

THE POLITICAL SCIENCE OF DR. MAXIMO M. KALAW*

*Remigio E Agpalo***

Dr. Maximo M. Kalaw was a great pioneer in the study of political science in our country and the first Filipino head of the Department of Political Science of the University of the Philippines. His political science, which he defined as a study of the state, focused on the political saga of the Philippines as it was conceived during the Propaganda Movement, born during the Philippine Revolution, conquered by the United States during the Filipino-American War, conquered also by Japan during World War II, and finally set free by the United States after a long and peaceful independence movement addressed to the American nation, in which movement he himself played a major role. Dr. Kalaw's commentaries and questionings on Philippine politics in 1930, during the peak of his academic career in the University of the Philippines, remain valid, relevant, and significant to our government and people today. His political science was professed in the grand manner, for it was infused with three great ideals — nationalism, freedom, and democracy.

These statements constitute the thesis of my lecture on Dr. Maximo M. Kalaw this morning. It is indeed a pleasure and a great honor to be assigned to present this lecture, for in giving it, I am provided an opportunity to discuss Dr. Kalaw's legacy to our discipline and at the same time to remember him and his works. We Filipinos have a saying: *Ang hindi marunong lumingon sa pinanggalingan ay hindi makararating sa paroroonan.*¹ And let us also take note of this fact: next year, on May 10, will be the centenary of Dr. Kalaw's birth.

Before I develop and discuss the thesis of this lecture, I would like to take up at the outset Dr. Kalaw's biographical sketch focused on his academic and political career.² This will shed more light on and a broader context of his political science.

*Second lecture delivered for the Diamond Year Lecture Series of the Department of Political Science, University of the Philippines, Quezon City, at the Faculty Center Conference Hall, on August 20, 1990.

**Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Department of Political Science, University of the Philippines.

Dr. Kalaw was born in Lipa, Batangas, on May 10, 1891. Finishing his elementary schooling at his hometown, he took his secondary education at the Batangas High School. From his home province he went to Manila and enrolled in the Normal School, where he studied in 1908-1909. He proceeded to the University of the Philippines and studied in the College of Liberal Arts from 1909 to 1910.

In 1911, Manuel L. Quezon, then Resident Commissioner in the United States, appointed the young Kalaw as private secretary.³ This appointment paved the way for Kalaw's university education in the United States. He obtained his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Washington and his Bachelor of Laws degree from Georgetown University. He finished these degrees by 1916. In 1924, the University of Michigan granted him a Ph.D. degree.

Since the Department of Political Science was not established until 1915, we do not find the name Maximo Kalaw as listed as a faculty member in the *U.P. Catalogue for School Year 1914-1915*. In the *U.P. Catalogue, 1916-1917*, we read that there were only two persons listed as staff members of the Department of Political Science: "Dean [George A.] Malcolm, Chief of Department, and Mr. [Maximo M.] Kalaw."⁴ Dean Malcolm was not Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, where the Department of Political Science belonged; he was the Dean of the College of Law.

During the school year 1916-1917, the Department of Political Science offered 5 junior courses and 5 senior courses. The five junior courses were: "Political Science 1. Principles of Political Science;" "Political Science 2. Constitutional History;" "Political Science 3. American Government;" "Political Science 4. Philippine Government;" and Political Science 5. "A Study of the Government and Political Relations of the Orient, particularly Japan, China, and the East Indies."⁵ All these courses were taught by Mr. Kalaw at that time. The five senior courses of the Department were: "Political Science 6. European Governments," taught also by Mr. Kalaw; and "Political Science 7. Political Parties," "Political Science 8. Municipal Government," "Political Science 9. Theory and Practice of Legislation," and "Political Science 10. Teachers' Course in Government,"⁶ all of which were taught by both Dean Malcolm and Mr. Kalaw. There were also three other courses offered as senior courses in political science, but these were courses in the College of Law — Administrative Law, Public corporations, and Constitutional Law, all of which were taught by Dean Malcolm.⁷

Dean Malcolm left the Department of Political Science as Chief of the Department and the College of Law as Dean of the College in 1917, when he was appointed as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.⁸ Mr. Kalaw must have been appointed as Officer-in-Charge or Acting Head of the Department of Political Science in 1917-1918 — I am not sure of this, for there is a gap in our knowledge of the academic career of Dr. Kalaw, since the catalogs and Minutes of the Board of Regents of the University during those years are not available. Nevertheless, our speculation is probably correct, for we know that Mr. Kalaw succeeded Dean Malcolm as head of the Department. In any case, available data tell us that he was Chief of the Department of Political Science in 1919, when he was also appointed Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, which ended in 1935 when Dr. Kalaw retired from the University of the Philippines.

Dr. Kalaw was the author of several books: *The Case for the Filipinos* (1916);⁹ *Self-Government in the Philippines* (1919);¹⁰ *Philippine Government*, co-authored with Dean Malcolm (1923);¹¹ *The Development of Philippine Politics* (1926);¹² *Philippine Government Under the Jones Law* (1927);¹³ *The Filipino Rebel*, a novel (1930);¹⁴ *An Introduction to Philippine Social Science* (1933 and 1939);¹⁵ and *Philippine Government* (1948).¹⁶

The author of the numerous popular articles or essays for newspapers in order to provide the general public with readable accounts of important events or issues of the times, he also published several articles in professional or learned journals.¹⁷

The political career of Dr. Kalaw started auspiciously in 1911 when he served as private secretary of Manuel L. Quezon. It progressed as the years marched into the 1920's when he served as technical adviser to important independence missions to the United States. However, it darkened into disillusionment in the middle of the 1930's.

During the bright and triumphant years up to 1933, Dr. Kalaw was a recognized authority on public affairs and Philippine government and politics. Cabildo even made a more glowing appraisal. He said:

He [Dr. Kalaw] became the prophet of the new era, the interpreter of our fundamental law, the guardian of our political faiths. Many were the books and pamphlets he wrote, the researches he undertook. Through all his works one could discern the vigor of the Kalaw mind. None dared question the infallibility of his manifestoes, the divine sour-

ces of his inspiration. Minds athirst for knowledge sought the cool waters from the brooks of Kalaw's wisdom. And they were not disappointed. Kalaw was the one and only. To have disputed his authority would have been as sacrilegious as to dispute the authority of the Dalai Lama of Tibet.¹⁸

But, like all prominent people all over the world in all times who encounter bad luck, Dr. Kalaw became the defender of an ill-starred independence law – the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Law of 1933 – which was won from the United States by the Osmeña-Roxas (OSROX) independence mission. Dr. Kalaw defended this law not only because he was a technical adviser and secretary of the independence mission that worked for the approval of this law in the United States¹⁹ but also because, as a political scientist, he knew well and correctly that an independence law granting the Philippines “immediate, complete and absolute” independence was utopian.²⁰ But while he was an excellent political scientist, he was not a good and effective politician like President Manuel L. Quezon, who effectively argued that the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Law was not a real independence law and successfully obtained from the United States another independence law – the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934. Quezon who was supported vigorously by Dean Jorge Bocobo of the U.P. College of Law,²¹ won conclusively in the politics of the independence law for the Philippines. U.P. President Rafael Palma, like Dr. Kalaw, was an avid defender of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Law. After Quezon's triumph in the politics of the independence law, President Palma was forced to resign as President²² and Dean Bocobo was appointed as President of the U.P.²³ Dr. Kalaw, who was a candidate for the U.P. presidency, was so disillusioned by the turn of events that he decided to retire from the University of the Philippines in 1935.

After retirement from the University of the Philippines, Dr. Kalaw ran for the office of Assemblyman in the Commonwealth National Assembly in the third district of Batangas. Winning in this election, he ran for reelection in the same district in 1938.²⁴ He won once more in this electoral contest. When President Manuel L. Quezon died in New York in 1944 and Vice President Sergio Osmeña succeeded to the presidency, the latter appointed Dr. Kalaw as Secretary of Public Instruction and Information.²⁵ Senate President Manuel A. Roxas succeeded Osmeña President of the Republic of the Philippines when the former defeated the latter in the 1946 presidential election. Under the Roxas administration, Dr. Kalaw served as Chairman and Manager of the

Philippine Coconut Corporation, now known as the Philippine Coconut Authority (PHILCOA).²⁶

Dr. Maximo M. Kalaw passed away on March 23, 1954.²⁷

Dr. Kalaw and Political Science

Political science, like all disciplines, has an object or subject of study. Botany studies plants; zoology, animals; sociology, the social relations of people in an urban or rural setting. In political science, the subject matter is still vigorously being debated by its practitioners. Some political scientists posit that the discipline should study the state. Others argue that it ought to study power relations among people.²⁹ There are many who posit that it should focus its study of the political system and its political process.³⁰

Dr. Kalaw, summarizing his thoughts on the subject in 1933, said:

Political science is the study of the state. The divisions of political science are: (1) Descriptive political science; (2) Historical political science; (3) Theoretical political science; and (4) Political law. Descriptive political science, as the name implies, is a discussion of the actual state governmental organizations... Historical political science deals with the development of the state and its institutions. It is practically a branch of history, only that in historical political science, we take up chiefly the development of those institutions connected with the state. *Theoretical political science is sometimes called political philosophy.* It takes up principles and norms of conduct that should be observed by persons and political entities... Political law takes up the law setting up the framework of the government or defining the relation between the individuals and the government.³¹

As posited by Dr. Kalaw, the object of study of political science is the state. How does he define a state? Dr. Kalaw said:

A state, to quote Garner, is a "community of persons more or less numerous, permanently occupying a definite portion of territory, independent of external control and possessing an organized government to which the majority of the people render habitual obedience."³²

From this definition, Kalaw drew the essential elements of a state. These, according to him, are: "(1) people; (2) territory; (3) government; [and] (4) in-

dependence or sovereignty.”

If we analyze carefully his summation of the idea of political science and draw conclusions from such analysis, we can conclude that there are four basic approaches to the study of political science as used by Dr. Kalaw: (1) juridical or legalistic; (2) historical; (3) institutional; and (4) philosophical.

In a critical mood in 1965, I said that the study of the state, making use of the four basic approaches as I have just mentioned, as made by Dr. Kalaw, was “old political science.”³⁴ I added that this kind of political science was essentially legalistic and static.³⁵

I observed in 1965, during the golden jubilee of the Department of Political Science:

It is legalistic because it studies the juridical concept of state, the various forms of government, the branches and agencies of a government, their legal powers and limitations, the people as citizens or aliens, or as voters or non-voters, their legal rights and limitations, the idea and nature of sovereignty, the legal relations between sovereign states, and the prerogatives and legal limitations of them. It is essentially static because it emphasizes legal structures and functions... When it studies the dynamics of government, it studies procedure. Thus, the analysis of legislation, administration, adjudication, and elections is mechanical.

Legislation, for instance, is analyzed in terms of first reading, second reading, the rules of procedure or debate, third reading, the kinds of voting during third reading, and so forth. In elections, the same mechanical approach is adopted — registration of voters, who are and are not voters, qualifications and disqualifications of voters, rules to be applied in counting the votes, and so forth. The interplay of social, economic, political, and other forces in the political system are not stressed and may even be ignored. Thus, all the life, complexity, grimness, grace, confusion, and dynamics of politics are underplayed or disregarded.³⁶

Describing another facet of the old political science, I also observed in my critique that it did not make use of field survey and interviews, which are used by the new political science in order to generate new data. Instead, the old political science “lays much emphasis on library study, analyzing legal documents, such as written constitutions, statutes, administrative rulings, and the

like."³⁷ In other words, the old political science did not generate new data in the study of political science; it merely made use of existing data found in books, articles, documents and other materials placed in libraries and repositories of books, documents, and similar materials.

While very critical of the political science of Dr. Kalaw and others with the same views as that of Dr. Kalaw, I also said in my 1965 critique that this kind of political science carried great advantages:

Their state-focused political science was appropriate to the problem of getting Philippine independence because it suggested to Filipino nationalists a simple and effective way of arguing and fighting for it. They argued that their country was already close to becoming a state, for the Philippines had a people, a territory, and a government. *The only thing it lacked was sovereignty, which the United States ought to grant since the Filipino people were entitled to it as a matter of right.* This kind of political science also facilitated the teaching of the rights of citizens and the procedures and powers of government agencies. Knowledge of all these was needed by a people who were struggling to wrest political independence from a colonial master.³⁸

The legalistic, institutional, historical, and philosophical approaches were used effectively by Dr. Kalaw in his works.

The legalistic and institutional approaches are well illustrated in *Philippine Government Under the Jones Law* of 1927 and *Philippine Government* of 1948. For example, the chapters of the former book discussed various governmental institutions then existing and analyzed them in terms of their legal basis and legal powers and limitations. Among the chapters presented in the study are the following: Chapter III, the Governor-General; Chapter V, The Council of State; Chapter IX, The Legislature – Organization and Powers; Chapter XIII, The Judiciary; Chapter XIV, Provincial Government; Chapter XVI, Municipal Government; and Chapter XVII, The Chartered Cities.

The historical approach is best illustrated in *The Development of Philippine Politics* of 1926. This study discussed from the perspective of history the conception, birth, and gradual development of the Filipino nation from 1872-1920, as influenced by ideas, social forces, and politico-governmental agencies established during the Propaganda Movement, the Philippine Revolution, the Filipino-American War, and finally the peaceful crusade for independence up to 1920.

The historical approach was also used by Dr. Kalaw as one of the major approaches in his last book, *Philippine Government*, of 1948. In this book, Dr. Kalaw traced the development of Philippine politics from the pre-Spanish *barangay* to the Republic of the Philippines established on July 4, 1946.

As regards the philosophical approach, it was not given full force in any of his books. The principal reason for this is that Dr. Kalaw's emphases were the historical, legalistic, and institutional approaches. However, the philosophical approach was already active or operative as tendencies or articulated ideals in his works. In his *Philippine Government* of 1948, Dr. Kalaw devoted two chapters – Chapter XXIV and Chapter XXV – on the principles of freedom and democracy. Earlier in 1946, Dr. Kalaw wrote an essay entitled "The New Philippine Ideology: An Exposition."³⁹ *The ideal of nationalism throbs as an omnipresent value in all his books*, for Dr. Kalaw was an ardent advocate and defender of nationalism, understood as Philippine independence not only in political but also in the economic and cultural realms.

Dr. Kalaw's political science, defined as the study of the state and making use of the legalistic, historical, institutional, and philosophical approaches, was learned initially by him from Dean George A. Malcolm. The influence of Dean Malcolm on Dr. Kalaw is profound owing to the following facts: (1) while the young Kalaw was an instructor in political science, his Chief of the Department was Dean Malcolm. (2) The only textbook on Philippine government existing in the Philippines before the 1920s which was used by the young Kalaw in Political Science 4, *Philippine Government*, was Dean Malcolm's treatise entitled *Government of the Philippine Islands*, which was published in 1916. In this book, Malcolm declared magisterially:

In modern political science, there is understood by "state" in its widest sense, an independent society acknowledging no superior. The United States Supreme Court in an early case defined "state" as "a complete body of free persons united together for the common benefit, to enjoy peaceably what is their own and do justice to others." A more comprehensive definition containing the essential constituent elements is that a state is "a community of persons, more or less numerous, permanently occupying a definite portion of a territory, independent of external control and possessing an organized government to which the great body of inhabitants render habitual obedience."⁴⁰

(3) Kalaw co-authored with Dean Malcolm *Philippine Government: Development, Organization and Functions*, published in 1923.⁴¹ This book repeated what Dean Malcolm had written in *Government of the Philippine Islands* in 1916, except that Kalaw provided it with a Filipino perspective and details from his own study of the Philippines. (4) Both Malcolm's book in 1916 and Malcolm's and Kalaw's text in 1923 on Philippine Government used the legalistic, institutional, historical, and philosophical approaches.

Although Dr. Kalaw learned initially his political science from Dean Malcolm, Dr. Kalaw, however, made significant changes on Malcolm's political science. While Malcolm stressed the values of freedom and democracy in his political science, Kalaw added a third value — nationalism. In other words, although both Kalaw and Malcolm believed in freedom and democracy, Kalaw was individually a Kalaw in his nationalism.

The second change made by Kalaw on Malcolm's political science was in the strengthening of the staff of the Department of Political Science and the increasing of the courses taught by the Department.

Let us recall that during the headship of the Department of Political Science by Dean Malcolm from 1915 to 1917, there were only ten political science courses offered by the Department, five of which were junior courses and the remaining five were senior courses. Also, there were only two staff members of the Department at that time — Dr. Kalaw and Dean Malcolm.

Dr. Kalaw's strengthening the staff of the Department and increasing its courses are recorded in the U.P. *General Catalogue, 1922-1923*. At this time, Dr. Kalaw was already the head of the Department. The staff of the Department, instead of only two during Malcolm's term as Head, had increased to seven. Besides Dr. Kalaw, the staff members of the Department included "Professors Malcolm, de las Alas, and Uychutin, as well as Messrs. Reyes and Austria, and Dr. Laurel."⁴²

With regard to the course offerings of the Department, these were increased by thirteen new courses. In other words, the courses offered by the Department by 1922-1923 had grown to twenty-three. The thirteen new courses were: "Junior House of Representatives. — Practice in Parliamentary Law, Debating, and Legislation;" "Political Science 11. Diplomacy;" "Political Science 12. Constitutional Developments in China;" "Political Science 13. Chinese Diplomacy;" "Political Science 14. Far Eastern Relations and

Politics;" "Political Science 15. History of Political Thought;" "Political Science 16. Problems of Municipal Government;" "Political Science 17. International Law;" "Political Science 18. Current Political Problems;" "Political Science 19. Colonial Government;" "Political Science 20. History of Diplomacy;" "Political Science 21. American-Philippine Relations;" and "Political Science 22. Seminar in Political Science."⁴³

An examination of the new courses in political science in 1922- 1935, if analyzed in terms of the present five fields of the Department – Philippine Government and Politics, Foreign and Comparative Governments and Politics, Political Dynamics, International Relations, and Political Theory and Methodology – shows that the fields of Philippine Government and Politics, Foreign and Comparative Governments and Politics, and International Relations were significantly enriched; and for the first time, Political Theory and Methodology courses – two of them – were added. It is also significant to note that there was no genuine course on Political Dynamics which was included.

Dr. Kalaw on Nationalism, Freedom and Democracy

At this juncture, we can now proceed to the discussion of the ideals of nationalism, freedom, and democracy, which were infused in Dr. Kalaw's political science.

We begin with the ideal of nationalism, for, as I had stated earlier, nationalism was omnipresent in all his books. Considering the strong family value in the Philippines, which involves intimate relations among family members and sharing social and political attitudes as a result of family socialization, Dr. Kalaw must have been strongly influenced by his older brother, Teodoro Kalaw, a well-known and respected nationalist. The older Kalaw was the author of books, among others, brimming with nationalism – *La Masoneria Filipina*,⁴⁴ and *La Revolucion Filipina*,⁴⁵ as well as the editor of works by Filipino national heroes: *Epistolario Rizalino*⁴⁶ and Apolinario Mabini's *La Revolucion Filipina*⁴⁷. His nationalism burned with fervor in the nationalist newspaper, *El Renacimiento*, and his trial arising from this newspaper's editorial, "*Aves de Rapina*."⁴⁸

In any case, Dr. Maximo Kalaw's nationalism was articulated very early. While he was an undergraduate student at George Washington University in 1912, nationalism was the value or idea which inspired him to articulate a win-

ning oration, entitled "The Case for the Filipinos."⁴⁹ Nationalism, to Kalaw, then, was defending Filipino dignity both for the individual and the nation and the nation's right to independence. In 1916, Kalaw summarized the Filipino struggle for dignity and independence in a book of the same title as that of his oration. Kalaw wrote:

With the laying down of their arms, the Filipino people continued their struggle for independence with the implements of peace... to defer independence for the Philippines until after several generations have gone by... is practically to deny the Filipino people their right to govern themselves... Independence should be recognized at once or within a reasonable time.⁵⁰

With regard to the ideals of freedom and democracy, Dr. Kalaw had discussed these in two chapters of his book *Philippine Government*, published in 1948. His ideal of freedom as discussed in this book, is liberty — civil and political — as expressed in the Bill of Rights of the 1935 Constitution, whose roots go deep into McKinley's Instructions of 1900, the Philippine Bill of 1902, and the Jones Law of 1916. As regards the ideal of democracy, also discussed in the same book, this is liberal, representative, and constitutional democracy.

Dr. Kalaw's view of democracy was comprehensively summarized in his essay, "The New Philippine Ideology: An Exposition," which was a commentary of President Sergio Osmeña's statements on democracy in 1946.⁵¹

President Osmeña said:

We condemn the totalitarian ideology which the enemy has sought to impose on us under a government by self-constituted or God-chosen rulers, and we hereby reaffirm our devotion to the principles of popular sovereignty, of a government of the people, for the people, and by the people....

We stand for the individual liberties, guaranteed by our Constitution, for the right of every man and woman to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.⁵²

Providing a commentary on President Osmeña's statements on democracy, Dr. Kalaw said:

The President's pronouncement on democracy is not new. It is merely a reaffirmation of our faith in and adherence to an old principle.

But it is necessary to rededicate ourselves to the cause of democracy because the efforts of the enemy, during his occupation of our country, to destroy the democratic institutions which America, with Filipino cooperation, had established here.⁵³

Elaborating on democracy, Dr. Kalaw observed:

Democracy is not only an American but a Filipino heritage. Research has shown that in pre-Spanish days the Malays who inhabited the Southeast Asia and the islands now, known as the East Indies and the Philippines, had institutions which, while not exactly democratic, contained the seeds of democracy. Many of the Malay kings, like those of Java, Sumatra, and Celebes, assumed office through some kind of election. And the Malays had a high sense of personal dignity and worth. The women enjoyed more freedom and occupied a higher place in society than the Japanese woman of today. During the Spanish regime of more than three centuries, some of these democratic traits were not encouraged by the governors; in fact, many of them were suppressed by reactionary administrators. But the seeds did not die even if the soil dried up; they were just waiting for a chance to sprout when the soil became richer and more congenial for their growth. That opportunity came toward the end of the last century when our revolutionary fathers rose against Spanish tyranny and founded the Philippine Republic of 1898. That republic was the first democratic state in the Far East, deriving the powers from the people, not from an emperor-deity. The greatest revolutionary exponent of democracy was Apolinario Mabini, the brains of the Revolution, who in his famous *Decalogue* said:

Thou shalt not recognize in thy country the authority of any person who has not been elected by thee and thy countrymen: for authority emanates from God, and as God speaks in the conscience of every man, the person designated and proclaimed by the conscience of a whole people is the only one who can use true authority.

Thou shalt strive for a Republic and never for a monarchy on thy country; for the latter exalts one or several families and found a dynasty; the former makes a people noble and worthy through reason, great through liberty, and prosperous and brilliant through labor.⁵⁴

Conclusion

I shall conclude this lecture on one of the statements constituting its thesis as put in the beginning — Dr. Kalaw's commentaries and questionings on Philippine politics in 1930, during the peak of his academic career in the University of the Philippines, remain valid, relevant, and significant to the government and the people of the Philippines today. These commentaries and questionings were eloquently articulated in Dr. Kalaw's novel, *The Filipino Rebel*.

This novel presents the changing careers of three major fictional Filipino rebels — Don Pedro Ricafort, Juan Licaroz, and Josefa, a.k.a. Juana Liwanag — during an epic period that begins at the close of the Spanish-Filipino War and the start of the Filipino-American War in 1898 and concludes at the culmination of the independence movement in the Philippines in the latter part of the 1920s. In between the beginning and the end of the novel, the capitulation of the Filipino armed struggle against the United States, the establishment of civil government, the Americanization of the Philippines, the development of political parties and elections, the political decay of the ideals of the Philippine Revolution, and the independence movement involving independence missions to the United States take place. The changing times and circumstances and the transformation of the lives of the three major rebels provided Dr. Kalaw's excellent strategic moments during which to articulate ideas and commentaries on Filipino culture, politics, economy, and society.

The three principal fictional rebels in the novel are a study of contrasts and similarities as to their loyalty to the ideals of the revolution, orientation towards the American people, and their personal fate.

Don Pedro Ricafort and Juan Licaroz are polar opposites in the sense that the former never betrayed his revolutionary ideals to the extent that he willingly opted for the life of an expatriate even after General Emilio Aguinaldo had reconciled himself with the Americans and Apolinario Mabini had returned to the Philippines from his exile and took an oath of allegiance to the United States; and the latter gradually cast aside the woman he vowed to love eternally and his revolutionary ideals, as his political ambition developed to become a lust for power and glory or political materialism.

Don Pedro and Josefa, a.k.a. Juana Liwanag, are likewise from one point of view polar opposites, for Don Pedro remained anti-American all his life;

but Josefa, a.k.a. Juana Liwanag, learned to have faith in the American people as good and just. However, both the former and the latter are similar in the sense that their love of country developed during the Filipino-American War remained in them so steadfast that they subordinated their personal interests to the national interest.

As regards their fate, Juan Licaroz died of heart attack or perhaps a broken heart; Josefa, a.k.a. Juana Liwanag, lived on to continue her crusade to promote feminism in the Philippines, even as she nursed her ill-starred love-life; and Don Pedro Ricafort lived on also to continue his life as an expatriate.

From this novel of Dr. Kalaw, I have chosen some commentaries and questionings on Philippine social and political life articulated by Don Pedro after returning to the Philippines in order to be at the bedside of his dying daughter and shortly before he returned to his exile at Hong Kong. These statements published in 1930 are so amazingly contemporary that they appear to have been said in order to apply to the present Aquino government and to us Filipino today.

Speaking before a group of Filipino political elites, most of whom were national legislators and Cabinet members, who were gathered in a *despedida* party for independence-mission envoys going to the United States, Don Pedro said in his preliminary remarks:

I thought that the only topics of speeches would be the new phases of the Philippine situation, the new trend of events in the United States, and the necessity for a united front to support the envoys who are leaving... [I]nstead, I heard petty wranglings here, the mutual accusations not on the question of independence but on the pork barrel and appointment....

My young friends, has it come to this? Has our representative government failed to guide and direct our nationalist movement, our struggle for independence?⁵⁵

Don Pedro then contrasted the Philippines to Gandhi's India. Afterwards, he spoke again about the Philippines.

I feel certain that if we can restore the spirit of 1896 and 1899— [substitute for this phrase the spirit of the EDSA People Power Revolution of 1986]—if we can show by acts and deeds that we are honest,

determined, dynamic in our nationalism; if we can forego our petty jealousies and suspicions and are prepared and ready to give *and* to sacrifice all for our country's freedom, nobody can stop the advent of independence.⁵⁶

After articulating this view, Don Pedro proceeded to mention the mistaken positions and values of various sectors of Philippine society in his speech. He said:

But so long as our timid businessmen still believe they are better off at present and do not realize that under the tariff protection of independent republic they will have their chance to progress; so long as people laugh at economic protectionism and continue preferring foreign goods to native products; so long as the Filipino youth, while academically shouting for freedom, follow the footsteps of those who worship the God of political and business materialism; so long as our intelligentsia confine their work to a few articles and do not back up their theories by actual campaigns of national purification; so long as hundreds, if not thousands of government offices are filled by men who have disgraced their country and have sold their jobs to the devil; so long as the Filipino mind indiscriminately welcomes and absorbs American ideas and institutions and thus prevents the Malay mind from unfolding itself; so long as we continue in this rut surrounded by the fatalistic air of indifference and apathy, content with our mock autonomy, proud of our patronage, jealous of our pork barrel—what can we expect? We might as well be resigned to our fate and abandon all hope for emancipation!⁵⁷

ENDNOTES

¹He who does not look back to his roots will not reach his destination.

²Most of the data in Kalaw's biographical sketch as presented in this lecture came from the following: "Kalaw, Dr. Maximo M.," in George F. Nellist, ed., *Men of the Philippines* (Manila: The Sugar News, 1931), pp. 149-150; "Kalaw, Maximo M.," in *Directorio Oficial de la Asamblea Nacional* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1940), pp.66-68; and "Kalaw, Maximo M.," in Zoilo M. Galang, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Philippines*, Vol. XVIII [Builders] (Manila: McCullough Pringting Co., 1958), in Addenda, pp. 269-270.

³From Manuel L. Quezon's "Introduction," in Maximo M. Kalaw, *The Case for the Filipinos* (New York: Century Co., 1916), p. ix.

⁴(Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1917), p.113.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 113.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 114.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 114.

⁸Cesar Bengzon, Oration at the Memorial Service for George Arthur Malcolm on July 14, 1961 at the Law Theater, in *Philippine Law Journal*, 36 (September 1961), No. 4, p. 423.

⁹(New York: Century Co., 1916).

¹⁰(New York: Century Co., 1919).

¹¹(New York: D.C. Heath and Co., 1923) and (Manila: Associated Publishers, 1923).

¹²(Manila: Oriental Commercial Co., 1926).

¹³(Manila: Oriental Commercial Co., n.d.).

¹⁴(Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild [Reprint Series VI], 1964).

¹⁵(Manila: Philippine Education Co., 1939).

¹⁶(Manila: Published by the Author, 1948).

¹⁷Some of the major articles are: the articles on the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Law — "The Story of Our Sacrosanct Battle-cry and How We Found Out That It Would Not Work in Washington," "The Responsibilities of Rejection," and "Our Economic 'Strangulation,'" in *The Philippine Social Science Review*, 5 (January 1933), pp. 13-70; "Materials for the Constitution," *The Philippine Social Science Review*, 6 (July 1934) Supplement, pp. 213-247; and "National Leadership in Philippine History," *Journal of History*, 4 (October-December 1955), pp. 14-17.

¹⁸Juan A. Cabildo, *Appraisals* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1953), p.114.

¹⁹Maximo M. Kalaw, "The Story of Our Sacrosanct Battle-cry..." p.20.

²⁰Maximo M. Kalaw, "Our Economic Strangulation," p. 65.

²¹Jorge C. Bocobo, *For Freedom and Dignity* (Manila: Oriental Printing, 1933).

²²Rodolfo T. San Diego, "Faculty Representation in the BOR." *U.P. Newsletter*, May 30, 1983, pp. 1 and 7. See also Salvador P. Lopez, "Academic Freedom in a Developing Society," *Philippine Collegian*, February 17, 1977, p. 5.

²³Celia Bocobo-Olivar, *Aristocracy of the Mind: A Biography of Jorge Bocobo* (Quezon City: New Day, 1981), p. 33.

²⁴*Directorio Oficial de la Asamblea Nacional* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1940), p. 67.

²⁵Sergio Osmeña, *The New Philippine Ideology* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1945), cover of the pamphlet and p. 1.

²⁶Interview with Maximo Kalaw, Jr., August 8, 1990.

²⁷Interview with Maximo Kalaw, Jr., August 8, 1990.

²⁸Dr. Maximo M. Kalaw was only one of the political scientists in the Philippines who posited this view. In the United States, James W. Garner, whose definition of the state was adopted by Kalaw, was only one of the numerous political scientists who adopted this position. See his *Introduction to Political Science: A Treatise on the Origin, Function, and Organization of the State* (New York: American Book Co., 1910) and *Political Science and Government* (New York: American Book Co., 1935).

²⁹George E.G. Catlin. *The Science and Method of Politics* (New York: Knopf, 1927); V.O. Key. *Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1956).

³⁰The author is identified with this position. See his article, "Political Science in the Philippines," in S.S. Hsueh, ed., *Political Science in South and Southeast Asia* (Asian Political Science Association, 1966), pp.55-74.

³¹Maximo Kalaw, *An Introduction to Philippine Social Science*, pp. 579-580.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 574.

³³*Ibid.*, p. 574.

³⁴R.E. Agpalo, "Political Science in the Philippines," p. 61.

³⁵*Ibid.*

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 61-62.

³⁷*Ibid.*, p. 62.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

³⁹In Osmeña, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-32.

⁴⁰George A. Malcolm. *Government of the Philippine Islands* (Manila: The Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Co., 1916), p. 9.

⁴¹See Note 11 above.

⁴²(Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1923), p. 137.

⁴³*Ibid.*, pp. 139-141.

⁴⁴(Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1920).

⁴⁵(Manila: Manila Book Co., 1924).

⁴⁶Five volumes. (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1930-1938).

⁴⁷Two volumes. (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1931).

⁴⁸Teodoro M. Kalaw. *Aide-de-Camp to Freedom* (Manila: Teodoro M. Kalaw Society, Inc., 1965), Chapter VIII, "The *Renacimiento* Libel Suit," pp. 69-79.

⁴⁹Galang, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

⁵⁰Kalaw, *The Case For the Filipinos*, p. 179.

⁵¹Osmeña, *op. cit.*

⁵²*Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁵³*Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

⁵⁵Kalaw, *The Filipino Rebel*, p. 192.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, p. 193.

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. 193.