secretary of Health and point-person in the Ramos Administration’s family planning program, ran for the Senate in 1995, the Catholic Church expended a lot of time, money and resources, to ensure Flavio’s defeat. Fortunately, for family planning, however, Flavio not only won in 1995, he was overwhelmingly reelected to a second 6-year term earlier this year. In like manner, certain organizations and individuals with ties to the country’s left-wing, who supported Estrada’s presidential candidacy in

1998, perhaps because of Estrada's "nationalist credentials" and 1991 "no" vote on the proposed extension of the U.S.-RP Basing Agreement, turned against Estrada in January 2001 and joined the *EDSA Dos* "people uprising," which resulted in Estrada's forced resignation from office. In the 1998 presidential election, Sin issued pastoral letters to the "flock" urging Filipino Roman Catholics to repudiate Estrada as "morally unfit" for the presidency. After Estrada's inauguration, however, Sin moderated his criticism of the Estrada Administration, became a frequent palace visitor and shortly thereafter, was awarded a commemorative medal by none other than Estrada himself.

## The Traditional Political-Economic Elite

The traditional political-economic elite includes remnants of the old-landed gentry, such as the Cojuangcos of Tarlac and the Yulos of Laguna whose flagship properties, the *Hacienda Luisita* and Canlubang Sugar Estate, respectively, have so far managed to avoid being subjected to land reform laws such as the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP) enacted during the Aquino Administration. Also part of the traditional political-economic elite are the entrepreneurial-business class exemplified by influential *taipan* families like the Tans, Gokongweis, Gatchialians, Roxas-Chuas, Sys, Tans, Yaps, etc., and Spanish *insulare* families like the Aboitizes, Aranetas, Elizaldes, Sorianos and Zobel de Ayalas. These wealthy families, either singly or in concert with others, bankrolled individual candidates for office or entire slates of candidates as an "investment in the future of the country." Most were content to remain in the background, although some family members did hold political office on various occasions, *e.g.*, Fernando Lopez (vice-president to both Quirino and Marcos); Gaudencio Antonino, Aurelio Montinola, Gil Puyat, etc. (all former senators); and Jose Cojuangco, Jr., Albertito Lopez, Manuel Villar, etc. (all former members of the House of Representatives). As a group, the traditional political-economic elite influenced the formulation and implementation of public policy and protected their interests through surrogates in the legislative and executive branches of government, an arrangement that worked well for decades, especially in the context of the country's vaunted *utang na loob* value system. A more recent addition to the traditional political-economic elite is the Makati Business Club (MBC), which played a key role in the overthrow of the Marcos regime in 1986, and the ouster of Estrada in 2001. The leadership and rank and file of the MBC are dominated by relatively young MBAs from high-profile American business schools like Chicago, Harvard, Stanford, or Wharton.

## The Armed Forces of the Philippines

Because of its monopoly of the organized forces of violence, well-delineated chain of command and an increasingly politicized officer corps, the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) is one of the most powerful political actors in the country. Should it choose to do so, the AFP could either grab power for itself or remain in the background and play the role of a power-broker either by withdrawing support of an incumbent regime (as it did in 1986 in the case of Marcos and in 2001, with respect to Estrada) or conversely, endorsing an individual or group poised to take over the reins of government. The fact that the AFP, both at *EDSA Uno* in 1986 and at *EDSA Dos*, in 2001, seemed content to play second fiddle to Corazon Aquino and Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, respectively, is to a large extent, attributable to the socialization of Filipinos and the AFP officer corps and rank and file into the principle of civilian



supremacy over the military. It is noteworthy, for example, that during *EDSA Dos*, the AFP leadership reportedly rejected a proposal to constitute itself into a military *junta* and serve as a caretaker government while the modalities of a peaceful transference of power from Estrada to Arroyo were sorted out. Had the top AFP leadership echelon succumbed to the temptation of grabbing power for itself, the country may very well have been plunged into chaos or even worse, a costly and destructive civil war. Yet, there is no question about the fact that Estrada's hand was forced into peacefully giving up the presidency, by the timely defection of the Secretary of National Defense, the AFP Chief of Staff and various service chiefs. Until that particular moment, the political situation was so fluid and volatile that anything could have happened.

## The Roman Catholic Church

Some 75 million Filipinos, out of an estimated population of 83 million, identify themselves as Roman Catholic and proudly point to the fact that the Philippines' is the only predominantly Christian country in Asia. James B. Reuter, S.J., of the Ateneo de Manila University, a naturalized Filipino and a long-time Philippine resident, perhaps put it best when he declared, rather breathlessly, "... because God has touched this nation," when asked to explain the success of the bloodless *coup d'etat* that toppled the Marcos martial law regime in 1986. As pointed out earlier, however, only about 50 percent of this total number may be considered devout, practicing Roman Catholics who regularly attend Sunday Mass and observe holydays of obligation; the rest are Roman Catholic in name only, roughly analogous to the *Muslim istatistik* category in neighboring Indonesia. Nevertheless, there is no question that the RCC is one of the most dominant and powerful social and political actors in the country. It is generally assumed, for example, that the "people power" uprisings, *EDSA Uno* (1986) and *EDSA Dos* (2001), materialized, because the RCC, led by Jaime Cardinal Sin and the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines (CBCP), successfully mobilized and organized the Catholic faithful to march to the "*EDSA Shrine*" and join ongoing or anticipated anti-regime demonstrations. With thousands of clerical workers, parish churches and other religious-oriented institutions (schools, orphanages, hospitals, etc.) and countless lay leaders spread throughout the country, the RCC has a readymade infrastructure for mass action either in support of, or in opposition to, any government.

There are three identifiable blocs within the RCC, namely: the conservative, moderate and progressive blocs. Nominally headed by Ricardo Cardinal Vidal, archbishop of Cebu, and one of two Filipino Cardinals, the conservative bloc believes that members of the Catholic clergy should confine their activities to purely spiritual matters—ministering to the needs of their flock—and if at all possible, to stay away from secular political issues and questions. On the other hand, the moderate bloc of the RCC, with whom an overwhelming majority of the current CBCP membership is identified (some estimates put the number at 80 percent) is led by Jaime Cardinal Sin, archbishop of Manila and the other Filipino in the RCC's College of Cardinals. Unlike the highly reclusive Vidal, Sin is a high-profile religious leader who has not shied away from involvement in controversial issues and events. Indeed, as mentioned earlier, Sin had no qualms whatsoever in openly endorsing—through homilies from the pulpit and pastoral letters to the faithful—specific candidates for the presidency (*e.g.*, Corazon Aquino, Ramon Mitra, Jr., and Jose de Venecia in the 1986, 1992, and 1998 elections, respectively) or in condemning others as "morally unfit for the presidency," *e.g.*, Ferdinand Marcos in 1986, Fidel Ramos in 1992, and Joseph Estrada in 1998.

By his own admission, Cardinal Sin was also a central figure in both *EDSA Uno* and *EDSA Dos* and in countless public interviews since, seems to relish his self-appointed role as kingmaker and regime-killer, rolled into one. Citing past papal encyclicals such as Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum*, John XXIII's *Mater et Magistra* and Paul VI's *Poppulorum Progressio*, among others, the progressive bloc contends that the Catholic clergy has a moral obligation to minister to the temporal needs of its flock or when called upon, to speak out against injustice and egregious abuses of power by government authorities and the exploitation of the poor by the country's privileged classes. During the martial law period, the progressive bloc of the RCC functioning through the Association of Major Religious Superiors of the Philippines (AMRSP) refused to temporize or enter into any kind of accommodations with the Marcos regime. Activist priests, many of whom were advocates of *liberation theology*, assisted displaced peasants organize against the government or helped set up Basic Christian Communities (BCCs), called *kristianong katilingban* in Hiligaynon-speaking areas of the country, as vehicles for social protest at the grassroots-level.

The moderate bloc of the RCC, under the leadership of Sin, pursued a policy of *critical collaboration* vis-à-vis the Marcos regime during “martial law proper” (1972–1981). In accordance with said policy, the moderate bloc of the RCC supported “correct” government programs, such as land reform, but condemned “morally reprehensible acts,” such as the torture of suspected political dissidents and the denial of basic human rights. Apparently, the *quid pro quo* for the RCC's critical collaboration policy were: (1) the shelving of legislative proposals that would have stripped religious organizations of their tax-exempt status; (2) the scuttling of bills that sought to institute absolute divorce (cf., limited or “bed and board” divorce) in the Philippines; and, (3) the discontinuation or deceleration of government-sponsored, birth-control and family planning programs. The RCC hierarchy praised the “lifting” of martial law on January 17, 1981, with no less than Sin himself urging the country's Roman Catholics to give Marcos the “benefit of the doubt” on the latter's assurance to return the country to political normalcy. Although the accommodation between the RCC and the Marcos regime was subsequently marred by the controversy over who should serve as official host—the government or the RCC—to Pope John Paul II's 1981 state visit to the Philippines, church-state relations up until January 1983, were relatively harmonious. In late January 1983, the CBCP withdrew from the Church-Military Liaison Committee, created in 1973 for the purpose of investigating alleged military abuses. A month later, on February 15, 1983, the CBCP released a pastoral letter, read in thousands of parishes throughout the country, denouncing the Marcos regime for repression, graft and economic mismanagement.

The CBCP decision followed a spate of military raids on church facilities, especially in Samar and Negros Occidental (where the BCCs or *kristianong katilingban* were most active), and the large-scale arrest of clerical workers and lay leaders suspected of involvement in “subversive” activities. In an unrelated event, Sin became embroiled in a public debate with government spokesmen and Imelda Marcos over questions of morality and art. In retrospect, two separate events served as the catalyst that moved the RCC away from its policy of critical collaboration to one of open opposition to the Marcos regime, e.g.,: (1) the brutal assassination of Benigno “Ninoy” Aquino, Jr., on August 21, 1983, as the latter returned home from self-exile in the United States, and the prolonged public outrage and anger that it provoked; and, (2) the Marcos regime's attempts to tamper with the results of the February 1986 snap election, that Corazon Aquino, Ninoy's widow, apparently won. The rest, as the saying goes, is history. Three years

later, in late February 1986, the RCC and Sin mobilized the Roman Catholic faithful to proceed to Epifanio de los Santos Avenue (EDSA) between Camp Aguinaldo (the general headquarters of the AFP) and Camp Crame (the general headquarters of the now-defunct Philippine Constabulary) to “defend” a small group of soldiers, affiliated with the Reform Armed Forces Movement (RAM), who had earlier joined Juan Ponce Enrile and Fidel V. Ramos, in a mutiny against Marcos. Heeding Sin’s entreaties and exhortations broadcast over the facilities of Radio *Veritas*, hundreds of thousands of Roman Catholic faithful—of all ages, occupations, callings and social backgrounds—did proceed to *EDSA* and at the end of the day, accomplished what many thought was impossible: overthrow a repressive regime and send it into exile without a single shot being fired in anger.

## The Technocratic Elite

One of the distinguishing features of the Philippines in relation to other developing nations in Asia and elsewhere is the presence of a large number of well-educated and highly skilled technocrats in positions of responsibility and power. This is an obvious upshot of the fact that the Philippines, with the possible exception of Singapore, has one of the largest pools of college-educated men and women in the region. It is interesting to note, for example, that even in the House of Representatives and Senate, there are a growing number of articulate and well-educated members (one House group identified with the opposition is referred to by the media as the “Bright Boys,” because its members are Ivy League graduates). This is in sharp contrast to the days when cabinet positions and directorships of government bureaus were held for the most part by old-school politicians, political lame ducks and the protégés of old-school politicians. The few technocrats who had an opportunity to work for the government generally declined to do so, because of the conventional wisdom that the old-school politicians and political kingmakers made it very difficult for the technocrats to do their jobs. During the martial law period, Marcos enjoyed great success in inducing technocrats to opt for government service instead of the private sector, so did Ramos and to a lesser extent, Estrada and Macapagal-Arroyo. It remains to be seen whether greater involvement by technocrats in policy formulation and implementation (especially with respect to the economy) will yield better results overall.

A perennial criticism of technocrats as a group—by nationalists and the public as a whole—is that they are too “elitist” in outlook, contemptuous of the “common man” and “out of touch with the real world.” In fact, this sentiment was expressed by Estrada and his followers after the latter’s ouster from the presidency; from its inception to its denouement, *EDSA Dos* was an “elitist plot” bankrolled by the entrepreneurial-business elite, e.g., the Makati Business Club, and promoted by the “elitist media” to oust a populist leader and deny his legions of impoverished and non-elite supporters their place in the sun. To prove their contention, Estrada’s supporters noted that pro-Estrada rallies attended mainly by poor Filipinos were not covered by the major print and broadcast media or if covered at all, invariably denigrated as “staged” and “paid” demonstrations. Conversely, “people-power” or anti-Estrada demonstrations, which featured political, business and entertainment celebrities and the elite, were thoroughly covered and reported. The technocratic elite is also faulted by various nationalist groups as being “too westernized” and pro-American; witting or unwitting agents of U.S. multinational corporations and the International Monetary Fund-World Bank (IMF-WB). Indeed, according to the nationalists, the various models and paradigms that have guided Philippine economic and developmental policy for nearly

two decades, have been American in origin and for the most part, heavily influenced by the IMF-WB. The nationalists and their supporters reject the technocratic notion that the key to economic growth and prosperity is industrialization—financed by foreign capital and long-term loans from the IMF-WB and other western financial lending institutions—suggesting that while such an economic strategy may, arguably, yield short-term benefits such as jobs and increased purchasing power, its long-term implications are detrimental to the country as a whole.

## **Communist Party of the Philippines—New People’s Army**

The Communist Party of the Philippines (cf., the *Partidong Komunista ng Pilipinas* or *PKP* of the 1950’s) was formally founded in 1969–1970 in Tarlac, in the central Luzon region. At the height of its power in the late 1970’s and early 1980’s, the New People’s Army (NPA), the military arm of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP), was believed to have had an estimated armed strength of from 25,000–26,000 armed partisans and a mass-base in excess of 2,000,000 throughout the Philippines’ 73 odd provinces. Unlike the *PKP-Huks* 2 decades earlier, the CPP-NPA conducted military operations nationwide, and its cadres were more highly ideological and better schooled on the issues and forces underlying the revolution. After the ouster of the Marcos regime in 1986, the collapse of the former Soviet Union—although not a supporter of the CPP, a Beijing-oriented communist party, the USSR-supported wars of national liberation worldwide and was indirectly helpful in fundraising especially in Europe—and the unraveling of the world Communist movement in 1990–1991, the CPP like various Communist parties in other parts of the world, experienced a steady decline in its ability to recruit fresh NPA cadres to wage war against the Philippine Government. The latter state of affairs was further exacerbated by a general amnesty program offered to “all rebels of the left and right” by the Ramos Administration in the mid-1990’s, of which thousands of NPA guerrillas and right-wing rebels (mostly former AFP officers and men who participated in the five abortive *coups* against the Aquino regime) took advantage. The net effect of the Ramos Administration’s amnesty program on ongoing insurgent movements like the CPP-NPA and the MILF was to hurt their recruitment efforts and further decimate their ranks.

Today, the strength of the CPP-NPA is believed to have been reduced to a mere 4,000–6,000 armed cadres. Even worse, the CPP-NPA has split up into two main factions, reportedly over the issue of strategy—one faction wants to shift the emphasis of the “struggle” to urban guerrilla warfare while the other faction continues to adhere to the Maoist concept of protracted guerrilla warfare waged from the countryside, designed to eventually encircle the cities—further diminishing the effectivity and solidarity of the Philippine Communist movement. The putative founder of the CPP-NPA and chief advocate of the strategy of protracted guerrilla warfare has been living in exile at Utrecht in the Netherlands—along with leaders of the National Democratic Front (NDF), the left-wing umbrella organization that has been involved in on again, off again, negotiations with the Philippine Government since the late 1980’s—after the failure of an attempt at a negotiated settlement of the Communist insurgency initiated by Corazon Aquino in November 1986. At the present time, previously scheduled peace talks between the Philippine Government and the NDF in Oslo, Norway, have been suspended by the Macapagal-Arroyo regime after a series of unexpected NPA attacks and ambushes on AFP troops and the broad-daylight assassination of the former governor of Cagayan and member of the House of Representatives this last summer. A CPP-

NPA comeback could not be entirely ruled out, however, especially if economic and social conditions and rampant lawlessness in the Philippines continues to worsen in the months ahead.

## The Moderate Political Opposition

The moderate political opposition is a loose and shifting coalition of various groups, some temporary and others more or less permanent, bound together by common opposition to Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo and her People Power Coalition (PPC). The main opposition political party around which the anti-Arroyo *Pwersa ng Masa* coalition revolves is the *Laban ng Demokratikong Pilipino* (LDP), headed by Edgardo Angara, former president of the University of the Philippines, Estrada's vice-presidential running-mate in 1998 and executive secretary during the waning months of the Estrada presidency. In addition to the LDP, the other political parties that were, in one way or the other, affiliated with the *Pwersa ng Masa* coalition are: (1) Joseph Estrada's *Partido ng Masang Pilipino* (PMP); (2) Eduardo Cojuangco's Nationalist People's Coalition (NPC); and, (3) and the Marcoses' *Kilusang Bagong Lipunan* (KBL). *Laban ng Demokratikong Pilipino* (Fight for Philippine Democracy) was organized in early 1978 to serve as a platform for various individuals who wanted to run for seats in the unicameral *Batasang Pambansa* (National Assembly) against President Marcos' handpicked slate of candidates. The LDP ticket was headed by Benigno Aquino, Jr. (Corazon Aquino's martyred spouse), who waged a valiant but futile campaign from his jail cell. All of *Laban's* 24 candidates in the Metro Manila area, some of whom were top vote-getters in previous elections, lost to Marcos' KBL.

As a political party, the Nationalist People's Coalition (NPC) was organized in 1992 to launch Eduardo Cojuangco's bid for the presidency. A former Tarlac governor, member of the House of Representatives and wealthy entrepreneur, Cojuangco was a protégé and business "crony" of Marcos. In spite of his close identification with the Marcos regime and allegations of "unexplained wealth," however, Cojuangco placed a close third to Ramos, the eventual winner, and runner-up Miriam Defensor-Santiago. To put things in proper perspective, the combined votes of Cojuangco and Imelda Marcos—the other presidential candidate closely linked to the fallen dictator for obvious reasons—exceeded the number of votes garnered by eventual winner Ramos. Joseph Ejercito Estrada, Cojuangco's vice-presidential candidate in the 1992 presidential election, was elected overwhelmingly and obtained more votes than all the other vice-presidential candidates combined. Five years later, Estrada left the NPC to found his own party, the *Partido ng Masang Pilipino*, later renamed *Laban ng Masang Pilipino* (LAMP) that became the *de facto* ruling party on June 30, 1998, after Estrada was sworn into office as the Philippines' ninth post-war chief executive. As is customary in Philippine political circles, a large number of *Lakas* (the ruling party at that time) congressional, provincial, and municipal officials defected *en masse* to LAMP and remained affiliated with the latter political party until the House of Representatives voted articles of impeachment against Estrada on November 13, 2000, when the same politicians rejoined *Lakas* and signed on to become part of Macapagal-Arroyo's People Power Coalition. The third political party that supported the *Pwersa ng Masa* coalition in 2001 was the *Kilusang Bagong Lipunan* (KBL) or New Society Movement, founded in the mid-1970s by Ferdinand Marcos and nurtured after the dictator's death in 1989 by Marcos' widow Imelda (elected to a seat in the House of Representatives in 1995), two of the Marcos children, Ferdinand, Jr. and Maria Imelda (better known as "Bong Bong" and "Imee," incumbent governor of Ilocos Norte and member of the House of Representatives, respectively), and a fairly significant number

of diehard followers concentrated primarily in northern Luzon and eastern Visayas.

## The Economy

The Philippine economy—a mixture of agriculture, light industry, and supporting services—is in a period of decline. Partly as a ripple effect of the 1997 Asian financial crisis and partly because of nagging internal political and social problems, the annual growth rate of the Philippine economy plummeted to a virtual zero in 1998 (from a healthy 5.0 percent the year before) as Ramos, credited by many for dramatic improvements in the economy during a 6-year period, prepared to leave office. Like other nations in the region, with the exception of Singapore, the Philippines has been beset by chronic economic problems, such as skyrocketing unemployment, high inflation, low *per capita* income, budgetary deficits, and since 1972, heavy foreign borrowings. These economic woes have been exacerbated over the years by government corruption in high places and in somewhat of a paradox, the so called “revolution of rising expectations” especially on the part of young college graduates cranked out annually by the country’s diploma mills in the tens of thousands, who are unable to find jobs. The latter is the principal reason why Filipino degree-holders, many of them with little or no marketable skills, leave the Philippines for menial jobs overseas—in North America, Western Europe, Southeast and East Asia, and the Middle East. Demeaning as the latter state of affairs might be to the Filipino elite and emerging middle class, the phenomenon of over a million overseas Filipino workers has been quite beneficial to the economy and the nation as a whole. Not only have Filipino overseas workers remitted badly needed foreign exchange to their families and relatives in the Philippines over the years; the government-supported program has also functioned as a safety valve and has served to defuse potential social and political unrest at home.

With an estimated *per capita* income of US\$3,800 in 2000, (cf., Singapore’s US\$26,500 on the high end, and Cambodia’s US\$1,300, on the low end), the Philippines is in the lower third of the *per capita* income spectrum. Although some of the Philippines’ economic problems were arguably triggered by exogenous factors (*e.g.*, skyrocketing crude oil prices in the late 1990s and most of 2000, a chronically depressed commodities market and the 1997 Asian economic crisis), some commentators contend that the economic downturn is the result of flawed government policies and the climate of political uncertainty that pervades the country in the aftermath of the Estrada Government’s ouster at the beginning of the year. Some of the reasons for the sharp decline in the economy’s annual growth rate (from an impressive 5.0 percent in 1997 to 3.0 and 3.6 percent in 1999 and 2000, respectively) are: (1) reliance on foreign borrowings to finance the government’s infrastructure programs; (2) the pursuit of a policy of import substitution for a prolonged period; and (3) the naïve assumption that an industrial base could be built on the shoulders of a small group of foreign investors, who were expected to plow back their earnings into the economy in the form of expanded plant capacity, hiring more workers, etc., instead of repatriating these to their home bases. As it turned out, many foreign investors were scared off by the widening Asian financial crisis and the ensuing devaluation of the local currency, that they have decided to withdraw from the Philippines (capital flight), at least for now.

The problem of high unemployment, estimated at 10 percent in 2000—a rather misleading piece of statistic since the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) does not make a distinction between the “partly employed” and “grossly underemployed,” on the one hand, and those who are “fully employed,”

on the other—is bound to worsen in the years ahead if the country’s population growth rate (2.03 percent in 2000) remains at current levels. Even the recent downturn in crude oil prices will not necessarily benefit the Philippines’ immediately, because of the large number of overseas workers who could lose their jobs should the Middle-Eastern OPEC nations run into cash-flow problems. A similar fate may await Filipino construction firms and workers who are involved in ongoing projects in nations like Saudi Arabia, not only because of depressed oil prices but the cloud of political uncertainty that hovers over the region. Needless to say, the forced repatriation of a significant number of Filipino overseas workers is bound to complicate even further the unemployment picture at home. More than anything, however, the most difficult task that the current government faces is how to narrow the ever widening gap between rich and poor. According to the government’s own Commission on Population and the National Statistical Coordination Board, 40 percent of the population or some 30.6 million Filipinos live below the “poverty line,” pegged at P12, 000 (US\$240 at prevailing exchange rates). While the minimum daily wage of a factory worker in Metro Manila is P255 and the “monthly living wage” is P8, 036.60—the highest in the country—this is far below P191, 878.40, the amount that a family of six must earn every year to “live decently” in Metro Manila.

## Philippine Foreign Policy

Philippine foreign policy has revolved around three basic guideposts since the birth of the Second Philippine Republic in 1946, *e.g.*: (1) active support of, and involvement in, the United Nations (UN) and its various organs and specialized agencies; (2) continuing friendship and partnership with the United States; and, (3) close friendship and cooperation with other Asian countries. As a charter member of the United Nations, the Philippines has been a principal player in the world body, especially in the General Assembly and Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) since 1945. The late Carlos P. Romulo, one of the world’s best known diplomats of his time, served as president of the General Assembly in 1950, and for many years as the Philippines’ Permanent Representative to the United Nations. Another Filipino diplomat who served multiple terms as Philippine Permanent Representative to the world body was the late Salvador P. Lopez, who played a key role in the drafting of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. A third Filipino diplomat, the late Rafael M. Salas, served as director-general of UNFPA until his untimely death in the mid-1980’s. During the Korean conflict, the Philippines was a full participant of the United Nations Expeditionary Force (UNEF) authorized by the 1950 Uniting for Peace Resolution and has been a participant in other UN peace-keeping efforts, including UNTAET (United Nations Transitional Authority in East Timor) tasked with overseeing East Timor’s transition to independence. The Philippines has also been an active player in the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), hosting UNCTAD V in 1979.

The second guidepost—continuing friendship and partnership with the United States of America—is the result of a long love-hate relationship that dates back to the turn of the 19th century, when the United States decided to acquire the Philippines from Spain after the Spanish-American War. Filipino and American soldiers fought side by side during World War II and in the campaign to liberate the Philippines from Japan in 1944–1945. Although Filipino-American relations have had some difficult moments, *e.g.*, when the Philippine Senate voted to terminate the RP-U.S. Military Bases Agreement in 1991, the special friendship between the two countries has endured and remains as strong as ever. Apparently, as pointed

out earlier, even the termination of the RP-U.S. Military Bases Agreement in 1991, and the “falling out” that ensued, has not diminished the strength of the U.S.-Philippines bilateral relationship. Indeed, two of the senators who voted against the extension of the Military Bases Agreement (MBA) in 1991, became ardent advocates of the Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) 8 years later. In fact, no sooner had the VFA been ratified by the Philippine Senate when Defense Secretary Orlando Mercado, during a trip to the United States, started talking about the need to “revisit” the RP-U.S. Mutual Defense Treaty to determine if some language could be added to the treaty that obligates the United States to come to the Philippines’ assistance if she were to get involved in a military tussle over the Spratly Islands.

The third guidepost has assumed even greater significance as a driver of the country’s foreign policy since the founding of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in 1967, although the Bali Treaty, ASEAN’s founding document, was not signed until 1976. Since 1976, ASEAN has evolved into a viable and effective vehicle for political and economic cooperation in the region. In addition to affording Filipinos an opportunity to showcase their leadership skills vis-à-vis other countries in the region, ASEAN has provided a symbolic rite of passage, as it were, for the Philippines; from being a “tail to the American kite”—as Jawaharlal Nehru derisively referred to the Philippines at the Bandung Conference in 1955—to that of a full-fledged Asian country with roots in Asia and a distinctly Asian identity. Philippine foreign policy was fundamentally reoriented in the mid-1970s to take advantage of the triple *détente* and *rapprochement* that was going on between and among the United States, the former Soviet Union, and the People’s Republic of China. In addition to the establishment of diplomatic and commercial relations with the two socialist bloc giants, the Philippines also expanded its diplomatic presence in sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. So far, the country’s new foreign policy outlook appears to have boosted Philippine credibility abroad, especially in the eyes of developing countries, which viewed the change as much as an effort to expand the country’s international horizons as it was to lessen Philippine dependence on the United States.

## Contemporary Problems and Prospects for the Future

Until relatively recently, Filipinos were regarded by other Asians as an “aberration” of sorts—an Asian people located in Asia but whose culture, political system, language, social mores, and religion were Western, not Asian. Even Filipino names are mostly Hispanic or Western in etymology and derivation; entries in Manila’s telephone directory have a lot more in common with telephone directories in Madrid or Mexico City than Kuala Lumpur or Jakarta. Before the advent of authoritarian rule in 1972, Filipinos were told that the Philippines is the “third largest English-speaking country in the world,” the “only Christian country in Asia,” and had the “freest press in the world.” Before 1972, Filipinos told anyone willing to listen that authoritarian rule was not possible in the Philippines because of the country’s free and unfettered press and institutionalized checks and balances built into the political system itself. The Philippines is not a “banana republic,” Claro M. Recto, the great nationalist of the 1950’s used to intone whenever the issue of the country’s potential descent into dictatorship became the subject of conversation in the Senate. But “banana republic” or not, authoritarian rule did come to the Philippines in 1972 and remained in place for nearly 14 years. Today, more than 15 years after the restoration of American-style democracy in the Philippines, the country is not all that changed. The same prominent families that dominated Philippine electoral politics prior to the imposition of martial law in 1972 continue to lord it



over the political arena, to the exclusion of others. Even term-limits and an explicit provision in the 1987 Constitution proscribing “political dynasties” has not prevented the traditional political elite from putting up their spouses, children, grandchildren, in-laws, siblings, etc., regardless of qualifications, to run on their behalf. Indeed, Philippine electoral politics has become a true family affair, *e.g.*, the sons of three current members of the Philippine Senate (Barbers, Biazon, and Cayetano) are members of the House of Representatives; two senators are estranged cousins (Sergio Osmena III and John Osmena), and the brother and spouse of two more senators (Oreta and Villar, respectively) are members of the House as well.

Filipinos also love to tell foreigners that the Philippines is a free country; the “showcase of American democracy in the Far East,” even as they contend that the country needs a “strong leader” to whip it into line; a leader who could stand up to the political warlords and Chinese-Filipino *taipans* and engender a sense of national discipline, cohesion, and seriousness of purpose. The freewheeling nature of Filipinos is perhaps best symbolized by the *jeepney*, the closest to a Philippine mass transit system and an enduring metaphor for Filipino creativity, practicality, and resourcefulness. This freewheeling nature is a bit related to *abilidad*—the knack of putting one over the other person and getting away with it or the skill to surreptitiously blend into the front-end of a long line without causing a commotion. Over the years, there have been conflicting images of Filipino society by Filipinos and their friends. Some invariably speak of the Philippines as a land of delicate beauty and charm; of a friendly and hospitable people, and a society steeped in democratic and libertarian values. Filipinos who subscribe to this school of thought take umbrage at such American characterizations of Philippine politics as “wild and wooly,” “bazaar-like,” and “Dodge City East.” Whenever the foreign press characterized Philippine elections as marred by “fraud,” “violence,” “vote-buying,” and other “irregularities,” subscribers to the latter school of thought were quick to point out that Philippine elections were no more fraudulent than Chicago’s, and Philippine political bosses no more cunning nor corrupt than the old bosses of Tammany Hall. The other image of the Philippines—a very negative and unflattering one—is that of a society where corruption is a “way of life;” a violent society that puts little value on the sanctity of human life; a nation mired in grinding poverty juxtaposed with almost limitless affluence. The pejorative nickname “Dodge City East” that some Americans gave the Philippines in the 1960’s and 1970’s, invariably evoked images of gun-toting and pistol-packing citizens. Metro Manila and other Philippine cities were dirty, filled with slums, squatters and uncollected garbage; and the streets teemed with child-beggars, pickpockets, prostitutes, and a whole host of other unsavory characters.

When perceptions differ greatly, the truth usually lies somewhere in between. Although it is true that the Filipinos have many vices, they have many virtues as well; and while there is a large number of corrupt public officials out to feather their nests at the expense of the people, there are also legions of officials and civil servants who are scrupulously honest, work very hard, live within their means, and remain poor for the rest of their lives. Flawed as elections may have been during the Second and Third Republics (1946–1972, 1986 to the present) these exercises did consistently provide a mechanism for the peaceful transference of power from one elected leader to the other. If there were any violent incidents at all during elections, these usually involved over zealous and fanatical followers out to impress their political patrons and employers. And until *EDSA Uno* in 1986, the Philippines has never experienced a *coup d’etat*, if indeed *EDSA Uno* was one. In the area of the economy, it is significant to note that among the 10

Southeast Asian countries, the Philippines fared better than most of her Southeast Asian neighbors in dealing with, and recovering from, the Asian economic crisis that originated in Thailand in May 1997. Nevertheless, the Philippines continues to face serious problems, not the least of which is the restoration of the faltering economy to some semblance of health. The Philippines also faces serious law and order problems, *e.g.*: (1) the criminal activities of the Abu Sayaff, a vicious terrorist organization that has made a mockery of law and order and the sanctity of human life; and, (2) the country's kidnap for ransom gangs that prey on innocent people, especially well-to-do Chinese-Filipinos in the Metro Manila area and other large cities. Not only have these two organizations given a black eye to the Philippines in international circles, they have also caused terrible harm to the Philippines' growing tourism industry, a vital source of revenue and badly needed foreign exchange, as indicated by travel advisories warning people about the dangers of traveling to the Philippines, issued by governments of Japan and the United States.

### **Discussion Questions on “The Philippines Today”**

- Why did the Philippines choose to return to an American-style presidential system of government in 1986?
- Given the unpredictability of Philippine politics and the proliferation of political dynasties—in spite of a specific Constitutional provision that unequivocally bans them—would a parliamentary system, which allows for a change of government at any time perhaps, be more suitable?
- Are the Roman Catholic Church and the putative leader of the country's 75 million Catholics, Jaime Cardinal Sin, really influential as a political actor/kingmaker, or is the Church's avowed political clout grossly exaggerated?
- If recent intelligence reports suggest that in spite of internal schisms and dwindling finances, the Communist Party of the Philippines/New Peoples Army (CPP/NPA) is beginning to regain some of its lost luster—the number of armed cadres has reportedly jumped from 5,000 to a new high of some 11,000—is a new round of hostilities in the offing?
- Could the Philippines overcome its current economic and political problems and restore public confidence in the efficacy of government and elected officials as handmaidens of change?
- Could the country's leaders move away from the politics of scandal and self-destruction, endless recrimination and finger pointing and put the public interest ahead of everything else?

## **Part IV**

### **Resources**

## Selected Bibliography

Berry, William E., **U.S. Bases in the Philippines: The Evolution of the Special Relationship** (Boulder: Westview Press, 1989).

Constantino, Renato E., **The Nationalist Alternative** (Quezon City: Foundation for Nationalist Studies, 1979).

Hutchcroft, Paul D., **Booty Capitalism: The Politics of Banking in the Philippines** (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998).

Jones, Gregg R., **Red Revolution: Inside the Philippine Guerrilla Movement** (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1989).

Kirk, Donald, **Looted: The Philippines After the Bases** (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998).

Lande, Carl H., "Political Parties and Representation: The Philippines," in Myron L. Cohen [ed.], **Asia Case Studies in the Social Sciences: A Guide for Teaching** (Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 1992).

\_\_\_\_\_. [ed.], **Rebuilding a Nation: Philippine Challenges and American Policy** (Washington, D.C.: Washington Institute Press, 1987).

May, R. J. and Francisco Nemenzo [comps.], **The Philippines After Marcos** (Sydney, Aust.: Croom Helm, Ltd., 1985).

McCoy, Alfred W. [ed.], **An Anarchy of Families: State and Family in the Philippines** (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Center for Southeast Asian Studies/Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1993).

Muego, Benjamin N., "Civilian Rule in the Philippines," in Constantine P. Danouopoulos [ed.], **Civilian Rule in the Developing World: Democracy on the March?** (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1992).

\_\_\_\_\_. **Spectator Society: The Philippines Under Martial Rule** (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Center for International Studies, 1988).

Rajaretnam, M. [ed.], **The Aquino Alternative** (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1986).

Rivera, Temario C., **The Philippines** (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1996).

\_\_\_\_\_. **Political Opposition in the Philippines: Contestation and Cooperation** (Madison, WI: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, 1987).

Steinberg, David J., **Philippine Collaboration in World War II** (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967).

\_\_\_\_\_. **The Philippines: A Singular and a Plural Place**, Fourth Edition (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 2000).

Wurfel, David, **Filipino Politics: Development and Decay** (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1988).

Youngblood, Robert L., **Marcos Against the Church: Economic Development and Political Repression in the Philippines** (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990).