

Bureaucracy and Political Development

RODOLFO ALCANTARA

Ladies and gentlemen, good morning!

First of all, I apologize for Director Francisco Hanopol for not being here as your resource speaker this morning. He is in Aklan on some important business. Also, I like to apologize for being Director Hanopol's substitute since I am not as competent as he is on the subject matter. He informed me that I would be his substitute only last week, and he knew that I would be busy because of the forthcoming election. Besides, my office is a political office. However, in my trips or in between my trips to the provinces, I have been able to come up with some sort of a paper which I hope will be of interest to you. I am actually awed by the array of experts that have been gathered by the organizers of the Conference.

The topic assigned to me is "Bureaucracy and Political Development." I think it is best, first, to define my terms. Political systems have the organization for the implementation of policies. It is what you call the "bureaucracy." Bureaucracy has been defined as that part of the governmental machinery which is concerned or charged with the execution of policy as distinguished from governmental organs that make policies and those that interpret them. Political development, in a book by Lucian Pye, is a summation of ten definitions that commonly hold equality as a necessary characteristic. And we have President Marcos pointing out that equality is the fundamental demand of the rebellion of the poor. The demand for equality is a demand for participation by all of the citizenry in the social, cultural, economic and political affairs and benefits that a nation can offer. Politics, it has also been pointed out, deals with the making or changing of policy. From the foregoing, I would attempt to define then political development as governmental activity in terms of policy-making which increases the participation of the governed in the acts of governance, if political development, therefore, is the in-

Coordinator, Sangguniang Bayan Secretariat, Region VI.

crease in the genuine participation of all of the citizenry in the processes of governance, any activity that prevents the above target of political development should be the subject of identification, criticism and eradication. It has, however, been pointed out that political development is not the only goal of society. There are other objectives in the cultural, social, and economic spheres as well. It has been pointed out that in developing countries the prime objectives are concerned more with economic development, and there is so little concern given to political development. When a choice is to be made between the two, the decision is mostly taken in the direction of economic progress.

Experience also shows that the rising expectations of the people of the developing nations brought about by modern communication systems that reveal the abundance of the West, manifest themselves in immediate demands that far exceed government capacities, forcing the latter into immediate commitments to economic development. Also, the great imbalances in society brought about by private entrepreneurship, the concentration of wealth as a result of the free enterprise system, decides the political leadership of a nation in favor of a centrally-planned economy that may altogether stifle political development. Thus, it has been stated that developing countries have a greater desire for economic progress than for freedom. There is also evidence that political development depends to a significant degree on economic development. And it has been pointed out many times that the individual must be economically independent before he could be able to exercise freely and maturely his political rights.

There is, however, proof that economic liberalism has a lot to do with political liberalism. The attitudes concerning freedom and the dignity of the individual have been the result of the propagation of economic enterprises that are individual rather than collectively-oriented; that exalts the place of the private entrepreneur rather than the collectivity symbolized by a gigantic, unwieldy and unbending government. Economic independence, then, and free enterprise are the keys to political development. Yet economic development, unless centrally-controlled, will take a long time to come, while the demands for its benefits are immediate. Free enterprise carries with it the creation of imbalance of the societal structure. It would seem, therefore, that any government that seeks the political development of its citizenry would have to allow free enterprise and yet regulate it to such an extent as to prevent the concentration of wealth in the

hands of a few. This, of course, is what we know as the mixed economy system. It combines regulation with the free market devices. A government can provide the control lacking in a free market system while at the same time retaining the essential elements of the system. A democratic government can convince the rich not to use political power as an additional device for the concentration of wealth and power. Instead of the rich controlling the state, the state can act against the short-run apparent interest of the rich. In a mixed economy the people do not have to choose between continuing degradation and revolution. Expanded free public education, welfare measures, economic stabilization and income redistribution are major steps in advancing the economic position of the people taken through a democratic political process. In the Philippines, former attempts to place the nation under such a system were failures because the rich were determined to use their political power for further concentration and the increase of their wealth.

With the declaration however of Martial Law the rich were forced to tow the line, while the government at the same time retained the elements of the free enterprise system. Free enterprise is supported within a framework that is democratizing in nature. Private wealth is democratized instead of socialized. Martial law Philippine-style is where freedom takes on the garments of discipline, order and responsibility for the national good. It is a Martial Law that proclaims the ultimate control of the people and insists on the holding of activities that reflect the accountability of government to the citizenry. It is a Martial Law that is transitory and initiates policies that may be said to be enhancive of political development. It is clear that the action of political leadership could not have been actualized in terms of Martial Law had the civil and military bureaucracy not been behind it, believed in it and supported it. One man cannot make Martial Law. It is the entire bureaucracy that makes it work. Should the bureaucracy refuse to cooperate, not openly, but in a lethargic execution of the law, policy will remain nothing but words on a piece of paper. Since a mixed economy system seems to be the way by which political development may be realized, the role of the bureaucracy is to work for private enterprise and for private entrepreneurship with responsibility; we need a free market system with a conscience. Joseph La Palombara states the responsibility of the bureaucracy in working for a mixed economy that will facilitate political development thus: "the bureaucracy should facilitate the growth of the private sector. It could create an objective setting

characterized by law, order and security. It should facilitate credit, allocate scarce resources and provide numerous physical and related inducements to economic growth. In order to maximize its own participation in a dual economic system, it could carry the major responsibility for limited national economic planning. In the political realm, the bureaucracy could set an example by spearheading democratization in its own sphere. It could also encourage the healthy growth of legislative and executive power as well as voluntary associations by exercising a judicious self-restraint in the use of its own powers and capacities."

Decentralization is a sign of democratization. It gives localities and communities and individuals greater autonomy and increases their participation in the governance of their own affairs. Since we have defined political development to be the policy-making activity of the government which increases the participation of the governed in the acts of governance, then it is apparent that decentralization is directly concerned with political development. I speak of decentralization because it is one of the three major thrusts of the Integrated Reorganization Plan.

Since the theme of this conference is development politics with a focus on Western Visayas, I will make an attempt here to describe the role played by bureaucracy in political development as we have defined it through efforts which, though national in scope, has been given regional perspective in the desire to effect a broader and more equitable distribution of benefits both economic and political to localities throughout the nation. I am sure that the efforts of the bureaucracy towards development in both the economic and political spheres have been in existence for as long as there has been a bureaucracy in this country. Considering this, I believe it would be best to start with government reorganization through the Integrated Reorganizational Plan. The premarital law government-wide reorganization was brought about by the enactment of Republic Act No. 5435. Its own purposes were to provide simplicity, economy and efficiency in the government to enable it to pursue programs consistent with the national goals of economic and social development, and to improve the transactions of public business and government agencies. The government-wide reorganization efforts were confined to the executive branch of government; however, corporations owned or controlled by the government could only be reorganized within the limits of their respective charters. Specifically exempted from the reorganization were the Legislative and Judicial

Departments, the General Auditing Office, Commission on Elections and local governments. At the Joint Legislative-Executive body, the Commission had nine members, three from the House of Representatives, three from the Senate and three Presidential appointees who may or may not come from the government. Its first executive chairman or secretary was Rafael Salas, succeeded by Ernesto Maceda and in turn by Armand Fabella. The Commission organized seventeen reorganization panels with six to eight members who were acknowledged experts and practitioners. Of the 123 members in all the panels, one-fourth came from the private sector one-fifth from the universities, and the remainder came from the civil, military and foreign services. Thus more than half or the majority came from the bureaucracy. The reorganization work was divided into seventeen functional areas. Intensive studies on reorganization were undertaken from June, 1969 to December 1970. Interviews were conducted and studies of agencies were made. As a result, the Integrated Reorganization Plan which was submitted to the President on December 31, 1970 reflected the ideas and practical insights of a wide cross-section of the community including political representatives, civil servants, technocrats, professors, business executives, labor leaders and others. To assure passage in both Houses of Congress and to maintain the integrity of the Integrated Reorganizational Plan, President Marcos issued Executive Order No. 281 creating the Presidential Commission to review and revise the plan. Behind the documents were 32 months of intensive work by experts of various persuasions in both the private and public sectors.

The Integrated Reorganizational Plan has three major thrusts, namely, the improvement and integration of planning and decision-making, the revamp of the civil service, system, and decentralization. Prior to reorganization, the Government was plagued with too many agencies performing planning work. There were at least five of them, the NEC, the PES, CB, the BOI and the Budget Commission. Now it is only the NEDA. Decentralization, the third major thrust of the Reorganization Plan, is the decentralization of governmental functions and operations. It has been observed that there was too much concentration of authority at the center. The President was over burdened by unnecessary administrative details because of the plethora of agencies under its supervision. At the time of reorganization, there were 146 offices directly under the Office of the President. To enable the President to concentrate on major policies, planning and development, the number of offices

reporting to him was reduced considerably. There was also a corresponding delegation of government powers and responsibilities to the Regional Offices established in the 12 uniform regional areas. As a consequence of this decentralization scheme, the Regional Director had come on his own. The scheme in effect made him the "Little Secretary" in his jurisdiction enjoying his share of powers and authority which used to repose wholly upon the head of office. The reorganization of government by decentralization had devolved the decision-making function and has brought the government closer to the grassroots in the best and most effective fashion. One of the priority measures of the President prior to the promulgation of Proclamation No. 1081 was the integrated Reorganization Plan, and to implement this, the President signed General Order No. 1 in order to effect the desired changes and reforms in the social, economic and political structures of the country. PD No. 1 created the Department of Local Government and Community Development which assists the President in the general supervision over the local governments. We also have reforms under the New Constitution and provisions for stronger local governments. In summary, it may be stated that the bureaucratic participation in political developments especially those with regional implications were to be found in the following endeavors: (a) in reorganization, efficient, economical and effective service of government to the public has improved the quality of life of the Filipino. Decentralization was the result of the clamor of localities for decision-making on services by the agencies of the national government to be made at their level; (b) integrated planning resulted in the designation of the NEDA as the national planning body which, in turn, in its four-year plan, came up with regional development as an avowed objective and as a strategy for national development. The regional offices of the NEDA were established and the Regional Development Councils were set up with membership of all the provincial governors and city mayors as well as the directors of the regional offices of the national government agencies in the regions; (c) the Department of Finance is mainly responsible for the passage of PD Nos. 477, 144 and 231 which seek to increase and enhance the financial viability of local government units and to develop their expertise in local fiscal administration. While there is no regional office for the Department of Finance, there is a plan for the establishment of one in the very near future; (d) finally, the reorganization brought about the organization of the Department of Local Government and Community Development. This agency exercises the President's

supervision over the local government units in the region. The DLGCD is responsible for strengthening the barangays politically in their own areas and in their participation in the municipalities, the cities and the provinces. The Regional Katipunan ng mga Sangguniang Bayans, the Regional Executive Councils, and the Regional Secretariats for the Sangguniang Bayans, are all designed to provide experiences to the local governments on the regional atmosphere.

Regionalization and decentralization, therefore, are answers to the need of all the citizenry for greater participation in the social, cultural, economic and political affairs and benefits that the nation can offer. It is a demand for equality and participation. If President Marcos has said that democracy is a revolution and that he has utilized the government and martial law not to restore the status quo but to restructure Philippine society for greater equality, then government has become mainly an instrument for revolution and any bureaucracy by this reasoning becomes nothing less than an army of that revolution. Nothing then, I believe, can picture more clearly the role on the bureaucracy in Philippine political development than this statement by President Marcos on the revolutionary use of the government. Whether, therefore, regionalization in terms of political development will increase the participation of Filipinos in Western Visayas in the institutions and policies that govern them will depend to a great extent upon the bureaucracy. Thank you.