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THE FILIPINOS' ANSWER TO THE WOOD-FORBES REPORT
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WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1922
Mr. De Veyra. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me by the House, and on behalf of both my colleague, Mr. Gabaldon, and myself, I include, first, a letter addressed by us as Resident Commissioners from the Philippines to the President of the United States, dated December 13, 1921; second, a speech by Sergio Osmeña, speaker of the Philippine House of Representatives, delivered before the delegates to the convention of the Nationalist Party held in Manila on December 3, 1921; and third, an extensive analysis by Prof. Maximo M. Kalaw, dean of the College of Liberal Arts, University of the Philippines, on the recent report submitted by the Wood-Forbes mission sent to the Philippines last summer by President Harding.

These papers deal directly on the report in question. The mission's report was given out to the public on November 30, 1921, by the War Department.

The Philippine question is of great interest to Americans and of vital importance to Filipinos, and I consider it my imperative duty to acquaint the Members of Congress and, through the Congressional Record, the American people with the viewpoint of the Filipino people on the questions raised by the Wood-Forbes mission. The documents referred to are as follows:

**LETTER TO PRESIDENT HARDING.**

*House of Representatives of the United States.*

*Washington, D. C., December 13, 1921.*

*The President,*

*The White House, Washington, D. C.*

*Dear Mr. President: You have recognized the Filipino protest against a report filed by Gen. Wood and ex-Gov. Forbes, who were appointed by you to investigate conditions in the Philippine Islands, and we appreciate assurances that opportunity will be given to meet what we deem to be hasty criticisms which it contains.*

*That report is being analyzed so that a correct statement may be set forth from the standpoint of the Filipino people.*

*At this time we briefly present for your consideration the great outstanding belief of our people in you because of your efforts to impart faith in international dealings by challenging selfish designs, exploitations of weaker people, and thereby giving to civilization a hope of lasting peace. The four-power treaty between the United States, Great Britain, France, and Japan guarantees the peace of the Pacific for 10 years, and with you, we hope, for all time to come. That treaty removes any vestige of fear of Japanese interference with the islands, never in fact considered a menace to the independence by the Filipino people, who intimately know conditions, but it has served as a convenient*
cloak to interests in the past that have urged a benevolent despotism in order to protect or exploit the islands. The partial sovereignty retained by the United States was stated by ex-President Roosevelt to be a military liability to your country, and it has been deemed none so to ours through its threat to involve us in international differences wherein we had no voice.

Following the expression of world-wide good will comprehensively laid down by you at the initial meeting of the disarmament conference Great Britain has negotiated a peace treaty with a portion of her own Government with which she has maintained the most intimate relations for many centuries, and she has now given to Ireland and the Irish people a separate free State with independent rights, marking a dawn of new freedom to subject peoples. England has surrendered control of an unwilling island within the shadows of her own coast without any past pledges or promises by recognizing the spirit of justice and good will to the world first inaugurated by the great Government of which you are the honored head and exponent.

In recognition of that same high purpose we pray that you give ear to the plea of over 10,500,000 people 7,000 miles distant from American shores, who look to you as the leader of high national ideals and who have implicit confidence in you and your Government and believe that an early performance of pledges repeatedly made to them will be kept. Your Government, with its glorious history of helping humanity and honest dealing among nations, set a high standard for subject people when a handful of pioneers, composing the weak, struggling colonies nearly a century and a half ago, wrote in history a new page of hope. Inspired by that same spirit your people have repeatedly expressed deep sympathy with Irish aspirations for independence, even as Cuba was granted that which we crave immediately following peace made with Spain.

Compared with the stability of your Government at that time or conditions in Ireland, Cuba, and many organized and recognized Governments of the Old and New Hemispheres to-day, we invite comparisons with our own Philippine Islands based even on the few concessions made by the Wood-Forbes report, from which we quote:

Of the 10,500,000 Philippine inhabitants, 90 per cent of whom are Christians, “over 1,020,000 are in school” (p. 17). “Public order is maintained principally by the constabulary, a force of 5,800 officers and men. This organization has proved itself to be dependable and thoroughly efficient” (p. 23). “They are naturally an orderly people” (p. 19). “The Philippine people possess many fine and attractive qualities—dignity and self-respect, as shown by deportment, complete absence of beggars, personal neatness and cleanliness, courtesy and consideration to strangers” (p. 16). “The number of votes cast (by men) at the general election, 1919, was 672,122” (p. 6). “We find that the legislative chambers are conducted with dignity and decorum and are composed of representative men” (p. 45).

“Financially the income of the Philippine Government in 1920 was $40,500,000 with tax per capita of $3.96” (p. 5) (or about 10 per cent of the per capita tax paid by the American people). “Resources of commercial banks 1920, $215,000,000” (p. 33). “Postal savings, 1920, 107,000 depositors and $3,327,000 deposits” (p. 33). “Trade with the United States. 1920, $197,506,041” (p. 5).

The supreme court (of which four of the members, including the chief justice, are Filipinos) has the respect and confidence of the Philippine people” (p. 24). What small government with the same handicaps, we submit, can offer better evidence of stable government represented by a report which we deem is not well considered in many respects. For illustration affecting the last statement, criticism is heaped on our inferior courts and an unstable government inferred in the report because in hundreds of different courts of the islands, including the supreme, municipal, and justice, the report alleges 50,000 cases are pending on the different court dockets. If true in fact, we regret this congestion in the judicial branch of our government, but we submit that by the same standard the United States Government might be found unstable, because 8 Federal district courts out of more than 100 in this country reported 69,844 cases pending on their dockets, according to statistics offered in Congress last week.

Bearing in mind the unexcelled record for peace, order, and law-abiding citizenship existing in the islands, which is admitted in the Wood-Forbes report and without any purpose of criticizing conditions elsewhere, we frankly say that stories of Lynchings, holdups, armed mail trains and orders of shoot to kill, bank robberies, and crimes generally, related in the daily press here, would shock and confound
the frequently exploited "head hunters" and "warring" Filipinos who long ago joined their peaceful neighbors and are now law-abiding citizens of the islands. They help till the 1,946,579 small farms now owned by Filipinos as reported in the last census.

Reading from the report Messrs. Wood and Forbes say: "We find the people are happy, peaceful, and in the main prosperous" (p. 45); again "we find everywhere among the Christian Filipinos (90 per cent of the population) the desire for independence" (p. 45); "the pagans and non-Christians, constituting about 10 per cent of the population, are for continued American control" (p. 21). "The Americans in the islands, numbering 6,981 out of 10,956,730 total population, or far less than one-tenth of 1 per cent, are for a continued American control" (p. 21). That is a situation conceded by a critical report of island conditions.

In your capacity of a world leader fearlessly engaged in arousing humanity's conscience heretofore subservient to force, power, and selfish ambitions, we further briefly submit to your attention pledges and guaranties that have come to us from your predecessors in office without political bias or partisanship.

President McKinley (1899), "the Philippines are ours not to exploit but to develop, to civilize, to educate, to train in the science of self-government." Again he says, "We must make these people whom Providence has brought within our jurisdiction feel that it is their liberty and not our power, their welfare and not our gain, we are seeking to enhance."

Gov. Taft (1907), "Our jurisdiction and control will finally end in the islands when they are capable of self-government." Ex-President Roosevelt (1915), "If we act so that the natives understand us to have made a definite promise, then we should live up to that promise. * * * These being the circumstances the islands should at an early moment be given their independence without any guaranty whatever by us and without our retaining any foothold in them."

The Jones existing law: "It is and always has been the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein." President Wilson (1920): "I respectfully submit that this condition precedent (stable government) having been fulfilled, it is now our liberty and our duty to keep our promise to the people of those islands by granting them the independence which they so honorably covet."

Ex-Presidents McKinley, Taft, Roosevelt, Wilson—four of your illustrious predecessors—at different times have reminded the Filipinos and the world that the promises made to them are promises made to be kept. The American Congress has voiced that same pledge for the American people in the Jones Act. May we not in this day of noble aspirations and accomplishments among nations led by the United States now look to you as representative of that people to urge fulfillment of the pledge to grant Philippine independence even as a mother country over a century and a quarter ago yielded to a small but sovereign people that which in recent days has made your Government the greatest power for good on earth?

We will submit as soon as possible views promised on the Wood-Forbes report in order to present a further record of the achievements and high standards of citizenship reached by the people of the Philippines. Herein we have sought to place before you briefly these accomplishments as evidenced by a hasty report, and above all we have endeavored to set forth the solemn guaranties heretofore given to our people so that at this momentous time, when the world is moved by great moral uplift toward high ideals and unexampled spirit of international brotherhood, we may hope for early fulfillment of national pledges given by the United States to the Filipino people.

Very respectfully,

JAIMÉ C. DE VEYRA,  
ISAURO GABALDON,  
Resident Commissioners, Philippine Islands.

VIEWS OF SPEAKER OSMENA, OF THE PHILIPPINE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

I will next offer the views of Sergio Osmeña, speaker of the Philippine House of Representatives. His conclusions of the now famous
Wood-Forbes report are contained in a speech delivered by him to the delegates attending the Nacionalista Party convention in Manila, P. I., December 3, 1921:

"These are special circumstances which demand the exercise of tact, ability, and perspicacity, so that we may be able to solve the big problems which confront us and which require big measures also," he said in beginning his speech. "In circumstances like this we should be calm, we should keep our poise and reflect carefully. The cooler we are, the better we shall be prepared to fight.

"The Nacionalista Party has been born in the midst of trying circumstances. It came into life poor, and it is but natural that at these moments it should continue to suffer, comforted only by the confidence placed in it by the people. We have a big task ahead of us, we are shouldering heavy responsibilities, and it is our duty to remain faithful to the people.

"What is the principal question now, the main issue? The question is whether we have fulfilled the conditions imposed upon us by Congress as a prerequisite to the granting of our independence, whether we have responded to the wishes not only of the people but also of Congress. In other words, the question is whether or not we have established here a stable and orderly government.

"Our struggle, therefore, is not only for independence, but for our fundamental rights. Our nationalism of to-day is the same as it was before. We have more than fulfilled the established conditions. We have now in the islands an orderly, free, and stable government. It is now up to Congress to fulfill its pledge of 1916 honorably. Our government has not been established overnight. It is merely a continuation of the government founded here the day following the withdrawal of Spanish sovereignty from the islands, a government improved gradually upon the old one.

"In asking for the establishment of a stable government here Congress did not mean, I am sure, that we should really have a stable government because such a government has been in existence here since American occupation of the islands, but to improve on the old one, to extend the powers already conferred upon the Filipinos.

"We have followed to the letter the wishes of Congress in this respect. Our bureau system remains the same as it was before 1916. The only difference is that while formerly the administration did not have any direct dealings with the people, the commissioners remaining isolated from them and the bureaus constituting independent branches of the government, now we have what we call departmental responsibility, the bureaus and departments can at any time be summoned before the legislature. The department secretaries are now chosen after every general election so that the influence of the masses may reach the high spheres of government.

"This present government has been brought about without making any marked changes in the old government. While we openly give ex-Gov. Forbes credit for his road construction initiative, it was the Philippine Assembly to which he appealed in 1907 for funds which established a fixed public works policy. Before 1907 there was no such policy. Funds were not regularly appropriated for public works, except for a few roads like that of Baguio. When 1916 came, we not only maintained but improved and extended the public works system of the islands. There is no town or Province here but has been benefited by this improvement.

"As to schools, you know full well how our people are anxious for an education and how the parents of the children are compelling their little ones to go to school. The progress of the public-school system in the islands began in 1907, when the Philippine Assembly was first established, and the Nacionalistas received an overwhelming majority at the polls. Without need of imposing any new taxes upon the people, we have made a big sacrifice by setting aside ₱30,000,000 from the insular funds for public schools only.

"The administration of justice in the islands now is as good as it was in the past. It is not true that the administration of justice has been neglected. Philippine judges are admitted to be competent. Even ex-President Taft recognized this fact and declared that they would be the pride of any bench in the world, even America herself. Formerly the judges were appointed at the pleasure of the Philippine Commission and could be summoned to hear, try, and decide certain special cases. Naturally, such a practice aroused the suspicion of the
public. Now no judge can be removed, even by the Governor General of the islands. Those who denounce the administration of justice in the islands must appeal to the corresponding authorities and must be prepared to produce facts for the removal of any judges. Otherwise, they alone should be held responsible for the consequences of their act.

"With regard to public order, you know better than I do that the Filipino by nature is peaceful and orderly. He is not headstrong or rebellious. On the contrary, he is submissive and ready to obey the law. During the war not only did we exercise self-control but also offered to send abroad a division of our National Guard. Former Gov. Gen. Harrison, despite the defects he might have had, was the only governor general we have had who could say that the Philippines was orderly and that there was no need of sending additional troops from the United States to the islands. The peace we had in the days during the war is the best proof of the stability of our government here.

"Nor are these alone our achievements in the past few years. We have improved our central government as well as our provinces. Formerly there was a confusion over the classes of provinces. Such is not the case now. The Nacionalista Party therefore has been able to establish an efficient and stable government, not because of its own efforts alone but with the aid and cooperation of the people.

"It goes without saying that the work of the Nacionalista Party is to secure independence. We may have a domestic platform, but independence will remain the principal issue, the fundamental problem. We should not feel relieved of our responsibility until we have attained independence. Nothing short of independence should satisfy us. After we have reached our goal it matters little if this party is dissolved. You may then seek other paths, form other groups.

"We have sent a message to President Harding in an endeavor to obtain a hearing. We have been judged and it is but logical that we through our representatives should be heard. I am confident that President Harding will give us the hearing we seek."

SPEAKER OSMEÑA’S GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

The Manila Times of December 4 itemized the general conclusions of Speaker Osmena as follows:

1. Anybody attacking our courts must appeal to the proper authorities and produce facts for the removal of incompetent and immoral judges, and should he fail to substantiate his charges he alone must be held responsible for the consequences of his act.

2. While due credit must be given to former Gov. Gen. Forbes for his initiative in establishing a fixed policy for road construction, it was the old Philippine Assembly which gave him the means to carry it out.

3. We have extended our school system to the point of appropriating 30,000,000 pesos exclusively for public schools without need of imposing any new taxes upon the people.

4. Public order in the islands is such that even during the war, the most crucial moment for the United States, no disorder of any kind was registered here, and consequently there was no need of sending additional forces of the Army or Navy to the Philippines.

The Wood-Forbes Report—A Critical Analysis by Prof. Maximo M. Kalaw, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, University of the Philippines.

The acceptance by President Harding and the American Congress of the conclusions and recommendations of the special mission would mean, in the first place, an indefinite postponement of Philippine independence. To quote former Vice Gov. Yeater, the report of the mission would place the Philippine question “on the table.” Analyzed more closely, the report spells a backward policy for the Philippines. It points out, however, in a graphic form some of the grave mistakes that have been committed during the last eight years. This is possibly its greatest merit.
It presents to our eyes the possibilities of the improvements that can be made. It does justice to some very salient and notable characteristics of the Filipino people, but its compliments are always followed by "buts" which go far deeper to prove the present incapacity of the Filipino people to support by themselves any decent constitutional government.

PRESIDENT HARDING'S REASONS FOR SENDING THE MISSION.

What was the reason for sending the special mission to the Philippines? President Harding frankly stated that the basis for the sending of the mission is the message of President Wilson to Congress on December 7, 1920, which he quoted in his letter of instructions to the mission, as follows:

"Allow me to call your attention to the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands have succeeded in maintaining a stable government since the last action of the Congress in their behalf, and have thus fulfilled the condition set by the Congress as precedent to a consideration of granting independence to the islands. I respectfully submit that this condition precedent having been fulfilled, it is now our liberty and our duty to keep our promise to the people of those islands by granting them the independence which they so honorably covet."

President Harding further admitted that the above message was based on the report of the highest authority of the Philippines, meaning Gov. Gen. Harrison.

In appointing the special mission, President Harding made it known that he wanted to find out whether the recommendation and report of President Wilson and Gov. Gen. Harrison were true to the fact or not. He stated that while President Wilson and Gov. Gen. Harrison had already certified that the Filipino people had fulfilled the requirements of stable government in the Philippines, there were other people who did not believe so, and hence the sending of the Wood-Forbes mission.

THE STANDARD OF A "STABLE GOVERNMENT" AS SET FORTH BY THE JONES LAW.

If the purpose of the mission was to verify the report of the previous administration, it is only but fair, nay, necessary, that we know the criterion or standard on which that report was based.

When President Wilson and Gov. Gen. Harrison officially certified that there was a stable government in the Philippines, they did not mean a perfect government, or a government on a par with an oligarchy in so far as efficiency is concerned, or even a government approaching the perfection of the six foremost democracies in the world, which have been described by Mr. Bryce in his recent book. President Wilson and Gov. Gen. Harrison simply meant a standard required both by the general practices of international law and by the United States whenever the phrase "stable government" is used. It must be remembered that the possession of a stable government is one of the conditions required by the League of Nations before new States can be admitted to it, and in this connection Austria, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, and Finland have been adjudged possessors of "stable governments." In other words, a stable government has been interpreted by the learned internationalists of the assembly of the League of Nations as a de facto government which has the support of the people. America's interpretation in the past is not far from that interpretation, as is shown when President McKinley urged Congress to declare war with Spain to liberate Cuba. He definitely stated that as soon as the Cuban people had established in the island "a stable government, capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations, insuring peace and tranquillity and the security of its citizens as well as our own," Cuban independence would be recognized.

In passing the Jones law, the American Congress simply adopted the American policy for the recognition of Cuban independence and provided that "as soon as a stable government can be established in the Philippines, Philippine independence would be recognized." When Gov. Harrison appeared before the congressional committee in 1919, he said:

"I wish to state upon my responsibility as the Governor General that, in my opinion, there exists to-day in the Philippine Islands a stable government, which, I think, should answer the requirements laid down by Presidents Grant and McKinley, and, as I understand it, also by Mr. Root,
namely, a government elected by the suffrages of the people, which is sup-
ported by the people, which is capable of maintaining order and of fulfill-
ing its international obligations."

In his official report to the Secretary of War he confirmed this statement. It
was the basis of President Wilson's message to Congress quoted by President
Harding.

President Wilson and Gov. Gen. Harrison applied, therefore, the standard set
down by the Jones law and followed by the United States and the League of
Nations.

A DIFFERENT STAND SET FORTH BY SECRETARY WEEKS.

While President Harding's desire seems to be to prove or disprove President
Wilson's and Gov. Gen. Harrison's statement, the instructions of Secretary of
War Weeks to the special mission were somewhat different. He did not take the
Jones law preamble as the criterion for the work of the mission, although the
preamble of the Jones law is the only statement of policy that was ever voted upon
and approved by the only legal and constitutional body that can announce any
policy at all binding upon the American people—the Congress of the United
States. Secretary of War Weeks in his letter of instruction rather considered
the Instructions of Mr. McKinley in 1900 as the standard. Now, the instruc-
tions of President McKinley apparently sound well, but when one analyzes it
more closely and more intensely he will find that it is less liberal than the
Jones law. In fact, it may never mean independence. The Philippine Commis-
sion was authorized to establish a government conformable, it is true, to our
customs, habits, and even to our prejudices, but only to the extent consistent
with the accomplishment of the "indispensable requisites of a just and effective
government." Apply a similar criterion to the question of Philippine inde-
pendence and you have this inevitable formula: If in the opinion of the United
States Philippine independence will not be for your happiness, peace, or pros-
perity, whether we like it or not, whether it has been promised us or not,
whether we have fulfilled the condition or not, it will not be given us.

It is true that in other portions of the instructions Secretary Weeks firmly
states that the determination as to whether the present government of the
Philippines has contributed to the happiness, peace, and prosperity of the
Filipino people "must necessarily depend largely on the views of that people."

It is also true that there is another apparently splendid provision requesting
the mission not to use the standard of other countries and other climates
and particularly the American idea of perfection in governmental matters.
But the last paragraphs neutralize the intent of the foregoing admonitions.
Secretary Weeks predisposed the mind of the mission in favor of indefinite
retention when he said:

"The pleasing of the Filipinos of this generation would be a minor satis-
faction if it were believed that it would result in the bondage or destruction
of the Filipino people for all time hereafter.

"Whether the result of your investigation may or may not be to the satis-
faction of the majority of the Filipino people at this time, I am convinced that,
undertaken in the spirit in which it is committed to you and in which you
have undertaken it, it can not but be to the future satisfaction of the Filipinos
and must, of necessity, result in their permanent well-being and progress."

Now, the foregoing pronouncement is clearly in conflict with the spirit and
letter of the Jones law. It is in conflict with President Harding's own attitude,
who has often assured the Resident Commissioners that he stands by the Jones
law. It is tantamount to saying to the Filipinos of to-day: "You might as
well quit all agitation for independence now. I will give it to you whenever
it pleases me to do so."

We have thought that with the enactment of the Jones law an entirely
different stage has been reached in the discussion of the Philippine problem.
The Jones law contains a definite pledge voted and approved by the Congress
of the United States and signed by the President to the effect that when the
conditions of a stable government have been fulfilled the recognition of inde-
pendence would be in order. That pledge was accepted by the Filipino people
in good faith. The Jones law became, in the words of its author, a "covenant
between the American and the Filipino peoples."

Why should another criterion be now injected, saying that it does not matter
whether the present generation of Filipinos is pleased or not?
The Wood-Forbes mission thus started its work with the apparently arbitrary standard set down by Secretary Weeks, which would eliminate from consideration the desires of the present generation of Filipinos.

It did not accept the standard of a stable government as defined by the League of Nations, by the United States in the past, and by Gov. Gen. Harrison. In fact, no mention whatever is made in the report of the promise of independence contained in the preamble of the Jones law. It seems that the chairman of the mission had a different interpretation as to the term "stable government." At the meeting held by the Philippine Columbian Association, he was reported to have defined "stable government" in the following words:

"A stable government means civic courage, courts of justice which give equal opportunities to the senator as well as to the simple 'tao,' resources ready for disposal at any moment they are needed by the country, organization which will enable the country to defend its integrity, adequate hospitals all over the islands which are not found in the provinces we have just visited, social organization which shows keen human interest in the protection of the needy and the poor, efficient public sanitation, common language, and many others."

Now, the foregoing was not the accepted definition of "stable government," as is seen in the definitions which we quoted above. It is true, however, that in judging the Philippine situation the mission was asked by Secretary of War Weeks to apply this apparently benignant rule:

"In passing on questions thus presented it is necessary to avoid comparison with a standard of other countries and other climates and particularly with our own idea of perfection."

But, again, does the foregoing suggestion when treated separately result in a fair statement? In the first place, the Philippines is the first attempt on a large scale at representative government in the Tropics. So there can be no tropical standard. Then what is the standard left? Only one; the standard of the previous administration of which Gov. Forbes, one of the members of the mission, was the head! And the Wood-Forbes mission made it its standard! It said:

"The general administration of the Philippine Government in 1913, the period of greatest efficiency, was honest, highly efficient, and set a high standard of energy and morality."

Now, unfortunately, Gov. Gen. Wood was not in the Philippines in 1913, so he could not have known the standard then. How could he, therefore, compare the 1913 standard with the present government when he was not here? So the only arbiter in judging the situation and comparing it with a definite standard was Gov. Gen. Forbes. Here was a strange anomaly unheard of in the annals of the United States, where an interested party, head of a previous administration, was made the judge as to the success or failure of his rival and successor. But even granting for the sake of argument that the Wood-Forbes mission, despite Gov. Forbes's participation, acted judiciously and fairly in comparing the administration of 1913 with that of the eight years of Philippine autonomy, we maintain that Philippine autonomy would still be at a disadvantage as regards the efficiency of the government. An oligarchic government, with no popular favor to cater or local constituencies to please, is likely to have a more efficient administration than a government controlled by the representatives of the people. This is a well-known axiom in politics. Thus Bryce says in his Modern Democracies:

"There are points in which a democratic government suffers by comparison with an oligarchic, for the latter is more likely to recognize the importance of skill in administration and of economy in the management of finance, since it is not tempted to spend money in satisfying the importunities of localities or of sections of the population."

The Good Points in the Report.

We will not go at this time into details of the report with regard to the different Government activities. The heads of the different bureaus and other people conversant in the different cases may come out in their support or
defense. The foregoing statement of the different standards used, I believe, will be sufficient for a conclusion that the Wood-Forbes report is based on unwarranted premises. It has evaded the issue of stable government and would inject a new criterion in the discussion of the Philippine problem. This is in no way a criticism of the individual members of the mission, for it seems that they have followed only the instruction. The chairman of the mission has always been considered by the people as a fair-minded, square man.

There are many good points in the report. For a Republican report it is a tremendous step toward a better appreciation of the good qualities of the Filipino people. Compared to the reports of the early days of American occupation one will see that it has apparently a more sympathetic view of the Filipino people. One entire chapter is devoted to a description of the people. Examined closely, however, many of the paragraphs which begin with apparently complimentary sentences invariably end with qualifications and criticisms which neutralize all the fine things that have been said in the first part. The Filipino people, we are told, are not lacking in capacity; that they are orderly and law-abiding; but their government is not reasonably free from those underlying causes which result in the destruction of government.” Viewed separately in connection with the purely local problems, the graphic picture that it has made of our shortcomings and deficiencies should be welcome. Surveys are necessary so that we may view what we have done and correct the deficiencies that we have made. The lack of sufficient press which will insure a sound public opinion; the mistakes that have been made in the finances; the delay in the administration of justice; the need of good teachers both in the schools and in the higher institutions of learning; the inadequate treatment and care of dependent peoples; the defects of the election law—all these are more or less recognized by the majority of the people, and measures are already afoot for their correction.

WHAT IF THE WILSON-M’KINLEY STANDARD HAD BEEN USED.

The reader may believe that the writer has already dwelt too extensively on the different standards used in gauging the Philippine question. But in the estimate of any social condition is not the standard a deciding factor? The Spanish verse, “Todo es segúen el color del cristal con que se mira,” is appropriate to the present case.

Let us suppose that the mission had used the Wilson-McKinley standard in the survey of Philippine conditions. Critical as the survey has been, I believe that the conditions exposed in the report would compare favorably with the existing conditions of four countries admitted to the League of Nations, because, among other things, they possess stable government—Austria, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, and Finland. There are apparently in President McKinley’s estimate two main elements in a stable government: First, ability to maintain order and insure peace and tranquillity and the security of citizens; second, ability to observe its international obligations. To these two elements, Mr. Root, in his instructions for the Cuban people, also added the following: It must rest upon the peaceful suffrages of the people and must contain constitutional limitations to protect the people from the arbitrary actions of the Government. These four elements will be found in the facts gathered by the mission. It is admitted by the mission that order has been in excellent condition and that our constabulary is sufficient to maintain internal peace. The tranquillity and security of the citizens are not jeopardized. As to the obligations for international life, the Wood-Forbes mission recognizes that there are people in our service who could do credit to any Government; that our legislature is filled with representative men. Without desiring to enter into invidious comparisons, the Filipinos have an advantage over any oriental country in so far as ability to maintain international relations is concerned, for the simple reason that we are the most western of all oriental peoples and our laws are not taken from oriental sources. Even to-day foreigners in the Philippines are being judged in the courts by Filipino judges, so that there will not be any need of extraterritorial courts. International obligations will naturally mean sound finances, and it is here that we must confess that the Filipino people have made the greatest blunders, but the financial situation of the Philippines is not as bad as that of other countries where moratoriums have had to be declared. In fact, the Wood-Forbes mission itself states that
we have comparatively more simple financial problems here and that our economic ailments can soon be healed. On page 39, for instance, it says:

"In view of the good earnings, moderate expenses, inherent wealth, a small public debt, and backed by the credit of the United States, the problem of rehabilitating the credit of the Philippine Islands should be an easy one. The lesson has been a bitter one for the Filipinos and the gravity of the mistake is generally appreciated."

Stable government has never meant ability to repel an outside attack, for indeed, how many nations will be independent to-day if this is criterion for independence? France, one of the great nations, was found unable by herself to repel a German attack.

Even the statement of the mission that "the Government is not reasonably free from those underlying causes which result in a destruction of government" can be applied to all the new nations of Europe and even to some old ones. Our country has been accustomed to constitutional restrictions. They are one of the greatest benefits that have been given us by America. Such constitutional limitations have been since 1900 the fundamental law of the land. It may be said that they are already embedded in the legal and political life of the people. No matter what political changes may occur, they will hardly find any material alteration.

DISREGARD OF OUR REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS.

In its report, as well as in its travels in the Philippines, the mission has, perhaps involuntarily, shown a tendency to disregard or belittle the attitude and work of the Government, especially of our legislature. Many people came to look upon the mission as an administrative court of last resort to hear and decide complaints of all kinds against the existing Government. This practice was certainly destructive of the principle of representative government, for instead of fostering the idea that the people themselves through the voters must correct the administrative abuses of those in power they were led to believe that they can look somewhere else for the remedies they desire. It is fortunate that the chairman of the mission became the Governor General, for as Governor General he will be in duty bound to require the support of the people for the Government. He will thus be able to erase the bad impression unconsciously made.

It is noticeable how the entire report fails to mention, even incidentally, the official attitude and representations that the Philippine Legislature has taken on the general independence question. Yet the Wood-Forbes mission certifies in its conclusion "that the legislative chambers are composed of representative men."

Now, if it is the desire to create and strengthen representative government in the Philippines, the people must be taught to respect and acquiesce in the decisions legally and officially rendered on their behalf by their representatives. This must be done unless the American people desire to establish direct legislation by the people themselves. But if in the opinion of the mission the people have not yet absorbed their present powers, it would seem absurd to advocate a more advanced step toward democracy such as the initiative and the referendum. Perhaps this attitude of belittling or ignoring the legislature was unconsciously made by the Wood-Forbes mission as a reflection of the attitude of distrust with which the legislature is held in many States of the Union to-day. But the Philippine Islands is not yet ready by any means to take this attitude; so that we must, on the contrary, try to foster the idea of representative government by urging the people to elect their best men as representatives, and then to follow the decision of such representatives in the government, subject, naturally, to their recall at the following elections.

The mission has completely ignored the legislature. Perhaps the members of the mission did not realize that the Philippine Legislature, representing the Filipino people, has taken official attitudes on the independence question. The Philippine Legislature has ratified in a joint resolution, signed by the Governor General, the establishment of a commission of independence for the purpose of discussing with the United States the ways and means for the recognition of independence. Perhaps this attitude of belittling or ignoring the legislature was unconsciously made by the Wood-Forbes mission as a reflection of the attitude of distrust with which the legislature is held in many States of the Union to-day. But the Philippine Islands is not yet ready by any means to take this attitude; so that we must, on the contrary, try to foster the idea of representative government by urging the people to elect their best men as representatives, and then to follow the decision of such representatives in the government, subject, naturally, to their recall at the following elections.

The mission has completely ignored the legislature. Perhaps the members of the mission did not realize that the Philippine Legislature, representing the Filipino people, has taken official attitudes on the independence question. The Philippine Legislature has ratified in a joint resolution, signed by the Governor General, the establishment of a commission of independence for the purpose of discussing with the United States the ways and means for the recognition of independence. The Independence commission is, therefore, a legal body clothed with powers to deal on the independence question. It was this commission of independence which sent a special mission to the United States, which was officially received by the Secretary of War on behalf of the President of the
United States. Now, it would seem to the ordinary observer that the special
Wood-Forbes mission cannot ignore the legal personality of the commission
of independence or the legislature, especially when the work of the mission was
to deal with independence problems and the relations between the United States
and the Philippines. Upon the arrival of the mission the commission of inde-
pendence sent a statement welcoming the mission to the Philippines and offer-
ing its services. One would believe that most of the dealings of this Wood-
Forbes mission would be with this body, especially in matters pertaining to the
relations between the United States and the Philippines. But the Wood-Forbes
mission—obeying, perhaps, instructions—treated the commission of inde-
pendence like anybody else. Nay, there is not even a mention of any resolutions
of the legislature in the body of the report. No. 12 of the list of exhibits is
listed as a “declaration of senators and representatives requesting inde-
pendence.” Now, this was undoubtedly the declaration of the commission of
independence in an official capacity, yet it was listed simply as a declaration
of individual senators and representatives! It is placed on the list of exhibits
and not even on the list of appendices. It apparently has the same weight with
the mission as the “letters from prominent Americans of long residence in the
Philippines” and “petitions from Americans of Mindanao.” It is perhaps in
the same category as the author’s “declaration of purposes.” The Present Government of the
Philippines, which was honored with a place on the list of exhibits. Now, it
would seem to me that a body clothed by law with powers and therefore author-
ized by the people to speak in their behalf would deserve better treatment
than that.

We do not in the least mean to question the fairness of the men composing
the mission, but we only will say that they are human beings, and, in the case
of ex-Gov. Forbes, it would practically be impossible for him to do away with
the personal equation. What we desire to impress is that if the United States
means to establish and has established in the Philippines the principle of repre-
sentative government by means of an elective legislature composed of the
senate and the house of representatives, it is only proper that we give this body
all the consideration and the authority which a representative organ should
have. If a representative organ is supposed to speak for the people through
legal channels, it would seem to us that next to the people themselves directly
it is the greatest authority on what the people want; so that, no matter how
extended has been its trip, no matter how thorough has been its investigation,
it would still be illogical and contrary to the principles of democracy to take
the word of the mission, in so far as the desires and aspirations of the people
are concerned, rather than the word of the duly elected representatives of the
people. The mission, for instance, in its heading on the present condition, has
stated the following:

“The great bulk of the Christian Filipinos have a very natural desire for inde-
pendence; most of them desire independence under the protection of the
United States; a very small percentage desire immediate independence with
separation from the United States; a very substantial element is opposed to
independence, especially at this time. The Moros are a unit against inde-
pendence and are united for continuance of American control * * *.”

Now, we admit that the representatives of the Moros in the legislature are
not designated by election, but by appointment, and perhaps in that case a
direct survey will prove of some help. But Gov. Gen. Wood, with only two excep-
tions, has reappointed the representatives of the non-Christian Provinces, ap-
parently believing them to be representative men.

Senator Hadji Butu was reappointed, who was present when the legislature
made known its “declaration of purposes.” But in all the Christian parts we
submit that the safest barometer, if we are to exercise self-government here,
the people’s representatives—the Filipino people have been electing representa-
tives for the last 13 years and the issue in all elections has always been inde-
pendence. If the statements of the legislature are still being questioned by the
American authorities, the only way left for a more faithful reflection of the
people’s desire is a nation-wide plebiscite.

REPORT WOULD HINDER DEVELOPMENT OF TWO STRONG PARTIES.

The Herald has rightly observed that while the American Government pre-
sents the spectacle of a sovereign power willing to exercise all important
powers of government possible, taking away even those which have already been granted to the people or their representatives, we can never develop in the Philippines a strong two-party system, for the Filipino people must always feel the necessity of having a united front. What nations engaged in an international conflict or discussion desire to have a strong party government instead of a coalition government? During the Great War all the Governments of Europe were coalition Governments. President Wilson tried to manage his Government during the war on the old system, and he failed. So, while the great issue of self-government and independence exists, it is doubtful whether the great Nacionalista Party will be foolish enough to split itself into liberal and conservative factions. It must always feel the necessity of preserving unity. Has anybody noticed how soon the clouds of animosity between the different Nacionalista factions have disappeared as soon as the report of the mission was known? How placid are the waters of the Nacionalista convention!

TWO THINGS THAT ARE AN IMPROVEMENT OVER 1913.

The report is firm in its conviction that, compared with 1913, the present Government has gone down in efficiency and usefulness. We are prepared to say that the present Government has made two fundamental improvements over that of 1913. One of them is the reorganization of the executive departments, some portion of which—especially those which took away bureaus from the supervision of American heads—the mission seems to take exception to. On the main object and result of the reorganization act the mission was silent, when, as a matter of fact, the law placed the Government on a secure foundation of efficiency—a much greater efficiency than the 1913 in so far as organization and proper coordination of the bureaus and activities are concerned.

There were several reasons why the reorganization was made.

In the first place, the Jones law authorizes such reorganization, and it was necessary to ratify in the statute books of the Philippines the new executive power granted the Filipinos to make the departmental secretaries partly responsible to the legislature. In the second place, it was urgent that there be a more logical and scientific regrouping of bureaus and offices. This need had long been felt, even before the passage of the Jones law, and for that purpose the emergency board provided in the appropriation law of 1915 was authorized to act as an efficiency board “to investigate and analyze as minutely as possible the organization of the bureaus of the insular government for the purpose of determining the utility of each of them, the possibility of their improvement by eliminating all duplication work * * * and in general indicating such changes in the direction and organization of the bureaus as will tend to simplify the system of work followed and result in economy and increased efficiency.” It became evident that it was necessary to provide for a harmonious action and cooperation between the executive heads and the legislature. And in the fourth place, it was felt that the new department heads should have more authority and power over the offices and bureaus under them.

Acts 222 and 1407 of the Philippine Commission, which were responsible for the organization of the executive departments up to 1916, left a great deal to be desired in the way of logical and scientific arrangement of bureaus. The departments, as created by the first act, were denominated the department of the interior, department of commerce and police, department of finance and justice, and department of public instruction. “The mere mention of the names given to these departments,” said Senator Palma, “shows that organization to be theoretically defective. No country in the civilized world has organized a department of commerce and police, because commerce and police involve completely contrary and antagonistic ideas. The commerce is essentially pacific, while the police is essentially warlike.”

Act No. 1407 reorganized the departments and bureaus and offices of the government, abolishing certain bureaus and offices and creating others in their stead. This organization was not better than the previous one, because under it bureaus whose activities were very dissimilar were kept in the same department. In the department of the interior the bureau of health remained side by side with that of lands and the bureau of agriculture with that of quarantine service. In the department of commerce and police the constabulary continued side by side with the bureau of public works and the bureau of posts, together with that of port works. The department of finance and justice still
performed its legal functions at the same time as the work of collecting customs dues and internal-revenue taxes. The department of public instruction continued to solve educational problems and have charge at the same time of the bureaus of supply and printing, a rare combination, indeed.

Heretofore each bureau was almost a department by itself. It used to send its estimates directly to the legislature through the executive secretary and the department head had almost nothing to do with it. It had great power of making regulations. The control of the department head was very slight. The reorganization act, therefore, as amended by act No. 2803 (sec. 79c of the Administrative Code) provides that the department head shall have direct control, direction, and supervision over all bureaus and offices under his jurisdiction, and may, any provision of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding, repeal or modify the decisions of the chiefs of said bureaus or offices when advisable in the public interest.

Thus the reorganization act united responsibility, abolished the sovereignty of bureaus, and placed them under six secretaries, with power of supervision and control, and subordinated the secretaries, in turn, to the Governor General, instead of the old order in which secretaries could demand similar executive prerogatives with the Governor General, as was shown by the incident between Commissioner Riggs and Governor General Harrison.

THE BUDGET.

"The forms of the budgets are good," the report states. This was the only mention of that great step which placed the Philippines, in so far as financial systems are concerned, above the United States. It could have gone a little further and frankly admitted that the budget, next to the reorganization act, is the other great reform to the credit of Philippine autonomy.

Here was the old procedure which savored of medieval methods: Thirty days before the opening of each regular session each bureau chief—not the department head—sent to the executive secretary a statement of the receipts and expenditures of his bureau or office during the year and an estimate of the receipts and necessary expenditures thereof for the ensuing fiscal year. Like the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the executive secretary simply compiled these estimates and sent them to the legislature. He had no power of revision or coordination. There was no executive responsible for the fiscal plan of the Government. It was the question of who had the greatest "pull."

Other bills appropriating money were introduced in a hit-or-miss fashion, following no systematized and unified scheme of national improvement. They were considered on their individual merits, and not on a well-defined fiscal plan for the entire country. They were not based on any possible amount of revenue that might be gathered. Thousands of this kind of bills were introduced at every session. Had they all passed, the resources of the country for the next 10 years would have been exhausted. We never knew whether we were expending more than we were earning. We never learned, even more or less definitely, whether we were running into bankruptcy or not. This was shown to be the fact when on the assumption of office by Gov. Harrison there were wide asseverations that the Philippine government had been running headlong toward financial ruin. "For three years prior to 1913," says Gov. Harrison in his first message, "the government had expended from two to two and a half million pesos yearly in excess of its ordinary income, and in 1913 had expended more than P7,000,000 in excess of such income." Seven million pesos in excess of our income! The fact had never been openly communicated to the people or their representatives.

That there was an unpardonable lack of systematized plan in our previous financial system can be easily seen in the number and nature of appropriation bills annually passed by the Philippine Commission and the Philippine Legislature. From April 3, 1915, to March 16, 1916, for instance, 37 acts, carrying a total appropriation of over P38,000,000 were passed. The list follows:
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Acts carrying appropriations passed by the Philippine Legislature or the Philippine Commission alone from April 3, 1915, to February 24, 1916.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of act</th>
<th>Amount carried.</th>
<th>Object.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No. 2519</td>
<td>P12,000.00</td>
<td>Lepanto trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No. 2521</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>Publicity for forest study in Agusan Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No. 2523</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>Locusts and rinderpest in mountain Provinces, Nueva Viscaya, Mindanao and Sulu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No. 2524</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>Roads and bridges in Nueva Viscaya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No. 2525</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>Cholera in Mindanao and Sulu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No. 2526</td>
<td>35,000.00</td>
<td>Agriculture, industry, health, and irrigation in mountain Provinces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. No. 2529</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>For Baguio fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. No. 2531</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>Education in non-Christian parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No. 2534</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>For destruction caused by baguios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. No. 2535</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>For repairs in Benguet road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. No. 2540</td>
<td>25,468,913.21</td>
<td>General appropriation bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. No. 2542</td>
<td>52,000.00</td>
<td>Repair Naguilian-Baguio road for 1916.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. No. 2543</td>
<td>1,458,491.00</td>
<td>Appropriation for Mindanao and Sulu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. No. 2546</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>For Hotel Pines, Baguio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. No. 2547</td>
<td>289,311.11</td>
<td>Current expenses for mountain Provinces and Nueva Viscaya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. No. 2548</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>For immunization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. No. 2550</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>For obligations on account of friar lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. No. 2575</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>For creation of fiscalship in Palawan, and other purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. No. 2583</td>
<td>2,621,000.00</td>
<td>Permanent improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. No. 2596</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>Aid to young industries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. No. 2598</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>For “Junta de Productos del Coco.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. No. 6207</td>
<td>2,600,000.00</td>
<td>Deposits in Commercial Bank for agricultural loans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. No. 2610</td>
<td>49,145.00</td>
<td>Judiciary deficiency bill during 1916.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. No. 2611</td>
<td>118,882.59</td>
<td>Deficiency bill for other governmental offices for 1916. (Total deficiency, 168,027.59 pesos.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. No. 2612</td>
<td>2,300,000.00</td>
<td>Part payment for National Bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. No. 2613</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>Foment of tobacco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. No. 2623</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>Conservatory of Music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. No. 2624</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>To pay interest on bonds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. No. 2625</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>For amortization of bonds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. No. 2626</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>For schools in mountain Provinces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. No. 2633</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>To combat infant mortality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. No. 2637</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>Exhibition at Formosa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. No. 2638</td>
<td>71,000.00</td>
<td>“Reembolso” of land taxes in typhoon-devastated provinces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. No. 2640</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>For forest-reserve purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. No. 2651</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>For immunizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. No. 2652</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Loans for irrigation purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. No. 2659</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
<td>For police quarters, mountain Provinces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 38,341,933.01

1 Not fixed.  
2 Not determined.

The table of laws shows a lack of systematized groupings of objects for the easy comprehension of the public or the legislature. At the end of every session a member could not know what had been the main fiscal policy of the legislature. Appropriations for social improvement or economic development are in several and independent bills. Act 2523, for instance, appropriates 20,000.
pesos for extermination of locusts and rinderpest in the mountain Province, Neuvia Vizcaya, Mindanao, and Sulu; act 2526 sets aside 35,000 pesos for agriculture, industry, health, and irrigation in mountain Province; act 2548 provides 50,000 pesos for immunization; act 2598 gives 10,000 pesos for Junta de Productos de Cocco; act 2613 appropriates 15,000 pesos for the foment of tobacco; act 2651 adds 25,000 pesos to immunization funds provided in act 2548; act 2652 provides for loans for irrigation purposes. All these acts refer to the development of agriculture, and should be grouped together in one bill under that heading. They were undoubtedly drafted by different persons who might not have the same ideas as to the way the agricultural development should be carried on. It is just as likely that some of these bills are at cross purposes with other bills on the same subjects.

Such was, in brief, the system of government finance in vogue prior to the establishment of the Jones law. There was no attempt on the part of the Filipinos to adopt a budget system, for there was no responsible executive to frame it. All executive posts were filled by appointment by the President of the United States or the Governor General without the consent of any representative body.

There was no centralized responsibility in the preparation and submission of estimates. Every little bureau was a department by itself, prepared its own estimate, and sent it to the legislature through the executive secretary. There was no coordination, each bureau trying to get as much as it could. There was no financial secretary to clip the wings of overambitious bureaus obsessed with self-importance. The result was an extravagant, top-heavy bureaucracy, and unnecessary duplication of work and activity.

The old procedure of the submission of estimates was inefficient and medieval. It was patterned after the old congressional system which has just been changed in the United States. These mistakes were corrected with the establishment of the budget.

SPECIAL REPORT SUGGESTS BACKWARD POLICIES.

While in the body of the report the Wood-Forbes mission states that a reversal of policy is not needed now, the second, third, and fourth, recommendations all express a backward policy. Let us analyze the second and third:

"2. We recommend that the responsible representative of the United States, the Governor General, have authority commensurate with the responsibilities of his position. In case of failure to secure the necessary corrective action by the Philippine Legislature we recommend that Congress declare null and void legislation which has been enacted diminishing, limiting, or dividing the authority granted the Governor General under act of Congress No. 240, known as the Jones bill.

"3. We recommend that in case of a deadlock between the Governor General and the Philippine senate in the confirmation of appointments that the President of the United States be authorized to make and render the final decision."

The government of the Philippine Islands, as it is at present constituted, is not based upon legal and statutory provisions alone. It has been largely built upon democratic principles and upon a clear constitutional understanding between the representative of the United States and the representatives of the Filipino people. Every Governor General has taken these factors into account. No Governor General has ever completely ignored these democratic principles or failed to enter into some sort of understanding with the representatives of the Filipino people on important questions. That is why the leaders of the Philippine Assembly were frequently consulted by the Governor General on serious domestic questions. There was no law which required this of the Governor General, but it was done as a matter of policy in pursuance of fundamental democratic principles.

Every legislation passed since 1916 has been in conformity with these principles and the spirit and letter of the Jones law. It was the purpose of Congress to give the post of departmental secretaries to Filipinos alone, except the secretary of public instruction. That was the reason why their appointment was taken from the President and given to the Governor General with the consent of the Senate. The present position of the Governor General has been the result of the Jones law. It simply followed the policy of Congress. Congress must mean a participation of the Filipinos in the administration,
otherwise the Jones law would not mean the autonomy that it now means to the Philippines. This was the interpretation given by Gov. Gen. Harrison in a statement explaining the Jones law, on September 1, 1916, in which he said:

"The main points of opposition to the bill centered upon the promise in the preamble of ultimate independence, and the power of confirmation of executive nominations by the Philippine Senate. So far as my own personal efforts could be of any influence these were the two points upon which the greatest insistence was laid. With the support of the President and the work of friends in Congress, both questions have been resolved favorably. I am a firm believer that an executive should consult the people, through their representatives, as to who shall serve them in office. This is the vital nerve of self-government. It should never be possible, and it will now never be so here, for an executive to ride ruthlessly over the people he is sent here to govern without due regard for their sentiments and due consideration of their wishes.

That was the understanding of the Filipino people. That is why they accepted the bill. It was simply another exposition of the intent and purpose of that law as proclaimed in its preamble which is "to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines as large a control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without, in the meantime, impairing their exercise of the rights of sovereignty by the people of the United States, in order that, by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be the better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence.”

THE LAST RECOMMENDATION.

Let us take the last recommendation:

"4. We recommend that under no circumstances should the American Government permit to be established in the Philippine Islands a situation which would leave the United States in a position of responsibility without authority." We do not know what is exactly meant by this recommendation. If it is simply an interpretation of the preamble by the Jones law to the effect that autonomy must be given the Filipinos to the extent "compatible with the exercise of the rights of American sovereignty," then it is not a new thing. We beg to state that this was followed in spirit and in letter during the last administration. In other words, on matters of domestic concern, the Filipinos were allowed to rule; but in matters where the sovereignty of the United States might be called in question, then the Governor General acted. What were those matters which might jeopardize the exercise of American sovereignty? To our mind they were simply those which pertain to order, the protection of alien lives and property, and the international relations in general. This was followed in the last administration. When there was a disturbance, like the Intramuros Constabulary case, Gov. Gen. Harrison would assume the command in person, for all disturbances are a defiance of the sovereignty of the United States. Similarly, all dealings with consuls or matters of foreign property and citizens have gone to the office of the Governor General. If this recommendation means that the United States intends to take direct control and responsibility for every act of the municipalities, Provinces, and every one of the 20,000 officials of the Philippine Government, then we wish to say that such procedure would be tantamount to the abolishment of autonomy in the Philippines. No autonomy is possible under such circumstances.

IT MAY KILL INDEPENDENCE FOR GOOD.

"1. We recommend that the present general status of the Philippine Islands continue until the people have had time to absorb and thoroughly master the powers already in their hands.”

Now, this recommendation may mean no independence either to-day, to-morrow, or a hundred years from now! When can the Filipino people "thoroughly master the powers in their hands”? To this I will answer, "Never.” What are the powers already in our hands? The Wood-Forbes mission admit that we have had practical autonomy. We elect our own local officials and our two houses of the legislature; the department heads are Filipinos with the exception; practically all of the courts of first instance are in the hands of the Filipinos. When will we master—not
only master but "thoroughly" master—the power of conducting our courts of justice, our legislature, our varied executive departments, and our local functions? In other words, when is our perfect democracy coming? Even the six great democracies of the world which have been examined by Mr. Bryce have failed to master "thoroughly" all the powers that have been given them.

Popular government is still an ideal which may never fully and thoroughly be realized.

CONCLUSION.

The report will prove a disappointment to both Americans and Filipinos for the simple reason that it does not propose in itself to settle the Philippine question once for all. The American investors who want to bring money to the islands and the American business men who already have interests in the Philippines would naturally prefer the continuation of American sovereignty; but if there is to be such a continuation, they want to see that it is definite and assured for a stated time, say, 10, 30, or 50 years. If there is to be independence at all, they want to know when it will come and what future relations will exist between America and an independent Philippines. The Filipinos, on the other hand, are convinced that the time has already come for independence, and are willing to talk about its terms and conditions. Neither Americans nor Filipinos want an indefinite continuation of American régime “until the people shall thoroughly master the powers in their hands.”

If the Wood-Forbes mission had only made even an approximate guess as to how many more years!
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