8-1973

Student Activism and Implications for Academic Governance in the Bicol University, Legazpi City, Philippines

Jaime Red Recana
Western Michigan University

STUDENT ACTIVISM AND IMPLICATIONS FOR ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE IN THE BICOL UNIVERSITY, LEGAZPI CITY, PHILIPPINES

by

Jaime Red Recaña

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Doctor of Education

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Morvin A. Wirtz, Dr. Rodney Roth, and Dr. Charles Houston; most especially to Dr. Wirtz, my major adviser, for his patience, understanding, guidance, and help. My thanks go to them as to Dr. John Sandberg, Dr. Kenneth Simon, Messrs. Jimmie Morton, Pamela Everitt and Mary Ramer, who have also given me much needed help. Finally, but not the least, to Miss Karen Sue McDougall, my fiancee, for moral support and all her unstinted help, my sincerest thanks and gratitude.

Jaime Red Recaña

DEDICATION

To the Filipino student-youth:

> whose efforts are "to dedicate themselves to the pursuit of knowledge, the strengthening of their moral qualities, and the acquisition of skills which will make them productive and useful members of the New Society."

To the Filipino citizen:

> "realizing that the making of the New Society ultimately depends upon him; that the initiative of leadership, and the integrity and efficiency of government provides him with the environment that encourages his best efforts, exerts . . . efforts by obeying the laws, and above all, supporting policies which are, after all, in his best interests."

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

Introduction

Student activism in the Philippines is a phenomenon of the twentieth century. It is considered an educational problem of recent vintage by the Philippine Department of Education, the government's national agency, which has a power over all institutions of learning in the country. Today student activism is a cause for a "dislocation of the educational system" in the country--characterized by disruption of classes, destruction of school property, and the wounding and death of some student participants and innocent bystanders.

The demands of the students were varied and many. The student demands at the university level were: (1) the right to have competent professors, adequate libraries and physical facilities; (2) the right to have a voice in the formulation of policies of the school with respect to student-faculty relations as well as student-administration relations; (3) reasonable tuition fees; (4) academic freedom within the campus; (5) the right to be apprised of the rules and regulations of the institutions; (6) the right to be heard before any penalties are imposed, and in particular, when the penalty is suspension or expulsion; and (7) the right to fair and humane treatment.

Since Manila is the location of the majority of universities and colleges as compared to the rest of the Philippines, it is easy

to understand why most of the student activism would take place there. Because the Offices of the national government are located in Manila, it is also logical for student activism to take place here, making it easier to get the attention of the national officials concerned with the implementation of the needed reforms.

The following are some of the reactions to student activism: The government felt that these student groups and organizations were Communist-infiltrated or formed by non-students who wanted to overthrow the government. On the other hand, some school officials and administrators saw student activism as an enlightened vehicle for educational reforms in the country. Presidents of three schools--University of the East, Philippine College of Commerce and University of the Philippines were for student demonstrations to continue.[1]

> Filipinos hostile to the idea of radical change like to think that when present leaders of the youth revolution pass into adulthood or graduate from college, the movement would gradually die out. This view, however, has been challenged by some of the leaders themselves. They claim that unlike the demonstrators and rallyists of the past, today's rebels are better organized.
> Says a student activist:
> "We'll never lack for leaders. In fact, every organization identified, with the struggle against fascism, feudalism and imperialism, has a training program for leaders, precisely in anticipation of the day when the incumbent leaders turn traitor or drop out."[2]

---

[1]P.A. Zapanta, "The Mentors Speak Out," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970, p. 42.

[2]Isabelo T. Crisostomo, "Today's Rebels--Tomorrow's Reactionaries," Philippines Free Press, July 18, 1970, p. 61. (Hereinafter referred to as Crisostomo, "Today's Rebels,")

The Problem

The President of the Republic of the Philippines by virtue of Executive Act No.202 s. 1969, created the Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education. One of the objectives of the Commission was to identify critical areas in Philippine education for more research and study. The results of the survey were released in December, 1970. Among the findings and recommendations was the recommendation that a study be made of student activism with a view of providing some means of increasing student participation in policy-making and government of academic institutions, and of finding constructive means of handling grievance and dissent and preventing the disruption of academic programs by violent student militants. The Commission's report states:

> Student protest and activism can be powerful instruments for achieving desirable educational reforms or for effecting dislocation in educational systems. Recent incidents indicate that the balance is tilted more to the latter. Two major negative consequences of student ferment are the widening gap between the administration and the faculty and the growing polarization of these two elements from the studentry. The consequent problems brought about by student activism requires a special body to conduct a depth study. Within time available to the Commission such an undertaking was not possible.[1]

At present there is no special body conducting that study, and to the personal knowledge of this investigator, there has been no study made on the subject.

---

[1]Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education, Education for National Development: New Patterns, New Directions (Manila: PCSPE, 1970), p. 187. (Hereinafter referred to as Presidential Commission, Education for National Development.)

This study, therefore, will attempt to present student activism in the Philippines from 1969 to 1971, and will try to identify the causes and their effects on Philippine colleges and universities. Further, it will suggest means of providing for student participation in academic governance and more specifically for the Bicol University, Legaspi City. In addition, some means of preventing the disruption of academic programs by violent student minorities and of finding some means of handling student grievance and dissent will be included in a section dealing with recommendations.

Significance of the Study

Student protest and activism, when properly channeled, "can be powerful instruments for achieving desirable educational reforms."[1] A school administrator in the Philippines, seeking for information on student activism, would find this study a modest source of information. The suggestions for student participation in academic governance, and means of handling student grievance and dissent might provide some insight for solving or preventing the disruption of classes caused by student activists. The suggestions will be specifically for the Bicol University, Lagaspi City, Philippines, therefore some modifications would need to be made to suit other institutions or student bodies with different characteristics.

A teacher in Philippine history, comparative education, and

---

[1]Presidential Commission, Education for National Development, p. 186.

the Philippine educational system, might be able to obtain relevant information which would otherwise be found in several separate materials, some of which might be difficult to obtain for anyone who is interested in the Philippines. Perhaps a Philippine agency or another investigator who is interested in making a further study on student activism in the Philippines might find this study a modest source of information.

Development of the Study

The main question to be dealt with is: what were the causes and effects of student activism in the Philippines from 1969 to 1971, and what are its implications for academic governance for Bicol University? This question can be broken down into smaller questions that can then be dealt with on a more individual basis. These questions are: (1) Did student activism begin in the colleges and universities? (2) Did student activism primarily concern demands from the schools for changes? (3) Was there evidence to indicate that there was more student involvement among the private institutions than in government supported schools? (4) What happened to the student demands and the student leaders? Questions such as these must certainly be dealt with if one is to answer the central question to this thesis.

Approach to the Study

The main emphasis of the study is to present the causes and effects of student activism in the Philippines from 1969 to 1971. The

study, therefore, will concentrate on the actions of the student activists and the reactions of the government officials, school authorities and private agencies or individuals.

A brief description of the geographical, historical, socio-economic, and political background is found in Chapter 11, and a discussion of education during the idfferent regimes in the Philippines is found in Chapter 111. Chapters 11 and 111 contain background information, especially for the reader who is not familiar with the Philippines. Chapter 1V presents the development of student activism in the Philippines. This chapter includes a review of related literature. It also includes implications of student activism for Bicol University. Chapter V deals with the summary, and conclusions.

The basic method is historical analysis. The first step is the formulation of the problem and this was already mentioned on page 3. The next two steps were collecting and criticizing source materials.

Sources and treatment of data. The investigator was aware of limitations when he was choosing his source materials. His first choices were those materials published by the Philippine Department of Education or its agencies such as the Bureau of Public Schools and the Bureau of Private Schools; official sources, among whom were Fresnoza (a superintendent who worked in the Philippines Department of Education Central Office), Isidro (former President, Mindanao State University), and Corpuz (former Secretary of Education), and organizations such as the Philippine Council on Population, Philippine Association of School Superintendents, and UNESCO. Secondary sources included material from Philippines Free Press, Graphic, Manila Times, Philippine

Panorama, Weekly Nation and Action Now, all published on the national level, Philippine Times, published in Chicago, Illinois, and magazines published by schools in the Philippines such as the Philippine Studies and Solidarity. Discovering that these data were still limited, third choices were data from dissertations about the Philippines and written by Filipinos. Having exhausted the information coming from these sources mentioned, his last choices were the articles, books, and publications about the Philippines which were authored by persons unfamiliar to the researcher. There was considerable difficulty involved here, for the choice of the data was based upon the researcher's value judgment which might be biased and subjective. In other words, it was difficult to be impartial and objective in selecting all the data from these last choices. However, all of these which pertain to the Philippines and relevant to this study were included. The data on student activism were arranged in the order of their dates of publications. These were grouped into years--1969, 1970, and 1971.

The fourth step was formulating hypotheses to explain events or conditions. These were mentioned on page 5 under the title "Development of the Study." The last step was interpreting and reporting findings. The data are found in Chapters II, III, and IV.

Delimitations of the Study

1. The term, student activism, as used here includes the following: student unrest, student demonstration, student rebellion, student movement, student power, and student protest.

2. The various manifestations of student activism were not

limited to campus unrest. It was difficult to separate out actions occurring on the school campus, for the actions might be outside the school campus but the demonstrations were against school authorities.

3. The investigation did not include a study of the student leaders and student organizations. Data on the membership of the student organizations and vita of the student leaders were difficult to obtain.

4. While the sources of data on student activism were mainly newspapers and magazines which were published on a national level in the Philippines, it was difficult to determine whether reports covered all those events which occurred in the provinces.

5. Information on the enrollments of individual colleges and universities from the years 1969 to 1971 was not available.

6. The data on the number of student activists in any of the events were based on the estimates of the press reports. Again, it was difficult to obtain an accurate estimate of the number.

CHAPTER II

BRIEF GEOGRAPHICAL, HISTORICAL, SOCIO-ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL BACKGROUND

Geographical Background

The Republic of the Philippines occupies an archipelago 600 miles off the southeast coast of Asia. It is a country of 7,100 islands which include the main island groups of Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. The total land area of 300,000 square kilometers, scattered and discontinuous, is heavily concentrated in the two largest islands of Luzon and Mindanao. Its population density is a little over 120 persons per square kilometer, with some densities approaching 1,200 per square kilometer.

Historical Background

The Philippines was visited by Magellan in 1521 but it was not until 1565 that the Philippines became a Spanish colony and it remained as such until the Treaty of Paris on December 10, 1898. It was named after King Philip II of Spain.

From the Spanish, the Filipinos absorbed Roman Catholicism. The village chieftains accepted Spanish overlordship and in return were allowed to keep their hereditary powers plus the authority to collect taxes. On the other hand, Spanish rule goaded Filipinos into a national consciousness. The Spaniards exacted forced labor and tribute. When the local groups found these demands harsh and unreasonable, they rose in sporadic, fruitless rebellions. What finally

persuaded most of the Filipinos to "hang together" was the 300-year experience of "hanging separately." Thus Spain inadvertently sowed the seeds of revolution and unity. Some of the leading Filipinos who rebelled against Spain in 1896 had been educated in Europe. The Philippine Revolution of 1896 was the first successful national uprising in Asia.[1]

In 1898, Filipino revolutionaries attempted to control and proclaimed the First Philippine Republic. This was short-lived however, as Spain ceded the country to the United States of America after the former was defeated in the Spanish-American War at the turn of the nineteenth century.

The United States justified its intervention by declaring that it intended to prepare the Filipinos for self-government and eventual nationhood. The United States exercised suzerainty until 1935 when a commonwealth form of government was established for the granting of independence in 1946. The Commonwealth Government was disrupted by the Japanese Occupation from 1942 to early 1945.

The Philippines became an independent country on July 4, 1946. The constitutional framework of the country resembles that of the United States in the organization of the executive, the legislative and the judicial branches of the government. Since the government is democratic in nature, the powers exercised by the officials stem from the people and the officials are responsible to the people. However,

---

[1]Raul S. Manglapus, Revolt Against Tradition, ed. by Rodolfo Severino Jr. (Manila: n.p., 1964), p. 146. (Hereinafter referred to as Manglapus, Revolt Against Tradition.)

there is no complete autonomy among the local political units. These are limited to disburse funds for local purposes, and if they cannot collect enough revenues national government aid would be necessary. The aid in general would come from the yearly public works fund and the President's contingency fund. The provinces and cities have little control over the appointment of the treasurers, auditors, judges and fiscals for these are appointed by the national government.

Historical factors account for the highly centralized structure of the government, having started thus during the Spanish times, carried on during the American regime and to the present. Although provincial governors head the provincial government, city and municipal mayors head cities and municipalities and barrio captains head barrios or villages, only limited authority is exercised by these officials. Governmental power and authority reside mainly in the national government and especially within the office and person of the President of the Philippines.

Socio-Economic Background

Population. The Philippines has an estimated population of 38 million according to the National Economic Council's mid-year report of the Philippines population in 1970. About five million are Muslims and other religious and cultural minorities. The remainder are Christians. The country's population growth, estimated to be around 3.2 per cent per year, is one of the highest in the world. The country's population increased by about 30 million from 1900 to 1969 and it is expected to grow by another 70 to 75 million in the

remaining three decades of the century.[1]

Nearly one-seventh of the total population live in cities. The increasing concentration of people in cities has brought about many problems. The pressures exerted by rural migrants for jobs, housing, potable water, sanitation, schools, and urban transportation have greatly compounded the country's development problems.[2]

The Philippines is now adding over 1.2 million people to its population each year; it is estimated that nearly 400,000 workers enter the labor force annually. Approximately 32 per cent of these are illiterates or equipped with less than four years of schooling, while 6.9 per cent have had some college training. Over one-third of the labor force are 19 years of age or younger.[3] Filipino labor force has a massive lower level of unskilled and semi-skilled workers, an adequate top level of managers and executives, but only a thin middle belt of skilled workers and technicians.[4]

As of October 1965, 57 per cent of employed Filipinos were in agriculture. This was a decline of 6 per cent since 1958.[5] On the other hand, it was reported that the highest rate of unemployment

---

[1]The Population Council and the International Institute for the Study of Human Reproduction, Country Profile: The Philippines (New York: The Population Council, 1970), p. 1. (Hereinafter referred to as The Population Council, The Philippines.)

[2]Ibid., p. 3.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Onofre D. Corpuz, The Philippines (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., p. 1965), p. 3. (Hereinafter referred to as Corpus, The Philippines.)

[5]The Population Council, The Philippines, p. 3.

was among college graduates whereas the lowest rate was among those who have had no formal schooling at all.[1] Another report reveals that while the Philippines holds the record for the number of agricultural schools in Asia all too often the graduates do everything else but turn into skilled farmers.

As of 1969, 610,789 or 60.6 per cent Filipinos were employed out of the 1,007,133 graduates with 4 to 5 years of college education. By 1974, out of 1,724,214 Filipinos with the same college attainment, only 698,397 or 40.7 per cent were employed.[2] During the school year 1967-1968 the greatest number of students were enrolled in the following: education, business administration, liberal arts, and engineering. Except for engineering, the first four programs are typically four years in duration. The province of Albay and the Bicol Region has had a problem of about 3,000 "excess" teachers every year since 1968.

Literacy. Literacy rates of persons aged 10 and older changed from 49 per cent in 1939 to 60 per cent in 1948 and, to 72 per cent in 1960. Because of the very rapid population growth, however, the actual number of illiterates aged 10 and over in 1960 remained at about the 1939 level.[3] Commenting on the percentage of literacy in the Philippines and its literacy programs, a speaker in a workshop on

---

[1]Ramon C. Reyes, "Report on the Workshop on Education," Philippine Studies, January, 1971, p. 113. (Hereinafter referred to as Reyes, "Workshop on Education,")

[2]Presidential Commission, Education for National Development, p. 42.

[3]Reyes, "Workshop on Education," p. 113.

education said that it is only after high school or some ten years of schooling that the literacy program becomes of some considerable economic significance.[1]

Education. The formal system of education has two sets of schools: the government (public) supported and the non-government (private) schools. The government schools are of three classifications: (1) those under the Bureau of Public Schools, (2) those under the Bureau of Vocational Education, and (3) the chartered colleges and universities. The non-government schools, under the supervision of the Bureau of Private Schools, are categorized into church-related, proprietary and foundations.

The total enrollment during the school year 1970-1971, was 10.2 million pupils from the different levels of education. More than one out of every four Filipinos were in school and the enrollment ratio in higher education was the second highest in the world (1,560 per 100,000 population) exceeded only by the United States. Ninety-two per cent of those in higher education were enrolled in 580 private institutions.[2] Education is about the only avenue of upward mobility open to the majority. As a result there is an extraordinary scramble for higher education. Manila has more than 200,000 college students, a higher percentage of the population than any major city in the world.[3]

---

[1]Reyes, "Workshop on Education," p. 113.

[2]Presidential Commission, Education for National Development, pp. 31, 45, and 98.

[3]George M. Guthrie, "The Philippine Temperament," in Six Perspective on the Philippines ed. by George M. Guthrie (Manila: Bookmark, 1968), p. 64.

Despite the uncertainty of getting a job after graduation, Filipino students continue to go to college and this can be attributed to the following: (1) possession of a degree is a mark of social status in the community; (2) there is still the belief that having a college degree is a means of securing a white collar job; and (3) there is no way by which the public is informed of the job markets for college graduates, for even colleges and universities do not have placement bureaus. It will take some time for many Filipinos to realize that possession of a college degree is not the only avenue for upward mobility. Many successful businessmen, for example, in the Bicol Region do not possess college degrees. These individuals are financially better off than some who possess college degrees such as the public school teachers.

As early as 1912, the Bureau of Public Schools issued a Service Manual for teachers and school administrators. This manual underwent several revisions due to the enactment of new laws, and to changes in educational practices and philosophies. Part IV of the Manual included provisions on school discipline--suspension and expulsion and on how to handle school strikes.[1] The manual helped many school administrators in dealing with school discipline but it was difficult to determine whether the private institutions made use of the same source.

Dialects. There are 87 dialects spoken in the country--7 major ones are spoken by the majority. Pilipino, which is Tagalog-based

[1]Bureau of Public Schools, Service Manual (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1960), pp. 69-70.

is the national language along with English which is the medium of instruction in the schools. Spanish, a secondary official language, is also used, especially in social circles.

Media. The characteristics of the Philippine newspapers and dailies were succintly described as:

> Today in Southeast Asia nothing can match the vigor, brashness, and courage of the daily and weekly press in the Philippines. Other newspapers of the region usually cower before their governments, if the governments let them appear at all. In the Philippines no such fear inhibits editors or reporters. Officials from the President down are fair game for attack.
>
> Philippine newspapers pay comparatively little attention to books, art, science, or foreign affairs. They concentrate on politics, crime, and social doings. . . . The biggest and best of the English-language dailies is the Manila Times. . . . The true glory of Philippine journalism is . . . the weekly Philippines Free Press . . . edited by Teodoro M. Locsin, a fearless crusader for political and economic reform. Few weeklies anywhere can surpass the Free Press in the sustained energy and sometimes the brilliance, of its writing.
>
> . . . The Manila press, with all its faults, is not a standpat press. It continually prods its readers by exposing alleged skullduggery in high places. One result is a rash of libel suits, most of which get nowhere. Another is public irreverence toward the holders of political power, whoever they may be.[1]

The writer agreed with Kuhn as far as her observations on the general contents of the Philippine newspapers and magazines went. Her generalization, however, concerning the "irreverence" of the press towards those who were in power is not entirely correct. She did not indicate her basis for that generalization. Even if she had gone over all the issues of the Philippines Free Press, she would have noted that the magazine did not only criticize, but it gives credit when credit is due.

In a similar vein, McHale commented:

---

[1]Kuhn, The Philippines, p. 194.

> . . . The circulation of the weekly Philippines Free Press, the most widely read and quoted, and perhaps the most influential publication in the Philippines, exceeded 100,000 by 1961. . . .
>
> The constant exposure of many Filipinos to the influence of the written word is changing the national political process. Today it is possible to ideologically communicate with a significant percentage of the population. The increasing knowledge of political ideas and awareness of policies has produced a wider response throughout society. Political functionaries are increasingly forced to adapt ideas, actions, and reactions to the demand of the national press. Control of the press organs has become critically important for those intent upon gaining or maintaining political power.[1]

McHale's statements had certain defects. He did not indicate (1) at which point in Philippine history he had reference, (2) the bases of his generalizations, and (3) the political functionaries to whom he was referring. He could have gone further by stating who owns the publications, but by so doing, he would have to explain how the owners who are oligarchs can be controlled by other groups. While the press could have intentionally or inadventently promoting student activism, it was difficult at that stage to determine how far it had influenced student unrest, the government, and school administrators so that they would react to student demands.

It is because the mechanisms of dissent and criticism through a free press and the right of free assembly are firmly established and zealously utilized that there is a healthy disrespect for all pretenders to one-man wisdom or goodness in politics.[2]

Corpuz was referring to how the electorate reacted in the

---

[1]Thomas R. McHale, "The Philippine Society in Transition," in Philippine-American Relations, ed. by Frank H. Golay (Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House, 1966), pp. 42-43. (Hereinafter referred to as McHale, "Philippine Society,")

[2]Corpuz, The Philippines, p. 127.

presidential elections since 1946 for there had been no president ever re-elected. The reason: past political administrations failed to solve the many problems of the country and the electorate wanted to change the administration. One thing he did not mention was the fact that elders are very much respected by the younger members of their families and have influence in their voting decisions.

Other media.[1] In 1965, the Philippines had an estimated one million radio receiving sets, served by approximately fifty radio broadcasting stations throughout the islands. In the same year, the Philippines had eight television stations, six of which were in Manila. The potential television audience in 1965 was estimated to be around one million.

Movies are also important media of communication. The total annual movie audience figures were not known, but in some 750 movie theatres it is probably in excess of fifty million. The American movies in particular have been a key vehicle of cultural transfer, although the impact has been concentrated in material aspects of culture.

McHale did not indicate the socio-economic status of the owners of the radio broadcasting stations, television and movie houses. It is common knowledge in the Philippines that the owners are oligarchs. Even the movie houses in the provinces are owned by the wealthy families.

Income. Per capita income remained very unevenly distributed

[1]McHale, "Philippine Society," p. 43.

and quite low. For 1964-1965, the median income of families was 1,648 pesos (one peso was about US $0.12). The percentage distribution of families by income class showed 29 per cent of families with incomes under 1,000 pesos and 23 per cent with incomes of 3,000.[1]

In a different version, the following was reported:

> . . . In a population of about 40 million, 80% or 32 million of our people are today victims of poverty and malnutrition. This is the direct result of the lopsided ownership of productive resources and the appalling maldistribution of income. 70% or more than 3.5 million families receive an average annual income of P1,200 each while only 2.7 per cent earn more than P10,000 per year or get 20.8 per cent of total family incomes. Of this 2.7 per cent only .6 per cent earn an average annual income of P44,080. And furthermore only .2 of the .6 per cent actually control the vast economic resources of the country along with foreign businessmen.
>
> Foreign investors control and dominate strategic economic areas as mining, petroleum, rubber, chemicals, batteries, cosmetics, paper products, drugs, agro-industries, import-export, banking, finance, insurance and more recently the local money market. As of December 1970, total foreign investments amounted to P4,037.5 (M) or about 20% of the GNP.[2]

Of the foreign investors in the Philippines, it was reported that 82 per cent of the total foreign investments was controlled by Americans, amounting to $2.18 billion. The next largest groups of foreign investors were: Spanish, $90 million; Dutch, $88 million; British, $79 million and Japanese, $44 million. The reason why other European investors were not too attracted to the Philippines was due to the parity agreements which they felt put them at a disadvantage in comparison to the Americans.[3]

---

[1] The Population Council, The Philippines, p. 3.

[2] Emmanuel Q. Yap, "Nationalization: Road to Greatness and Internationalism," Solidarity, February, 1972, p. 23. (Hereinafter referred to as Yap, "Nationalization,")

[3] Philippine Times (Chicago), January 31, 1972, p. 12.

The family income report would mean that about 70 per cent of Filipino families would not be able to send a child through college. A conservative estimate of from 6,000 to 8,000 pesos as a family income would at least be sufficient for this purpose. Students coming from families whose incomes are below 6,000 pesos would have to work their way through college. Unfortunately there were no available data to show the number of working students. Crisostomo noted that majority of the Filipino revolutionaries came from this latter group and a few from relatively affluent families.[1]

The Constitution of the Philippines provided that lands of the public domain containing minerals or forest were the property of the State. The lands could be leased to Filipino citizens or corporations that were 60 per cent Filipino ownership for periods not to exceed 25 years. Appended to the Constitution was the provision that citizens of the United States were to be granted the same rights as the Filipinos until Independence was granted. This same provision was extended to 1977 as a result of a 1948 agreement with the United States. Here lies the basis for the large American investment in the Philippine mining and lumber industries.[2] The Philippine Supreme Court ruled, however, in 1972 that American individuals and businesses must either sell their lands or reduce their equity from 60 to 40 per cent for continued possession. This higher court ruling upheld the earlier decision of Judge Revilla of the Rizal Province Court on the petition

---

[1]Crisostomo, "Today's Rebels," p. 10.

[2]Alden Cutshall, The Philippines: Nation of Islands (New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1964), p. 95. (Hereinafter referred to as Cutshall, The Philippines.)

of an American lawyer, William Quasha, on the status of American holdings.

Nationalism. Immediately after the World War II, nationalism blossomed throughout Southeast Asia. Its strongest expression was in a widespread movement against a Western colonial regime. Philippine nationalism, in practice, has become economic nationalism, exemplified in national policies with regard to exploitation of minerals, certain limitations to investment of foreign capital, and a strong emphasis on industrialization. It has meant a reduced influence of foreign firms and a stronger Filipinization of the economy.[1] Filipino nationalists see their independence and sovereignty as incomplete until the ownership of modern enterprises have been transferred to Filipinos and they pre-empt the rewarding and prestigeful functions within the economic system. Filipinization has been pursued almost relentlessly since the 1950's. It has not been very successful however, for "it has created powerful elements motivated by self-interest which provided inflexible support of Filipinization policies."[2] While the economic system was "stacked" to favor Filipinos with wealth and mobility, the economic system depends upon powerful incentives subject to administrative discretion and political manipulation.

> . . . Sophisticated Filipino readers understand that 'graft and corruption' are in part descriptive but they are also euphemisms for the incompetence of government in the roles of manager, entrepreneur, saver, and investor. Because this state of affairs

---

[1] Cutshall, The Philippines, p. 95.

[2] Frank H. Golay, "The Philippine Economy," in Six Perspective on the Philippines ed. by George M. Guthrie (Manila: Bookmark, 1968), p. 278. (Hereinafter referred to as Golay, "Philippine Economy,")

> widely understood by Filipinos, they resist expansion of the public sector and the depth of their disillusionment is periodically revealed in national elections. . . . They are quick to reject leadership which fails to manifest genuine and effective concern with such fundamental problems as the competence of the public sector to directly organize and use resources as well as the integrity of that sector.[1]

Political Background

The Constitutional framework of the Philippines resembles that of the United States in the organization of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches.

Politics and leadership. There are two political parties to which most of the elected officials belong: the Nacionalista Party and the Liberal Party. Only the Communist Party has been banned by the Philippine government.

There were no basic ideological and party platform differences between the two political parties. Candidates for both parties were either elected by party leaders or chosen by the party national committee. "Turncoatism" was not rare. Elections since 1946 had been generally characterized by separate instances of vote-buying, overspending, and terrorism at the polls. Campaign speeches were rarely devoid of "mud-slinging." It was difficult to determine whether independent votes carried as much weight as those from party members. While public school teachers were required to man the polls, they and other government employees under the civil service were prohibited from campaigning for their candidates.

While making government policies, agreements were reached

---

[1] Golay, "Philippine Economy," pp. 256-257.

based on personal arrangements among the leaders, and not decisions that are derived primarily from the relationships between national resources and national needs.[1] The shortage, and shortcomings, of leaders in the Philippines has been a distinct handicap to national growth and to the development of a favorable national image. Charges of nepotism do not build confidence in national leaders.[2]

Problems of the government. One fundamental political problem for the Philippines in the next decade appears to be the tightening up of the structure of national leadership. This leadership could be found in the Office of the President of the Philippines for:

> . . . the Powers of the Philippine president are abundant and are available both within the constitution and outside of it. But the powers of the position, by the 1960's, had not yet been exercised to the constitutional limits, and incumbents have not seriously used the presidential power to influence and educate the public toward rallying public support independently of the parties for the forthright implementation of development policies.[3]

The President has to contend with powerful political forces, the privileged and vastly propertied, otherwise "the elections would still offer little hope to the many of meaningful changed in their condition."[4]

Despite certain obvious negative aspects of Philippine leadership, however, it is far superior to that of most of the postwar new nations. By comparison with Western nations, Philippine leader-

---

[1]Corpuz, The Philippines, p. 139.

[2]Cutshall, The Philippines, p. 103.

[3]Corpuz, The Philippines, p. 139.

[4]Ibid.

ship at the national level has notable weaknesses; by comparison with nations of similar geographic resources and political history, the Philippine leadership looks very good indeed.[1]

But the Philippine national problem is not only of leadership, but poverty too:

> . . . What is fundamentally wrong with the Philippines is not Marcos or the other politicians that preceded and are likely to succeed him, but poverty, which has made a mockery of its so-called democratic institutions and made the Constitution with its Bill of Rights an empty thing.[2]

Poverty is not easy to measure. To identify the poor where 75 per cent of the people are poor one may use the following criteria: (1) those who earn less than 1,000 pesos a year per family, (2) those who live by subsistence farming or by menial occupations in the city slums, or, (3) those who do not have electricity, inside plumbing, telephone, clean water, a radio, or rarely see a doctor.

> That is most relevant to poverty in the Philippines is to be found in the farmer's relationship to his land, the terms on which he works it, the methods he uses, and the depth of his indebtedness. These are the circumstances that determine how much a family can produce and earn, how free it is to move, and where it will come to rest on the social pyramid.[3]

> . . . This is the economic challenge in the Philippines today: to deliver three-fourths of Philippine humanity from threadbare existence to a life of vigor, imagination, fulfillment and substance.[4]

---

[1]Cutshall, The Philippines, p. 104.

[2]Teodoro M. Locsin, "The Philippines: Leadership and Poverty," Pacific Community, October, 1971, p. 180. (Hereinafter referred to as Locsin, "Leadership and Poverty.")

[3]Kuhn, The Philippines, p. 197.

[4]Vicente B. Valdepenas, Jr.,"The Economic Challenge in the Philippines," Philippine Studies, April, 1968, p. 278.

> Our socio-economic problems are the accumulated residue of the historical experience. . . . The basic elements of our malaise are the direct result of more than 400 years of colonialism which have developed institutions and attitudes that have obstructed our path towards a desirable measure of progress and change. . . . Foremost among these obstacles is an economy based essentially on agro-merchandising activity as the mainspring of income and employment. . . . A second obstacle is a social structure marked by an extreme disparity in income distribution, with wealth concentrated in the hands of a thin elite.[1]

> . . . the architecture of Philippine society is . . . a pyramid rising to a sharp point. Early Filipinos designed it; Spain found it convenient and strengthened it; Americans accepted the existing social order, used it, and trusted in mass education, democratic politics, and time to modify it. The Philippine Republic inherited it virtually intact.
>
> On the pinnacle of the pyramid sit the ruling families. Many of them are direct descendants of the early datus and the later caciques. Their power has derived from the resulting access to wealth and local influence. Spain enhanced their wealth by making them tax collectors and enhanced their power by making them responsible for public order. The United States turned to them for leadership in staffing the new institutions of self-government and for captaining new industries. Thus it is not a surprise to find in the independent Philippines only about 13,000 owners of more than 150 acres of land, and only 2 per cent of the Filipino families accounting for 47 per cent of the national family income.[2]

Middle-class Filipinos are still few: one estimate put their number at 12 per cent of the population. During the first half of the century, the Chinese dominated the middle-class. American policies of mass education, free enterprise and training in self-government encouraged the growth of the Filipino middle-class. It was noted that this group had channeled more of their energy into personal advancement through education, acquired professions and/or went into government service.

---

[1] Yap quoting the Chairman, House Special Committee on Social and Economic Planning in the Ninth Special Session of Congress, "Nationalization," p. 23.

[2] Kuhn, The Philippines, p. 195.

Kuhn's generalization about the emergence of the wealthy elite since the datus' time was not totally correct; it did not happen entirely in the Philippines. For example, the descendants of the early datus in the Bicol Region were not among the oligarchs, but the wealthy elite were from families that were related either by consanguinity or affinity with political stalwarts since 1946. It was difficult to find Kuhn's source of information about the Filipino middle-class. If belonging to the middle-class is equated with having a college degree, then higher education in the Philippines is producing them directly each year. The problem of determining class is compounded if income is to be considered, for there are no available data to indicate the income bracket of the current middle-class. Furthermore if employment is to be considered, then the problem would be more critical because, for example, those in the government service (from janitors to chiefs of departments) would be included and there is a wide range of income distribution. In this instance, where there are no available data on the attainment of those in the government service, except public school teachers, the Philippine higher education can be said to be either producing directly or indirectly the "middle-class." A definitive answer would require further analysis.

Effects of agrarian problems. It was in the rich Central Plain of Luzon, where vast estates of rice and sugar were owned by a few landlords and where agrarian relations persisted almost unchanged as they had been in the haciendas that had developed in the nineteenth century, that farmer unrest was strongest. Two agrarian uprisings took

place among the provinces of the Central Plain of Luzon: (1) the Tanggulan (Mutual Protection) uprisings in 1931, and (2) the Sakdal (Complaint) revolt in 1935.[1] During the Spanish time, it was in the slums of Manila where the Katipunan (Association), the organization that paved the revolution into a national scale, was founded. It was also in Manila, in 1930, when the Communist Party of the Philippines was founded. The Party was outlawed in 1931, its leaders were imprisoned but were pardoned in 1938. During the Japanese occupation, on March 29, 1942 the communists organized their Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon (People's Anti-Japanese Army), abbreviated as Hukbalahap. Members were referred to as "Huks." The Huks harassed the Japanese forces in the provinces of central Luzon. The postwar period saw the Huk uprising and its suppression by Magsaysay. Since Magsaysay's death in 1957,

> . . . the Huk movement has remained in check, although the armed forces regularly come up with reports of renewed Huk activity every year, about the time when the military budget is due for consideration in Congress.[2]

The problems confronting the Philippines were summarized as follows: (1) poverty, (2) unemployment, (3) population explosion, (4) peace and order, (5) deforestration, (6) graft and corruption, (7) tax evasion, (8) educational reform, (9) Philippine-American relations, (10) getting Filipino troops out of the Vietnam War, and (11) winning back of the young. Filipino troops had been withdrawn

---

[1] Gregorio F. Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, Vol. II (Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1957), p. 382. (Hereinafter referred to as Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History.)

[2] Corpuz, The Philippines, pp. 108 and 112.

from the Vietnam War and that was about all the Marcos administration had done.[1]

The problem of military bases. The Philippines and the United States have treaties for the location of United States military and naval bases in the Philippines, and a 1951 Mutual Defense Treaty.[2] In the Philippines the presence of American military bases has been a major source of friction not because of the bases themselves, but because of the terms on which they were held and reluctance of the United States to change those terms. The agreements reached between the two countries in August 1965, on the revision of criminal jurisdiction arrangement came after a decade of bitter negotiations which was damaging to United States-Philippine relations. Negotiations for the revision did not begin until 1956, by which time a series of incidents at Clark Field, the principal American air base, had made the atmosphere tense. Over a period of ten years some twenty Filipinos has been killed by guards while scavenging for bombs dropped by United States planes on the gunnery range.[2]

Highlights. The Republic of the Philippines, which is composed of 7,100 islands, is 600 miles off the southeast coast of Asia. It achieved independence in 1946 after having been a colony of Spain, the United States, and Japan. The population growth is one of the highest in the world. Unemployment rate is high even among the

---

[1]Locsin, "Leadership and Poverty," p. 172.

[2]George E. Taylor, "The Challenge of Mutual Security," in Philippine-American Relations ed. by Frank H. Golay (Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House, 1966), p. 88.

college graduates. Literacy rate is 72 per cent. There are two kinds of schools: the government-supported schools and the private institutions. The desire for education is due to the fact that it is the only means of upward mobility to the majority. There are eighty-seven dialects. Pilipino is the national language along with English which is the medium of instruction in the schools. The Philippines has a free, militant, and courageous press. About 70 per cent of the population receive an average annual income of 1,200 pesos each while 2.7 per cent earn more than 10,000 pesos. Among the foreign investors in the Philippines, the Americans control about 82 per cent of the foreign investments. This is partly due to the parity rights granted to Americans by the Republic of the Philippines. Attempts were made to Filipinize the economy after independence. The Republic of the Philippines has many problems. Among these are: (1) poverty, (2) unemployment, (3) peace and order, (4) graft and corruption in the government, and (5) educational reform. One solution to those problems could come from the national government through the President of the Republic.

CHAPTER III

EDUCATION DURING THE SPANISH, AMERICAN, COMMONWEALTH, JAPANESE AND INDEPENDENCE PERIODS

Education in the Philippines was, for almost four centuries of its domination by other countries, an instrument of colonial policy of the ruling powers. The schools were used for the propagation and development of the ideals and culture of the colonizing nation. Spain, the United States, and Japan each taught what was believed best for a subject nation. Each designed a school system for the entire country and prescribed the means to realize its objectives.

Since language and education are closely interrelated, each sovereign power exerted every effort to teach and develop its language as the national language of the Filipinos.

The Spanish Period: 1565 to 1898

The Philippines was visited by Magellan in 1521 but it was not until 1565 that the real beginning of Spanish rule began. At this time Legazpi undertook the task of unifying the archipelago into a single nation with a centralized government in Manila.[1] The Spanish period ended when Spain ceded the Philippines to the United States on December 10, 1898 for twenty million dollars.

---

[1]Evergisto Bazaco, History of Education in the Philippines (Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press, 1953), p. 31. (Hereinafter referred to as Bazaco, History of Education.)

Education during the Spanish regime was aimed primarily at teaching moral and religious subjects through the medium of the Spanish language. The conversion of the governed people to Christianity was the dream of the Spanish kings, and missionaries were sent to the Philippines from time to time to spread the gospel.

The first school in the Philippines, according to Zaide, was the parochial school and was founded in Cebu in 1565 by the Augustinian missionaries.[1] But Fresnoza and Casim wrote that the first school was a secondary school which was the College of San Jose and established by the Jesuits in 1601.[2] They both agreed, however, that the College of Santo Tomas, formerly called the College of Our Lady of the Rosary, was established in 1611. Several colleges, according to Zaide, were established by the Jesuits and the Dominican missionaries. The schools founded by the Jesuits were: College of San Ignacio (1580). College of San Ildefonso (1595) now the University of San Carlos, and the College of San Jose (1601). The Jesuits took charge of the Escuela Pia (Charity School) of Manila in 1859, and transformed it into the Ateneo de Manila which is now the Ateneo de Manila University. The Dominicans established two colleges: the College of Santo Tomas and the College of San Juan de Letran (1620).[3]

---

[1]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, p. 90.

[2]Florencio P. Fresnoza and Canuto P. Casim, Essentials of Philippine Educational System (Manila: Abiva Publishing House, Inc., 1964), p. 7. (Hereinafter referred to as Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System.)

[3]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, pp. 90-91.

The colleges for boys were secondary schools which prepared the students for university work and conferred upon their graduates the degree of bachelor of arts. Secondary school instruction for boys was also provided by a limited number of seminaries in big parishes, and private secondary schools accredited by the University of Santo Tomas.

There were three universities established during the Spanish regime, namely: (1) the University of San Ignacio formerly College of San Ignacio but lasted only until 1768. (2) the University of Santo Tomas formerly the College of Santo Tomas, and (3) the government-sponsored University of San Felipe (1707) which closed in 1726.[1]

The University of Santo Tomas served for many years as the apex of the educational system. It offered courses in Latin, Greek, physics, philosophy, ethics, canon law, Roman law, and theology. Later civil law, pharmacy, notarial law, dentistry, and medicine were offered. The degrees granted by the University were recognized in all Spanish-speaking countries.

The reasons why there was only one university that survived during the Spanish regime were: (1) the difficulty in securing permission for the creation of new universities; (2) the limitation of financial support for opening new faculties; and (3) the opposition of the government toward further improvements in the university which might encourage the education of rebels.[2]

---

[1]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, pp. 91-92.

[2]Bazaco, History of Education, p. 20.

Two types of schools were established by the Church for the girls, namely: the college and the beaterio. The college was a regular school for girls, while the beaterio was a religious house for those who preferred to live in seclusion. The chief aim of the schools for girls was to prepare women either for motherhood or for a religious life.[1]

Prior to 1863, the government did not maintain an adequate system of elementary education for the masses. No particular law or decree governed elementary education. There were no uniform courses of study. Since schools were founded and controlled by private individuals, parish priests or curates, and religious orders, the course of study differed widely. The government did not have any agency for the control and supervision of the schools. Each school was left to administer its own affairs, according to the desire of the founders. When the Educational Decree of 1863 was issued, it provided only for primary instruction, but also included government supervision and control of secondary and collegiate schools.[2] The same decree established normal schools to private teachers for the elementary schools.

To encourage attendance in these schools, it was decreed that no person could hold any salaried position if he could not speak Spanish within five years after the issuance of the decree. Also, no

---

[1]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, p. 92.

[2]Bazaco, History of Education, p. 5.

person who could not speak, read, and write Spanish, should be exempted from personal service tax thirty years after 1863.[1]

In 1870, there was an attempt to further revise the educational system of the Philippines, but these were not fully implemented. The primary reason was that some of the proposed revisions were revolutionary in nature--the government taking over sectarian and private schools. The proposed revision would consolidate five private secondary schools into a "Philippine Institute" under government control. The University of Santo Tomas was to be converted into the "Philippine University" under the government which would appoint the rectors, deans, and professors.[2]

Defects of the educational system. The most serious criticisms against the system of education during the Spanish regime was its emphasis on religion, the obsolete teaching methods, the limited curriculum, the absence of academic freedom, the prejudice against Filipinos in the schools of higher learning, and the friars' control over the system.[3]

If judged from present-day pedagogical standards, the schools founded by Spain in the Philippines were defective; but if the conditions and circumstances of the age would be considered when those

---

[1]Bazaco, History of Education, p. 5.

[2]Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System, p. 13.

[3]Ma. Corona S. Romero and Julita R. Sta. Romana, Rizal and Philippine Nationalism (Manila: St. Anthony Book Service, 1969), p. 19. (Hereinafter referred to as Romero and Romana, Rizal and Philippine Nationalism.)

schools existed they were better than what Spain established anywhere in America, and would compare favorably with the schools of Spain of the same period. These schools produced Dr. Jose Rizal (the national hero of the Philippines), Rafael Palma, who became a president of the University of the Philippines, Manuel L. Quezon, first president of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and Sergio Osmena, first vice-president and later second president of the Commonwealth.[1]

Schools were closed at the beginning of 1898 due to the effects of the Spanish-American War and Filipino-American skirmish which followed. It was during this short period of time then General Emilio Aguinaldo, of the Philippine revolutionary forces, proclaimed the first Philippine Republic on June 12 (now being celebrated as Philippine Independence Day). One of the first laws passed by the Philippine Republic under General Aguinaldo, was to place all universities, colleges, and other schools under state control and regulation. A presidential order founded the Universidad Literaria de Filipinas in October, 1898. It offered courses in medicine, law, surgery, and pharmacy.[2] A military academy and a private secondary school were also opened during this period. These schools did not continue to operate due to the Filipino-American war which resulted in the defeat of the Filipino forces.

---

[1]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, p. 96.

[2]Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System, p. 13.

The American Period:[1] 1898 to 1934

If Spain ardently spread the Catholic faith, the Americans inculcated the democratic principles and way of life among the Filipinos. In transplanting her ideals of democracy, the United States established a system of education designed to train the people in the art of government. Through popular education America sought to teach the elements of citizenship and the fundamentals of the vocations under a democratic form of government.

After the occupation of Manila in August 1898 by the American army, schools were reopened in Manila. As soon as peace and order were secured in the provinces, more schools were established there, all under the military. The establishment of schools was considered a potent factor in the pacification of the people.

English was proclaimed as the national language upon the instruction of President William McKinley. This policy was based on the assumption that the possession of a common language was essential to the success of democracy. In schools, the children were prohibited from speaking the vernacular and penalties were imposed for violation.

The curriculum prescribed was also designed to realize the objective of transplanting democratic ideals. The textbooks used during the early years of the school system were books written by

---

[1]Telesforo N. Boquiren, "Educational Leadership Handbook for Philippine Public Schools," (unpublished dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1973), pp. 9-16, passim. (Hereinafter referred to as Boquiren, Educational Leadership Handbook.)

American authors for American children. In the later years of the American occupation, the curriculum was revised. Textbooks and reading materials regarding Filipino life and culture were used, and revised editions of some American books were co-authored with Filipinos.

The first teachers of English in the newly opened schools were men of the United States army. Instructions in subjects other than English were carried in Spanish by Filipino teachers. Spanish editions of textbooks were ordered for use in the public schools.

In 1899, Lt. George P. Anderson was assigned as superintendent of public instruction to take charge of the overall educational system and Dr. Fred Atkinson became the first General Superintendent. He proposed an educational bill which became the basis of Act 74 of the Philippine Commission and the framework of an educational system of free public schools.

American teachers were recruited in 1901 to relieve the military men from teaching duties. Some arrived on the United States transports Faust and Sheridan, but close to a thousand arrived on the Thomas in December 1901. Some military men who were discharged from the army also were assigned as teachers.

The assignment of American teachers was a delicate task. They had to work with the Spanish parish priests who felt that the children were being drawn away from the church schools.

The General Superintendent had broad powers over the establishment of schools, appointment of teachers, preparation of the cur-

riculum and other matters related to the extension of education. He was assisted by an advisory board composed of four members appointed by the Commission, and he served as chairman. The immediate control and supervision of the schools in the provinces and in Manila were placed under Division Superintendents. In each municipality, a local school board was created composed of the town mayor as ex-officio member with four to six members recommended by the division superintendent.

Secondary education, which started in 1903, prescribed four years of study. The government established and maintained, usually at the provincial capital, at least one high school in each province.

Act 74 also created the Philippine Normal School in Manila, to provide formal training of teachers and supervisors. The Philippine School of Arts and Trades was also established in Manila to prepare teachers of industrial arts.

The demand for higher public education was met through the establishment of the University of the Philippines by Act 1870, in 1908. This law was authored by W. Shuster Morgan, member of the Philippine Commission. The first president of the University of the Philippines was Murray Bartlett who served from 1911 to 1915. He was succeeded by Ignacio Villamor, 1915-1920, as the first Filipino president of the state university. Since then, except for Guy Potter Benton who served from 1921 to 1923, the presidency was occupied by Filipinos.[1]

---

[1]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, p. 287.

For about three decades after 1908 the University of Santo Tomas and the University of the Philippines dominated the field of higher education. During the early years of the American regime, these two institutions divided the university students into two groups. The graduates of secondary schools which used Spanish as the medium of instruction sought admission in the University of Santo Tomas; while the graduates of the public schools, where English was used, went to the University of the Philippines. After a few years, however, the private schools and colleges adopted English as the medium of instruction.[1]

Higher education was also provided by private colleges and universities. Section 25 of Act 74, authorized the establishment of private schools, but made no provision for their control and regulation. In 1906, with the passage of Act 1459, known as the Corporation Law, private schools came under government supervision. It was also during this period that more private schools were founded due to the fact that the public schools could not accommodate all the pupils who sought enrollment.[2] In 1910, the Office of the Superintendent of Private Schools, under the Department of Public Instruction, was created to supervise all private schools in the Philippines. In 1913, there were thirty private schools which were recognized by the government.[3]

---

[1] Antonio Isidro, The Philippine Educational System (Manila: Abiva Publishing House, 1949), p. 20. (Hereinafter referred to as Isidro, Philippine Educational System.)

[2] Ibid.

[3] Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System, p. 19.

Religious instruction in the public schools was regulated by Act 74 which states that "no teacher or other person shall teach or criticize the doctrine of any church, religious sect, or denomination, or shall attempt to influence the pupils for or against any church or religious sect in any public schools under this Act."

The years from 1910 to 1920 saw a great expansion of the educational system. The national government was reorganized, and the General Superintendent became the Director of Education. The Director performed his duties under the supervision of the Vice-Governor of the Philippines who acted concurrently as the Secretary of Public Instruction.

Emphasis was placed on the improvement of the teaching force and the school plant facilities. Industrial education was also emphasized by the vocationalization of the intermediate curriculum. Teaching, trade, business, domestic science, and agricultural education were offered in the intermediate grades in addition to the general curriculum.

An athletic program was introduced in the intermediate grades, and athletic meets were encouraged. Regional athletic associations were organized and in general the physical education program was intensified.

The demand for more teachers was met with the introduction of the intermediate teaching curriculum. Later, it was realized that the intermediate teaching curriculum did not provide sufficient training for teachers. A two-year and four-year secondary normal curriculum

was established in some high schools. Provincial normal schools offering the four-year general curriculum were organized in strategic places to serve the needs of the different regions of the country.

The years from 1921 to 1935 were characterized as the period of further expansion and adaptation. Up to 1935 there were seven private universities, namely: University of Santo Tomas, Silliman University, National University, Centro Escolar University, Philippine Women's University, University of Manila, and Far Eastern University. Except for Silliman University, all are located in Manila. The University of Santo Tomas was the only university authorized by the government to offer courses leading to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Sacred Theology, Doctor of Canon Law, Doctor of Civil Law, and Doctor of Pharmacy.[1]

The government felt that there was a need to evaluate the educational system. For this purpose an educational survey was authorized by the Philippine Legislature (formerly the Philippine Commission) in 1924. Paul Monroe of Columbia University headed the survey which was finished in 1925. In line with some of the major recommendations of the survey, methods and techniques of teaching and supervision were improved and the preparation of teachers was intensified. The curriculum was revised to suit the needs of the time. Child accounting and the evaluation of instruction were given now emphasis.

The Monroe survey team was satisfied with the high standards

[1]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, p. 291.

of instruction given in the University of the Philippines. It recommended that these standards be maintained by using some methods of selective admission and by freeing the university from political interference. It further recommended that the efforts on higher education should be concentrated in Manila and expansion through junior colleges should be avoided until after adequate facilities could be provided.[1]

A Joint Committee on Education in 1925 created by the Philippine Legislature in its Concurrent Resolution No. 15 did not only go over the report of the Monroe survey but also conducted its own survey. The committee agreed with the Monroe survey that the University of the Philippines should coordinate the offerings with private colleges and universities in order to avoid duplication of activities that might be very well left to the care of the private higher educational institutions. The committee recommended that private schools should be encouraged by giving them ample freedom in matters of discipline, administration, and curriculum and that definite instructional standards should be set for them.

Another evaluation, made in 1930, was concerned with vocational education. Financed jointly by the Philippine government and the Rockefeller Foundation, this study was headed by C. A. Prosser of the William Hood Dunwoody Industrial Institute. It recommended increased emphasis on vocational training and preparation for the youth of the country.

---

[1]Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System, pp. 496-497.

The growth of the educational system may be seen from enrollment in the schools. Starting with a handful of hesitant, timid pupils in 1901, the system grew to enroll 985,721 in 1935 largely because of the sovereign power's commitment to the policy of bringing the advantages of education and the extension of educational facilities to the greatest number and of the Filipinos' desire to get an education.

> Some of the leading Filipinos who rebelled against Spain in 1896 had been educated in Europe. From Western Europe's more advanced countries, they absorbed ideas of civil rights and mass secular education. These ideas they took back and incorporated into their abortive rebel constitution, so that the Philippines might also become an 'advanced' country. Although the illiterate majority had no experience with education, the word took on magic connotations, promising deliverance from poverty and servitude. This helped the American teacher . . . to gain acceptance, as a symbol of potential dignity and eventful freedom.
>
> Today Filipinos are undoubtedly among the most passionately education oriented of . . . independent people.[1]

The increased enrollments brought about many problems. Financial support became one of the major problems. The lack of facilities to accommodate the children of school age became more acute each year. The business recession of the 1930's caused a decline in the school revenues and many classes in the public schools were closed for lack of funds. In 1933, one of first problems which Governor-General Murphy had to tackle was the school crisis.

Each Vice-Governor (who was concurrently Secretary of the Department of Public Instruction) up until 1935, the Directors of Education, the school superintendents of selected provinces and

---

[1]Kuhn, The Philippines, p. 35.

key cities and the heads of key divisions in the General Office were all Americans. They formulated the broad policies of the Philippine educational system.

It should also be stated that a number of Filipino teachers were sent to the United States as government scholars for further training and education to prepare them for future administrative positions in the educational system.

The American regime was distinguished by the extension of educational facilities to the masses. The schools were made free and secular so that all children could go to school. This policy was reaffirmed in the Constitution of the Commonwealth and in the Educational Act of 1940.[1]

The Commonwealth Period: 1936 to 1941; early 1945 to 1946

The Commonwealth period was a time of transition to prepare the country for the final granting of independence in 1946, in accordance with the Tydings-McDuffie Law of the United States Congress. There was an interruption of the Commonwealth period because the Japanese forces occupied Philippines from 1942 to early 1945. After the Japanese forces were defeated in early 1945, the Commonwealth government resumed briefly until independence was achieved in 1946.

The Commonwealth period brought about a re-orientation of educational plans and policies needed to carry out the mandates of

[1]Isidro, Philippine Educational System, p. 20.

the Philippine Constitution which had been adopted in 1935.

In 1936, with the passage of Commonwealth Act No. 180, the government set the guidelines for the operation, control, and supervision of private schools.[1] Among the restrictions were the use of the name university. Section 3 of the law states:

> No institution shall call itself or be called a University unless and until it shall have fulfilled the following requisites in addition to those that may be prescribed by the Secretary of Public Instruction:
> 1. The operation of a recognized postgraduate course in liberal arts and sciences or in education, leading to the master's degree;
> 2. The operation of at least three professional colleges;
> 3. The operation of a four-year undergraduate course in liberal arts and sciences;
> 4. The possession and maintenance of a professionally administered library of at least ten thousand volumes of collegiate books; provided, however, that the operation of a recognized postgraduate course in liberal arts and sciences or in education, leading to the master's degree shall not be required as such prior to the approval of this Act.

The Secretary of Education is required by Commonwealth Act No. 180 to maintain a general standard of efficiency in all private schools and colleges. The task of supervision and inspection of private schools was to be undertaken by the Bureau of Private Schools. Some of the Bureau's general requirements were:[2]

1. Private schools and colleges should refrain from activities that partake of the nature of commercial firms.

2. Private schools operating with government approval would possess sufficient financial resources to guarantee the efficient

---

[1] Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System, pp. 118-119.

[2] Ibid., pp. 121-122.

operation of the school. They are expected to be in a position to meet promptly all financial obligations.

3. A bond equivalent to the amount to twelve months estimated expenditures in the case of elementary, secondary, and special vocational schools and three years in the case of collegiate courses to guarantee on the part of the school payment of all teachers' salaries and commercial obligations shall be filed with the Department of Education.

4. The Department does not require the use of any specific books, but expects that only such textbooks will be used as are of fairly recent issue and are not contrary to the provisions of Act No. 3872 (later amended by Republic Act No. 139), otherwise known as the Textbook Law.

The seven private universities which existed during the American regime, as mentioned on page 40, increased to eight under the Commonwealth, the eighth being the Adamson University founded in Manila by the Adamson brothers who were Greek scientists.[1]

A survey of the University of the Philippines was made in 1938. President Edward C. Elliot of Purdue University and Dean Paul C. Packer of the College of Education of Iowa University were contracted by the Committee on Educational Policy of the Board of Regents of the university. Some of the recommendations of these two educators

[1]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, p. 325.

were:

1. The University of the Philippines should be transferred to a site outside but near Manila because the site of the university was inadequate to meet its present and future needs.
2. More money should be appropriated for the maintenance of the University. The minimum annual appropriation should be not less than two million pesos.
3. The study of English should be stressed. The curriculum should be enriched by including courses in Latin, Greek, contemporary events, and Filipino culture. Women students should take a course in euthenics.
4. Instruction should be improved by insisting on productive scholarship among faculty members. There should be selective admission of students. The teaching load of instructors should be as light as it was and the small class size should be maintained. Experimentation in methods of teaching should be encouraged and seminars for instructors should be frequently held.[1]

In order to give the University of the Philippines a better site, the National Assembly passed Commonwealth Act No. 442 on June 3, 1939, providing for the transfer of the university to Quezon City and appropriating the sum of seventeen million pesos for the purpose.[2]

The recurring school crisis in the early 1930's became very acute in the late 30's. This led to the passage by the Philippine Legislature of Commonwealth Act No. 586, otherwise known as the Educational Act of 1940. Enacted as a measure of expediency, it provided for a revision of the system of public elementary education by reducing the schooling from seven to six years and allowing the introduction of the double-session day wherein a teacher had to

---

[1]Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System, pp. 503-504.

[2]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, pp. 324-325.

handle one class in the morning and another in the afternoon.

Inadequate financing resulted in a number of problems such as, limited supervision, poor plant facilities, lack of instructional materials, limited equipment and supplies, lack of trained teachers and an increased number of pupils per class.

World War II broke out in December 1941 and the Japanese forces occupied the Philippines.

The Japanese Period: 1942 to early 1945

The aim of education during the Japanese regime was to make the Filipinos understand the meaning of the so-called East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, and to promote friendly relations between Japan and the Philippines to the fullest extent.[1]

Steps were taken to make the schools the instrument for the realization of the Japanese dream of Co-Prosperity Sphere. Immediately after the capture of Manila, the Japanese Imperial Forces proclaimed Nippongo, the Japanese national language, as the future national language of the Philippines. The curricula of the public schools were overhauled particularly to have Nippongo supplant English. Every child from the first grade up was required to learn the Japanese national language. Language institutes were created. Newspapers, periodicals, and the radio were used as media for teaching Nippongo.

On June 1, 1942, elementary schools were authorized to be

---

[1]Isidro, Philippine Educational System, p. 4.

reopened. There were great difficulties encountered in the reopening of the schools. Both teachers and pupils were reluctant about going to school. The books used were those in the pre-war days but parts which had reference to America, to democracy and any other subject which, in the opinion of the Japanese Military Administration, was hostile to the Axis Powers were deleted, covered, or banned. English remained the medium of instruction since there were very few teachers in the elementary and secondary schools who could teach the Japanese language.

The emphasis on vocational education during the Japanese occupation was manifested not only in the granting of authority to reopen only strictly vocational schools and technical colleges, but also in the revision of the primary and secondary curricula to give these a greater vocational slant. These were found in Instruction No. 92 dated October 2, 1942.[1] Only a few of these schools were able to open or chose to open their classes.[2]

> Under the policy of guidance in higher learning, collegiate courses were authorized only when they met the imperative needs of the country and were distributed according to those needs. The government encouraged the students to pursue technical and professional courses like engineering, medicine, pharmacy, dentistry, and nursing. Selective admission was prescribed in the colleges of liberal arts, law, and commerce. The courses in the liberal arts and commerce were authorized for only a few institutions that had the best facilities for such courses.[3]

---

[1] Isidro, Philippine Educational System, p. 21.

[2] Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System, p. 26.

[3] Ibid., p. 29.

The Japanese-sponsored Republic, established on October 15, 1943, through its Bureau of Private Education provided the guidelines for the private schools such as:

> . . . The opening of each professional course by an institution was considered in the light of social demands for the profession, the existence of other institutions offering the same or similar courses, and the ability and resources of the institution to accomplish its state functions.[1]

The University of the Philippines was made the cultural center of the State. The following principles of higher education were enumerated in Executive Order No. 44, dated March 31, 1944:

> 1. The State should encourage higher education under proper guidance.
> 2. Private universities directed by Filipinos should be given encouragement.
> 3. To avoid unnecessary duplication and competition, the demands of professionals and facilities of higher education to meet these demands should be surveyed.
> 4. Colleges and universities should be equitably distributed throughout the country for the speedy enlightenment and culture.[2]

A National Education Board was created as an advisory body, and was directed to make a study and to submit recommendations for the improvement of the educational system. Some of these recommendations which eventually became executive orders were:

> All teachers, from the elementary school to the college and university, were required to secure a license for teaching. A code of professional ethics was prescribed for observance of all teachers. The job of teaching the national language, character education, and Philippine history was limited to Filipino citizens. The national language was prescribed in the curricula of all schools, colleges, and universities. Private schools, colleges and universities were required to secure approval from the Ministry of Education of the tuition and other fees they charged.

---

[1]Isidro, Philippine Educational System, pp. 13-14.

[2]Ibid.

> The governing boards of educational institutions were required to have the majority of its members composed of Filipino citizens. . . . The training of elementary school teachers was reserved for the normal schools established by the state; the privilege enjoyed by private normal schools to share in this task was withdrawn.[1]

The educational policies of the Japanese-sponsored Republic were intensely nationalistic. In spite of the pressure which the Japanese Military Administration placed on the government, the Filipino leaders succeeded in pushing through many far-reaching reforms.[2]

The Japanese military authorities abolished all political parties and organizations in the Philippines, except the Kapisanan Sa Paglilingkod Sa Bagong Pilipinas (Association for Service to the New Philippines), popularly known as KALIBAPI. This was designed as a propaganda agency to gain the people's cooperation and goodwill. The KALIBAPI initiated a nation-wide fruit-tree planting campaign, fostered the teaching of the Philippine national language, propagated the teachings of Filipino heroes, sponsored cultural and provincial fairs and encouraged athletics and calisthenics. It became the People's Party on May 1, 1944 and became the only political party in the Philippines.[3] The People's Party was short-lived because the American liberation forces arrived and finally the Japanese forces in the Philippines were defeated.

---

[1]Isidro, Philippine Educational System, pp. 13-14.

[2]Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System, p. 29.

[3]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, pp. 353-354.

Period of Independence: 1946 to 1971[1]

Soon after the war, in mid-1945, the schools were re-opened. The same problems faced before the war plus others caused by the aftermath of the war had to be met with judicious, often deliberate, care and use of scarce resources. Independence was achieved on July 4, 1946 at a time when the country lay devastated.

The present system of education in the Philippines is modeled after the prevailing state educational systems in the United States, but structured within the framework of the Constitution of the Republic.

Section 4, Article II of the Constitution provides:

> The natural right and duty of parents in the rearing of the youth for civic efficiency should receive the aid and support of the government.

Section 5, Article XIV states that:

> All educational institutions shall be under the supervision and subject to regulation by the State. The government shall establish and maintain a complete and adequate system of public education, and shall provide at least free primary instruction, and citizenship training to adult citizens. All schools shall aim to develop moral character, personal discipline, civic conscience, and vocational efficiency and to teach the duties of citizenship. Optional religious instruction shall be maintained in the public schools as now authorized by law. Universities established by the State shall enjoy academic freedom. The State shall create scholarships in arts, science and letters to specially gifted citizens.

The Philippine school system is composed of two coordinate branches--the public schools organized and maintained by the Government which are under the Bureau of Public Schools, the Bureau of

---

[1]Boquiren, Educational Leadership Handbook, pp. 16-18, passim.

Vocational Education, and the state universities and colleges; and the private schools organized and maintained by private individuals and corporations. The latter are schools, colleges and universities not given any direct financial aid by the Government but regulated and supervised by the State through the Bureau of Private Schools.

Both in terms of money spent and the number of people involved, public education is the biggest government undertaking in the Philippines, and doubtless, the most important service, operating as it does under a highly centralized form of control and authority.

One significant aspect of this centralized control is the fact that education is a part of the national government and is represented in the President's cabinet by the Secretary of Education, who is the chief education officer for the public schools and is vested with powers and duties to carry out the educational policies of the Republic. Another fact that resulted in educational control being centered in Manila is that the National Government appropriates a high percentage of funds, averaging thirty per cent of the annual budget, for educational support.

To meet the need for broader participation in educational planning and policy determination, the Board of National Education was created in 1954 by Republic Act No. 1124. That act makes it the function of the Board to formulate, implement, and enforce general educational objectives and policies; and to coordinate the offerings, activities and functions of all educational institutions in the country, with a view to accomplishing an integrated, nationalistic and democratically-inspired educational system in the Philippines.

The Board's chairman is the Secretary of Education and he, as their executive, implements the decisions of the Board.

There are other national agencies that deal with education. One is the Civil Service Commission which exercises control through the examination and certification of eligibility of teachers and school employees and disciplinary measures against employees. The Government Service Insurance System provides retirement and insurance benefits to teachers and employees of the Department of Education. The National Economic Council influences education primarily through its control over foreign aid programs, notably in joint efforts with the Agency for International Development of the United States and with other regional and international agencies and other countries on a bilateral or unilateral basis.

The Wage and Position Classification Office classifies teachers and other school employees for salary scales under the "equal pay for equal work" concept of government service. The Unesco National Commission exists as a part of the United Nations' program for member countries to increase the benefits of educational, scientific and cultural pursuits. The National Coordinating Center for the Study and Development of Filipino Children and Youth conducts and encourages research among schools, agencies, institutions and entities interested in child and youth development as a basis of a more effective system of education.

The Institute of National Language developed and adopted a common national language using one of the existing major dialects as

a basis. All materials of teaching in the national language are studied for their linguistics characteristics by the Institute.

Language of Instruction. The English language has continued to be used as the medium of instruction up to the university level. When the Revised Educational Program of 1957 was adopted for the elementary and the secondary schools it included a policy on the use of the local dialect as the medium of instruction for Grades I and II in each school, with Pilipino introduced as a subject in Grade I and given increasing emphasis in the higher grades. English is introduced informally as a subject in Grades I and II. Beginning with Grade III, English becomes the medium of instruction while the dialects are used as the auxiliary medium in the primary grades. Pilipino is the auxiliary medium in the intermediate grades and in the secondary schools.

Two acts which affected all institutions of higher education are Republic Act 709 which declared the mandatory teaching of Spanish in all courses in public and private universities and colleges, and Republic Act 1425 which laid down that ll public and private colleges and universities should offer courses on the life, works and writings of Jose Rizal. The Department of Education issues department orders that affect both public and private educational institutions (an example is the requirement that students in education and liberal arts courses shall take at least nine units of the National Language).

The Community Schools. The community school concept was adopted in 1949-1950 as a principal instrument for rural reconstruc-

tion and improvement of rural life (which comprises almost three-fourths of Philippine society), also to meet the demands brought about by the post-war conditions and the political status of the country. Significantly, the Philippine Association of School Superintendents contributed much to the adoption of this policy.

Other significant developments. General secondary schools were organized in municipalities other than the provincial capitals to meet the increased demand for secondary education. In the mid-60s secondary schools were organized in some barrios.

In 1961 the Peace Corps Volunteers from the United States started to serve as assistant teachers of English, Science and Mathematics in the country.

The education system has been evaluated by various studies and surveys in order to make it relevant to the changing needs and times. In 1949 the Unesco Consultative Mission to the Philippines undertook the first post-war study of the country's educational system. It made recommendations on the language problem, a school financing plan and a general reorganization plan. This was followed by a study made by the Joint Congressional Committee on Education in 1951 which held the view that no radical steps should be taken on the change in language instruction until valid scientific evidence has been established. The Unesco Mission and the Congressional Committee recommended the adoption of examinations for entrance to college in both the private and public institutions.[1]

---

[1]Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System, p. 511.

Also in 1951, a survey on the financing of public education was undertaken under the Bell Economic Mission to the Philippines which was followed by the issuance, in 1957, of the General Education Policies by the Board of National Education. The Mission noted the "praiseworthy characteristics" of the Filipinos in their earnest desire for education and the establishment of private institutions which had unusually large classes especially in law, accounting, and business administration. It agreed with the findings of the Unesco Consultative Mission that the following conditions existed in the private institutions:

> . . . the indiscriminate admission of unqualified students, inferior curricula of little value, passing of inferior students in order to continue fees, use of low-paid part time instructors, overloading of courses to put students through quickly, and unethical rivalry among schools for student business.[1]

The Mission concluded that "the offering of so-called higher education on this low-grade basis is an imposition of an education-hungry people." Since the number preparing for a professional career is out of proportion to the needs of the country, especially trained workers for agriculture and industry, the Mission predicted that the country would soon be faced with the problem of white collar unemployment. It recommended that the Department of Education should apply the same standards to private as well as to public schools, and the granting of degrees should be confined to institutions which maintain satisfactory university standards.[2]

---

[1] Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System, p. 512.

[2] Ibid.

Another survey was undertaken in 1958 to 1960 which was comprehensive in nature, but limited only to public schools. It was conducted jointly by the National Economic Council of the Philippines and the United States Operations Mission to the country. Headed by J. Chester Swanson of the University of California with Philippine counterparts, i.e. the assistant directors of the Bureau of Public Schools, the survey resulted in three general recommendations: (1) improvement of the quality of educational service; (2) expansion of educational service; (3) provision of better financing for schools.

Finally, in 1969, the President of the Philippines created a Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education. The Commission worked within the purview of the general reorganization of the national government. Undertaken mainly by the Filipinos with the assistance of education experts from Australia and the Ford Foundation, the Commission's report in 1970 was entitled Education for National Development: New Patterns, New Directions. This report is the basis for the reorganization of the education system of the Philippines which is underway at the present writing.

Higher Education

The objectives of higher education in the Philippines are:

> Higher education shall be concerned with the conservation, transmission, and extension of human knowledge, with the preparation of leaders in arts, sciences, and the professions, and with the preservation and enrichment of Philippine culture.
>
> Leadership requires the highest quality in our human resources; and extension of the frontiers of knowledge demands

> a high degree of competence in specialized lines of study. Toward this end the government should extend every measure of assistance to implement the constitutional mandate for the promotion of arts, sciences, and letters.
>
> To be of maximum service to society, higher education should always be guided by an enlightened love of country and of fellowmen.[1]

Graduates of any of the four-year secondary schools are eligible for admission to the college or the university. These graduates of the secondary school spend six years in the elementary school. Compared with students entering the university in other countries, Filipino students spend only a total of ten years of schooling where they had to spend most of their time learning a foreign language which is the medium of instruction. In some parts of the Philippines, the students are practically learning another language--Pilipino, which is the national language.

There is an unrestricted admission of students in higher institutions of learning. The Philippines is a nation where any one can go to college provided he pays the required fees.[2] Tuition fees are charged in both public and private universities but vary considerably depending on the course of study followed.

There is no nation-wide survey of the socio-economic origins of college students, however a study made in 1956-1957 of the women students in the University of the Philippines revealed that over 43

---

[1]Philippines, Board of National Education, General Educational Policies. Report of the Board for 1955-1957 (Manila: Phoenix Press, 1958), p. 15.

[2]Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System, p. 529.

per cent of the fathers of the women students came from the upper-income groups. In another study made from 1959 to 1969 on students admitted to the University of the Philippines, it was revealed that the students came from areas near the state university or its branches. It was concluded in this second study that poor parents sent their children to the nearby colleges or university, therefore the private universities had an advantage in attracting students than the state university. Furthermore, there were indications that those who supported themselves through college, worked during the day and attended evening classes at private colleges and universities.[1]

It was reported that the average annual expense for undergraduates in the University of the Philippines in 1962-1963 was estimated at 1,500 pesos per year: tuition and other fees, 300 pesos; books and supplied, 400 pesos; room and board, 800 pesos. The financail burden of sending just one child to college may be gathered from the fact that the top salary of an assistant professor during the same year was about 6,000 pesos: it would take well over 25 per cent of his income to maintain one child at the University if clothing and other miscellaneous expenditures were taken into account.[2]

All universities have regular systems for student guidance and counselling. Student counselling has not escaped criticism. The Hannah Survey group found indications that the program of academic

---

[1]UNESCO, Higher Education and Development in South-East Asia Vol. II (Bangkok: UNESCO, 1967), p. 600. (Hereinafter referred to as UNESCO, Higher Education.)

[2]Ibid., p. 601.

counselling was far from adequate. For example, Dr. Virgilio de los Santos, Vice-President of the University of Manila, suggested that the failure in student organizations could be attributed to lack of skillful guidance on the part of advisers.[1]

> . . . student councils or other student government bodies and cultural or academic student associations are encouraged at most universities, and in certain cases the administration assists them by collecting student activity fees, distributing the proceeds between them according to established criteria. At the national level, however, there is considerable duplication, and, more unfortunate, destructive rivalry between a multiplicity of different types of voluntary national student organizations.[2]

> Most universities have general medical and dental clinics to look after student health, and simple treatment is given without charge. The University of the Philippines, for example, provides elaborate laboratory examinations free of charge. Some universities have student infirmaries; here services are usually free or at a nominal charge.[3]

The State and many private universities have residence halls for students. But these residential facilities could not cope with the number of students who were in need of adequate accommodation at reasonable prices.[4]

In a 1968 study it was reported that there were 34 universities in the Philippines: 28 private and 6 state-owned. There were 573 colleges: 556 private and 17 state-run. Appendix A lists these public and private universities. In that same year, the cost per student to

---

[1] UNESCO, Higher Education, p. 602.

[2] Ibid., p. 603.

[3] Ibid., p. 924.

[4] Ibid., pp. 601-602.

the government per year in state institutions was about 590 pesos while the cost of students in private institutions was 320 pesos based on a survey of 16 private institutions in Manila from 1966 to 1969.[1] The 1970 survey report of the Presidential Commission also revealed that higher education costs less in private institutions.

Philippine universities and colleges are both similar and dissimilar to the original American model. Manila alone has a dozen universities. The University of Santo Tomas is older than Harvard. The University of the Philippines is roughly comparable to a large university in the United States. The smaller church-controlled colleges or universities, like Silliman University and Ateneo de Manila (now a university) are similar to a small American liberal arts college with a religious affiliation. But there is no American counterpart for the commercially operated university with an enrollment of 25,000 to 40,000 per university that pays dividends to stockholders[2] and "whose shares are sold openly on the Manila stock exchange."[3] While these private institutions have filled the need where the state institutions have tended to leave the largest gap, they have to depend not only on tuition fees for their income, but also to a large extent upon the number of its graduates who can successfully pass the vocational or professional examinations prepared by the re-

---

[1]Pedro E. Teodoro, "Higher Education Costs Less in Private Schools," Philippine Panorama, July 9, 1970, pp. 6-7.

[2]Cutshall, The Philippines, p. 44.

[3]Corpuz, The Philippines, p. 128.

spective professional bodies or examining and accrediting agencies of the government. The success of the graduates is a good advertisement for the private institutions. As a result, these schools have produced an impressive number of competent lower-and intermediate-level trained people, such as accountants, dentists, pharmacists, and teachers.[1]

Fischer[2] attempted to classify Philippine universities as represented by the following five institutions:

1. University of the Philippines is the elite-producing type. It represents the most important channel for upward mobility in the Philippines.

2. Ateneo de Manila University is for the upper-middle and upper-class backgrounds.

3. University of Santo Tomas tends to serve the lower and middle class of Catholics.

4. Far Eastern University serves the working middle class.

5. Feati University serves part-time students who have neither the time, desire or money to attend the four types of institutions but are compelled to accumulate education credits for better employment in a diploma-oriented society.

> In the final analysis, schools at all levels, both public and private, have been and continue to be overcrowded without proper regard to any rational use of the limited financial and material resources that are available for education. Hence, the original principal and the government's policy of free educational

---

[1]Cutshall, The Philippines, p. 44.

[2]Joseph Fischer, Universities in Southeast Asia: An Essay on Comparison and Development (Ohio: A Kappa Delta Pi Publication, 1964), p. 101.

> opprtunity for everyone has become unrealistic. The children of the wealthier families attend the better private schools and colleges that charge higher fees.[1]

Aside from two weaknesses--lack of trained teachers and overcrowded classes, the control of all private educational institutions by the State poses a problem, for the present laws are insufficient for such purpose. It was reported that the Department of Education had become helpless in controlling enrollment and course offerings in some schools because it did not have definite legal powers.[2] And in another instance, it is possible for them to escape supervision and regulation if they do not offer the courses enumerated in Commonwealth Act No. 180, or do not issue diplomas or certificates nor grant titles and diplomas. Such schools are potential threats to the State because it is possible for them to teach dangerous doctrines, creeds, and ideologies.[3]

Some private institutions are trying to upgrade their standards. Twenty-eight private institutions had entered upon a voluntary system of accreditation through the PAASCU (Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities) with funding support from the Fund for Assistance to Private Education (FAPE).[4] Considering the fact that there were 580 private institutions in the Philippines according to the 1970 survey report, there is much left to be desired.

---

[1]Cutshall, The Philippines, p. 44.

[2]Philippine Times (Chicago), February 29, 1972, p. 6.

[3]Fresnoza and Casim, Philippine Educational System, p. 129.

[4]Presidential Commission, Education for National Development, p. 99.

The state institutions are not without problems. A number of the state institutions which were converted into universities after the post-war period were initially agricultural schools and regional colleges. An example of the latter, is the Bicol University, in Legazpi City, founded in 1969. Its nucleus was the former Bicol Teachers College and originally called Albay Normal School. With a few exceptions, these state institutions are inadequately financed, staffed, and equipped, and there is no machinery for imposing quality standards in curriculum, faculty and facilities.[1] This tendency to create state institutions without a well-conceived plan, based on the specific needs of the country and without regard to the institutions already existing might, if not properly checked, create unnecessary duplication of functions and unnecessary expenditure of public funds.[2] The teachers in the state institutions could not contribute productive scholarship and scientific endeavors for they were overloaded with teaching assignments. Meanwhile the private institutions could not be depended upon to do scientific research for education, for research was a drain on their finances.[3] The problem of educational research is compounded by the public's greater interest in politics than in science and technology and the reluctance of the government to provide the necessary funds for research.[4]

---

[1]Presidential Commission, Education for National Development, p. 99.

[2]Isidro, Trends and Issues, p. 92.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid.

Every year Filipino students seek admission to American universities and colleges, either with private financing or through scholarships. Since there is no standardized examination or consistent plan of accreditation in the Philippines by which quality of applicants might be judged, foreign student advisers from different institutions in the United States who participated in a workshop prepared a list of Philippine institutions.[1] These institutions were grouped in two categories. The grouping was based upon the opinions of several Philippine educators and of the majority of the workshop participants. The other limitations of the list are:

> . . . that there may be other colleges and universities which should be included on the list, and conversely, that the fact that an institution is included on the list does not constitute an endorsement of it by the participants of the workshop. It should also be remembered that, as is true in the United States, good students can be found in any school; the quality of a student's institution is only one of the factors to be considered when he applies for admission.[2]

Those institutions that were in Group I offer programs of the highest quality and have traditionally sent large number of students to the United States. The academic preparation of these students is similar to that found in students from good institutions in the United States. Group II institutions meet at least the minimum accreditation standards in the United States in one or more disciplines. Since there may be a great variance in quality between the

---

[1]Lee Wilcox (ed.), The Evaluation of Asian Educational Credentials A Workshop Report: Japan, India, the Philippines, and Taiwan (New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1966), p. 45. (Hereinafter referred to as Wilcox, Asian Educational Credentials.)

[2]Ibid.

different faculties which form any one institution, it was suggested that care should be exercised when considering the admission of a student from any of these in Group II. Appendix B shows this list of Philippine institutions and their locations.

Summary of educational problems.[1] The following are the problems of the Philippine educational system:

1. Quality and social relevance. There is a need for quality education which is relevant to the changed social and political order. The sub-problems are:

> (1) complexity and difficulty of bringing about administrative and curricular reform; (2) continuing shortage of textbooks, related teaching materials and instructional facilities; (4) the undesirable influence of politics; (5) inadequate financing and programming of in-service education for teachers and school administrators; (6) the lack of research base for educational reform and inadequacy of funding as well as expertise for continuing educational research and (7) difficulty of reorganizing the entire educational system.

2. Manpower and supply-demand mismatch. There is a need for the provision of training programs for critical occupational areas and a redirection of the flow of students in higher education so as to encourage the right kind of students to enter into training programs into the critical areas.

3. Financial constraints. There is an upward trend in the cost of education brought about by the cost of living which is increasing at a rate faster than the increased annual expenditures for education at the first level and the high birth rates. There are other

---

[1]Unesco/Minedas. Report on Education in the Philippines. (Manila: Department of Education (Philippines), 1971)

competing demands in the total development of the country.

4. Student activism. Filipino students, especially those in colleges and universities, have become restive. The issues and demands are many and varied, and student activism has been marred at times by unnecessary violence. While student unrest could be considered as a positive force bringing about needed social reform--social, economic, and educational--some of its manifestations have become causes for concern. Specific measures have been taken to cope with the situations, but it appears that the issues are broader than education itself and the solutions to social and economic problems that give rise to them are not easy to bring about.

It was mentioned earlier that the President of the Philippines had created a commission to survey the educational system of the country and that the recommendations of the survey team are now, up to this writing, the bases for the reforms and reorganization being made in the country.

The survey commission revealed that the patterns of higher education in the Philippines were largely determined by four basic factors, namely:[1]

1. There is a tremendous social demand for university education, producing an aggregate output of graduates much greater than the market can absorb.

2. Higher education has been left largely to private

---

[1]Presidential Commission, Education for National Development, pp. 97-100 and 110-116.

enterprise, which, with the inadequacy of control by the Bureau of Private Schools, has produced a situation of a serious lack of common standards, though new interests in upgrading standards is visible in the recent establishment of the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges and Universities.

3. There is a fairly large number of State colleges and universities operating under their own separate charters, independent from the Department of Education except for the chairmanship of the Secretary of Education on individual Boards. These institutions are generally inadequately financed, staffed and equipped, and have no machinery for imposing quality standards in curricula, faculty, and facilities.

4. The Greater Manila area has an undue concentration of higher education enrollment and crowding of institutions. Nevertheless, institutions which are located near one another are not known to have viable cooperative programs. This concentration has also caused slow development of regional institutions.

As policy recommendations in higher education, the Commission has indicated that there be three categories of institutions of higher learning as determined by the Department of Education and Culture--State colleges and universities, accredited colleges and universities, non-accredited institutions. The University of the Philipppines should be designated as the National University of the Philippines and the other existing chartered State colleges (except teacher training colleges) and universities be organized into three groups--the State

University of Luzon, the State University of Visayas and the Mindanao State University. A State College and Universities Board needs to be established to formulate general management and development policies among State institutions and serve as an advisory body to the National Board of Education on general policy for State institutions of higher education. A national polytechnic system also needs to be established, with the Philippine College of Arts and Trades as its nucleus and with a University of Technological Sciences to be developed as the apex of the system. All Government teacher-training colleges should be organized into a national teacher training system to be called National College for Teacher Education, with the Philippine Normal College as its nucleus institution. The system should have its own governing board.

Private colleges and universities should be encouraged to join or form associations for accreditation and matters of common interest, and a national federation of these associations (Federation of Accrediting Associations) should be established. Among its functions would be to moderate standards among associations and to advise the National Board of Higher Education on financing and development policies for higher education and accredited private institutions. The nucleus of such a federation would be the Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, College and Universities. A system of grants-in-aid to accredited institutions should be established, with requests for grants being made with application through the Federation of Accrediting Associations. Institutions that fail to be accredited

would be directly supervised by the Bureau of Higher Education.

A Board of Higher Education, consisting of representatives from the State Colleges and Universities Board and the Federation of Accrediting Associations should be established to ensure comparable standards in State and private accredited institutions and to coordinate funds for the development of Government and non-Government schools and colleges. The Board would have the Undersecretary of Education and Culture as Chairman and the Director of Higher Education as Executive Officer. In the adoption of long-range educational plans, the National Board of Education should provide a more effective balance between the number and quality of entrants into post-secondary institutions and the National demand for high-level manpower. There is need for a national admissions policy to govern entrance to institutions of higher education and for a system of scholarships, loans, and other forms of assistance to students in order to relate educational opportunities to student needs and ability, and to make the educational system more responsive to national manpower requirements.

The National Board of Education should adopt a national research policy and provide funds for research directly related to national development goals. The Department of Education and Culture should adopt such measures as may be necessary to enable higher education institutions to undertake systematic appraisals or revisions of their programs in the light of admission and accreditation policies. It should also develop and institute effective admission programs with

a view to improving quality of entrants and graduates in higher education institutions. The establishment of placement assistance services should be encouraged in institutions of higher education.

CHAPTER IV

STUDENT ACTIVISM IN THE PHILIPPINES

The emphasis of this chapter will be on the causes and effects of student activism in the Philippines from 1969 to 1971. In order to understand and appreciate the causes and effects of student activism during this period, information was provided in the background of the Spanish, American, Japanese, Commonwealth, and Independence periods. During the Independence period, student activism came under the political administrations ranging from President Roxas to President Marcos. Since the educational system was, and is still under government control and supervision, the policies of the central government was included where feasible.

Spanish Period

Background. The head of the central government in the Philippines during the Spanish regime was the governor-general. The King of Spain, except during the short-lived republic, appointed the governor-general. Owing to the great distance of Spain and the slow transportation and communication facilities, the governor-general ruled virtually as a monarch in the Philippines. With the exception of three brief periods--1810-1813, 1820-1823, and 1834-1837, the Philippines was denied representation in the Cortes, the national legislature in Spain. In the nineteenth century most of the governors-general from 1871 to 1898 were decidedly inferior to their predecessors in character, executive ability, and intelligence. For example: Governor Rafael Izquierdo

(1871-1873) was responsible for the execution of three innocent Filipino priests who even Archbishop Gregorio Meliton Martinez refused to defrock. Governor Fernando Primo de Rivera (1880-1883; 1897-1898) tolerated gambling and graft to enrich himself in office. General Valeriano Weyler (1881-1891) returned to Spain with a fortune worth about three million pesos which was purportedly given to him by the Chinese in order to evade the anti-Chinese laws.

The governors-general were not the only ones who were corrupt and incompetent during the last decade of the Spanish regime, the same can be said of the other members of the colonial officialdom. Notwithstanding their training and experience, those appointed to the offices in the central government or as governors and judges in the provinces were the favorites of the governor-general or proteges of high officials in Madrid. Their only qualifications were the white skin and Spanish citizenship.

> During the last decade of the Spanish rule, the colonial officials pursued and discouraged the entry of foreign traders and travelers, banned the use of foreign books and periodicals, censored strictly all publications, and kept away all ideas that smacked of democracy and liberalism. Educated Filipinos who dared raise a cry of protest against Spanish misrule were branded filibusteros and were persecuted, imprisoned, exiled, or executed. . . .
>
> There was no equality between the Spaniards and the Filipinos before the law. The laws of the Indies and other Spanish laws guaranteed the rights and interests of the Filipinos, but the Spanish officials ignored them.[1]

> . . . the Spanish government, in collusion with the friars succeeded in isolating the Filipinos, both intellectually and

---

[1]Zaide, Phillippine Political and Cultural History, p. 120.

> physically, to prevent the Filipinos from receiving any impression they thought expedient for them to have.[1]

One rare occasion when the Filipinos were allowed to experience freedom of speech, freedom of association, and freedom of the press was during the tenure of Governor-General Carlos Ma. de la Torre (1869-1871) when a republican form of government briefly took the place of the Spanish monarchy in Spain.

The University of Santo Tomas, established in 1611, was the only institution of higher learning in the Philippines until the end of the Spanish regime. Initially established solely for the Spaniards and mestizos(half-breeds), it accepted Filipino students four decades before the end of the Spanish rule.[2] Filipino students were not admitted to the seminaries until late in the Spanish regime. The training of the Filipino seminarians was geared toward their roles as assistants only to the Spanish parish priests.

There was only one secondary school where there was no racial discrimination and the Filipinos were not subject to humiliation. The Ateneo Municipal, maintained by the Jesuits, was the place where most of the prominent Filipino families sent their sons to study. The Filipinos who finished their secondary school education here would logically attend the University of Santo Tomas. A few of the wealthy even went to Spain because they did not like the kind of education

---

[1]Cesar Adib Majul, Apolinario Mabini: Revolutionary (Manila: National Heroes Commission, 1964), p. 25.

[2]Romero and Romana, Rizal and Philippine Nationalism, p. 18.

being offered at the University of Santo Tomas. The Ateneo Municipal, however, did not have as much prestige as the College of San Juan de Letran for the latter was the only one considered as the official secondary school in the Philippines at the end of the Spanish period by the Philippine Commission in its report in 1900.[1]

The first nationalist student movement. Sometime in 1870, a group of students at the University of Santo Tomas organized a society called the Juventud Escolar Liberal (Young Liberal Students), with Felipe Buencamino as president. This was the first known nationalist student movement in the Philippines.[2] For the first time, Filipino students began to discuss openly public issues of the government in the country without fear of reprisal.

The Juventud took note of the defects of education at the University of Santo Tomas and believed that there was a need to take drastic steps to remedy the situation.

> . . . the students circulated . . . letters which criticized the Dominican methods of instruction, clamored for better professors, demanded shifting the control of the university from the friars to the government, and suggested keeping the university abreast with academic developments in Spain. The petition was taken by the authorities as subversive in nature, and persons involved were sought, though no one was found guilty of conspiring against the government.[3]

In 1871, General de la Torre tried to implement the Moret

---

[1]Romero and Romana, Rizal and Philippine Nationalism, pp. 17-18.

[2]Carmencita Acosta,"The First Nationalist Student Group," Variety, February 23, 1969, n. p.

[3]Horacio de la Costa, Readings in Philippine History (Manila: Bookmark, 1965), pp. 219-220.

Decrees of 1870 which provided for the secularization of the University of Santo Tomas, but he was not able to carry out the provisions of the Decrees because: (1) the friars bitterly opposed the implementation and (2) there was a change of government in Spain which consequently led to his replacement. His successor removed all the freedoms which de la Torre had enforced.

The formation of the Juventud was the first and last attempt to organize a student group during the Spanish regime. These events followed: the Philippine Revolution of 1896, the Spanish-American War marking the entry of America in the Philippines, and the Philippine-American skirmishes and the occupation of the Philippines by the United States--leading into another colonial administration.

American Regime

Background. From 1898 to 1901, the Philippines was under American military governors and from 1901 to 1935, civil government by governors-general. Aside from the military conquest of the Philippines, the American military regime established a public school system.[1] Under the civil government, the following were attained: (1) religious freedom became an established right, (2) hygiene, sanitation, and public welfare received much attention, (3) the American system of education, language, arts, and sciences were introduced and taught, (4) agriculture developed rapidly, (5) commerce and trade soared to unprecedented

[1]Alip, Philippine History, p. 260.

level, (6) communication and transportation was modernized, (7) banking and currency were improved, and (8) manufacturing industries were given impetus.[1]

The growth of Philippine self-government began with Governor-General Francis Burton Harrison (1913-1921), who was successful in placing trained Filipinos in offices formerly occupied by Americans. The Wood-Forbes Mission in 1921 reported to President Harding that the Philippine government was 96 per cent Filipinized. Except for Governor-General Leonard Wood (1921-1927) who reversed the Harrison's policy of the Philippines for the Filipinos (originally Governor-General Taft's dictum) the succeeding governors-general "pursued a policy between the liberalism of Harrison and the conservation of Wood."[2] Despite his unpopularity, Governor-General Wood (1) removed nepotism in the government, (2) stabilized the government finances, (3) improved sanitation and health, and (4) developed the facilities of communication and transportation. The last American Governor-General in the Philippines was Frank Murphy (1933-1935). His administration was "seldom surpassed in the history of colonial administration."[3] Frank Murphy became also the first United States High Commissioner to the Philippines serving until 1936.

---

[1]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, pp. 270, 285, and 258.

[2]Ibid., p. 255.

[3]Ibid., p. 257.

The University of the Philippines was created in 1908. The first president was Murray Bartlett who served from 1911 to 1915. He was succeeded by Ignacio Villamor, the first Filipino to become president of the state university and he served from 1915 to 1920 which more or less coincided with the term of Governor-General Harrison. Except for Guy Potter Benton, who occupied the presidency of the state university from 1921 to 1923, all the rest were Filipinos.

Two incidents of student activism were noted during the American regime. The first was in 1918 and the second one, 1930.

The first student demonstration. In 1918 a group of students from the University of the Philippines staged the first student demonstration. The leader was Carlos P. Romulo, president of the student council and editor of the Varsity News (forerunner of the Philippine Collegian, organ of the University of the Philippines). The cause was the editorial by the American editor, W. L. Thibault, of the first Manila Times who called Ignacio Villamor, first Filipino president of the University of the Philippines, incompetent. Romulo (who later became Philippine Ambassador to the United States, fourth president of the United Nations General Assembly, Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Secretary of Education, and President, University of the Philippines) wrote a similarly biting editorial, called a mass meeting of students, and led the march to the newspaper office where they confronted the editor. The editor finally retracted his editorial and the retraction was published in the afternoon edition of the Manila Times. The stu-

dents were later called by President Villamor to thank them.[1]

The first student strike. The students of Manila North High School, now the Arellano University, went on strike in 1930. The cause was an American teacher's remark that her class "can't learn anything," and that her students had better be rig drivers and laundry women. The school principal, Mabel Carlson, was also known for being very strict. The class walked out and demanded the ouster of the offending teacher. This move of the students gained the support of the rest of the student body despite the knowledge that the penalty for their act was debarment for life for all government schools. The result was that the teacher was sent back to America and the penalty for the strike leaders was only one year suspension from the public schools.[2] One of the leaders of the strike later became a vice-president of the Philippine Air Lines, the flag-carrier of the Republic of the Philippines.

The Commonwealth Period

During the period when the Philippines was undergoing a transition towards a commonwealth form of government, the University of the Philippines (then located in Manila) became the fountainhead of student agitations and protests. The students of the University of the Philip-

---

[1]Mary R. Tagle, "The Restless Youth of the Halycon Years," Sunday Times Magazine, February 23, 1969, n.p. (Hereinafter referred to as Tagle, "Restless Youth,")

[2]M. G. M. "First Student Strike," Sunday Times Magazine, November 1, 1970, p. 24.

pines even before the Second World War were noted for their militance against issues which they thought were inimical to the nation.[1] Perhaps the most outstanding student leader in the thirties was Wenceslao Vinzons who was editor of the Philippine Collegian and president of the student council. In 1932 the Philippine Collegian supported the university's Writers Club by criticizing and disagreeing with President Bocobo of the state university who had expelled a student writing a poem which he considered obscene. The poem was published in the Philippines Free Press but the writer did not clear his poem with the university administration for outside publication. The members of the Writers Club (one of them, S. L. Lopez would later become a president of the state university) thought that the poem was not obscene and that the student should not be expelled for his thoughts nor his views curtailed. The members of the club went to the president to head off the expulsion order, but they were too late for the order has already been signed. One of the members later said that even if they had come earlier, the president would not change his mind anyway. It was ironic for the student who was expelled later became a nationally known poet in the Philippines.

Vinzons organized the Young Philippines in 1932 which was perhaps the first attempt to organize a national youth and student movement in the Philippines.[2] He led rallies against "bloated"

---

[1]A. O. Flores, "Student Militance Through the Years," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970, p. 30. (Hereinafter referred to as Flores, "Student Militance,")

[2]Onofre D. Corpuz, "Student Power in the Philippines: A Perspective," General Education Journal, December, 1969, p. 4. (Hereinafter referred to as Corpuz, "Student Power,")

congressional allowances, diminution of judicial power and the "incipience of dictatorship."[1] Vinzons, for one, made then Senate President Manuel L. Quezon his favorite target, whom he believed was becoming more powerful and moving towards a dictatorship.[2] He supported Roxas of the OSROX (named after Osmena and Roxas) mission which brought back the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act from the United States. When the OSROX team arrived, the law students of the University of the Philippines carried Roxas on their shoulders which was an open opposition to Quezon's stand on the said Act. When Quezon went to the University of the Philippines to deliver a speech, three days after the OSROX mission arrived, he was met with anti-Quezon placard-bearing students. Quezon was cheered wildly by the students when he promised that he would go to the United States and bring back a much better independence bill.

One of the students present was a brilliant undergraduate, Ferdinand E. Marcos. At the height of the February 1969's youth agitations, President Marcos was reported to say that he, too marched to Malacanang to pick a bone with a president.

> I was in the group of Vinzons (Wenceslao) and Tolentino (Arturo) in supporting Roxas. But I was one of the leaders in the student demonstrations against Quezon on the Cuervo-Barredo Case and the transfer of the university to Diliman.
>
> Quezon then came to the UP and delivered his famous speech on the irresponsibility and frivolity of youth and his doubts as to the capability of the young to defend his country. In answer, I delivered an oration on the inter-collegiate contents entitled,

---

[1] Flores, "Student Militance," p. 30.

[2] Ibid.

"We Too Can Suffer, We Too Can Die."[1]

Quezon was successful in opposing the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act, for under his leadership, the Philippine Legislature rejected it on October 17, 1933 on the following objections: (1) the provision regarding Philippine-American trade relations were disadvantageous to the Philippines; (2) the clause which restricted Filipino immigration to the United States was objectionable and offensive to the Filipinos; (3) the power of the American High Commissioner was too indefinite; and (4) the retention of military and naval reservations by the United States violated the national dignity and sovereign rights of the country.[2] He did get the Tydings-McDuffie Act which was a much better independence bill and became the basis for the Philippine independence in 1946.

Meanwhile, Vinzons graduated from the University of the Philippines' College of Law and was elected, shortly after, the youngest delegate to the Constitutional Convention of 1934. On the floor debates, he fought unsuccessfully for the lessening of the executive power which he though could lead to a dictatorship under the proposed charter. He campaigned for General Emilio Aguinaldo for the presidency of the Commonwealth. After Aguinaldo's defeat, he made fiery speeches against President-elect Quezon and for these he was charged with both libel and sedition, He was convicted by the

---

[1]Tagle, "Restless Youth," n.p.

[2]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, p. 311.

Court of First Instance but was acquitted by the Court of Appeals. Surviving this ordeal, Vinzons converted his student organization, the Young Philippines, into a political party. Two members of this party would later become presidents of the Republic of the Philippines. Through the Young Philippines, Vinzons was elected governor of his province, Camarines Norte, in 1939 and then a congressman in 1941. He was executed by the Japanese for his guerilla activities in 1942.[1] Today the student union building of the University of the Philippines was named for Wenceslao Vinzons and the municipality where he was born in the province of Camarines Norte was re-named after him.

The Young Philippines died with Vinzons but it also failed because:

> . . . it sought to articulate a distinct and separate voice for the youth and the students at a time when it was necessary for the Filipino people to speak with one voice and act as one during the last years before the national independence.[2]

Compared with the Nacionalista Party of Quezon and Osmena, which was firmly established and accepted as the nation's voice and agent for independence, the Young Philippines did not have chapters or branches in the provinces as those established by the Nacionalista Party. The Nacionalista Party also had the best of credentials: success in dealing with the Americans since 1907.[3]

From the Young Philippines until 1940 to the early 1950's during the student youth participation in the Magsaysay-for-President

---

[1]Flores, "Student Militance," p. 30.

[2]Corpuz, " Student Power," p. 4.

[3]Ibid.

movement, there was no student movement which caught national attention.

Corpuz, a former Secretary of Education commented:

> Outside of these two instances, each separate from the other, history does not record in clear terms the emergence and participation of student movements as such in our national political life. Campus student leaders have been many, brilliantly leading their fraternities and clubs, and later becoming illustrious, occasionally notorious, national leaders. But their rise to prominence was invariably built upon a record of fighting other student leaders on campus; thereafter, success in politics was ensured by their entering into the warm embrace of the traditional political parties.[1]

Agreeing with Corpuz, was Roces, another former Secretary of Education who wrote in 1961:

> This student disunity is best summed up in the number of national student organizations that have cropped up for the past decade-and-a-half.
>
> . . . Something has to be done to gather these splintered groups into one collective force.
>
> A rallying point for the country's young is imperatively needed. For them to be united into a cohesive group, they must be provided with a legitimate cause--at once attractive and patriotic--to consecrate their efforts to. For the youth can only be militant and responsive as long as there are valid and urgent reasons to be.
>
> The youth who fell in the fields of Bataan rose up in arms because there was a worthy cause to fight for--freedom. Wenceslao Vinzons and the young men and women who figured in the independence movement in the middle 30's fought with audacity because they had a noble mission. It was in the name of justice that the Filipino propagandists in Spain devoted their "golden hours" to the struggle for reforms in the Philippines.
>
> All these outbursts of the Filipino youth of the past were touched off by noble and pressing reasons. Unfortunately for the present crops of student leaders they have none of these. All they have is slogans, as empty as they are insincere, flashed before them by shrewd politicians to win their votes.[2]

---

[1] Corpuz, "Student Power," p. 5.

[2] Alejandro Roces, "Student Leaders: Rebels With Many Causes," Progress, 1961, p. 130. (Hereinafter referred to as Roces, "Student Leaders,")

It seemed that until 1961 the student movement in the Philippines had not been active when compared with other countries. The student movements of India and Japan had been active for almost half a century. In Indonesia the student movement was born simultaneously with the birth of the university system which took place immediately after independence. Burma's students had been so militant that the military regime was impelled to close the university for a number of years, and in order to break down student resistance, the student union building was bombarded by government artillery. Since 1918 students in Latin America have immersed themselves in political activity as an accepted vocation. The nationalist movements of the emergent African states regularly relied upon the students to provide the left-wing leadership.[1] At the beginning of the 1930's, there was no student movement in the United States.[2]

The Japanese Period

During the Japanese occupation, the only association which was permitted to exist was the Kapisanan sa Paglilingkod sa Bagong Pilipinas (Association for Service to the New Philippines), or KALIBAPI. This association was established by Executive Order No. 109 and inaugurated on December 8, 1942.

---

[1] Corpuz, "Student Power," p. 5.

[2] Edward Shils, "Dreams of Plenitude, Nightmares of Scarcity," in Students in Revolt ed. by Seymour Martin Lipset and Philip G. Altback (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970), p. 1.

> . . . The KALIBAPI assisted actively in food production by initiating a nation-wide fruit-tree planting campaign. It fostered the teaching of the National Language and propagated the teachings of Filipino heroes. It sponsored national art expositions, cultural contests, provincial fairs, and patriotic holidays. Moreover, it encouraged athletics and calisthenics in order to improve the people's health.[1]

Then on May 1, 1944, the KALIBAPI was reorganized into the People's Party, as such, the only political party in the Philippines during that time.

> . . . As of April 10, 1944, the KALIBAPI had 811 provincial, city and municipal chapters throughout the Philippines with a total membership of more than 1,500,000 adult KALIBAPI members and 80,000 Junior KALIBAPI members.[2]

This organization was short-lived because the Americans arrived and defeated the Japanese forces in the Philippines.

Independence Period

Background

President Roxas' administration (1946-1948). The Philippines held its first national elections after the Second World War on April 23, 1946. Manuel Roxas and Elpidio Quirino of the Liberal Party were elected president and vice-president respectively. The main policies of President Roxas' administration were as follows:

> . . . (1) closer ties with the United States, (2) adherance to the United Nations Organization, (3) reconstruction of the war-devastated economy, (4) relief for the masses, (5) social justice to the working class, (6) maintenance of peace and order, (7) preservation of the individual rights and liberties of the

---

[1] Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, pp. 353-354.

[2] Ibid., p. 354.

citizenry, and (8) honesty and efficiency in the government service.[1]

President Roxas was not able to implement fully those policies because he died on April 15, 1948. His administration failed to (1) curb graft and corruption in the government as evidenced by the "Surplus War Property Scandal," the "Chinese Immigration Quota Scandal," and the "School Supplies Scandal," and (2) to check the Communistic Huk movement.[2]

Student activism. Backpay and amnesty were the twin issues that brought the demonstrations from the student population, especially those in Manila. In the early 1946, an enraged student population, organized by two students of Arellano University, Saturnino Aricheta and Pablo Caella, "lambasted the solons who have voted themselves three years backpay before everybody else."[3] The group of students were joined by the laborers and the plain curious and these gathered at Plaza Guipit at two p.m. and by 6:00 P.M. the last of the indignant speakers had said his piece. Some of the speakers were: Jesus Barrera from the Democratic Alliance and the Civil Liberties Union, Isaias Salonga of the Cosmopolitan Colleges, Librado Cayco of the Arellano University, Renato Constantino of the University of the Philippines, and Sergio Loyola, University of Manila. The efforts of the student group seemed futile for the solons did not change their minds.

---

[1]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, p. 365.

[2]Ibid., p. 370.

[3]Tagle, "Restless Youth," n.p.

This "indignation rally" as the organizers called it was later followed by another rally in the same year at the same place, with Sergio Loyola of the University of Manila at the forefront and with "representatives of various organizations."[1] The subject was collaboration and amnesty. The students had been keeping their counsel about the subject, encouraged by the newly elected President Roxas' staunch defense of the Filipino leaders who served during the Japanese occupation or occupation leaders. In his election campaign, Roxas called these occupation leaders patriots. But after the election, there was no more word from him about the fate of the occupation leaders. The students became more indignant when President Roxas sent his Executive Secretary to meet with the students. The students, joined by other sympathizers of the occupation leaders went to where these occupation leaders--Jose P. Laurel (President of the Japanese-sponsored Republic), Claro Recto (Commissioner of Education, Health and Welfare), Benigno Aquino (Commissioner of the Interior), Jorge Vargas (Philippine Ambassador to Japan), and Quintin Paredes (Commissioner of Public Works and Communications)--had been "lodged" after arrival from Sugamo Prison, Japan. Laurel counselled the students to be patient and this was probably why the students did not pursue their demands. The government later acquitted the occupation leaders. Laurel ran for the presidency of the Republic in 1949 and Claro Recto was elected a senator and became the most outspoken critic of the Magsaysay administration.

Then in 1947, a "motley" group of students including Armando

---

[1]Tagle, "Restless Youth," n.p.

Manalo (who later worked at the Philippines Department of Foreign Affairs) marched from Padre Faura street to City Hall, Manila, where Congress was holding its session. This group did not favor parity rights for Americans. It was a very quiet group, as quiet and orderly as the next one that Manalo joined which gathered in front of the Netherlands Embassy to show its sympathy for the Indonesians who were pressing for independence.

The mid-forties saw scattered student rallies such as those staged against congressional backpay, amnesty, and parity rights.

President Quirino's administration (1948-1953). Vice-President Quirino assumed the presidency after the death of President Roxas in 1948. The two main objectives of his administration were: (1) economic reconstruction of the nation and (2) restoration of the faith and confidence of the people in the government. It was in the realm of diplomacy that his administration excelled but the following caused the unpopularity of his administration: (1) unabated graft and corruption in the government, (2) extravagant presidential junkets abroad, (3) rising unemployment, soaring prices of commodities, and unfavorable balance of trade, and (4) frauds and terrorism committed by the Liberal Party in the elections of 1947, 1949, and 1951.[1]

The Communist threat was menacing so the writ of habeas corpus was suspended in several places in the country. It was also the beginning of a whole decade of anti-communist hysteria and witch-hunt.[2]

---

[1]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, pp. 371-372.

[2]Ray M. Hizon, "The Left in the Sixties," Graphic, February 25, 1970, p. 10. (Hereinafter referred to as Hizon, "Left in the Sixties,")

Ramon Magsaysay, Defense Secretary, emerged as the man who could suppress the Huk movement.

An American, who was a former Adviser on Higher Education on the Staff of the SCAP (Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers) at Japan, visited the Philippines from March 25 to April 11, 1951. After interviewing Dr. Manuel L. Carreon, Director of the Bureau of Private Schools, Dr. Bienvenido L. Gonzales, President of the University of the Philippines, and Dr. Vidal L. Tan, President of Far Eastern University (the largest private university in the Philippines because of its student population), the visitor made the following general conclusion:

> Although the Philippine Islands were overridden with Communist influence and direct violence flared up almost daily, the universities, colleges, and secondary schools of the Republic of the Philippines appeared to be surprisingly and gratifyingly free from immediate Communist influence, either in their faculties or among the thousands of ambitious young people enrolled in these universities.[1]

Student activism. Student activism in the fifties was comparatively tame.[2] In 1953, a group of students led by Rafael Salas (who later became Executive Secretary to President Marcos) marched from the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier to Malacanang to demonstrate against the attempt of the Quirino administration to remove then Defense Secretary Ramon Magsaysay from office. It was difficult to ascertain whether this group of students contributed to the retention

---

[1]Walter Crosby Eells, Communism in Education: In Asia, Africa, and the Far Pacific (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1954), p. 62.

[2]Hizon,"Left in the Sixties," p. 1.

of Magsaysay in office for Magsaysay was already becoming popular because of his successful campaigns against the Huks. Magsaysay later defeated Quirino in the presidential election of 1953.

President Magsaysay's administration (1953-1957). Former Defense Secretary Ramon Magsaysay, under the banner of the Nacionalista Party, defeated Elpidio Quirino by "the biggest majority ever polled by a presidential candidate over his rivals in the annals of Philippine elections."[1] Magsaysay got the full support of the legislative leaders of both Houses of Congress. The press, the radio, and public opinion were overwhelmingly for him.

> Magsaysay had restored the people's faith in their Government, broke the back of the Communist uprising in the Philippines, and called the attention of the nation to the urgent need for improving life in the rural areas so that people might be saved from Communism.[2]

One weakness of the Magsaysay administration was that the spoils system seemed to have crept into appointments to government positions. Appointments and promotions in the civil service had been based on merit and competence and the system was at its best during the time of the American period.[3] Magsaysay's pro-American stand was criticized by Senator Claro Recto who wanted to do away with the whole gamut of United States-Philippines "special relations."[4]

President Magsaysay died in an airplane crash on March 17, 1957 at the height of his popularity.

---

[1]Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History, p. 375.

[2]Alip, Philippine History, p. 460.

[3]Ibid., p. 459.

[4]Hizon, "Left in the Sixties," p. 11.

Student activism. It was during the 1953 presidential elections that the practice of hiring student leaders for political campaign purposes was started[1] and the next effort was made to bring the students into the national political life.[2]

The first effort resulted in professionalism and opportunism in youth leadership. Several of the student leaders were old enough to be grandfathers.

> These over-aged politicians bandy themselves around as leaders of the young so that when national elections come their services could be utilized by some unscrupulous candidates. And this means fat salaries and allowances, and a good paying job to boot should the candidates win.[3]

A student leader would even go to the extent of "selling" his student group to the highest bidder. Such was the case of the NASTUM (National Student Movement) which became infamous because this student group was reportedly sold to President Quirino by one of its officers.[4]

The SCAP (Student Council association of the Philippines), one of the earliest student organizations formed on a national scale shortly after the Second World War, had been split because it involved itself in national politics. The NUSP (National Union of Students of the Philippines) was the new organization created as a result of the SCAP split. This group vowed to rid student leadership of professionalism

---

[1] Roces, "Student Leaders," p. 102.

[2] Corpuz, "Student Power," pp. 4-5.

[3] Roces, "Student Leaders," p. 103.

[4] Ibid.

and opportunism.[1]

The second effort saw student participation in the YMPM (Youth for Magsaysay for President Movement). The YMPM was nationally organized, with provincial chapters and local coordinators. Unlike the Young Philippines, which had set out as a separate voice of the youth, and failed, the YMPM merged themselves from the outset with the larger Magsaysay campaign organization. When the immediate goal of the YMPM was achieved, that of electing a President, the liaison between the student leaders and the President was harmonious. The final result was: the student electoral campaign led by the YMPM did not develop into an authentic movement.[2]

President Garcia's administration (1957-1961). Vice-President Carlos P. Garcia took over the reins of government after President Magsaysay's death. That same year, 1957, Garcia was elected president and for the first time in Philippine political history, the Vice-President, Diosdado Macapagal, belonged to the opposition party. Unlike his predecessors who were given the portfolio of Foreign Affairs Secretary, Vice-President Macapagal was not given any portfolio or office in the government, but as a constitutional officer he drew his 15,000 pesos annual compensation.[3]

The following could be credited to the Garcia administration:[4]

---

[1]Roces, "Student Leaders," p. 103.

[2]Alip, Philippine History, p. 461.

[3]Ibid., p. 462.

[4]Ibid.

1. Firm stand on the military bases and firm demand for payments from the United States government.

> It demanded Philippine jurisdiction over cases committed in the U.S. military installations. It also demanded payment of 900 million dollars from the United States government for claims arising from the balance of war damage payment, for differential pay of Filipino military servicemen in the U.S. army, the oil excise tax, and the devaluation of the dollar. He did not get all that he demanded but this showed his independent and firm policy toward the former Mother country.

2. Firm stand against the Huks. It successfully demanded the surrender of Huk leader Alfredo Saulo who took refuge in the Indonesian Embassy in Manila late in 1958. The government vigorously pursued the campaign against the remaining Huks and dissidents.

3. Reparations agreements and reestablishment of Philippine-Japanese diplomatic relations.

President Garcia announced his policy of austerity in the government and urged the people to do likewise. But it soon appeared that his administration was not following its own austerity program because when President Garcia went to the United States, Japan, and Taiwan in 1958 and to Vietnam in 1959, he was accompanied by a big entourage which consequently incurred big expenses for the taxpayers. He also purchased a luxurious presidential yacht and a presidential plane at a combined cost of more than seven million pesos. Then there were reports of big scandals in the operations of government-owned corporations which entailed heavy financial losses to the government. The amounts involved were much bigger than those that were reported during the Quirino administration.[1]

---

[1]Alip, Philippine History, p. 461.

> It appears likewise that he (President Garcia) tolerated the men around him to commit graft, corruption, and venalities to enrich themselves.[1]

Student activism. In November, 1958, a group of students from "various schools and colleges" practically laid siege to the Indonesian Embassy in Manila.[2] Huk leader Alfredo Saulo sought sanctuary in the said Embassy from the Philippine authorities. The placard-bearing youth demanded the surrender of the Huk leader. Saulo was later surrendered to the Philippine authorities, not because of the student group, but due to the diplomatic representation made by the Philippine government.

In 1960, a typhoon caused a disastrous flood in Manila and the provinces of Central Luzon. The flood which lasted several days brought death to hundreds of people and the destruction of property. Similar destructive typhoons took place in Mindanao.[3] That may have been a reason why there was no incident of student activism this year.

About 4,000 students demonstrated by forcing their way into Congress, thus causing a brief suspension of the CAFA (Committee on Anti-Filipino Activities) hearings on March 14, 1961. The demonstration was a protest against the CAFA which was having its congressional hearings in the publication of certain "subversive" articles at the University of the Philippines. The demonstration was spearheaded by

---

[1] Alip, Philippine History, p. 464.

[2] Flores, "Student Militance," p. 101.

[3] Alip, Philippine History, p. 464.

the SCAUP (Student Cultural Association of the University of the Philippines). The issue was a defense of academic freedom. The demonstration further encouraged students and faculty members of the University of the Philippines to write against the "United States imperialism and all its local lackeys and also to launch mass actions against them."[1]

Then on October 13, 1961, "about a hundred university students" gave Cuban Charge D'Affairs Andres Avino Soler an angry send-off at the Manila International Airport. The university students' angry protest was a futile cry for Avino Soler had been declared persona non grata by the Philippine government and was leaving the country for good.

The Saulo and Avino Soler incidents involving students were described as generally designed to impress, mere echoes of some unscrupulous elders and self-serving seekers.[2]

President Macapagal's administration (1961-1965). Vice-President Diosdado Macapagal defeated Garcia in the presidential election in November, 1961. Macapagal's victory was mainly due to the following:[3]

1. There was a popular clamor for a change in the administration.

2. There were disagreements among the top leaders of the Nacionalista Party to which President Garcia belonged.

---

[1]Hizon, "Left in the Sixties," p. 12.

[2]Roces, "Student Leaders," p. 101.

[3]Alip, Philippine History, p. 466.

Unlike Presidents Magsaysay and Garcia, who had the full support of the their respective Congresses, President Macapagal began his administration with a hostile Congress. Accordingly, his pet administration measures, including appointments to most key positions, never had a chance of approval or confirmation. In the case of major appointments, Macapagal resorted to ad interim appointments or appointments in acting capacity.[1]

Macapagal had to deal with Garcia's "midnight" appointments, these were the last minute appointments made by President Garcia. Macapagal withdrew all Garcia's appointments and appointed to those offices his own partisans. He was sustained by the Supreme Court in a case which questioned the legality of his action.[2]

Documents were uncovered by the Secretary of Justice which linked government officials to certain scandalous and shady business transactions of Harry S. Stonehill, a former American army officer turned businessman. The documents showed that Stonehill, through bribery and dubious acts, succeeded in enriching himself and making certain officials his tools in his multi-million peso business enterprise. As the scandal became public knowledge, Congress ordered the case investigated. But in the midst of this investigation, Macapagal ordered Stonehill deported.[3] The case did not end there for it

---

[1]Alip, Philippine History, p. 467.

[2]Ibid., p. 468.

[3]Ibid.

continued to drag on for several years.

President Macapagal tried to implement his socio-economic program with the catchword, "continuing unfinished revolution," through the EEA (Emergency Employment Agency) and a land reform act. The intention for the EEA was to give employment to many people. Unfortunately, the EEA was badly managed and the 100 million pesos it spent were squandered by unscrupulous officials. This was a blot in the Macapagal administration.[1] The land reform act provided for the purchase of big landholdings by the government which were to be subdivided for re-sale to the landless on installment basis, but President Macapagal succeeded only in one piece of property in the province of Bulacan.[2]

His administration was also characterized by frequent changes in his cabinet members which might have affected the success of his administration. It was also characterized with political "turncoatism" and "fat allowances" for congressmen and to a certain extent for the senators.[3]

President Macapagal was instrumental in changing the celebration of Philippine Independence Day from July 4 to June 12. His Executive Order changing the independence day anniversary became permanent under Republic Act No. 4166. July 4, still a national

---

[1] Alip, Philippine History, p. 470.

[2] Ibid., p. 469.

[3] Ibid.

holiday, is now officially observed as United States-Philippines Friendship Day.[1]

Student activism. The University of the Philippines in 1962 protested the appointment of General Carlos P. Romulo as president of the state university by President Macapagal. It seemed that the protest fell on deaf ears for Romulo was still appointed as the president of the said university.

Student demonstrations in the Philippines until the middle part of 1962 appeared to be at a minimum. The reason students did held demonstrations and why these were not a familiar scene in Manila was given by Senator Raul S. Manglapus, a former Secretary of Foreign Affairs, at the World Conference of Pax Romana at Montevideo, Uruguay on July 26, 1962:

> Student demonstrations seem to fill the need for political action where the elite has not sufficiently enlarged to cover the whole field of active political leadership. When the social institutions of the country do not find the kind of quantity and quality of leadership that they need to keep them moving forward, there is a gap which must be filled, a break in the rolling chain, and the most ready gap-filler is the demonstrating student.
>
> If the sight of students marching down the streets of Manila is not a familiar one, I think it must be because our leadership elite has been sufficiently enlarged to fill any gap in the leadership spectrum. There is a general acceptance that post-university leadership is at least quantitatively sufficient and the people are not prone to look to -student riots as an extreme recourse to elicit government action.[2]

Data were not available showing the extent of student activism in 1963.

---

[1]Alip, Philippine History, pp. 472-473.

[2]Raul S. Manglapus, Revolt Against Tradition, ed. by Rodolfo Severino, Jr. (Manila: No name of publisher, 1964), p. 45.

On June 29 and 30, 1964, came the most destructive typhoon in eighty years, which rendered about half a million people homeless, caused the death of over 100 persons, and damaged property worth over three million pesos. Manila, Central, and Southern Luzon were hardest hit. In July of the same year, several other typhoons struck other parts of Luzon, but the damages were lesser in extent. Notwithstanding the results of the typhoon in June 1964, three incidents of student activism were reported for that year.

The first riot. The decontrol policy of President Macapagal had so incensed workers, students and nationalist businessmen that the first riot of the decade occurred near Malacanang, the official residence of the President of the Philippines, after the demonstrators had come from the American Embassy to denounce the Laurel-Langley Agreement and the Parity Amendment. The demonstrators responded with "defensive violence" against the provocations of the Presidential Guards Battalion. This incident occurred on October 2, 1964.[1]

On November 30, 1964, the KM (Kabataan Makabayan or Nationalist Youth) was formed to consolidate the young workers and students who had joined the militant October 2 demonstration under a single organization. Jose Ma. Sison was elected chairman.[2]

In Angeles City on December 27, 1964, the KM was holding a demonstration of about 5,000 townspeople against the United States

---

[1]Hizon, "Left in the Sixties," p. 12.

[2]Ibid.

military bases, all unequal military treaties with the United States, and all previous killings of Filipinos in the said military bases. By January 25, 1965, the KM led about 20,000 workers, peasants, and students in a march and held a demonstration before the American Embassy, Congress, and Malacanang against the whole gamut of foreign and feudal exploitation.[1]

President Marcos' administration (1965-1971). Senate President Ferdinand E. Marcos defeated Macapagal in the 1965 presidential election. There were no major issues involved during the campaigns. Huge spending by both political parties was reported by the press, radio and television.[2]

In about three years and a half, the Marcos administration had accomplished the following: (1) increased rice and corn production to the point of self-sufficiency, (2) built more roads and bridges, and (3) constructed more school houses than any preceding administration.[3]

The problems which confronted the government included the following:

> . . . (1) peace and order problem, (2) rising prices of commodities, including food, (3) unemployment, (4) squatter-housing problems, (5) perennial school crises, (6) problem of over-staying Chinese, (7) problem about the cultural minorities, (8) venalities in the government offices, (9) presence of American military bases, and (10) the Sabahn question.[4]

---

[1]Hizon, "Left in the Sixties," p. 12.

[2]Alip, Philippine History, p. 474.

[3]Ibid., p. 475.

[4]Ibid., p. 477.

> Side by side with the peace and order problem which has seriously plagued the Marcos administration are the manifestations of unrest and the holding of rallies and demonstrations from various sectors of society. Students, public school teachers, university professors, fiscals, muncipal judges, hospital doctors, government employees, jeepney drivers and lay religious leaders--all these segments have organized rallies and demonstrations against governmental, religious or privately owned educational institutions, to make known their non-conformity to existing orders.[1]

Student activism. During the years 1965 and 1966 several demonstrarions brought to the national consciousness the "unjust character of the United States war of aggression in Vietnam and of Philippine involvement there."[2] The high point in the campaign against the Vietnam war was the huge and tumultuous demonstration on October 4, 1966 in front of the American Embassy and then in front of the Manila Hotel where President Johnson and other Asian diplomats were billeted for the Manila Summit Conference. The police attacked the demonstrators. Several students were clubbed and two or three were shot.[3] A congressional investigation which followed later, on the alleged police brutality during this incident, blamed the demonstrators for the start of violence even though the demonstrators were seated and unarmed when set upon by the police.[4]

---

[1]Alip, Philippine History, p. 478.

[2]Hizon, "Left in the Sixties," p. 12.

[3]Petronilo Bn. Daroy, "The Politics of a New Nation," Graphic, January 27, 1971, p. 10. (Hereinafter referred to as Daroy, "Politics of a New Nation,")

[4]Ninotchka Rosca, "The Irony of the Tanada-Agbayani Reports," Graphic, April 15, 1970, p. 5. (Hereinafter referred to as Rosca, "Tanada-Agbayani Reports,")

As a protest against police brutality, the KM (Kabataan Makabayan) held a demonstration on November 3, 1966. There was no report of violence.

The year 1967 was relatively peaceful. It was during this year, however, when the Partisans, students of the University of the Philippines were responsible for the DOW Chemicals expose. The Partisans exposed the University of the Philippines' contract with the DOW Chemicals where 200 square meters of land in Mount Makiling was being used as a testing ground for defoliants and other gas products. According to this group of students, the result of the experiment would be later used by the United States government for its aggressive purposes. The expose led to the termination of the contract between the state university and the said American company. Sixto Carlos, student leader of the Partisans, was suspended for thirty days when, with three other students, they draped the oblation. The oblation is a monument in front of the administration building of the University of the Philippines at Diliman campus, Quezon City. The university administration considered this act a desecration of a public monument. The administration's charges against the students had to be dropped when the students staged a rally against General Carlos P. Romulo, at that time the president of the state university whom they called, "the perfect American stooge."[1]

The year 1968 witnessed a world-wide phenomena on university campuses which had never been seen before: hundreds of students in

[1]Mario M. Baluyot, "Where Are They Now?" Graphic, July 14, 1971, p. 21. (Hereinafter referred to as Baluyot, "Where Are They Now?")

revolt against university administrators and government officials.

France, Italy, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Yugoslavia, England, Brazil, Mexico, Uruguay, Israel, Egypt, the United States, and Japan were the scenes for the student demonstrations.[1] Small and big universities, did not escape the wrath of the angry rebels. The students did not confine themselves to simple demonstrations; they seized buildings, held deans and presidents captive, battled police, upturned and burned cars and nearly toppled a regime.

France. Students of the University of Paris, more particularly Sorbonne, from 12,000 to 15,000 of them, thronged the streets in protest against the medieval character of method and curriculum of their institution, crowded classroom and dormitories, absentee professors,a "ruthless" examination system, antiquated laboratories, lack of physical facilities, and almost complete absence of student-teacher relationships. The strikes were violent; they spread like wildfire and caused a chain reaction among the labor unions, which staged a general strike in the industrial sectors paralyzing the entire country and endangered the regime of President Charles de Gaulle.

Italy. Students of the University of Rome, Turin and Milan staged violent strikes and demonstrations, occupied buildings for several days, battled with one another on account of conflicting ideologies and fought against the police who tried to quell them.

Spain. Students of the Universidad Central de Madrid as well

---

[1]Marcos Herras, "Student Activism: Here and Abroad," Action Now, date of issue, missing, pp. 6-9.

as the University of Barcelona declared strikes and staged demonstrations demanding academic freedom. Riots and violence accompanied the strikes. The students of Barcelona seized the Rector and threatened to throw him out of the window of one of the buildings.

Czechoslovakia. At the University of Prague, the students struck in protest against the occupation of their country by the Russian Army. One of them committed suicide by pouring gasoline over his clothing and then setting his body on fire.

West Germany. About 4,000 students stormed Springer's $20 million headquarters with rocks and molotov cocktails; they blamed the editorial publications of Springer for the frustrated assassination of Red Rudi Dutschke, who was called the pied piper of West Germany's leftist student movement. At Heidelberg, the university authorities threatened to close the institution if student agitations did not stop. This was the cause for further demonstrations in three other cities.

Yugoslavia. A student demonstration at the University of Belgrade started with a brawl at a dance in the student quarter of the city. When the police intervened, the situation became worse, in spite of the use of truncheons and water cannons.

England. In Oxford, more than 300 undergraduate students fought with the police over the distribution of leftist pamphlets. They actively participated in demonstrations against the Vietnam War. At the Hornsey College of Art, the largest art school in England, the students took over the buildings, seized the college switchboard and

ran their own classes and cafeteria.

Brazil. Student protest started from "O Calabuoco" (the dungeon) a state-owned restaurant where the students protested against the food and the poor sanitary conditions. The police, who tried to quell the demonstrations, accidentally killed one of the students. Due to the killing, the demonstrations swept all over the country; the crowds demanded an end to censorship and wage controls. The government had to use the army with tanks and planes to quell the demonstrations.

Mexico. Student strikes at the University of Mexico started with a seemingly trivial brawl among rival students of Mexico City High School. Police brutality, however, inflamed the strikers. The situation worsened when the police occupied the university buildings on the ground that the demonstrations were Communist-inspired. The students retaliated by distributing inflammatory leaflets, throwing concocted fire bombs in chemistry laboratories, firing pistol shots at the police, and hurling debris and water over them. The students almost overthrew the government. The University President Javier Barros Sierra resigned due to the occupancy of the university by the police.

Uruguay. At the University of Montevideo, thousands of undergraduates took to the streets, smashing show windows, looting and setting cars on fire. They gave no quarter to the police; as a matter of fact, they attacked the police with fire bombs and scrap metal hurled by improvised catapults. The schools were closed for

three weeks while the students were engaged in urban guerilla warfare.

Israel. More than 10,000 chanting students took to the streets protesting against the stoppage of the sale of firearms and planes by France to Israel.

Egypt. Students from five Egyptian universities staged strikes for several days protesting against the educational curricula. Rioting was extended to Cairo, Alexandria and Mansoura; the violence displayed by the students prompted President Gamal Abdel Nasser to order the closure of the universities.

The United States. At Brandeis University, black students occupied the buildings. The university authorities had to resort to court action to evict the sixty-five black students who barricaded themselves in a classroom building. President Morris B. Abram was reportedly compelled to negotiate with the students in an attempt to work out a settlement. It was reported that about 90 per cent of the demands of the students were met.

About 21,728 students in Boston University protested the Maurice Gordon's donation of $500,000.00 to the university because they said that it was "blood money." Gordon was reportedly able to get that amount from his real estate holdings in Boston and its schools as an owner of ghetto buildings.

About five hundred students and faculty members in Colgate University staged a sit-down strike in the administration building for almost five days until the school officials promised to reform the fraternities' selective and discriminatory "rushing" system.

At Columbia University, more than 200 students seized control of five major buildings, occupied and vandalized the office of President Grayson Kirk, held the Dean of the College a prisoner for 24 hours. The demonstrations were characterized by vandalism, theft and obscene language. The student revolt originated from the following: (1) a controversial project to build a new gymnasium adjacent to the Morningside Park; (2) the school's ties with the Pentagon; (3) a demand that students who first demonstrated against the two issues be granted amnesty.

Students at the University of Denver staged a demonstration protesting against university policies. Violence broke out and about forty students were arrested.

The administration at Harvard University managed to diffuse student power campaigns by avoiding direct confrontations on broad issues and by its willingness to talk over specific "gripes" at length. Reform-minded students enjoyed almost complete accessibility to Harvard deans.

About 1,000 students and faculty members staged a demonstration at Princeton University against the traditional trustee control over the institution. They stopped only when President Roberto F. Goheen said that there would be a fresh and searching review of the decision-making process of the university.

Students and teachers picketed at San Francisco State College, California, in protest against the black-white conflict. Leftist students staged a continuing battle with club-wielding policemen in

their demands for courses in Negro history and black power demands. Most of the demonstrators were members of the Black Students Union and Third World War Liberation Front.

At Trinity College, Connecticut, 200 students invaded the administration office for more than a day, where the President and six trustees were captive for three hours and demanded that the school create more scholarships for black students and a course on the psychology of the ghetto. The university officials agreed.

There were protests at Yale University regarding university policies but President Kingman Brewster, Jr. went out of his way to discuss policies with the editorial staff of the Yale Daily News, adopted a policy of student consultation before the formulation of any university policy. Thus, he nipped further protests in the bud.

Members of the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) at the University of Wisconsin staged a demonstration in protest against the policies of the institution.

More than 1,500 students at Duke University, in North Carolina, staged a sit-down strike to force the trustees to pay non-academic employees more than $1.15 per hour; they boycotted classes and cafeterias.

These incidents of student activism in the United States did not, however, mean that it happened only in 1968, for in 1963 student protests were reported in the universities of Princeton, Brown, and Yale and in 1966, at the universities of Harvard and Brown.[1]

---

[1]William W. Brickman, "Student Activism and Academic Apathy Since 1963," from Conflict and Change on the Campus ed. by William W. Brickman (New York: School & Society, 1970), pp. 18-20. (Hereinafter referred to as Brickman, "Student Activism,")

It was also reported that the American student movement first emerged out of the civil rights activities in the South, then it spread to the North where the tactics of sit-ins and other forms of civil disobedience were particularly effective in controntation with the authorities among the universities. Then from Berkeley in 1964 these forms of civil disobedience were diffused throughout the world.[1] At this juncture, it is difficult to determine whether these forms of civil disobedience were adopted by the Filipino students. Although Califano found a similarity of student tactics around the world, he attributed these tactics to the following: (1) the enormous impact of the media, particularly television, and (2) the increase of student travel.[2]

Japan. Riots took place at Tokyo University. The demonstrations were led by the Zengakuren (All Japan Federation of Student Governments). They fought with the police for several weeks. The main target of the demonstrations was the abrogation of the United States-Japan Security Treaty and the toppling of the conservative and pro-American government of Prime Minister Eisako Sato. The roots of the student violence in Japan, which affected about fifty-one of the nation's universities, stemmed from the American occupation following the Second World War.

---

[1]Seymour Martin Lipset, "The Possible Effects of Student Activism on International Politics," from Students in Revolt ed. by Seymour Martin Lipset and Philip G. Altback (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970), p. 512.

[2]Joseph A. Califano, Jr. The Student Revolution: A Global Confrontation (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1970), p. 53. (Hereinafter referred to as Califano, Student Revolution.)

Philippines. At Guagua National College, the students staged a sit-down strike for two months to compel the school administration to listen to their grievances. They picketed the school for about a month. They complained that certain members of the faculty were reactionary and intolerant; that the administration displayed lack of sympathy for national activities; that the funds which should go to the student government were withheld and that the school fees were excessive.

Demonstrations likewise took place at the Holy Angels Academy, in Angeles City, Pampanga against school policies and the conduct of certain officials.

In March and April, student rebels at the Lipa City College staged a three-day walk-out led by the editor of the school paper. The issue was student government. The students protested that fees were collected from them for a student government though no such government was allowed to exist.

It was difficult to determine whether the students in those three schools were granted what they were asking for but those school protests were reportedly led by the KM (Kabataan Makabayan) as experiments leading to nation-wide application.[1]

In the province of Pampanga, during the early part of the year 1968, students and teachers picketed St. Augustine College. The group claimed that the PC (Philippine Constabulary or national police) and the local police were used against them. The student revolt in

[1]Hizon, "Left in the Sixties," pp. 12-13.

St. Augustine College spread to the Angeles Institute of Technology where the PC rangers had to be called when the students rose in revolt.

At the Lyceum of the Philippines, Manila, during the first week of March 1968, a demonstration was staged by the student council, Scholastic Society, and the editorial staff of the school paper. A manifesto of grievances was distributed all over the school.

In these two separate incidents of student activism, it was difficult to determine whether the demands by the groups were met by the school authorities concerned.

Student Activism in 1969

The January activism. On January 30, according to Galang[1] and Lacaba,[2] just after the Manila Public School Teachers Association agreed to end their strike, momentarily conciliated by a partial release of salary differentials and the promise of salary increases, the students belonging to the Far Eastern University Student Movement for Reforms cordoned off the university premises. The group was protesting excessive tuition fees. The school administration refused to deal with the demonstrators because the organization was not a recognized university association--the administration claimed it had been born overnight. Nevertheless, it agreed to negotiate with the student council whose powers the student activists had already sought. The demands brought forward by the student leaders were for the most

[1]Roz M. Galang, "The Day the Campus Exploded," Variety, February 9, 1969, p. 4.

[2]Jose F. Lacaba, "The Clash of '69," Philippines Free Press, February 8, 1969, pp. 2-3.

part granted: improved enrollment system, free examination booklets, scholarships for honor students, revision of library regulations, and the issuance of organizations' financial standing at the start of every term. If the "uprising" was swiftly quelled, it was perhaps because the administration, represented by the Executive Vice-President Nicanor M. Reyes, met with the students immediately.

Long before the Far Eastern University students staged a protest, the Lyceum of the Philippines was already astir with dissatisfied students, grieving over what they charged was a loss of press freedom in the university concerned. This was manifested by the dismissal of four campus writers. According to the Lyceum President Sotero Laurel, the trouble began when a student exploded a firecracker during an examination in the classroom. The school administration had a strict view of discipline, he said, and the investigating committee found the student guilty. That he was a staff member of the college paper was beside the point, Laurel stressed, and the student was speedily dismissed. Three other students were asked to leave the university because they made "scurrilous" attacks against persons in the school administration, and were therefore "undesirable" to the university. The student activists, however, maintained that the four students were dismissed without specific and sufficient reason. They felt that if the students did not fight now for the cause of the four students, the school administration later on could always summarily dismiss anyone from the Lyceum. Other charges, like the betrayal of the nationalist cause, the high tuition fees, the lack of school

facilities, had been added to the main issue, but President Laurel stood adamant on his refusal to speak to the demonstrators because they were not, he believed, students of Lyceum itself, but were "imports" from other universities. The restiveness threatened to erupt in more violent forms as days passed, and on the night of January 27, the protesters stoned the Lyceum and kept its administration officials prisoned within it till 2:00 A.M. Rioting followed the next day and the police had to quell the demonstrators. Only after damage had been done to the buildings of the Lyceum did President Laurel agree to meet with the students.

At De La Salle College, almost during the same week, the demonstration was sparked by the news that Brother Edward Becker was being "reassigned" to a more distant land because of his sympathetic attitude towards the students. Most of the demands of the students were granted. The school's academic council unanimously voted to allow the president of the study body to sit in the council with a right to vote. On the unlimited absences demand, the school, subject to the approval of the Bureau of Private Schools, would allow all honor students unlimited absences. Students were allowed to smoke on campus but not in their classes.

Three days after the student revolt at the De La Salle College, some 500 San Beda College students staged a demonstration which turned into a mob characterized by name-calling and shouting of profanities. The students' complaints were: (1) the unfair suspension of students who failed to pay their tuition fees on time and (2) the administration's failure to weed out incompetent professors. It was difficult to

determine whether the administration finally granted the students' demands.

The students at Ateneo de Manila University did not declare a strike, but published articles in the school organ questioning the relevance of the Ateneo curricula and studies. The students of the University of Santo Tomas distributed leaflets clamoring for greater autonomy and the removal of incompetent professors.

At almost the same time these incidents were happening in January, the NUSP (National Union of Students of the Philippines) joined by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, the Confederation of Student Leaders of the Philippines and separate delegations from city schools and universities demonstrated also in front of Congress clamoring for justice, land reform, peace and a welter of other causes the youth also wished to espouse: the teachers', the market vendors', and the taxed citizenry. The youth arm of the Christian Socialist Movement took to the streets, crusading for a lower voting age and for a Magna Carta of Students.

The school authorities decided that it was time for an unsparing re-assessment. University presidents and college deans began a series of talk-ins with Secretary of Education Onofre D. Corpuz. Together they groped for the sore spots and the blights in the educational system. As Dr. Cresencio Peralta, president of the National Teachers College said:

> . . . We are dealing with a generation born in the aftermath of the wars who did not know how it was to lose three meals a day, who didn't know the Kempetai. Do we know, do we try to understand the present generation?

> Let us look at the youth around us--so what if they are mini-skirted or long-haired? Let us decide a more fundamental issue: What is our present role in the new pattern in which we are finding ourselves? A continuing dialogue--in all departments in the hands of well-trained guidance counsellors--would this not anticipate problems? If so, all the other issues on press freedom, tuition, etc. will then become mere peripheral problems. To try to understand, to know what these people are thinking is tiresome, but in the end, more profitable.[1]

The results of the talk-ins were never revealed to the public.

> That the first explosion of "student power" took place in the campuses is incidental. The student demands of school authorities were mere trial balloons of future bigger challenges. Coming true to form, as it has been is characteristic mode around the world, student activism had for its target the university as the Big School which is the first authority figure outside the home. Movements devoted to societal objectives are born here. It is the activist core. Intellectuals and students are a major potential mass base for new revolutionary movements. The university has remained a source of radical leadership and mass support, as experience in countries of America and Europe bears out. Revolutionaries from Mao to Castro and Cohen-Bendit know this.
>
> Schools have always been cradles of protests and revolutions and will continue to be so. If only for this, our national leaders should see the handwriting on the wall in the present restiveness among our young.[2]

> Grievances and dissatisfaction abound in any institution. The very character of the university fosters debate and dissent.[3]

The Youth and Student Affairs Board. The YSAB (Youth and Student Affairs Board) was created by Executive Order No. 169 on February 8, 1969 and was intended as the government's response to the clamor among the students for a greater participation in public affairs. It was supposed to be responsible for advising and assisting the

---

[1]Ma. Elena H. Abesamis, "A Confrontation in the Academe," Sunday Times Magazine, February 9, 1969, pp. 12-15.

[2]F.M. Cevallos, "The Youth Have Something to Tell You," Variety, Febraury 9, 1969.

[3]Brickman, "Student Activism," p. 24.

government with regard to the problems affecting youth and students and was to serve as an open channel of communications between the students and government officials, serving as a forum through which they might maintain a continuous dialogue on matters of common concern. The National Youth Coordinating Council was abolished to make way for the new organization. The former's accomplishment in two years was negligible. Fifteen student groups were listed in the Executive Order as follows:

National Councils Association of the Philippines
National Union of Students in the Philippines
Confederation of Student Leaders of the Philippines
Kabataan Makabayan
College Editors Guild
Student Catholic Action
Student Christian Movement
World University Service
Philippine Youth Corps
Conference Delegates Association of the Philippines
National Students Conference
School Volunteer Program
Muslim Students Association of the Philippines
Student Reform Movement
National Students League

The College Editors League agreed to join the YSAB only as a provisional member, but the Kabataan Makabayan, the National Union of Students of the Philippines and the World University Service refused to join at all. The NUSP objected to the presence in the board of organizations recently formed, organizations long defunct and suddenly ressurrected, and organizations whose national following was open to question. These organizations were not, however, identified in the report. The KM would have nothing to do with any entity organized by the government. During its brief period of existence, the YSAB went

through three presidents and the death of the board was rapidly enhanced by the scandals that rocked the organization when one of its members charged the board with misappropriation and malversation of funds, "kickbacks" and missing vouchers.[1]

Secretary of Education Corpuz recommended the abolition of the YSAB which had been spawned by the student unrest. The board was unable to achieve unity in policy and failed to ably represent the student base.[2]

The "new revolution." During his Independence Day speech on June 12, President Marcos aligned his administration with the youth's "new revolution." He wanted the school system attuned to the youth so that they would be able to participate and share in decision-making in state-run educational institutions.

> So long as student autonomy does not interfere with their education . . . so long as self-government is not marred by abuses, so long will the new education policy proves its worth. President Marcos may have arrived at a happy solution to student unrest.[3]

It was also observed that rallies and demonstrations had been held in front of Malacanang and Congress more often than anywhere else. It also appeared that the demonstrations were made against the

---

[1]Jose F. Lacaba, "Look Out, Sir! Student Power's Going to Break More Windows," Philippines Free Press, August 16, 1969, pp. 9, 33, and 34.

[2]Editorial, "Going About Student Rallies in the Right Way," Saturday Mirror, p. 95 from Editorials '69 ed. by Andres Cristobal Cruz (Manila: The National Library, 1969) and (Hereinafter referred to as Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz.)

[3]Editorial, "The Youth Today," Manila Bulletin, pp. 118-119 from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz.

government because it is the peak of the Establishment. While the rallies were not as violent as they had been in other countries, their thrust was unmistakable. Officials had responded to many of the students' demands and they had been made part of the government's program,[1] but this seemed not to be enough. The President felt he should lead the way in order to give substance to his "new revolution." Three ingredients in leadership were necessary to make it succeed--sincerity, ideology and sense of mission.[2]

The year 1969 was an election year. President Marcos was seeking a second term in office and his political opponent was Senator Sergio Osmena, Jr. of the Liberal Party. It was reported that President Marcos warned that the Liberal Party would be behind student demonstrations designed to embarrass his administration at the start of the school year in July. The Liberal Party countered with their own charge that Malacanang was organizing a rally against Senator Osmena, Jr. when he landed at the Manila International Airport.

> There is nothing wrong with organizing rallies and demonstrations for or against an individual or an issue. The national conventions of political parties as a matter of fact, are often nothing but demonstrations, especially when they make no real decisions on party candidates. The show of enthusiasm and unity is aimed at impressing the electorate with the strength of the party.
>
> There is, however, something objectionable in the plan of some politicians to make use of student and youth groups to achieve partisan political ends. It would be less than honest for any party of politicians to try to make the public believe

---

[1]Editorial, "June 12 Holds Special Meaning for the Youth," Daily Mirror, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz, pp. 93-94.

[2]Editorial, "The Call for a Revolution," Manila Chronicle. from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz, p. 95.

> that the youth are with them, as shown supposedly by the demonstration.[1]

There were rallies and demonstrations which took place later but it was difficult to determine whether the accusations of both political parties were true and correct.

Preparing for the July activism. There was great fear that the opening of the school year in July would be marked by widespread student demonstrations and renewed student activism. To this end, the Secretary of Education suggested that the government, as well as the private and public colleges and universities, should prepare for them.

The Secretary said further:

> The government will actually endeavor to promote mutually acceptable arrangements, promoting such settlements as are fair to students, school administrators and faculties, but opposing all proposals that will destroy or undermine the existing good in our college and university.[2]

In another report, the Secretary of Education remarked that, from the point of view of student leaders, this was the time to get public attention because 1969 was an election year.[3]

In another development, the Philippine Constabulary Chief conferred with mayors in order to promulgate "positive" steps in the face of student unrest. The things that could be done, were to withhold issuance of rally permits and alert the police officers.

---

[1]Editorial, "Politics Endangering RP Youth Movement," Manila Times, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz, p. 110.

[2]Editorial, "Secretary Corpuz Warning on Student Unrest," Philippines Herald, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz, pp. 112-113.

[3]Editorial, "The Student Unrest," Manila Chronicle, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz, pp. 96-97.

But withholding permits to rally could not be done before any actual violence occurs, for to do so would violate the Constitution which guarantees peaceful assembly and association. It was observed that the student leaders were excluded from this conference and it was from this group that the officials might have learned first-hand what ails the campuses.

In Manila where most of the student demonstrations were held and were expected to be held, Mayor Antonio Villegas set conditions for the holding of student rallies and demonstrations. With the application for a permit to hold a rally or demonstration, the applicant or applicants must present resolutions duly approved by their student councils and must also show proof that they had previously presented their grievances to the officials concerned. By so doing, the city authorities would have at least the assurance that the demonstrations were sanctioned by their respective student councils and not plotted by just a handful of trouble-makers.[1]

Officials of the departments of National Defense and Education also held a conference to discuss the prospects of more student demonstrations. The difference of opinions between these two groups on student activism was most noticeable. The Department of Education seemed to favor student demonstrations for it resulted in something more tangible.

These demonstrations . . . had done more good than harm.

---

[1]Editorial, "Keeping Agitators Out of Student Rallies," Philippine Herald, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz, pp. 114-115.

> After the debris had been swept up, the school concerned started doing something about their inadequately stocked libraries, rickety furniture, and insanitary washrooms.
>
> The improvements have been most extensive in the school libraries. Book-dealers in Manila have been experiencing a run in their stocks these past few months as a result of a wave of heavy book-buying by many colleges.[1]

Officials of the Department of National Defense reportedly presented documents indicating a connection between Communists and student activists.

In this connection, Califano found no evidence of an international conspiracy among students in Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, India, Kenya, Tanzania, and Israel "except for occasional assertions that the Chinese Communists were putting funds into radical student movements."[2]

> Communists are not the only ones interested in infiltrating student movements. Certain groups with mysterious sources of funds for periodic conferences and seminars are no less interested in acquiring control of campus affairs. But the military are silent and about this other kind of subversion while they are quick to connect student rebels with Communist subversion.
>
> As a matter of fact, if there is any group which has a fair chance of taking over student movements, it is the one that is permitted to operate freely, without any interference from the military. Not only is such a group free of military interference, it is also highly probable that it receives tacit encouragement from military people.[3]

President Salvador Lopez outlined the basic approach of the University of the Philippines administration to student activism:

> . . . (1) willingness to listen to student demands and

---

[1]Editorial,"Not Just One Source of Danger on Activists," Manila Times, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz, pp. 107-108.

[2]Califano, Student Revolution, p. 53.

[3]Editorial, "Not Just One Source of Danger on Activists," Manila Times, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz.

> grievances, (2) serious consideration given to their desire for increased participation in decision-making, (3) acceptance of student suggestions to the extent of their reasonableness, (4) forthright disapproval of student demands deemed to be unreasonable, improper or illegal, (5) clear rejection of demands violative of faculty rights and university interests, and (6) continuing dialogue on all differences which deserve further consideration and appear to be negotiable.[1]

Fears of widespread student demonstrations attending the opening of the school year failed to materialize. This was no indication, however, that the threat of student activism had tapered off.

> But education officials should not be lulled into a sense of false security. The restlessness is still apparent among the studentry, though nothing has happened to reignite thus far. The heat and clamor of the political campaign had drowned out among other things the youghful cry for reforms. And really it's no easy trick to upstage two presidential candidates going up and down the breadth of the land with their political noise-makers. The students may be disinclined to add their voices to the tumult for fear of being tainted by the very things they deplore.[2]

As long as the following factors are found in the colleges and universities, student activism would continue as a feature on school campuses.[3]

1. Presence of protest-prone personalities. These refer to the politically, optimistic, active and socially-oriented protester and its opposite--the culturally alienated activist. They attend the schools that provide the best undergraduate education and studies show that the field of specialization is non-vocational: social

---

[1]Editorial, "The Golden Mean with Student Protests," Philippine Herald, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz, pp. 116-117.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Kenneth Keniston, "The Sources of Student Dissent," from Academic Governance ed. by J. Victor Baldridge (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971), pp. 359-380. (Hereinafter referred to as Academic Governance ed. by Baldridge.)

sciences and humanities.

2. A climate that sanctions and encourages activism. A school that is noted for its big school population, highly selective admission policy and having a reputation for academic excellence and freedom.

3. Settings in which protests are likely to occur. There is academic support, students come from background with deviant views, and the school conditions promote psychological flexibility.

4. A historical situation which facilitates flexibility.

Court decision against student demonstrations. The entire student body at the University of the Philippines, Diliman campus, Quezon City, went on sympathy strike on July 23, 1969, with the walk-out of the students at the University's College of Education.[1] The original strikers, graduate students of the college, were thought to have complaints about the curricula which included one foreign language and comprehensive examinations, generally regarded as unreasonable. However, these turned out to be cover for complaints against the college dean's administration. At the start, the students limited themselves to conventional negotiation in the redress of their grievances against the college and the dean. The negotiations lasted six months. It was only afterwards, frustrated by what the students claimed to be an unsatisfactory posture of the dean that they went on strike. On the second day of the boycott in the College of Education,

[1]Editorial, "Student Unrest," Manila Bulletin, pp. 120-121, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz.

the student council declared a sympathy strike. It was in the face of this emergency that the state university President Lopez decided to transfer Dean Sta. Maria to the position of Special Assistant to the President, without diminution of academic rank or salary, and "in the interest of the service." The dean refused and legal action reached the Supreme Court which decided in favor of the dean on February 18, 1970.[1] The Court said that the decision to transfer Dean Sta. Maria was dictated by the howling protest of demonstrating students who wanted to enforce their demands for curricular changes. It was in this situation, the Court continued, that one should be on guard lest reason and justice be overwhelmed by excitement and passion. This court decision in effect outlawed "howling" demonstrations as the means of securing changes in the administrative system.

The Magna Carta for Students. A bill to provide a Magna Carta for Students was prepared at the height of student demonstrations in 1968.[2] Congress enacted it the following year. As soon as details of the bill were known, it was criticized by both students and school administrators. The students denounced it as Magna Carta for School Administrators,[3] so the students were reported to have staged a massive demonstration to protest the measure and ask the President to veto it.

---

[1]Simeon G. del Rosario, "High Court Upholds Dean," Graphic, March 2, 1970, p. 5.

[2]Editorial, "A Makeshift Affair," Manila Chronicle, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz, p. 102.

[3]Editorial, "Veto Affords Closer Magna Carta Study," Manila Times, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz, pp. 111-112.

The President of the PASUC (Philippine Association of State Universities and Colleges),Dr. Nemesio E. Prudente, speaking for the school administrators and the students as well, gave the major objections to the bill as follows:[1] (1) it would prevent student representation in the board of trustees or directors of any school, thus nullifying a precedent already established in one state institution, the Philippine College of Commerce, whose board of trustees included a student as a full-time member; (2) the Department of Education, instead of the students themselves through their councils, would take over collection, custody, and disbursement of student funds, and (3) it would impose restrictions on student activities, particularly in running the school organ and in the formation of legitimate student organizations. President Marcos doubtless was aware of the hostility that the bill in that form was likely to generate, so he vetoed the bill on August 4, 1969. Congress would meet the next year to act on it but it was difficult to determine what happened to the bill.

In contrast to the Philippines two studies were made on boards of trustees in American colleges and universities which showed that students were members of governing bodies.

The American Council on Education revealed that 14 per cent of colleges and universities had students on their governing bodies. However, 58 per cent of those institutions did not allow the students to vote, and most limited the number of students to one. Most student

---

[1]Editorial, "President's Veto of Students Magna Carta Well Taken," Philippines Herald, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz, pp. 117-118.

trustees were found at public four-year colleges.[1]

McGrath found that where students have been fully involved in academic government, they have typically discharged their responsibilities with effectiveness and with dignity.[2]

Another center of activism. Early in September, 1969, the NSL (National Students League), in cooperation with the NUSP (National Union of Students of the Philippines) and the supreme council of the Philippine College of Commerce started a nation-wide boycott of schools--mostly in the provinces while thousands of students from Manila and the suburbs converged in front of Malacanang. The students pitched camp on the street and camped there all night.

> The students of state colleges now demonstrating at Malacanang are demanding the release of P10 million for their schools. President Marcos wants to release only P2 million which, he said, is what is available. He cannot, he said, juggle public funds and transfer funds from one program to another.
>
> If this were all that was involved in the present student-Malacanang dispute, the President has much in favor. It is indeed true that under the present system, far too many appropriations are approved by Congress than the executive can provide funds for. The result is that many meritorious projects are left unimplemented because there simply is not enough money for all of them.
>
> But the present controversy seems to be beyond the question whether there are funds or not. The students claim President Marcos promised to release P10 million in a recent meeting with them. They just want him to keep his promise. For his part, the President has denied he ever made such a promise.
>
> In effect, the demonstrating students are questioning the word of the President. It is a sad thing that even the word of a President had to be challenged but the students apparently are so sure of their ground that they have come out to demonstrate. Their voices of protest then are as much against the President

---

[1] _____, "14 Per Cent of Colleges Have Students as Trustees," Chronicle of Higher Education, November 13, 1972, p. 1.

[2] Earl J. McGrath, Should Students Share the Power: A Study of Their Role in College and University Governance (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970), p. 105.

allegedly turning back on his word as the non-release of funds for the state-supported schools.[1]

The following day the President entered into a compromise. He would release 3.5 million pesos because the government was without funds. He would meet the students and their leaders on their own ground. The day after that negotiation the President went to the Philippine College of Commerce, re-enacted the signing of the bills for the college, and swore in Ernesto Ocampo, the first student to become a member of the college's board of trustees. The students cheered the President and promised to help him in the presidential campaign. In a survey later it turned out that the President was the overwhelming choice over his political opponent, Senator Sergio Osmena, Jr. by a ratio of 75 to 25 per cent.

These incidents brought the Philippine College of Commerce into the national limelight as the new center of student militancy and activism. That eminence had to belong to the University of the Philippines and was shared by the Lyceum of the Philippines. Several factors could be attributed to the nationalistic activism of the students and faculty members of the Philippine College of Commerce, as follows:

1. The President of the college, Dr. Nemesio E. Prudente (Ph.D. in political science, University of Southern California), had vigorously decolonized the academic community and had rejected any financial assistance from a foreign source, however inadequate its

---

[1]Editorial, "Student Questions Need Hones Answers," Manila Times, from Editorials '69 ed. by Cruz, pp. 108-109.

operational budget may be.

2. Since the birth of the militant NSL (National Students League) in 1963 under the paternity of the Philippine College of Commerce, the college became more active rather than passive. It was the first school to lead a demonstration against the British government on the controversial Sabah problem. It had led demonstrations against the special relations between the United States and the Philippines and against the murder of Filipinos in and outside of the United States military bases.

3. For a business school, the college offers a wide range of liberal arts subjects. The heavy emphasis on economics, sociology and political science could be a factor to the development of an awareness among the students that there was something wrong with their society, especially so because the students came mostly from the lowest-income group.

4. The more progressive faculty members joined the students in their rallies and demonstrations.

> But Prudente believes students should not sacrifice their classroom education for activism. 'There must be a balance between theory and practice, between the idealistic and practical.' This applies to both teachers and students. He insists that they should be aware of what is happening outside. 'They should be identified with and involved actively in the movement for social and political reforms. The classroom is not a church where the teacher preaches and the students simply listen.'[1]

The December incident. Students held a demonstration on

[1]Isabelo T. Crisostomo, "The Philippine College of Commerce: A New Center of Activism," Sunday Times Magazine, November 2, 1969. pp. 38-39.

December 29, 1969 at the American Embassy in Manila protesting the visit of Vice-President Spiro Agnew. One or more persons exploded firecrackers and in the din of exploding firecrackers the police swung their truncheons at the students, sparing no one--even the women.[1] Whoever exploded those firecrackers was never identified but the students believed that it was the work of provocateurs who were state-hired and who provided the police with an excuse to attack the students. Three students from the University of the Philippines were arrested and were required to post a bail of one thousand pesos each. The amount was later raised by the National Press Club and private individuals. The student council of the University of the Philippines issued a manifesto stating that whenever there is a visiting American "imperialist" and the main target of protest was the unholy alliance between American imperialists and the Filipino feudal lords, police security was at its peak and crowd-dispersing methods were most brutal. More than fifty faculty members of the state university likewise issued a manifesto denouncing the emerging standards of justice in the Philippines in addition to the problem of one standard of justice for the rich and another for the poor. Soon after the December 29 incident, University of the Philippines President Lopez arranged a meeting with Manila Mayor Antonio Villegas to enable the students and faculty members to narrate the details of the rally and present their demands to the mayor. What happened, however, was a lecture given by Mayor

---

[1] Millet G. Martinez, "A Protest Against Fascism," Sunday Times Magazine. February 1, 1970, p. 15. (Hereinafter referred to as Martinez, "Protest Against Fascism,")

Villegas on certain ground rules concerning the conduct of students and policemen during demonstrations.

Student Activism in 1970

On January 7, 1970, a more massive rally was staged in front of Malacanang by about a thousand students from the University of the Philippines and Lyceum of the Philippines. They were joined by members of the Northern Motors Labor Union. The rally was not meant as a protest against police brutality. Rather, the rally was held to denounce the more basic issues behind such brutality. The students protested against the "rise of fascism" which was now becoming more discernable.[1] There was no report of any untoward incidents.

The January 26 movement. The NUSP (National Union of Students of the Philippines) spearheaded a peaceful mammoth rally in front of Congress to urge the solons to take some measures so that the 1971 Constitutional Convention would be non-partisan. This was the day, January 26, when Congress would hold its joint session and the President would deliver his State-of-the-Nation address. On the same day, three other organizations were given permits to hold their demonstration: Ang Magigiting (The Brave), in front of Congress; Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataan Pilipino (Free Association of Filipino Youth), at the back of Congress, and the AFP (Armed Forces of the Philippines) Retired Veterans Association, in front of Malacanang.[2]

---

[1] Martinez, "Protest Against Fascism," p. 15.

[2] Daroy, "Politics of a New Nation," p. 8.

Demonstrations, however, were never restricted to members of the organization to which a permit was issued. They were, according to practice, open to all sympathizers who cared to join. Therefore the number of the dissenters was swelled by members of the youth organizations like the KM (Kabataan Makabayan) the SDK (Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan or Association of Democratic Youth), the Kilusan ng Kabataan Makati (Youth Movement of Makati), labor groups and peasant organizations. According to conservative estimate, there were between 20,000 to 50,000 of these demonstrators at one time. After several speakers had given their point of view, the NUSP was about to leave as their permit was good only until 6:00 P.M. The events went so fast that the microphones being used by the NUSP were reportedly seized by some members of the militant groups who continued to lambast the occupants inside Congress.

> Where the demonstration leaders stood, emblems of the enemy were prominently displayed; a cardboard coffin representing the death of democracy at the hands of the goonstabulary in the last elections; a cardboard crocodile, painted green, symbolizing congressmen greedy for allowances; a paper effigy of Ferdinand Marcos. When the President stepped out of Congress, the effigy was set on fire, and according to report, the coffin was pushed toward him, the crocodile hurled at him.[1]

Another report stated:

> As the First Couple were coming out of Congress the restive placard-bearing students surged forward. All of a sudden a cardboard coffin and a crocodile was hurled in the direction of the presidential limousine. The anti-riot squad strategically situated pushed back the crowd. At the same time, the coffin was thrown back at the students. Before anybody could duck,

[1]Jose F. Lacaba, "The January 26 Confrontation," Philippines Free Press, February 7, 1970, p. 45.

placard handles, bottles, and stones started flying in the air. It just happened. Thus, began a free-for-all that turned out to be one bloody traumatic mess many will long remember.[1]

Even as the confusion broke out the security of the First Couple was not neglected. In fact the pair was whisked away from the scene of turmoil in no time, but when the presidential limousine finally made good its exit the anti-rioters descended on the students. The police pushed, kicked, hit and swung clubs; the students cursed, howled and stoned back. This was the first demonstration in which quite a number of the police got hurt.

The following day, January 27, about 120 student leaders, representing 36 schools and at least a dozen national youth organizations, gathered at the Far Eastern University. NUSP president Edgardo Jopson, of the Ateneo de Manila University, presided over the three-hour meeting during which a resolution was passed demanding the resignation of certain officials of law enforcement agencies, and Friday, January 31, was set as the starting day of a series of rallies. While the student were conferring at the Far Eastern University, President Marcos was conferring with law enforcement officials at Malacanang. He told them to be "more tolerant to the future leaders of the country" and ordered them to drop charges against the students arrested on January 26.[2]

---

[1]Nancy T. Lu, "The Night of the Truncheons," Sunday Times Magazine, February 15, 1970, p. 15.

[2]Jose F. Lacaba, "And the January 30 Insurrection," Philippines Free Press, February 7, 1970, p. 16-b. (Hereinafter referred to as Lacaba, "January 30 Insurrection,")

On January 28, Manila Mayor Villegas announced that the Manila police would stay away from future demonstrations to avoid trouble, but that they would stand by, within beck and call if violence erupts."[1] The NUSP and the NSL rejected an invitation to meet with President Marcos in Malacanang, staying they preferred to have talks on Friday. Another group of students went there anyway and heard the President say that he did not want anything to do with the Constitutional Convention. The Senate and House created committees to investigate the root causes of demonstrations in general. Brigadier General Vicente Raval of the Philippine Constabulary proposed the immediate acquisition of "non-lethal" equipment for the police and urged that they be re-trained in the "highly sensitive" science of dealing with demonstrators.

Four demonstrations were held on January 29. The students from the Philippine Normal College and members of the College Editors Guild of the Philippines held separate rallies. Students and faculty members from the University of the East gathered first in front of Malacanang then moved toward Manila City Hall. When this group left Malacanang, the University of the Philippines professors led by President Lopez arrived and were angrily reprimanded, according to reports, by the President. Meanwhile, police reporters agreed to wear distinctive uniforms when covering demonstrations, to avoid being stoned by students and clubbed by the police.

The "battle of Mendiola". On Friday, January 30, there were

[1]Lacaba, "January 30 Insurrection," p. 16-b.

simultaneous demonstrations.[1] Members of militant groups like the KM (Kabataan Makabayan), SDK (Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan) and the MPKP (Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino) went to the Congress. The NUSP and NSL marched to Malacanang. At about three in the afternoon, Jopson of the NUSP, Portia Ilagan of the NSL and other student leaders went into Malacanang for a meeting with the President.

What precipitated the "battle" that spread out to other parts of the city and lasted till dawn of the next day was never known. A group of students was able to capture the fire truck whose fire hose failed to operate, mauled the firemen, drove the truck toward Gate No. 4 of Malacanang and rammed it against the iron gate. Then the demonstrators stampeded into the Malacanang grounds, burned the fire truck plus two parked cares while molotov cocktails and pill box bombs exploded. All the while, the President was closeted with student leaders Jopson and Ilagan. Whatever was taken up between them was never revealed but after the conference, the President went to the Presidential Guard Battalion and gave the order to disperse the crowd.[2] The following day it was found that four students had been killed: Roldan of Far Eastern University, Alcantara of the University of the Philippines, Catabay of Manuel L. Quezon University, and Tausa of Mapa High School. Almost 300 demonstrators and bystanders were arrested; most of them were detained at Camp Crame. That night, the President

---

[1]Benjamin V. Afuang, "The Storming of Gate 4," Sunday Times Magazine, Fearuary 22, 1970, pp. 18-23 and 26-31.

[2]Daroy, "Politics of a New Nation," p. 10.

appeared on television to inform the nation of the "premeditated attack on the government, an act of rebellion and subversion," which the military has successfully repulsed. To the "insurrectionary elements" he warned "any attempt at forcibly overthrow of the government will be put down immediately. I will not tolerate nor will I allow Communists to take over."[1]

Reactions to the January 26 and 30 incidents. Nacionalista Party Senator Salvador Laurel and Liberal Party Senator Benigno Aquino, Jr. criticized President Marcos for calling the demonstration Communist-inspired and a well-organized plot to capture Malacanang.[2]

Former Ambassador Amelito Mutuc observed that student activities were now geared toward the solution of the social, economic, and political problems of the country. President Marcos and Congress were not concerned with student activism. It was good for the President to invite the student leaders for a frank exchange of views. Bills had been introduced in Congress to give meaning and substance to the Constitutional rights of free speech and assembly for a redress of grievances.[3]

The discontent of the students was of fairly recent origin. Like their contemporaries in Paris, Djakarta, or San Francisco, they increased their influence amid great tolerance and even prodding from

---

[1]Lacaba, "January 30 Insurrection," p. 16-c.

[2]Editorial, "The Real Confrontation," Philippines Free Press, February 21, 1970.

[3]Amelito R. Mutuc, "The First 30 Days of President Marcos," Weekly Nation, February 16, 1970, p. 4.

the adult world. First they were sure it was only lack of student councils. After having got the councils, then it appeared that it must be poor classrooms and underpaid teachers. Then came the discovery that something more fundamental was at stake: congressional allowance, political parties, the Constitution, or the President and his friends. But these were no longer enough. It was the entire system itself.[1]

The message of the January 26 and 30 incidents were clear: the students had lost faith in the government and they wanted a sweeping reform.[2]

If the January 30 incident had happened in other countries, it could have led to a state of emergency, but the President of the Philippines had announced that there would be no curtailment of civil liberties. A sociologist at the University of the Philippines, Ruben Santos Cuyugan, said that the youth were disenchanted about adult leadership. What they had been taught was not exactly what they saw in practice.[3]

In analyzing the January 30 incident in Manila, Califano found that in riots where students were involved the following factors were similar in Great Britain, France, West Germany, and Japan:

1. There was a small group of hard-core radical students

---

[1]Carmen Guerrero-Nakpil, "The Shedding of Innocence," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970, p. 7.

[2]Hernando J. Abaya, "Marcos Misread the Times," Graphic, February 16, 1970, pp. 14-17.

[3]E.P. Patanne, "A Forestate of Revolution," Weekly Nation, February 16, 1970, p. 16.

probing for an issue to broaden their base of support.

2. There was instant communication, at least within the immediate geographic area of the incident.

3. Add in a mistake in judgement made by the established authorities.[1]

At this juncture, it would be difficult to compare the Philippine reaction to the killing of four students on January 30 with with American reaction to the killing of four students at Kent State University on May 4, 1970.

The educators viewpoint. Presidents of three schools--University of the East, Philippine College of Commerce and the University of the Philippines were unanimous in condemning police brutality and the killing of four students during the demonstrations, and at the same time were all for demonstrations to continue.

President Francisco Dalupan of the University of the East explained the demonstrations as an expression of the youth against what they felt was not right in the society. Furthermore, he said:

> Demonstrations should not be repressed because the demonstrators are expressing their views on the problems facing the country today. The students want honesty and sincerity of purpose on the part of our leaders. Their motives and commitments must be respected because they are fighting on valid grounds. That's why we encourage demonstrations, provided, they are conducted in a peaceful manner, because it's one way of moving our authorities into action. As you know, there's a big credibility gap between the students and the authorities.[2]

---

[1]Califano, Student Revolution, p. 5.

[2]P.A. Zapanta, "The Mentors Speak Out," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970, p. 42. (Hereinafter referred to as Zapanta, "Mentors Speak Out,")

Philippine College of Commerce President Nemesio E. Prudente said the students demonstrated owing to the complacency on the part of the officials concerned in the solving of social ills, such as the inadequate implementation of the land reform code, the bases irritants, the disparity of benefits in the Laurel-Langley Pact, the rampant graft and corruption and violence. In the aftermath of the bloody riots, the distant future looked hazy to Prudente. He said that no one could predict what the students would do.

University of the Philippines President Lopez said that the students' struggles against political interference in the Constitutional Convention must continue and that student movements must also go on.

> Since the student demands are not really radical, some observers are struck by the seeming disproportion between what the students ask for and their way of dramatizing their demands. There is a radical element in student activism, namely, its resort to unconventional methods--to picket, strike or boycott--in order to obtain redress of grievances. It is in this domain that the capacity of our institutions and authorities is directly challenged.[1]

Lopez revealed that the majority of the students of the University of the Philippines were "moderates" in their thinking; and that the extremists were in the minority. He said further that one could only hope to prevent further disorder and violence in student activism by recognizing its true character, adding that it was a part of a world-wide movement which one might deplore but could not ignore, which one might dare not thwart or repress by force or intimidation.

Dean Gonzalo T. Santos of the University of Manila's College

---

[1]Zapanta, "Mentors Speak Out," p. 43.

of Law said that the youth deserve to be heard, furthermore:

> . . . The shift of the young militant's ire from the educational institutions to the Establishment is very significant. It shows maturity in their cause and improvement in their clamor for reforms. Their issues are now more pertinent to the plight of the common people and more national in scale and scope.[1]

While the dean did not advocate violence as a means of redress of grievances, he believed that the collective force of the students was sufficient enough to startle the officials concerned from their complacency. He saw the so-called generation gap as a communication gap brought about by the diversity of outlook between the preceding generation and the emerging ones. His way of handling student unrest was to talk to the students and convince them of his sincerity. Since the young are very idealistic, he said and if one was sincere in dealing with them, then they would listen and respect the decisions.

The University of the Philippines Faculty Assembly saw student activism as a new social force with a capacity to compel a re-structuring of the existing social system. The Assembly is a much broader group than the University Council for it included all the instructors and was organized precisely by President Lopez to deal with issues that involved the academic community as a member of the whole society. The Council is composed only of professors, from assistant to full professor.

The Assembly said:

> . . . The current movement aims at goals that transcend the boundaries of the system. It puts in question not only government policies and their implementation, but also challenges the structure of the system. Thus, the fulfillment of its goals will

---

[1]Ricardo F. Lo, "The Right to Be Heard," Sunday Times Magazine, April 19, 1970, p. 37.

> necessarily have a deeper impact on the transformation of Philippine society.
>
> In defining its goals, the present movement appear to assimilate the aspirations of people outside the schools, thus promising to become a focal point of a massive movement for liberty, justice and national democracy. It also forms a part of a world-wide revolt against imperialism, sharing common characteristics with student movements in other countries.[1]

According to the Assembly, student activism is the net result of various factors, the most significant of which are:

1. The objective factor--serious maladjustments and problems facing Philippine society side by side with increasing plenty for the privileged classes, widespread corruption, and governmental inefficiency.

2. The subjective factor--perception by students of social injustices and abuses, arising from their social experiences and catalyzed in the process of intellectual development.

3. The voluntaristic factor--the idealism and meliorism inherent in youth which propel them to action, in quest of revolutionary change.

The above factors seem to have some similarities to the issues which Flacks mentioned as the themes of student protest, as follows: (1) romanticism, (2) anti-authoritarianism, (3) egalitarianism, (4) anti-dogmatism, (5) moral purity, and (6) anti-institutionalism.[2]

The reasons why Manila was and will be the scene of frequent activism was made in the following observation:

---

[1] Harnando Abaya, "U.P. Spells Out the Issues," Graphic, April 8, 1970, p. 16.

[2] Richard Flacks, "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest," from Academic Governance ed. by Baldridge, pp. 394-395.

> The emergence of large student population on one campus or within a great city, particularly a national capital, has facilitated student activism. It has become relatively easy therefore, to mobilize a large protest demonstration. Students in Bueno Aires, Mexico City, Berkeley, Calcutta, Manila, Tokyo, or Paris can constitute an impressive protest in absolute numbers.[1]

Other reactions. A member of the Senate said that three days after the January riots President Marcos had wanted to declare martial law.[2] If martial law had been imposed, the entire process of education would have been stultified. Some of the educational institutions would have been closed and the type of teachers and students very likely would have to be controlled and filtered to serve the plans of the dictatorship.[3]

The NUSP (National Union of Students of the Philippines) and the NSL (National Students League) declared that the tension that had gripped Manila area as a result of the riot was unfortunate. The two organizations pledged that they were firmly committed to reforms through peaceful means and would not creat any disturbances that would cause senseless panic among the citizenry.[4]

In a privileged speech before the Senate, Senator Sergio Osmena, Jr., the Liberal Party presidential candidate in 1969 elections, criticized President Marcos' insinuations that he had instigated the

---

[1]Bernardo J. Daroy, "Student Power: A World-Wide Phenomenon," Perspective, March, 1970, p. 10.

[2]Petronilo Bn. Daroy, "Legitimized Murder and Mass Imprisonment," Graphic, April 22, 1970, p. 11.

[3]Mercedes B. Tira, "Militarization and Free Speech," Weekly Nation, April 22, 1970, p. 16.

[4]Editorial, "The Time Calls for Sincerity, Sobriety," Weekly Natdon, February 16, 1970.

the riotous student demonstrations.[1]

In another privileged speech before the Lower House, Congressman Jose B. Lingad said that the student unrest at that time could be attributed to the same basic reasons which was causing the upsurge of Communist dissidence in Central Luzon and the growing cynicism and apathy of the people.[2]

If there had been no January 26 demonstration and no January 30 assault, it would be doubtful if the government would have been conscious of the clamor for change. The government "laughed" at all the orderly and non-violent demonstrations before January 26. Something good came out of the demonstration. It was different because there was violence. However, violence was met with greater violence by the government following a move by a court which put demonstrators on notice that the use of force to repel "aggression" of a rampaging mob chanting for destruction would be lawful.[3]

> The irony of the aftermath of the bloody riots seems to be backfiring on everybody suspected to be behind its tragic consequences:
>
> The student leaders, for being unable to control their ranks;
>
> The "Maoists" for bringing about a government crackdown on their group for their premature show of force;
>
> The Administration, for the damage it is doing to Mr. Marcos' leadership;
>
> To the military, for hastening the resignation of General Raval;
>
> And even to the opposition party, for giving the President

---

[1]Sen. Sergio Osmena, Jr. "Not I," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970, p. 10.

[2]Rep. Jose B. Lingad, "The Students and the Huk Rebellion," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970, p. 11.

[3]Editorial, "The Voice of Moderation or Violence," Philippines Free Press, May 2, 1970.

an opportunity to exercise more military powers.[1]

> After the turbulence of January 30 came uneasy peace. The cabinet was purged and streamlined. The constabulary chief, under attack since the elections of 1969 resigned and was replaced. Government troops made no effort to be inconspicuous. Banks and stores started boarding up their glass facades with plywood or steel sheets. The stock market did not crash but the prices of stock took a sharp plunge that brought about an orgy of short selling. Classes in Greater Manila were suspended for a whole week, and for a whole week the Mayor of Manila and the Mayor of Makati refused to grant permits to demonstrate.[2]

The Manila fiscal's office dropped the sedition charges against the 210 demonstrators and a student leader involved in the January 30 riot but decided to continue with the four others who allegedly rammed the Malacanang Gate No. 4 with the commandered fire truck. The student leader was Fernando T. Barican, chairman of the student council at the University of the Philippines and member of the state university's board of regents. He was a senior in the College of Liberal Arts majoring in political science.[3]

Other developments.[4] The riots polarized the students into two major factions: the radicals or the Left who believed in violence as a means of achieving reforms and the moderates who were pledged to

---

[1]Emcy Corteza-Tinsay, "Student Power: Why the Escalation," Perspective, March, 1970, p. 3.

[2]Jose F. Lacaba, "The Plaza Miranda Teach-in," Philippines Free Press, February 21, 1970, p. 2. (Hereinafter referred to as Lacaba, "Plaza Miranda Teach-in,")

[3]_____. "In the News," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970, p. 9.

[4]Bert Formento, Jr., "Battle's Aftermath," Weekly Nation, February 16, 1970, pp. 2-3 and B.P. Ronquillo, "Uncertainty Over Student Unrest," Weekly Nation, February 16, 1970, p. 52.

a peaceful, orderly and lawful method of achieving the same ends. (See Appendix C for a listing of the schools and the student organizations.) The radicals had scheduled demonstrations on February 12 and on February 18, 1970. Both rallies were decided upon at a meeting of forty-eight leaders of student, peasant, and labor groups sharing views of the extremist KM (Kabataan Makabayan) and the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. Leaders of the NUSP and NSL announced that their groups would not participate in the two rallies. The joint committees of Congress, the Tanada-Agbayani Committee, began conducting their investigation of the tragedies to ascertain the truth about what really happened with a view of enacting remedial legislation. President Marcos had acceded to the demand of the NUSP and a faction of the NSL that he refrain from seeking a third term and from influencing the 1971 Constitutional Convention. He later created a permanent $602,518.00 trust fund for financing student projects. This was to be taken from the special $28 million fund for education which the United States Congress had diverted from the original War Damage Funds for the Philippines. In the face of mounting demands for reforms in more fundamental areas of the Filipino society, it was doubtful that the funds as promised would be sufficient to ease student unrest.

The Tanada-Agbayani reports. The reports made by the joint committees of the two Houses of Congress indicated that the principal cause for unrest was the credibility gap not only between the government and the governed but also between leaders of the religious,

educational and economic sectors of the society.[1]

The roots of disenchantment reached deeper into the social, economic, and political set-up. The following problems, according to the Tanada-Agbayani Committees, remained unsolved and were unsolved, not because there were no solutions, but because the status quo suited the leaders:

1. The inequitable and lopsided distribution of material wealth among the people;

2. The absence of representative democracy;

3. The widespread graft and corruption in almost all sectors of society, most especially in the government;

4. The undue interference, influence, and domination of foreign powers, particularly the United States, in the economic, social, political, and cultural life of the people;

5. The compartmentalization or commercialization of justice in favor of the powerful and the rich.

> Feeling that the ordinary channels of protest are ineffective, the alienated elements of society have resorted to the so-called parliament of the streets. Mass demonstration have become the principal instrument to arouse national consciousness.[2]

The report added that there was no plan by the students to seize or sack Malacanang. The military and police were unable to seize firearms from the demonstrators or to arrest persons with arms both on

---

[1]Edward R. Kuinisala, "Crisis and Credibility," Philippines Free Press, May 2, 1970, p. 2.

[2]Edward R. Kuinisala, "Roots of Discontent," Philippines Free Press, May 9, 1970, p. 8.

January 26th and 30th rallies.[1]

> The Tanada-Agbayani report on student demonstration has been completed. It placed the blame on the police for the riots that took place in connection with demonstrations. The conclusion is not surprising.
>
> The whole question now is: So what?
>
> What happens now?
>
> One can go through one public agency after another in our government set-up and point to all kinds of acts ranging from failure to implement the law to outright violation of it.
>
> Only too often the persons responsible for these acts remain protected.[2]

To this date, nothing really happened after the report was made.

The mass teach-in. After January 30 came the February 12th rally during which there was no violence. It was planned and coordinated by the MDP (Movement for a Democratic Philippines), a group that came into existence after the demonstration at the American Embassy during the visit of Vice-President Spiro Agnew. The chief problem at first was obtaining a permit to hold a demonstration even though the MDP's member organizations in the provinces and in other cities, where simultaneous mass gatherings were to take place, apparently had little trouble getting permits. The Mayor of Manila at first was adamant in his refusal to allow a demonstration in any part of the city, least of all on Plaza Miranda. Then organizers of the demonstration announced that permit or no permit, they would go to Plaza Miranda on February 12. Two days before the rally, however, when a permit

---

[1] Rosca, "Tanada-Agbayani Reports," p. 5.

[2] Editorial, "The Report on Student Demos Was Fine, But--What Now?" Graphic, April 1, 1970, pp. 1-2.

had already been granted, President Marcos met with the leaders of the MDP for five hours. Among the "demands" presented to the President were: (1) nationalization or transfer to public ownership of oil, mining, communications, and other vital industries; (2) nationalization of all educational institutions to thwart commercialization and sectarianism; (3) abrogation of all inequitious treaties with the United States; (4) promotion of trade and cultural relations with all countries, whatever their political color, and (5) expropriation of big landed estates. The President reportedly agreed to grant what he could, to study what he could not. (For more details, see Appendix D.) The result of the meeting was an announcement that the rally on February 12 would be called off and instead there would be separate rallies on the campuses of the University of the Philippines, Lyceum of the Philippines, La Salle College, and the Philippine College of Commerce. On the morning of February 12, the MDP leaders had an emergency meeting at the University of the Philippines, and the consensus was to go on with the simultaneous rallies on the four campuses, but from there to proceed to Plaza Miranda. The January 30 incident gave the demonstrators a ready audience on this day, and they took advantage of the situation by converting what was meant to be an indignation rally against the President, and a demonstration to denounce the January 30 "massacre" into a massive teach-in for presenting the issues they have been fighting for. Everybody praised the rally for being peaceful, but few noticed what was said during the rally. Those who did not notice remarked only that the speakers were

addicted to catchwords and slogans like imperialism, feudalism, and fascism. Newspaper estimates on the size of the crowd varied from 10,000 to 50,000. More than half of the crowd was made up of the organizations taking part in the rally: Kabataan Makabayan, Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan, Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino, Kilusan ng Kabataang Makati, Kilusan ng Pambansang Demokrasiya, the National Association of Trade Unions, and the Socialist Party of the Philippines. For about four hours--roughly from 4:40 to 8:30 P.M.--the demonstrators listened patiently to more than a dozen speakers denouncing imperialism, feudalism, and fascism. There was no policeman in sight, and there was no confrontation.[1]

The sit-in. On February 17, the United Youth and Student Front staged an 800-strong sit-in demonstration before Congress. Backed up by students from Arellano University, Adamson University, Philippine College of Commerce, University of Manila, Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Maynila, and some members of the Muslim Association of the Philippines, the United Youth and Student Front presented twenty-two demands among which were: (1) the publication of assets and liabilities of President Marcos, and high-ranking officers of the Armed Forces of the Philippines; (2) freeing the economy from the American and Chinese "imperialism" and (3) investigation of the reported 389 million pesos deficit.

That same day, three separate groups picketed Malacanang. The Masbate Youth Movement, supported by the Young Christian Socialist demanded government action on the unsolved killings in the province of

[1]Lacaba "Plaza Miranda Teach-in," pp. 2, 3, and 63.

Masbate, the investigation on the burning of the DYVP radio and the alleged existence of armed "goons" and "liquidation squads" in the said province. Pilipino Students Movement for Reforms clamored for the immediate deportation fo over-staying Chinese and denounced the alleged violation of the labor law by the Chinese General Hospital and other Chinese business establishments. The Katilingban Hiligaynon (Club Hiligaynon) demanded the revamping of the Bureau of Customs, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Reparations Commission, Commission on National Integration and the Public Service Commission.

In Makati, a picket line was put up before the Japanese Embassy by the Students Action Committee. The issue here was not known. The NUSP and NSL were already picketing Malacanang.[1]

The response of the President. The President, in response to the clamor of the students, ordered the constabulary to dismantle the notorious tobacco blockade in the Ilocos Region and to disband the equally notorious military contigent known as the Special Forces. He ordered Secretary of Labor Blas F. Ople to prepare a legislative proposal to increase the minimum wage law. He formed a committee, headed by Secretary of Education Onofre D. Corpuz to study the operation of all foundations, particularly those financed with American money. These foundations were said to be fronts for economic subversion. The President vowed to eliminate the corrupt and deadwood elements in the police organizations throughout the ocuntry. He directed the newly-installed Secretary of Finance, Cesar F. Virata, to examine the

---

[1] _____, "People's Congress: The Aftermath," Weekly Nation, March 2, 1970, pp. 3-4.

financial status of the Philippine National Bank, Government Service Insurance System, Social Security System, Development Bank of the Philippines, and the Philippine Charity Sweepstakes. He also agreed with the student demonstrators that all transactions of the government institutions should be made known to the people--even if such transactions would expose the names of his cronies.[1] The result of the investigations and studies of the government agencies designated by the President was never made public.

The "People's Congress." The rally on February 18 was planned at Vinzons Hall on the University of the Philippines campus. About fifty students from various schools plus a handful of older men representing labor, the peasantry, market vendors, professionals, and even the unemployed were involved in the planning. They all came to assess the gains and losses of the February 12th rally and to plan the next massive demonstration at Plaza Miranda. The group decided that it would be another giant teach-in and called it the "People's Congress." The teach-in came. The speakers were chosen well in advance and advised to limit their speeches to about fifteen minutes each. Then about past 6:00 P.M. the Philippine College of Commerce Kamanyang Players presented a two-part drama showing the exploitation of the working class and the "battle of Mendiola" in pantomime. Several speakers followed. Then shortly after 8:30 P.M. some 5,000 members of the most militant groups marched toward the American Embassy. Student marshals were unable to control the group from the

[1]Greg M. Datuin, "Response to Student Outcry," Weekly Nation, March 2, 1970, p. 13.

unwarranted display of vandalism along the way and from destruction made on the floor on the American Embassy. It was later, about 10:00 P.M., when the police arrived and dispersed the demonstrators. There were no fatalities but seventy-two demonstrators were arrested. The total damage to property, including a number of edifices in Ermita, Manila, was officially placed at 500,000 pesos.[1]

The following day, February 19, United States Ambassador Henry Byroade personally delivered a note to Secretary of Foreign Affairs Carlos P. Romulo protesting the wanton destruction at the American Embassy during the previous night's riot. The Philippine government promptly apologized for the incident and it was understood that the government would pay for the damages at the embassy.[2]

Court decision on permit to rally. On February 23, Manila Mayor Antonio Villegas would not issue a permit for the next "People's Congress." He suggested that the next mass teach-in be held on a Saturday or a Sunday in order not to disrupt the educational and economic life of the city. He said, however, that if the demonstrators wanted a Thursday rally he would give them a permit if they would hold it, not in Plaza Miranda, but at the Sunken Gardens, near City Hall, far from the heart of the city.

The following day, the MDP (Movement for a Democratic Philippines) called a meeting at the University of the Philippines to decide,

---

[1] Jose F. Lacaba, "More to Come," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970, pp. 4-5.

[2] _____, "Exchange of Notes," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970, p. 50.

considering the mayor's stand, on its next move. The decision was to remain firm on the Plaza Miranda issue. The third day, February 26, the MDP went to the Supreme Court contesting the Manila Mayor's stand. The Supreme Court upheld Mayor Villegas' contention that a permit could be denied because the proposed demonstration posed a present and clear danger of damage to property. What then followed was the march to the American Embassy where there was again student and police confrontation.

Police raid at the PCC. Some of the demonstrators were allegedly seen by the police fleeing to the PCC (Philippine College of Commerce). On the strength of a search warrant, the police were on the college campus at 2:30 A.M. of February 27. They tore through the school gates, broke open office doors, ransacked desk drawers and found several arms, molotov cocktails and some suspected subversive materials. Thirty-nine students and school employees were later brought to the police precinct. They were released later without any charges being filed against them. The President of the Philippine College of Commerce explained that the ammunitions and arms found in the college belonged to the school security guards. The students maintained that the molotov cocktail bombs were planted. As to the alleged subversive materials, Dr. Prudente explained that it was the school's policy--to be tolerant of all views, respectful of all ideologies, and to pursue all knowledge.[1]

[1]N.T.L. "The PCC Raid Puts the Academe in Crisis," Sunday Times Magazine, March 22, 1970, p. 14.

The Jesuit case. On March 2, 1970, President Marcos, during a conference with newsmen, was reported of accusing the Jesuits of inciting revolution in the Philippines. While the report was later denied by Malacanang, two leading Jesuit officials, Fr. Horacio de las Costa, Provincial Superior of the Society, and Fr. Pacifico Ortiz, Rector of the Ateneo de Manila University, denied the accusation.

There might have been other reasons why the President disliked the Jesuits as follows: (1) Senator Raul Manglapus, Ateneo alumnus, presented a bill which sought to clip the powers of the presidency, (2) the NUSP headed by an Atenean, Edgardo Jopson, and the Young Christian Socialists of the Philippines, headed by a Manglapus-influenced San Bedan College student, Ben Maynigo, had been very critical of the Marcos administration, and (3) the report of Fr. Arsenio C. Jesena, of the Loyola House of Studies, exposed the miserable conditions of the workers in the sugar plantations in Negros island and alienated President Marcos because his closest political allies belong to the so-called Sugar Bloc.[1]

In another article, the writer believed that the apparent involvement of certain Jesuit priests in the current youth unrest should be investigated. She noted that (1) certain lecturers (it is not known if they were professors) in the Ateneo de Manila University were former Huk leaders--Alfredo Saulo, Luis Taruc, and Amado Hernandez, (2) most of the leaders of the demonstrating aggregations were

[1]Amadis Ma. Guerrero, "Marcos and the Jesuit Subversives," Graphic, March 18, 1970, pp. 6-7 and 41.

Ateneo graduates and students, and (3) the techniques of demonstration were taught there.[1]

Dante Simbulan, former professor of the Ateneo, in a study of the Philippine power elite, revealed that Ateneo had always been an elite school and was a big supplier of leaders to the country. Therefore, this core of alumni belonged to the Establishment which provided funds for scholarships. Furthermore, many Jesuits came from elite families.[2] Simbulan was one of the two instructors at the Ateneo de Manila University whose teaching contract was terminated because he could not meet the standards of the university according to the university rank and tenure committee. The students protested the committee's decision but it was in vain.

The "People's March" On March 3, 1970 the "People's March" as the Movement for a Democratic Philippines called it, started at about 2:00 P.M. and lasted about three hours in the thoroughfares of Manila. Another report described this demonstration as a "political kamikaze" designed to exhort the masses into deciding the change they wanted.[3] The student marchers who were identified by the streamers they carried belonged to the following: Kilusan ng Kabataan Makati, Nationalist Corps Executive Board of San Beda, Katipunang ng mga

---

[1]Maria Kalaw Katigbak, "The Jesuits and the Students," Weekly Nation, March 2, 1970, p. 8.

[2]Sylvia L. Mayuga, "The Jesuit Dilemma," Philippines Free Press, July 31, 1970, p. 8.

[3]Edel E. Garcellano, "Protest on the March," Graphic, March 18, 1970, pp. 11-13.

Kabataang Demokratiko (Association of Democratic Youth), Araneta University Foundation, Student Cultural Association of Araneta University, Masbate Youth Movement, Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino (Free Association of Filipino Youth), Kabataan Makabayan, Darul Islam Union, Youth for a Democratic Society, Alliance of Manila Universities and Colleges, Samahang Makabayan ng Pandacan (Patriotic Association of Pandacan), Student Cultural Association of the University of the East. This was the day that the jeepney drivers went on strike so public vehicles were practically out of sight. At its full force, the marchers were estimated at about 20,000. The Kabataan Makabayan formed the vanguard of the march. The march officially ended at sundown when the demonstrators reached the Post Office building in Manila. The marchers then proceeded to the American Embassy. There were about three explosions with which the students later denied having any connection. Anti-riot squads surprised and instantly chased the demonstrators who tried to cross the boulevard towards the American Embassy. Toward midnight the riot squads intensified their round-up operations. This march ended in flight and in the death of another victim.[1] It was also the time that a Metrocom (Metropolitan Command) sergeant who tried to infiltrate the student ranks, was caught, and nearly lynched by the students. Furthermore, the police also caught a non-student with molotov cocktail bombs. These incidents served to support the demonstrators' position

[1]Jose F. Lacaba, "The People's March," Philippines Free Press, March 14, 1970, pp. 2-3 and 45-46.

that they should be the last one to be blamed for the violence that accompanied the demonstrations. It also supported the student leaders' charge that provocateurs were planted in their ranks by those who sought to discredit student militancy.

> The demonstrators have made many demands--too many to be met in a short time, but, certainly, there are a number of those demands that are eminently reasonable and may be met right now if there is the necessary presidential integrity and good intention. Meet as many of the reasonable demands of the demonstrators now. Not in the indefinite future but NOW! . . .
>
> And do stop using hired goons or government agents to provoke student demonstrators into retaliatory violence, to "justify" counterviolence by the alleged forces of law and order. Give the demonstrators a chance, a last clear chance, to show that they can be militant without being violent. Make it clear that violence is not necessary to effect reform. If they insist on violence, well, unjustified violence calls for the appropriate counter-violence; force will be met with force.
>
> Stop provoking student demonstrators--not the Christian Social Movement, which is merely a form of political bowel movement, but the militants in the streets--into violence to justify their slaughter as in Indonesia, where the favorite Jesuit of the President was supposed to have been organizing students for the greater glory of God and foreign interests.
>
> These are some of the things the President, if he would recover the confidence of the people, should and can do. Right now. . . .[2]

The NACIDA case. A demonstration on March 16 in front of the NACIDA (National Cottage Industries Development Authority) office was led by the NUSP (National Union of Students of the Philippines) and was joined by students from Jose Rizal College, Polytechnic College of the Philippines, Philippine School of Business Administration, Araneta University, Ateneo de Manila University, Mapua Institute of Technology, St. Theresa's College, St. Joseph's College, College of the Holy Spirit,

---

[1]Editorial, "Who Hired Them?" Manila Times, March 5, 1970.

[2]Editorial, "Who Can Believe the President?" Philippines Free Press, March 14, 1970.

and Maryknoll college, The speakers, in the presence of the administratrix, Mrs. Gonzales, denounced the anomalies of the management of the said government office. Then the students marched to Malacanang. The two main charges against the NACIDA were: (1) malversation of funds and (2) falsification of public documents. Mrs. Gonzales resigned. This NACIDA case was the result of the NUSP's anti-brigade work which had pored over public documents available in the different governmental institutions in Manila.[1]

The People's Court. Still another demonstration was carried out on March 17, also student-led with the demonstrators waving the same old banners and crying out about the same old problems. This rally was called the "Poor People's March." At Plaza Moriones the group set up a "People's Court." There a series of speakers expounded on the sins of the accused, among them President Marcos, Mayor Villegas, the idle rich, the police, the military, and the big landowners. From there, the group proceeded toward the American Embassy where they were stopped by the Air Force anti-riot men. Action was over after midnight when government troops dispersed the rallyists with tear gas bombs.[2]

Protest graduations. On April 3, 1970, a group of twenty-five graduating seniors had their "protest graduation" outside of their Sta. Scholastica College. They did not wear the traditional cap and gown but the Secretary of Education was there and after a

---

[1]Amadis Ma. Guerrero, "The Nacida Under Fire," Graphic, April 8, 1970, pp. 9-11 and 27.

[2]Jose F. Lacaba, "The Via Dolorosa of Protest," Philippines Free Press, March 28, 1970, pp. 4, 46, and 48.

very simple ceremony, he distributed certificates to the graduates testifying that they had completed the requirements of the Department of Education. The leader of the "guerrilla graduates" was the president of the college student council. This was the group which had refused to take the comprehensive examinations, a requirement for a diploma in their college. There had been dialogues previously between the school administration and the student representatives but the college authorities stood firm in their stand that diplomas would be awarded only to those who took the comprehensive examinations.[1]

At the University of the Philippines, on April 11, 1970, about fifty of the graduating students staged their own protest graduation. The leaders of the protest, all cum laude graduates, were: Student Council chairman Fernando T. Barican, outgoing Collegian editor Victor H. Manarang, 1970 Philipinensian editor Orlando B. Vea, college councilors Vicente B. Paqueo, Ericson Baculinao, and Rafael A. Morales, and Arts and Science president Rafael G. Baylosis, also an officer of the Movement for a Democratic Philippines. These student leaders were among those who had turned down an invitation to join the Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society induction a week earlier. They denounced the payments involved which went to the American-based society. This was the first time that (1) placards and manifestos found their way into the scene together with souvenir programs,

[1]Ethelwalda A. Ramos, "The Rebel Graduates," Graphic, May 13, 1970, pp. 14-15.

(2) the national language was used in various parts of the program, (3) the guest speaker, United Nations Secretary-General U Thant, was absent for he was advised by higher authorities not to be there for "security reasons" and (4) the program lasted only seventy-five minutes instead of the usual four-hour ceremony. Hundreds of undergraduates, mostly members of the Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan, Kabataan Makabayan, and Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino sang nationalist songs in between shouts of protest.

Part of the manifesto said:

> We turn to our education gained in four years or more years in this University for guidance, but we find that this had not prepared us for such a change. Indeed, we find out that this knowledge of our conditions in society did not come from the University but from direct experience outside of it. We find out that not only is our education irrelevant to the democratic struggle of the masses, it is even geared to producing pillars of the exploitative status quo.
>
> We are trained to be artists with an eye for Western forms, scientists for American establishments, businessmen in an unregulated free enterprise economy, legal counsel for the ruling classes, doctors and nurses of the urban rich. We are, in other words, educated to reinforce the oppressive classes or else join the brain drain.[1]

The protestors had long been denouncing Philippine miseducation, but graduation day seemed to them the fitting occasion for this outburst of protest. They came, not to receive their honors and diploma, but to denounce the mockery of these all. So the commencement rites marked the last in a series of protests for the school year 1969-1970.

An all women protest. On April 18, the founding members of

---

[1]Millet G. Martinez, "U.P Graduates Stage a Pageant of Protest," Sunday Times Magazine, May 3, 1970, pp. 22-23.

the MAKIBAKA (Malayang Kilusan ng Bagong Kababaihan) or Free Movement for the New Women picketed the Miss Philippines contests. The group came from the following: University of the Philippines, St. Theresa's College, St. Paul College, Philippine College of Commerce, Philippine Women's University, Maryknoll College, Adamson University, Centro Escolar University, and Far Eastern University. They denounced the fragile image of the Filipino woman, the commercialization of sex, and the beauty contest as a diversionary tactic and a feudal practice.[1] It was a very peaceful protest and it was not the last. In 1972 it was reported that the MAKIBAKA led by former Miss Philippines and Miss International, Gemma Cruz Araneta, again picketed the same beauty contest. Their placards said that beauty contests were the height of irrelevance, and exploitation of the Filipina, and a misrepresentation of the Philippines.[2]

Activism in May and June. During the vacation period, May and June, and even up to October it was reported that most of the student activists lived with the people in the slums, on the farms, and in the far-flung villages to get first-hand information on their conditions and to explain why they were in such conditions. The student activists during this time believed that they would be more effective if they were to conduct teach-ins, rather than to demonstrate.

---

[1]Mercedes B. Tira, "Campus Beauties vs. Commercialized Maria Claras," Graphic, May 13, 1970, pp. 8-9 and 46.

[2]Paulynn P. Sicam, "Pickets Fail to Dampen Beauty Contest Crowd," Manila Chronicle, July 3, 1972, p. 50.

During that part of the year, some people began to believe that student activism was at an end. This period accounted for the quiet spell on the student front.[1] However, some student activism was reported in the city of Manila, as demonstrations were held to oppose the higher taxicab passenger rates. Operasyong Tuligsa (Project Vigilante), which had eighty-seven students from the Christian Socialist Movement acting as vigilantes, was able to put pressure on the legislators to enact a bill banning the importation of luxuries and non-essentials. While this group of students did not influence the legislators to work harder, at least, many of the lawmakers were seen attending the sessions regularly.[2]

The Independence Day march. On the night before Independence Day, a loose coalition of left-of-center groups identified with the Church banded together under the name Pagkakaisa (United Front). They gathered in the patio of the Pinaglabanan Church in San Juan, province of Rizal (where the first shot that triggered the Filipino-American War had been fired) for an all-night vigil that was to culminate in a re-enactment of the Filipino rebels' tearing up their cedulas (tax receipts) and with a march the following morning on Malacanang and Congress. Pagkakaisa was made up of nineteen youth and labor organizations; in its ranks were the NUSP, SUCCOR (Students

---

[1]Fred J. Reyes, "Demos Fever Hits Campus Anew," Philippine Panorama, October 11, 1970 p. 4. (Hereinafter referred to as Reyes, "Demos Fever His Campus Anew,")

[2]Editorial, "Student Activism Need Re-Direction in Their Objectives," Philippine Panorama, October 11, 1970.

Crusade for Constitutional Reforms), Young Christian Socialists, Lakasdiwa (literally meaning strength of spirit) as well as some relatively unpublicized aggregations like the Samahan sa Pagbabago ng Lipunan (Association for the Reform of Society) and the CIA (Christianity in Action). Word got around that Nilo Tayag, the Kabataan Makabayan chairman, had been arrested a few hours before in San Pablo, province of Laguna and was charged with violating the Anti-Subversion Law. The following day, members of the Movement for a Democratic Philippines who had participated in the Independence march carried a number of placards which bore their new battle cry: Palayain si Nilo Tayag (Release Nilo Tayag). The marchers were drenched by the rain by the time they reached Plaza Miranda. There the speakers explained the title of the printed manifesto distributed before the march: Expose Fake Democracy! Finish the Unfinished Revolution! The speeches were openly and defiantly subversive. Where the speakers used to expound, explain and curse, they were now proclaiming the "Revolution." Curiously enough, the demonstration ended peacefully.[1]

The high point of the Free Nilo Tayag movement by militant groups was the September 17th rally at Plaza Miranda. This rally was attended by about 2,000 demonstrators who listened to the fiery speeches of the militants. Some of the speakers were subsequently to be charged with sedition by the government.[2]

---

[1]Jose F. Lacaba, "Rain and the Rhetoric of Revolution," Philippines Free Press, June 20, 1970, pp. 6 and 61.

[2]Wilfredo S. Baun, "The Nilo Tayag Case," Graphic, October 7, 1970, p. 4.

Why classes were postponed in July. Classes for the school year 1970-1971 were supposed to open during the first week of July but were postponed from July 6 to July 30 for the following reasons: (1) to give the Price Control Commission a chance to negotiate with school suppliers in arriving at moderate prices for educational supplies; (2) to provide a cooling off period for both the private school authorities and students, for the latter threatened to stage a massive demonstration and (3) to give Congress a chance of drafting a remedial measure regarding tuition fees that would satisfy the students and the private school authorities.

The first reason for the postponement of classes got positive results. The manufacturers and suppliers agreed not to increase the prices of textbooks, notebooks and elementary school writing pads. The second reason appears to have been successful too for there were no massive demonstrations. Earlier, at the University of the East, the students staged a semblance of a protest demonstration at the opening of the summer classes in May. The third reason did not satisfy all concerned. House Bill No. 2364 met with disatisfaction by school administrators who claimed that they were compelled to hike tuition fees in accordance with the high cost of living. Legislators in favor of the bill believed that it would discourage diploma mills since the profits were limited only to twelve per cent. The Tuition Fee Act, enacted later, did not prevent the private institutions from increasing tuition fees[1] and students from participating in demonstrations

[1]"Private Schools Increase Fees, Face Boycott," Philippine Times, January 15, 1972.

and boycott of classes.

Congress inquired into the financial status of private schools and it was revealed that the following schools had made big profits: Feati University, Arellano University, National Teachers College, Manila Law College, Centro Escolar University, University of the East, and Far Eastern University. On the other hand, the following were found to have lost heavily: De La Salle College, Ateneo de Manila University, Letran College and San Beda University. These Catholic schools, according to congressional records, had been losing from 200 to 500 pesos per student yearly.[1] After the inquiry, however, nothing was done about it.

The Department of Education also proposed a re-examination of the existing curricula for collegiate courses for a possible reduction of academic load. The rationale: while students in other countries take as few as twelve units per semester, Filipino students take as many as twenty-seven units. This proposal would benefit the students studying in the private institutions who paid tuition fees based on the number of units and it would be less expensive if the academic load were reduced. But the PACUP (Philippine Association of College and University Professors) believed that reduction of academic loads for a bachelor's degree would result in less earnings for their colleagues who would have to teach a lesser number of courses. There was no positive resolution in favor of the students.

There was a lull on the student front from the last week of

---

[1] Edward Kuinisala, "Higher Tuition Fees?" Philippines Free Press, June 20, 1970, p. 5.

July when classes commenced until the second week of September.

September activism. Students from the Philippine School of Business Administration held a demonstration on September 25, 1970 for better school facilities. They were joined by students from the University of the East and Far Eastern University. Rioting started and in the ensuing mayhem, Felix Mendoza, a student of the PSBA died and ten were wounded.

Four days later placard-bearing students again picketed the PSBA. Their demands for better school facilities had not been acted upon and now they were blaming the PSBA security guards as the ones who hurled the molotov cocktail which killed Mendoza from one of the PSBA buildings. Late in the afternoon the ranks of the picketers swelled and rioting started again. The police, further reinforced by the Metrocom (Metropolitan Command) troopers, quelled the students after nearly four hours of street fighting. Nobody was killed but many of the students were hurt.[1]

From then on activity at university row was to assume the proportions of pockets of revolt instead of big rallies or demonstrations concentrated in one place.

October activism. Another student picketing Mapua Institute of Technology on October 2 was seriously injured by sharp nails which came from a molotov cocktail bomb that exploded in front of him at the gate of the school.

On October 5, several picketing faculty members and student sympathizers at the San Sebastian College were hit by empty bottles

[1]Reyes, "Demos Fever Hits Campus Anew," p. 4.

and pails of garbage thrown by unknown persons from nearby buildings. That same day several pill box bombs were exploded in front of the University of the East, causing the disruption of traffic and classes at the Far Eastern University, Philippine College of Commerce, and Philippine School of Business Administration, all in the Sampaloc area, a suburb of Manila.

On October 8, four places were picketed simultaneously--University of the East, San Sebastian College, Mapua Institute of Technology, and finally by students of the University of the Philippines in front of Malacanang to protest government inaction on the killing of Ricardo Alcantara in a riot on January 30. Students of the University of the East were demanding the lowering of tuition fees and the return of a part of their tuition fees and the return of a part of their tuition fees for the time their classes would be suspended in deference to the election of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention. The Mapua protest, on the other hand, denounced the wounding of a student when molotov cocktail bombs exploded in front of him on October 2. At San Sebastian College, picketers demanded salary adjustments and fringe benefits for faculty members.

By October 11 the unrest had spread to five schools: La Salle Green Hills, where a student was expelled on the ground that he had incited his fellow students to boycott their classes: Letran College, where members of the Bagong Kabataan (New Youth) of Letran and numerous sympathizers had exploded firecrackers and blew car horns to manifest long "pent-up" frustrations; San Beda College, where a

group called the San Beda Students for a Democratic Society had started criticizing the school administration for systematic harassment of student activists; the National University, where students presented ten demands, most of which were economic in nature; and in the International School in Bel-Air, Makati, where the International School Alliance of Educators demanded their recognition as a union by the school management.[1] It was difficult to determine whether all the demands of the students were met by the school officials concerned.

Also, during the week of October 11 other groups marched to Malacanang. About three thousand residents of Sapang Palay walked forty kilometers to Malacanang to ask the President to help them with conditions there. The school teachers in Manila area wanted an increase in salary was well as the release of salaries of the teachers who had not been paid for a year. The President sent his men to talk to the Sapang Palay residents but the latter did not want promises. The President met with the teachers and granted their demands including a promise to give all the teachers in the country a cost-of-living allowance, depending on availability of funds. The pilots and employees of the Philippine Air Lines staged a walk-out. Their demand was salary increases.[2]

Gunfire and explosions rocked downtown Manila as violence

---

[1] Mila D. Aguilar, "Revolt in the Universities," Graphic, October 28, 1970, p. 9.

[2] Aloysius B. Colayco, "A Bit of a Blast," Philippines Free Press, October 17th, 1970, pp. 8 and 74.

broke out at the Feati University, the Philippine College of Criminology and Lyceum of the Philippines. A bus was reportedly set on fire and other vehicles were damaged as the trouble spread to the surrounding streets. The Feati and PCC students were picketing to demand a refund of the tuition fees they had paid for the month of November during which they would receive no instruction because of the coming election recess.

Some 100 demonstrators identified with moderate groups staged a rally at the Department of Justice protesting the jailing of a lawyer representing two farmers in the province of Davao del Norte. About forty of them reportedly occupied the office of the Secretary of Justice Vicente Abad Santos for six hours, after which Manila police arrested all of them and took them to police headquarters. Secretary Abad Santos had left his office shortly before the demonstrators entered. Among those arrested were two priests, a nun and a dozen seminarians. Abad Santos directed the Manila police to file charges against four of the leaders of the demonstration. All of the demonstrators were, however, released shortly after.[1]

November activism. From November 3 to 7, the Second National Conference on Nationalist Student Movement was held at the University of the Philippines. Unlike the first conference held in 1969 and sponsored by the University of the Philippines Student Council, this conference was sponsored by twelve student councils each led by student radicals. They were: University of the Philippines,

---

[1] _____, "Protest Rally at Justice Department, Students, Cops Clash," Philippines Free Press, October 31, 1970, pp. 14 and 48.

Araneta University, De La Salle College, Feati University, Lyceum of the Philippines, Mapua Institute of Technology, Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Maynila, Philippine College of Arts and Trades, Philippine College of Commerce, Philippine School of Business Administration, University of the Philippines College of Agriculture and College of Forestry. At the peak of the conference the number of the participants was about 250, coming from about seventy schools, colleges and universities all over the country. Students from colleges in Greater Manila constituted more than half of the conference. The keynote speaker was Angel G. Baking, Politburo prisoner for almost twenty years. There were other speakers but it was the speech of Chit Sta. Romana, spokesman of the MDP (Movement for a Democratic Philippines), who precipitated the clamor for the formation of the STAND (Student Alliance for National Democracy). The NUSP (National Union of Students of the Philippines) was criticized, not only by Sta. Romana, but by the next speaker, Crispin Aranda, president of the Philippine College of Commerce student council. Aranda's tirade was that the NUSP president Jopson admitted that his election was financially supported by the Jesuits and certain officials of the International Harvester, an American firm. Several resolutions were passed. Among them were: (1) formation of the STAND and committing all participants in the conference and the students of the schools that they represent to be active members of the alliance; (2) to put up student reform candidates with a national democratic orientation in all schools where the student councils had become tools of the reactionary school

administrations; (3) to recognize American imperialism, domestic feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism as the basic problems of the Filipino people; (4) to launch a propaganda campaign to expose the true character of the Armed Forces of the Philippines as the biggest private army terrorizing the people; (5) to publish a national newspaper with a national democratic orientation; (6) to support the Sorsogon School of Arts and Trades in their fight against the oppression of the school administration.

> The conference proved distinctly different from ordinary student conferences where the usual main attraction is the squabble for positions to be used in the squabble for spoils from politicians and the state. The conference was clearly anti-Establisment and revolutionary as can be seen from the resolutions, speeches, and deliberations. It was clearly anti-reformist as it realized the futility of reformism and the revolutionary potential of the students in the nation-wide struggle for change.[1]

The November elections. Among the student groups that had worked so hard for the peaceful and full participation of the voters was the NUSP which conducted teach-ins informing the people of the importance of the coming Constitutional Convention. On election day, the NUSP crusaders went to trouble spots like the province of Ilocos Sur to see for themselves that elections there were free from fraud and terrorism. There were also students who participated in the peaceful elections and were the ones who helped relay the advanced tally results to the municipal, city, provincial and national offices of the Commission on Elections.

The results of the November 10 elections for the delegates

---

[1]Mila Astorga Garcia, "A Gathering of Militants," Sunday Times Magazine, December 13, 1970, p. 43.

to the 1971 Constitutional Convention revealed that: (1) most of the elected delegates were backed up by the political machines that went into full gear in the closing days of the campaign, (2) most of those elected were either close relatives of political stalwarts in their respective districts, the moneyed, or those backed up by the local politicians and (3) for a nation whose youth below the age of twenty-one constitutes 55 per cent of the population, the number of delegates elected to the Constitutional Convention that could be said to speak for the young was disapointing. Thirty-one candidates below 30 years of age were elected out of 320 delegates--a mere 9.7 per cent.

The students were not satisfied with the election results so they planned to create a strong pressure group to make sure that the delegates would write a Constitution that would express and be responsive to the needs of the people, no matter how politically motivated the delegates might be. Furthermore, the NUSP planned to hold a rally at the opening day of Congress to ask that the election code be revised, for it did not stop over-spending, vote-buying, and the direct participation of the party machines in the election of delegates to the convention.[1]

December activism. Many students from various schools, colleges and universities in the Greater Manila area staged rallies and demonstrations in Manila to protest the killing of a young scholar and the exlusion of hundreds of known student activists from

[1]Fred J. Reyes, "Students Restive, Set More Demonstrations," Philippines Free Press, December 6, 1970, pp. 6-7 and 11.

schools all over the country. The slain scholar was Francis Sontillano of the Philippine Science High School in Quezon City. He was killed at about noon on December 4 when a pill box bomb landed on his head during a student demonstration on Echague Street near Feati University. The bomb that killed Sontillano also wounded eleven other students. A suspect, one of the security guards of Feati University, was arrested. He was the first suspect ever apprehended in the seven cases of violence in student rallies and demonstrations. The suspect posted and later jumped bail. Another cause of the renewed restiveness of student demonstrators was the black-listing of an estimated 800 student activists in many schools all over the country. The black-listed students were denied enrollment in their respective schools at the beginning of the semester.[1] It was difficult to determine whether some of these students were later admitted to their respective schools.

It has been noted that students frequently marched, picketed or held demonstrations in front of the American Embassy in Manila. Aside from the accusations made by the student groups about American imperialism, a survey made by Dr. Chester Hunt for two different years--1954 and 1970 revealed that Filipino students' attitudes to Americans were unfavorable.[2] Asked their opinion about the military bases in the Philippines, nearly half of the respondents, or 47 per

---

[1] _____, "Student Demos Restive Again," Philippines Free Press, December 19, 1970, p. 54.

[2] "RP Students Attitude to Americans Unfavorable," Philippine Times, February 29, 1972.

cent, felt that the presence of American bases was an insult to Philippine sovereignty. A lesser percentage, or 40 per cent, considered the bases a necessity for the Philippines from both military and economic standpoints. The students' reactions to the Vietnam war showed that 47 per cent believed that the United States' participation in the war was a form of brutal imperialism as compared to 35 per cent who regarded the American involvement a courageous stand. Hunt also said that a comparison of the two surveys indicated that fewer students would prefer to have Americans as business partners in 1970 than in 1954. A poll reported in 1972 also revealed that 76 per cent of the Filipinos wanted the American bases to remain because the American military men spend about 125 million dollars in the Philippines.[1] It was not reported however, who conducted the poll and who were the participants in the survey.

Student Activism in 1971

January activism. In the month of January, the jeepney drivers again went on strike. Students, sympathizing with the jeepney drivers, held a demonstration on January 13 at Plaza Miranda. About 5:00 P.M. pill box bombs and molotov cocktails started falling on the demonstrators. Law enforcement agents clashed with the demonstrators with the result that three students were killed, more than forty were injured and twenty others were charged in criminal cases filed by the

[1]"Reform or Revolution: Hard Choice in Philippines," U.S. News & World Report, October 16, 1972, p. 35.

police. Student leaders charged that the police officers were not only determined to disperse the demonstrators but were on orders to shoot-to-kill. The Manila Municipal Board passed a resolution urging the Manila Police Department to adopt "gentler methods" in dealing with student demonstrators in the city. Manila Councilor Isidro said that photographs taken during the rally showed clearly that Manila police officers fired point blank at the demonstrators who were only armed with placards. The NBI (National Bureau of Investigation) investigated the case but there was no evidence of any positive results stemming from the investigation.

The biggest number of student activists who faced criminal charges as a result of their participation in the jeepney drivers' strike came from the College of Agriculture and College of Forestry of the University of the Philippines at Los Banos, province of Laguna. Fifteen students were among the forty-seven persons charged by the police with disturbance of public peace and grave coercion.

Shortly after this incident, students, mostly from Ateneo de Manila University and Maryknoll College, picketed the main gate of Camp Crame to protest the use of the military against the students and to demand the impeachment of President Marcos.

The LSD (Leaders of the League of Social Democrats), a newly organized group of young college graduates and professionals, scheduled an indignationl march. The LSD made the following demands:

> Justice for the students who died in the "Battle of Mendiola" in January of last year.
> Revelation of the real state of the nation by President

Marcos.

Resignation of President Marcos and all national officials, except members of the Supreme Court.

No martial law.

At this writing, student leaders were in fear of being placed under arrest by police and military authorities. Most of them were living in the homes of friends and "on the move all the time" for fear that their tormentors would catch up with them.[1]

The rally of January 13 once again bared fascism, but it also unveiled the fact that, from now on, worker-student unity will not only be talked about in press statements or practised in isolated factory sites, but actively pursued in massive demonstrations and rallies. The threat of martial law and the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus may have been hung over our head once again, but the mass actions will continue, and the rumor that the top student leaders will be assassinated to stop these student leaders from standing on a platform on that day to assail the ills of the nation.[2]

The police . . . went back to their tactics of January 13, shooting, beating up, arresting young leaders on trumped-up charges, delaying the presentation of charges where there were absolutely none that could be presented, merely to harass the young people.

If anything kept up the fires of the strike, it was this senseless use of superior power.[3]

The fears of many that the opening of Congress on January 25 would be marred by tumultuous demonstrations did not materialize. On this day, however, most of the stores in downtown Manila were closed. There were two groups of demonstrators: the pro-Marcos groups were delegations from all the regions of the country numbering around 9,000 while the anti-Marcos faction, consisting of student

---

[1]Filemon V. Tutay, "Charges and Counter-Charges," Philippines Free Press, January 30, 1971, pp. 38 and 40.

[2]Mila G. Aguilar, "January 13: View of the Impending Avalanche," Graphic, January 17, 1971, p. 5.

[3]Editorial, "When Will the Lackeys of the Law Ever Learn How to Use Their Heads?" Graphic, February 17, 1971, p. 2.

activists from some fifteen universities and colleges of Manila, numbered about 7,000. About 5,000 soldiers and government operatives saturated the area around Congress and the presidential route from Malacanang to the legislative building. This was a day when, if the student activists were not provoked, there was a chance for a genuine demonstration for the redress of grievances which would be staged peacefully and orderly.[1]

Militant students went to the streets again on January 30. They held mock funeral marches in downtown Manila, massed in the afternoon on the narrow Mendiola bridge to pay tribute to the four students who were killed during the previous year's January 30 demonstration, and held rallies in front of Malacanang. The day's activities ended with an all night vigil at Plaza Miranda. Youth, labor, and peasant organization representatives took turns criticizing the administration before a crowd of about 10,000. The mothers of two dead students, Catabay and Alcantara, spoke to the rallyists. Both of them asked for justice for their sons. In spite of the emotional climate, the rally was peaceful.[2]

The "Diliman Commune." The University of the Philippines, Diliman campus, Quezon City, was like a battleground from February 1 to February 8.[3] Barricades were set up across the streets inside the state university campus. These were erected at first by the

---

[1]Edward R. Kuinisala, "January 25; Demos Vs. Demo," Philippines Free Press, January 30, 1971, pp. 2-3 and 41.

[2]Manuel H. Ces, "Battle of Mendiola: 1st Anniversary," Philippines Free Press, February 13, 1971, p. 14.

[3]Cres Vasquez, "Days of Darkness or New Dawn at Diliman," Philippine Panorama, February 21, 1971, pp. 7-8.

members of the SDK (Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan), KM (Kabataan Makabayan), and the MDP (Movement for a Democratic Philippines). Later on several students helped members of the organizations set up more barricades. These student organizations were sympathizing with the striking jeepney drivers who were protesting the price of oil products. The barricades were set up to prevent buses, taxicabs, and non-striking jeepney drivers from entering and/or passing the school campus. Every time the police would attempt to remove the barricades, clashes would break out between the police and the students. The police fired tear gas bombs at the students who would in turn retaliate with a molotov cocktail, pill box bomb, or stones. Classes were immediately suspended. A student of the state university was shot and killed by a faculty member of the university who was angered when somebody threw a pill box bomb at the rear of his car. Twenty-six students were arrested but were later released following a meeting attended by Quezon City Mayor Amoranto, Police Chief Karingal and President Lopez of the state university. President Lopez requested the Quezon City authorities that he be given time to use his own kind of persuasion with the students and asked that the police be withdrawn from the campus. On the fifth day, the police withdrew. After two days without any untoward incident, the students dismantled the barricades, allowed the free vehicular movement inside the campus, and repainted the buildings which had been renamed at the height of the seige. Normalcy returned again to the university.

While those things were happening at the University of the

Philippines, students at the Ateneo de Manila University at first planned to barricade the gates of the university. When classes were called off, the students decided that they would barricade the public road instead. In La Salle College, students picketed and obstructed the public road. When pursued by the police, they retreated behind the school fences. At the University of Santo Tomas, students set up barricades, fought the police with stones and pill box bombs then retreated into the university sanctuary. Violence was also averted here when the police were withdrawn.[1]

April activism. Students and faculty members of the Philippine College of Commerce and members of the MDP (Movement for a Democratic Philippines) and KM (Kabataan Makabayan) staged a rally at Freedom Park in front of Malacanang on April 12. At issue was: justice for the missing activist, Carlos B. del Rosario, and the release of two million pesos for the Philippine College of Commerce. Del Rosario was a faculty member of the Philippine College of Commerce who had helped Jose Ma. Sison organize the KM in 1964. He had been missing since March 19.[2] Sison went underground and was wanted by the government which had placed a price on his head.

The demonstration was peaceful until pill box bombs were thrown at the demonstrators by unidentified persons. Then government troops and demonstrators clashed again, resulting in the death

---

[1] Editorial, "When Will the Lackeys of the Law Ever Learn How to Use Their Heads?" Graphic, February 17, 1971.

[2] _____, "Activist Missing," Philippines Free Press, April 10, 1971, p. 30.

of one demonstrator, and injury to eleven others. According to the KM, twenty of the demonstrators were apprehended by the police and had not been heard of since.

The following day another group of activists disrupted the House proceedings when several of them jumped from the gallery into the session hall. one activist grabbed the micophone and shouted the group's demands. The activists, members of the Kapulungan ng mga Sandigan ng Pilipinas (Association of the Pillars of the Philippines) demanded that the House open its account books and complete its investigation of a twenty-six million pesos fund transfer. Police arrested the student-activists.[1]

Labor Day incident and aftermath.[2] The rally by students and laborers on Labor Day (May 1) ended in tragedy. It was reported that government troops opened fire to frustrate an attempt on the part of some of the demonstrators to haul down the Philippine flag before Congress and invert the colors. (The Philippines is at war when its colors are inverted.) The government agents continued to fire even as their human targets scampered away. The three demonstrators who were killed raised the total of the dead to twenty-two. The MDP (Movement for a Democratic Philippines) charged that the Labor Day massacre in front of Congress was premeditated and systematic on the part of the government. The Senate passed a resolution later expressing its

---

[1] _____, "Activists Stage Demos at Palace, Congress," Philippines Free Press, April 24, 1971.

[2] Wilfredo S. Baun, "The Truncheon Prevails," Graphic, May 20, 1970, p. 7.

"outrage" over the use of guns and other deadly weapons during student demonstrations. President Marcos ordered an investigation of the carnage before Congress. The President banned the Metrocom (Metropolitan Command) from the site of the demonstration. He also ordered that on no account was the Philippine Constabulary to intervene in the demonstration unless upon a written request of the mayor of Manila. The mayor of Manila, on his part, promised to keep the Manila police away from the demonstrations.

Workers and students, estimated to number from 5,000 to 10,000 led by the KM (Kabataan Makabayan), converged at 4:00 P.M. May 8 on Plaza Miranda to protest the killing of three demonstrators and the wounding of eighteen others by government troops during the Labor Day rally before Congress. The police and other law enforcement agents were conspicuously absent. There was no confrontation and there was no violence. This was considered a moral victory for the Kabataan Makabayan which had acquired a reputation as an incendiary organization. Almost at the same time, similar rallies were held at Marawi City, Tacloban, Cebu, Tarlac, Pampanga and Baguio.[1]

On May 15, the Philippine Constabulary Chief issued a directive to all zone, task force and provincial commanders, the Metrocom, and other Philippine Constabulary units ordering them to "observe, listen and record proceedings in demonstrations, teach-ins, seminars, and radio or television programs and prosecute, in court,

---

[1] _____, "A Nation Rises Against Fascism," Graphic, May 26, 1971, pp. 10-11 and 47.

all those who commit crimes as defined in the Revised Penal Code."[1] There was a report that the AFP (Armed Forces of the Philippines) possessed a list of activist.

> But the capping joke was to come when the news that the original 200 names in the AFP blacklist had been upped to 780, and included not only student and labor leaders, but newsmen, teachers and about 150 women.[2]

On May 17, Manila Mayor Villegas declared that student demonstrators would not be arrested in Manila for mere use of inflammatory words during the rallies.

Pickets at the Convention. The Constitutional Convention began its meeting at the Manila Hotel on June 1. The radical students turned in full force to give voice to their hostility toward the Convention. Ang Con-Con ay huwad! (The Constitutional Convention is a fake!). The "moderate" group of student activists brought fifty symbolic coffins to mark the death of democracy should the Convention turn out to be a farce. Later the coffins were set ablaze. When President Marcos delivered his speech before the delegates, seventeen of them walked out of the session hall. The delegates, however, declined to speak before the crowd outside of the Manila Hotel.[3]

Report of the AFP.[4] The AFP (Armed Forces of the Philippines)

---

[1] Mila G. Aguilar, "Who's Afraid of the Fascist Beast?" Graphic, June 9, 1971, p. 12.

[2] Ibid.

[3] _____, "Circus for a Revolution," Graphic, June 23, 1971, pp. 4-7 and 42.

[4] "Student Activism Assessed," Manila Times, June 10, 1971, pp. 1 and 24.

warned on June 9 that the "moderates" who composed the great majority of student-youth activists might ultimately rise up in arms with the "radicals" in the event of a failure by the Constitutional Convention. Of the twenty-four leading student-youth organizations, the AFP placed eighteen to the left-of-center, the Kabataan Makabayan, Movement for a Democratic Philippines, Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan and the National Students League in the farthest left. To the "right" were placed the National Union of Students of the Philippines, which reportedly had the largest membership, the CONDA (Confederation of Delegates Association), the College Editors Guild, and the SUCCOR (Students United Crusade for Constitutional Reforms). The Secretary of National Defense, Ponce Enrile, warned that the threat to internal stability posed by student activism emanated primarily from Red exploitation which, if left unchecked, would cause the radicalization of the whole movement and so jeopardize the country's stability, for it would likely undermine government efforts to maintain peace and order. Earlier, Secretary Enrile said:

> . . . Youth demonstrations of yesteryears were not like the recent ones where, for the first time, we saw placards carrying communist slogans. Many of the young people carrying these placards do not know what they mean. These youths have been utilized by subversives who had infiltrated the demonstrations.
> . . . We know which student organizations are affected. We know the extent of influence some individuals have on some of these organizations. We are not making any statement on whether the infiltrators are Huks. But we know their beliefs, motivations and objectives are identical to those of the Huks.[1]

It was difficult to determine which twenty-four organizations were mentioned by the AFP report. Also, it was interesting to note

---

[1]Wilfredo S. Baun, "The Truncheon Prevails," Graphic, May 20, 1970, p. 7.

that eighteen out of the twenty-four organizations were labeled left-of-center or seeking reforms through parliamentary means without violence.

A new Constitution for the Philippines was finally approved on November 30, 1972 and was ratified overwhelmingly by the Citizens Assembly which was called for that purpose in January, 1973. The Citizens Assembly was composed of Filipino citizens from fifteen years and up, literate and illiterate, and their votes were viva-voce. These events took place after the declaration of the martial law in the Philippines. This procedure of voting was used for the first time in the Philippines. Usually only those who were twenty-one years of age and considered literate could vote. Furthermore, voting was always done in the polls with secret balloting.

Confrontation at the Ateneo.[1] On July 9, students at the Ateneo de Manila University led by the KM (Kabataan Makabayan) burned the effigies of the university President and Dean of Men, made a bonfire of the school rules and regulations and stormed the university administration building. Their issues were: (1) reinstate two professors whose contracts were terminated and (2) withdrew the expulsion proceedings against the students who led a boycott of classes the previous week. The two professors were identified with leftist activities. The school administration insisted that the two professors were not qualified and their contracts were not renewed on the recommendation of the rank and tenure committee. The leaders

[1]Sylvia L. Mayuga, "The Jesuit Dilemma," Philippines Free Press, July 31, 1971, pp. 11, 38-41.

of the boycott of classes, joined by about sixty out of some 1,600 students in the College of Arts and Sciences, violated the regulations concerning the disruption of classes issued by the Bureau of Private Schools. It was difficult to determine what finally happened to the student leaders and the two professors.

The "wholesale" arrests of activists. The Liberal Party held a "miting de avance" at Plaza Miranda on August 21. Seconds after the Liberal Party candidates had stood up to be proclaimed, two grenades were reportedly hurled by an unidentified person or persons, exploding on the stage. Nine were instantly killed and 129 were wounded. All the candidates of the Liberal Party were wounded but no one was killed. Whether this Plaza Miranda bombing was the important factor in the later victory of most of the Liberal Party senatorial candidates in the polls was difficult to determine.

Among the suspects in the bombing were the student activists who were identified with the extreme left and suspected also of having links with the NPA (New People's Army), allegedly the armed unit of the Communist Party of the Philippines. Most of those arrested were identified with the Kabataan Makabayan but not one from the so-called "moderate" organizations was arrested. This government crackdown shook the KM ranks, disconcerted the "moderate" groups and a sector of the society noted the difference:

> In a country of the very rich and the very poor, there is now a void in the political life of the Philippines in that before the August crackdown in 1971, the student activists acted as the "moral organ" of the society.
>
> Even middle-class Filipinos who disagreed with the thick Maoist tints of the extreme left of Philippine citizenry often

agreed that the activists served the purpose of pricking if not goading the conscience of society.[1]

Among those arrested were: Luzvimindo David, former president of the SCAUP (Student Cultural Association of the University of the Philippines) and secretary-general of the Kabataan Makabayan; Gary Olivar, spokesman of SDK (Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan); Manuel Alabado, head of the KM's Worker's Bureau; Diosdado Guanlao, business manager of the KM's cultural group; Antonio Tayco, former Km's vice-chairman for organization and Lyceum of the Philippines KM chairman; Fluellen Ortigas, KM spokesman in 1970; Angelo de los Reyes, fomer vice-president of the KM's bureau for education and information; and Rodolfo del Rosario, vice-president of the Socialist Party of the Philippines. Ortigas was the Most Outstanding Student of the Philippines in 1968, a scholar in political science, former president of the student council in Central Philippine University and a delegate to youth organizations outside of the country. De los Reyes, when arrested, was an instructor of the Philippine College of Commerce in political science and sociology.[2] Already in jail before the August crackdown were: Leoncio Co, general-secretary of the KM in 1968, of middle class origin, a philosophy student at the University of the Philippines, and twice recipient of the KM National Council's Bonifacio Militance Award. Nilo Tayag, KM chairman in 1968

---

[1]Teodoro Benigno, "Student Activism: From the City to Countryside," Sunday Times Magazine, May 14, 1972, p. 5.

[2]Millet G. Martinez, "Activists Behind Bars," Sunday Times Magazine, August 20, 1972, pp. 22-23.

and son of a wealthy landowner in the province of Quezon.

About fifty more student activists were still at large after the mass arrests were made in August 1971. President Marcos has since ordered the military tribunals to try these activists in absentia. Whether this was to include those who were in mainland China when the government made the mass arrest in August was not revealed. Some of these student leaders were reportedly visiting mainland China when martial law was imposed on September 23, 1972. Two former student leaders were working in mainland China: Ericson Baculinao and Santiago Sta. Romana. Baculinao was a college councilor of the student council at the University of the Philippines and one of the leaders of the protest graduation at the state university where he graduated cum laude.[1] Sta. Romana was the former chairman of the De La Salle College student council and a leading officer of the MDP (Movement for a Democratic Philippines).[2] Pedro Vergara, KM leader for the Bicol Region Chapter, was unaccounted for.[3]

Other former student leaders were reportedly abroad. Nelson Navarro, former spokesman for the MDP was in the United States. Gerry Barican, chairman of the University of the Philippines student council in 1970, and one of the leaders of the protest graduation in 1970 where he graduated cum laude, was in Rome.

---

[1]"Student Leader; Filipino Activists in Red China Homesick," Philippines Free Press, April 29, 1972, p. 14.

[2]"RP Youths Working in China," Manila Times, May 22, 1972, p. 30.

[3]"15 Youth Activists Reported Missing," Manila Times, May 22, 1972.

The following were in the Philippines as of 1972: Edgardo Jopson was serving his second term as president of the NUSP. Portia Ilagan, former president of the NSL was a movie actress under contract with Tower Productions. Violeta Calvo, vice-chairman of the University of the Philippines student council in 1966 and a participant at the October 24th rally at the Manila Hotel, was a lawyer working as Assistant Legal Attorney in the Legal Division of the Department of Justice. Voltaire Garcia, twice chairman of the University of the Philippines student council, in 1962 and 1966, was a lawyer and a delegate to the 1971 Constitutional Convention.

The fate and whereabouts of the other student activists, either those whose names reached the national printed media or not, would require another study.

Keniston revealed that student protesters generally have the following characteristics: (1) they are generally outstanding students; the higher the student's grade average, the more outstanding his academic achievements, the more likely it is that he will become involved in any given political demonstration and (2) they are not drawn from disadvantaged, status-anxious, underprivileged or uneducated groups.[1]

It is not, however, within the scope of this study to discover whether the above findings would be true for the Filipino activists. To determine this would require another study.

---

[1]Kenneth Keniston,"Sources of Dissent," from Academic Governance ed. by Baldridge, 1971, pp. 366-367.

The non-violent form of student activism. The least publicized part of student activism was of a non-violent form. At the height of the floods in 1972 which affected the provinces of Bulacan, Pampanga, Pangasinan, Tarlac, and Nueva Ecija and even the city of Manila, when President Marcos declared a state of emergency in those places the Operasyon Tulungan (Project Help) of the MDP (Movement for a Democratic Philippines) distributed food, clothing, and medicine to the flood victims.[1]

Large numbers of youth activists did not appear in the headlines but probably influenced the thinking of over a million farmers and their families from the northern to the southern part of the archipelago. Most of them were college and university students from Manila who had been doing their part for the past five years in far-flung barrios or villages of the country and they were probably as effective as their counterparts who took to the streets to protest. These youths initiated projects designed within the context of bayanihan or working together. They dug ditches and wells, demonstrated the production and installation of water-sealed toilets, repaired schoolhouses and even barrio clubs's buildings, and with the assistance of field technicians of the various government agencies worked with the farmers in the construction of small irrigation dams and farm-to-market roads. These students were volunteers of the RSVP (Rural Service Volunteer Group) undertaken by the Department of Education.

---

[1]Erlinda Baledo, "The Case of the Missing Activists," Manila Bulletin, July 30, 1972.

Dr. Lorenzo Ga. Cesar of the Bureau of Public Schools said that since the project was started in 1966, 2,268 students had gone to the barrios. He further stated that reports received from the barrios where these youths lived and worked during the months of May and June, which are vacation months, were very encouraging.[1]

Another form of student activism. With issuance of Department Order No. 53, series 1972 on December 29, 1972, the YCAP (Youth Civic Action Program) was integrated into the curricula in all schools of the country. Immediate implementation in the elementary and secondary schools was required. For higher education institutions, implementation began in the summer of 1973. Starting with the school year 1973-1974, all students will be required to undergo such training as a requisite for graduation. The program will be of five weeks duration.

The plan is for the different levels to concentrate on the following projects or activities as present conditions demand:

Elementary school pupils:
1. Home cleanliness and beautification
2. Environmental sanitation and beautification
3. Intensive food production

Secondary students:
1. Environmental sanitation and beautification
2. Intensive food production
3. Solution of contemporary problems e.g. drug addiction, conservation of natural resources

College students:
1. Environmental sanitation and beautification
2. Solution of contemporary community problems e.g. drug addiction, conservation of natural resources

---

[1]Dell H. Grecia, "The Other Side of Student Activism," Weekly Nation, July 12, 1971, p. 36.

3. Orientation of the community to the goals of the New Society.

Objectives:

1. To orient the youth and community to the ideals and goals of the New Society.
2. To imbue the youth with social and civic consciousness and social responsibility and a desire to participate in the development of one's community through the wise use and conservation of both human and material resources.
3. To make the youth realize the role they must play in the socio-economic development of the country.
4. To involve the youth in the development of their communities.
5. To give more meaning to school experiences through the actual application of learning in the solution of community problems.
6. To instill love for and pride in our country and people, particularly through the revival of those aspects of our cultural heritage that are supportive of the goals of the New Society.
7. To develop citizens who are upright, clean, orderly, law-making, physically fit and God-loving, and
8. To guide the youth in forming a more realistic perspective of life.[1]

The Impact of Martial Law on Student Activism

President Marcos signed the martial law order (Proclamation No. 1081) on September 21, 1972 and authorized its implementation by the military at 9:00 P.M. September 22, 1972.

He said, "I am utilizing the proclamation of martial law, for one purpose alone: to save the Republic and reform society,"

Under the proclamation:

1. Schools in all levels are suspended for one week . . .
2. The carrying of firearms outside residences is prohibited.
3. Curfew is imposed from midnight to 4:00 A.M.
4. Media and other forms of communication will be under government control.
5. Public utilities such as the Meralco, PLDT (Philippine Long Distance Telephone) and the waterworks system, and transportation firms such as the Philippine National Railways, Philippine Airlines, Filipinas Orient Airways, and Air Manila

[1]"BU Juniors on YCAP," Bicol Universitarian, Summer, 1973, p. 1.

are placed under government control.

6. Travel abroad, except those authorized by the government, is banned.

7. Rallies, demonstrations and strikes are banned.

The judiciary, the President said, will continue to function under the present organization and personnel except in the following cases:

1. Those involving the validity, legality or constitutionality of government rules, orders or acts by the President or his duly authorized representative.
2. Those involving crimes affecting national security.
3. Those involving the fundamental law.
4. Those involving public order.
5. Those involving usurpation of authority.
6. Those involving crimes by public officers.[1]

Only two newspapers were allowed to publish last night, the Manila Times and the Daily Express. The Times, however, could not gather enough editorial and production personnel to put out an issue today.[2]

See Appendix E for the proclamation declaring that the President will govern the nation, and Appendix F for information about the control of the media.

Appendix G describes the means and rules by which government officials and employees will be charged for disciplinary action.

Appendix H shows the guidelines under which colleges and universities may operate.

Two youth organizations were outlawed: the KM (Kabataan Makabayan) and the SDK (Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan). The latest report indicated:

The Kabataan Makabayan, the most militant and outspoken

---

[1]"FM Declares Martial Law," Philippine Sunday Express, September 24, 1972, p. 2.

[2]Ibid.

front organization of the radical left, has increased the number of its chapters from 200 as of the end of 1970 to 317 as of July 31, 1972, and its membership from 10,000 as of the end of 1970 to 15,000, as of the end of July, 1972, showing very clearly the rapid growth of the communist movement in this country.

The Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan, another militant and outspoken front organization of the radical left, had also increased the number of its chapters from an insignificant number at the end of 1970 to 159 as of the end of July, 1972 and has now a membership of some 1,495 highly indoctrinated intensely committed and almost fanatically devoted individuals.[1]

Furthermore it was also the government's belief that some 3,000 high school and college students who dropped out of school and/or disappeared were reported to have joined the insurgents for training in the handling of firearms and explosives. Another report stated that some 2,000 students who "disappeared" from college campuses had joined the insurgents over the past two years--1970 and 1971. These youths reportedly come from middle-class and wealthy families.[2] Whether these 2,000 youths were a part of the 3,000 reported by the government was difficult to determine.

The New Society. Concern for the goals of the New Society are what student activism was about. They are: restoration of peace and order, the reform of the government and the restructuring of the society. This is the response of an older generation to the demands of the young. The obligation of the student-youth is "to dedicate themselves to the pursuit of knowledge to the strengthening of their

---

[1]Proclamation No. 1081, Proclaiming a State of Martial Law in the Philippines, September 22, 1972.

[2]Reform or Revolution: Hard Choice in Philippines," U.S. News & World Report, October 16, 1972, p. 35.

moral qualities, and the acquisition of skills which will make them productive and useful members of the New Society."[1]

The role of the citizen is expressed as follows:

> It is the moral obligation of the citizen . . . to break old habits and develop new and desirable ones.
> The New Society is for everyone, but everyone must do his share in bringing it about.
> If he is a laborer or employee, he must give his full share of work for his pay or wages. If he is an employer, he must share his profits justly.
> If he is not doing anything, let him produce, no matter how modest that may be.
> If he is a teacher, he must not be content with a routinary compliance with the requirements of the law. His main aim is to mould a new generation of citizens. Let him do so.
> If he is a leader, let him lead with dedication and self-sacrifice.[2]

While Filipino college students are greatly affected by the martial law, it seemed that American college students' attitudes have also changed. A nation-wide survey of eighty-four presidents of American colleges and universities made by the U.S. News & World Report at the end of the 1971 to 1972 academic year revealed that the American college student was: (1) less radical in his approach to education and life than the undergraduates of the 1970 and 1971; (2) more interested in getting an education and afterwards, a job; (3) more involved in off-campus politics and public affairs and interpreted by the educators in the survey as signs of increased willingness to work with the Establishment; and (4) growing more interested in social life and religion than in demonstrations and

---

[1]Department of Public Information (Philippines), The New Society (Manila: National Media Production Center, no date), p. 9.

[2]Ibid.

protests.[1]

It would require further study to determine whether there was a similarity between the American and Filipino college students' attitude toward student activism today.

Implications for Bicol University

Pre-martial Law Era

The Bicol University is the only state-supported university in the Bicol Region which comprises six provinces. The university administration offices are located in the Regan Barracks campus near the boundary between Legazpi City and the municipality of Daraga, province of Albay. (For more details about Bicol University, see Appendix I and for a comparative enrollment with other universities see Appendix J.) The university was formed by a consolidation of four existing schools: Bicol Teachers College, Tabaco School of Fisheries, Bicol Regional School of Arts and Trades, and Roxas Memorial Agricultural School. These individual institutions did not experience any student unrest prior to their consolidation. The Bicol Teachers College was a member of the College Editors Guild. Later the Bicol University was identified as a member of the CONDA (Conference Delegates Association of the Philippines). Both organizations were identified by the Armed Forces of the Philippines as being "rightist." Perhaps Keniston was right when he observed that the value commitments of activists are rarely found among future engineers, future teachers, students of business administration, or

in schools where there is a vocational or professional preparation.[1] All the units of the Bicol University offer vocational and professional preparation. Two exceptions to Keniston's findings were noted in this study: Portia Ilagan was a student of the Philippine Normal College when she was president of the National Students League. Students at the College of Education of the University of the Philippines led the boycott of classes which led to the Sta. Maria case. Students of the Bicol Teachers College were predominantly women. There were incidents in this study where the MAKIBAKA, an all female group, protested the beauty contests in Manila, however, the pickets were peaceful.

The students in the four units of the Bicol University came mostly from the lower-income groups. Children of the very few wealthy families go to Manila for their studies. For example, instead of going to the Bicol Teachers College, they would go to the College of Education of the University of the Philippines; instead of the Roxas Memorial Agricultural School, to the College of Agriculture of the University of the Philippines at Los Banos, province of Laguna or to Araneta University; and instead of the Bicol Regional School of Arts and Trades, to the Philippine College of Arts and Trades. There is no school in Manila which is equivalent to the Tabaco School of Fisheries.

The presence of the police and other law enforcement agencies was revealed in this study as a cause of the clashes between student

---

[1] Kenneth Keniston, "Sources of Dissent," from Academic Governance, ed. by Baldridge, p. 359.

groups and the police. The students of the Bicol Regional School of Arts and Trades have long been aware of the presence of the national police near their school buildings because the provincial headquarters of the Philippine Constabulary was in the Regan Barracks campus long before the organization of the Bicol University. Whether the presence of the national police was a deterrent to student activism in that school or that the students were already conditioned to police presence was difficult to determine.

Immediately after the organization and integration of these four schools into the Bicol University, the Board of Regents adopted the Bureau of Public Schools Service Manual for purposes of governing the Bicol University in its resolution No. 7, series of 1970. Part IV of this Manual deals with solving cases of student disciplinary problems. The contents of the Service Manual, especially Part IV, were not new to the students of the Bicol Teachers College for the college was once under the Bureau of Public Schools. The other three schools belonged to the Bureau of Vocational Schools which might have had a quite different rule or regulation on student discipline. There was no evidence that after the Service Manual was adopted that students of any of the four schools were suspended or expelled because they participated in school strikes, boycott of classes, and violent demonstrations. It is also a standard practice among the public schools in the Philippines to circularize in the schools the names of students who are expelled. In July 1972 a Code of Discipline for students of the Bicol University was issued. (See Appendix K.) It was difficult

to determine whether some students of the Bicol University were under disciplinary actions under the said Code. The Code, however, was superseded by the Department Order No. 30, series of 1972 dated October 13, 1972.

Among the causes of student unrest were high tuition fees and inadequate school facilities. The four schools of the Bicol University charged tuition fees much lower than that of the private institutions. Furthermore, the school facilities are equal or superior to those found in the local private schools. There was no evidence among the students of the local private schools that they protested against high tuition fees and inferior school facilities.

The charter of the Bicol University, (see Appendix L) shows that the Chairmen of the Appropriations Committees serve as ex-officio members of the Board of Regents. During the violent student activism, the chairmen, Senator Aytona and Congressman Alberto, were both from the Bicol Region, and both belonged to the political party in power. These national officials, and Congressman Imperial of the Second Congressional District of Albay, where the Regan Barracks campus of the Bicol University is located, plus the provincial government and Legazpi City, have fully supported the university from their public works funds appropriations in the allocation of pre-fabricated school buildings and campus road improvements. The problem here, however, is that the time will most likely come when the Chairmen of the Appropriations Committees will no longer come from the Bicol Region.

A major purpose of the Bicol University is to attract students from the region to study there instead of going to Manila or Quezon City. Among other things, steps were taken to recruit the best teachers in the region. Selective admission of students through entrance examinations were made because of the large numbers of students who would like to study in a state university. There was no indication that the students protested against their professors or against the kind of selective admission made. So far, the graduate programs offered in the university had led to masters degrees in teaching, public administration and education. The latest plan was to offer the Doctorate degree in education and political science starting with the summer term in 1973. Most, if not all, of the students in the Graduate College came from the ranks of the public and private school teachers and school administrators within the region. The figures from 1972 showed that there was a graduate enrollment of 644 and an undergraduate enrollment of 2,947.[1] The public school teachers in the region did not join the Manila Public School Teachers Association in their strike for salary increases and long-delayed salaries.

Once a year the elementary and secondary school students in the province of Albay participate in the City Youth Week, where for one week these youthful leaders "run" the city government of Legazpi City. This yearly activity is sponsored by the City Youth Coordinating Council of the city. As of March 1972, most of the elected youth leaders came from the University High School of the Bicol University.

---

[1] Bicol Universitarian, March, 1972.

Whether this yearly activity has beneficial effects would require careful analysis, but these prospective college students were already beling exposed to the actual situations and problems of a city government. The Bicol Teachers College (now the College of Education) has integrated Adult and Community Education into its curriculum. This is a type of work activity wherein the classes went to the barrios where they initiated and/or helped in projects with which the barrio councils needed further assistance. The projects were involved with home beautification and sanitation, food production, and helping the barrio councils conduct their meetings, and preparing minutes of the meetings or resolutions. This is a semster's, or four month's work. The number of hours involved may range from forty to eighty. The Tabaco School of Fisheries (now the College of Fisheries) has been involved in informing the public about the scientific ways of catching fish and other marine products, as well as better ways of processing and preserving them. The Roxas Memorial Agricultural School (now the College of Agriculture) has always been open to the public for demonstrations on scientific farming and the care and/or production of farm animals. The Bicol Regional School of Arts and Trades (now the College of Engineering and a School of Arts and Trades) offers, aside from the regular technical courses, classes for the out-of-school youth in cooperation with the Legazpi City government. This discussion of some aspects of the curricula at the four colleges of the Bicol University is an attempt to indicate that the curricula in those schools involve projects within the community.

If student unrest should come, it appears that it would most likely be from the Regan Barracks campus because it has the greatest number of students concentrated in one place. However, that possibility seems remote as long as the university administration continues the policy of meeting all the student leaders of all the units once a year where "gripes" and problems are aired and solutions are suggested. The policy of President Lopez's administration at the University of the Philippines might work also with the Bicol University. While there should be a forthright disapproval of student demands which are deemed to be unreasonable, improper or illegal, there should also be a continuing dialogue on all differences which deserve further consideration and appear to be negotiable. Two things came out of the Supreme Court's decision on the Sta. Maria case: (1) it does not take a "howling" demonstration to produce an administrative change, and (2) any school head might be able to prevent student unrest as long as he meets with the student leaders and is sincere with what he can and cannot do.

The most probable location for a student rally or demonstration is either Legazpi City or the municipality of Daraga. They are about five kilometers apart. Legazpi City is the business center of the province of Albay. Plaza Miranda in Manila is not like Penaranda Park in Legazpi City or the Locsin Park in the municipality of Daraga. These two places are small and are not as cosmopolitan as Manila.

The rallies which were participated by students from Bicol

University and from other private schools were concerned with the Constitutional Convention and these rallies were peaceful. However, the possibility of provocateurs infiltrating student held demonstrations is not remote. The number of students who attended rallies in Legazpi City would not reach a thousand. Furthermore the students came in school uniforms and they usually grouped themselves in mass formations. It was also revealed in this study that most of the riots took place in the late evening. This could be prevented if rallies would terminate during the early part of the evening.

The offices of the mayors of Legazpi City and the municipality of Daraga are always open for conferences with student leaders and student groups. Perhaps it would be feasible to adopt the requirement of the mayor of Manila that applicants for a permit to rally would present a resolution approved by their respective student councils. The mayor of the municipality of Daraga is also the President of the Bicol University Alumni Association and therefore makes him a member of the Board of Regents of the university.

Student groups in Manila, as revealed in this study, held rallies in front of Malacanang, Congress and the American Embassy. There are no counterparts of those offices within the province of Albay.

While there is no student representation on the Board of Regents as there is in the Philippine College of Commerce and the University of the Philippines, it is a common practice among the schools to involve student leaders in the planning and implementation

of school activities. Students in the College of Education vote for their student leaders as well as their faculty advisors. This system seems to work better than the former practice of having the school administration appoint the faculty advisors to the school organizations. The office of the Dean of Student Affairs coordinates all school activities and supervises student elections. This office plans with student leaders all the activities which will be carried on during the academic year. By so doing, there is the possibility that this office might be able to know whether student activism is a possibility.

Immediate Implications of the Martial Law

It seems that currently there is nothing that the students and school administrators can do but follow the orders coming from the President of the Philippines and from the Department of Education and Culture. Whether faculty members and students have been dropped or removed from the rolls would be difficult to determine. Rallies and demonstrations are banned, every member of the academic community is identified with ID cards, parcels or packages being carried inside the school campus are inspected, and student councils are not allowed to exist or to publish their school organs.

A report stated that private universities and colleges have registered as much as fifty per cent decrease in their student enrollment in Manila.[1] The decrease was caused by: (1) martial law,

[1]"Enrolment Down in City Schools," Philippine Times, June 30, 1973.

(2) financial problems, and (3) highly selective admissions started by private institutions. It has been impossible to determine whether this enrollment drop was also reflected at the Bicol University and in the private schools in the region. Since there was a decrease in student population in Manila, there might be an increase of enrollment in the provinces, however the Bicol University can not take as many students as it wants because it has limited classrooms, library facilities, faculty members, and appropriations. As stated earlier, the university has already limited the number of students to be enrolled in the different colleges by means of entrance examinations.

The new regulation of the Department of Education and Culture which requires undergraduates to work for five weeks in the barrios as a prerequisite for graduation, is not entirely a new idea for the units of the Bicol University. What is new is that such community activities is a requirement for all colleges and universities.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The study reported here was an attempt to present student activism in the Philippines with emphasis on the years 1969 to 1971. It sought to answer the following questions: (1) Did student activism begin in the colleges and universities? (2) Did student activism primarily concerned demands from the schools for changes? (3) Was there evidence to indicate that there was more student involvement among the private institutions than in government schools? (4) What happened to the student leaders?

It was motivated by a recommendation made by the Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education 1970 which stated that there was a need for a study of student activism in the Philippines.

The method of approach was historical analysis. Data were grouped gathered from books, magazines, and newspapers written by Filipinos as the first choice and from other materials written by other authors as the second choice. The data were compiled, analyzed, collated, and then presented in this study.

The study included the geographical, historical, socio-economic and political factors as well as a brief presentation of the educational system in the Philippines from Spanish times to 1971. As data were available, student activism before 1969 was

presented for each political administration to provide more background materials.

Summary of student activism. In 1870 , the Juventud Escolar Liberal of the University of Santo Tomas asked for better methods of instruction, competent professors, and updated academic offerings. The demands were not met because there was a change of Governor-General.

During the American regime, a group of students from the University of the Philippines, in 1918, protested against an editorial written about the First Filipino president of the state university. The editor retracted his statement. The leader of this group of students was later on Philippine Ambassador to the United States, fourth president of the United Nations Assembly, Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Secretary of Education and President, University of the Philippines.

Some students of the Manila North High School went on strike in 1930. The cause was an American teacher's remark which was considered an insult to the Filipino students. The teacher was sent back to America, and the student leaders were suspended, which was a lighter penalty than the expected expulsion from the public schools. One of the leaders of the strike was later on a vice-president of the Philippine Air Lines, the flag-carrier of the Republic of the Philippines.

The students of the University of the Philippines were active during the period of Commonwealth. In 1932 the members of

the Writers Club, supported by the editor of the school organ of the university, criticized the president of the state university for the expulsion of a student who was responsible for writing a poem which was considered obscene by the school administration. He later became a nationally known poet. One member of the Writers Club later on was a president of the state university. Vinzons, the editor of the school organ, organized the Young Philippines, and two of its members later became presidents of the republic--Macapagal and Marcos. Vinzons became a lawyer, a delegate to the 1935 Constitutional Convention, a governor, a congressman and was finally executed by the Japanese for his guerilla activities in 1941. The Young Philippines was the first student organization which became a political party but it was not able to compete with the existing political party, the Nacionalista Party, in terms of the party branches in the provinces. Vinzons led rallies against the Senate and President Quezon, and was in favor of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act. The students of the University of the Philippines during Vinzons time were interested in the kind of political independence the Philippines would have in 1946.

The Commonwealth period was interrupted by the Japanese occupation. The KALIBAPI was the only organization at that time, but the organization was able to initiate projects in food production, propagation of the Philippine national language and the teaching about Filipino heroes. Whether this organization, which was composed of both young and adults, had some semblance of

student activism was difficult to determine. The KALIBAPI became the People's Party, the only political party of this particular regime. The Party was disbanded when the American forces arrived and defeated the Japanese forces in the Philippines.

Student activism before 1969 was characterized by separate groups of students protesting for backpay, amnesty, and parity rights. Amnesty was given to the political prisoners but it was difficult to determine whether the student groups had anything to do with it. The members of Congress got their backpay and parity rights were given to American citizens.

A group of students protested in front of Malacanang against the plan to remove Defense Secretary Magsaysay from office. Again it was difficult to determine whether this student group influenced in any way President Quirino's decision to retain Magsaysay. One of the student leaders in this protest demonstration later became the executive-secretary to President Marcos.

It was during the elections in 1953 that student leaders became involved in the presidential political campaigns. The MPYM (Magsaysay for President Youth Movement) was organized on a national level but the organization ended when Magsaysay became president. At that time there was fear of a Communist take-over of the country and the investigation of suspected Communists was to reach its height during the administration of President Garcia. It was also during this time that the SCAP (Student Councils Association of the Philippines) was split because the organization

meddled with politicians. The NUSP (National Union of Students of the Philippines) was then organized with the biggest membership and later identified as a "moderate" group.

A group of students held a demonstration in front of the Indonesian Embassy in Manila during President Garcia's administration. The cause: Huk leader Saulo sought sanctuary in the embassy. Saulo later surrendered to the Philippine government because of the representations made by the Philippines. Saulo served some time in prison and was later an instructor at the Ateneo de Manila University.

Another student group led by the SCAUP (Student Council Association of the University of the Philippines) protested the CAFA (Committee on Anti-Filipino Activities) hearings in Congress. Most of these students came from the University of the Philippines. The CAFA was investigating some of alleged subversive articles written by faculty members and students of that institution. It was difficult to determine what happened because of this incident. Another group of university students gave Cuban Charge D'Affairs Avino Soler an angry send off at the Manila International Airport. Soler was declared persona non grata by the Philippine government.

Students protested the appointment of Carlos P. Romulo as the president of the University of the Philippines, but President Macapagal appointed Romulo anyway. Then in 1962 Senator Raul S. Manglapus said before the World Conference of Pax Romana at Montivedeo, Uruguay that student demonstrations in the

Philippines, particularly in Manila, were absent because there was no gap in the quantity of leadership in the Philippines.

In 1964 a group of students held a demonstration in front of Malacanang and the American Embassy to denounce the Laurel-Langley Agreement and Parity Amendment. The demonstrators clashed with the Presidential Guard Battalion at the Malacanang grounds. This demonstration spearheaded the birth of the KM (Kabataan Makabayan) which would later become the most militant, outspoken and radical Left organization. The KM, on December 27, 1964 and on January 25, 1965 led the demonstrations against the special relations between the American and Philippine governments.

President Marcos' administration faced a multitude of problems. Some of these problems were those of the previous administrations as follows: peace and order, rising prices of commodities, unemployment, school crises, graft and corruption in the government and the presence of American military bases.

On October 4, 1966, students held demonstrations in front of the Manila Hotel and of the American Embassy. This was considered the high point of student protest against American intervention in the Vietnam War. Several students were clubbed by the police. A congressional inquiry, made later, pinpointed the student demonstrators as the source of the provocation. The KM led a protest rally on police brutality on November 3.

The members of the Partisans (students of the University of the Philippines) protested the experiments being made by the

Dow Chemical Company in Mt. Makiling. The company finally cancelled its contract with the state university. One of the leaders of the Partisans was suspended because, with three other students, he draped the oblation. The suspension was lifted when other students led a demonstration against the President of the state university.

The year 1968 was marked with a world-wide phenomena of student activism in France, Italy, Spain, Czechoslovakia, West Germany, Yugoslavia, England, Brazil, Mexico, Uruguay, Israel, Egypt, the United States, and Japan. The causes of student activism were varied. It ranged from a dance brawl to specific protests against school policies.

During the same year, three schools in the Philippines, all in the provinces, experienced student unrest which was reportedly led by the KM, as an experiment to nation-wide application. The protest was against school policies and it was not reported whether the students were able to get what they were asking from the school administrations.

Student activism in 1969 began when the Manila Public School Teachers Association's strike ended. The causes of student unrest were: loss of press freedom (Far Eastern University), transfer of a teacher to another assignment, suspension of students who failed to pay their tuition fees and failure of the school administration to fire incompetent professors (De La Salle College) and irrelevance of the curricula (Ateneo de Manila University). The NUSP, CONDA (Conference Delegates Association) and the

Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation held a demonstration in front of Congress asking for land reform, justice and peace. Most of the demands of the student leaders at the Far Eastern University and De La Salle College were granted by their respective school administration. There was no result from the Ateneo. The demands of the three organizations which held a demonstration in front of Congress would continue to be ignored.

University presidents and college deans conferred with the Secretary of Education on how to meet student activism, however, there was no report on what transpired in this conference.

The YSAB (Youth and Student Affairs Board) was organized as the government's answer for the students' clamor for participation in public affairs. Three national organizations refused to join the board which was later dissolved because it was rocked with scandals, purportedly caused by two members of the board.

Preparations were made by the Department of Education, heads of colleges and universities, the Philippine Constabulary, and the mayors for massive demonstrations in July which did not materialize. The Supreme Court handed down a decision outlawing "howling" demonstrations as a means of securing administrative changes in schools. A Magna Carta for Students was vetoed by President Marcos because the bill was more in favor of the school administration than the students. The Philippine College of Commerce emerged as a new center of activism because, among other things, there was academic support coming from the President of

the college and some faculty members who joined student demonstrations. Among the Philippine College of Commerce led demonstrations was one in front of Malacanang asking for the President to release the funds for state colleges and universities. The President promised to release the funds but this promise was not fulfilled. The year 1969 ended with the student demonstration on December 29 in front of the American Embassy. The result of the riot: three students from the University of the Philippines were arrested; bond for these students were raised by the National Press Club and private individuals. The state university student council issued a manifesto protesting police brutality. About fifty faculty members from the same university, led by President Lopez, met with the mayor of Manila. The result of the meeting was a lecture from the mayor on rules which should govern the conduct of students and policemen during demonstrations.

Student activism in 1970 began on January 7 with a rally in front of Malacanang protesting the rise of fascism. Students came from the University of the Philippines and Lyceum of the Philippines. There was no untoward incident.

The NUSP led a rally in front of Congress for a non-partisan 1971 Constitutional Convention on January 26. Other groups were present and rioting followed after President and Mrs. Marcos went out of the legislative building. In the free-for-all that followed, both students and police agents were hurt as a result, and the NUSP demanded the resignation of certain high

government officials. President Marcos instructed law enforcement officials to be more tolerant with student demonstrators and Manila Mayor Villegas announced that the Manila police would stay away from demonstrations. A joint committee from Congress investigated the incident and reported that the police had provoked the students.

Groups of citizens, other than students, held demonstrations in front of Malacanang, for example, a group of faculty members who came from the University of the Philippines and led by President Lopez was reportedly reprimanded by President Marcos.

The January 30 incident was marked by the death of four students and the arrests of about 300 demonstrators. This incident occurred during the time that the President was conferring with student leaders, Jopson and Ilagan of the moderate groups, at Malacanang. The radical groups were holding their demonstrations in front of Malacanang and then at the American Embassy. What really happened was difficult to determine for some of the students who were returning from the demonstrations in front of the American Embassy were able to capture a fire truck which they use to destroy Gate 4 of Malacanang and set off several explosions inside Malacanang grounds. The result: not one of the victims' assailants were ever apprehended or identified. Reactions from the different segments of the society were as follows: (1) Two senators belonging to opposite political parties criticized President Marcos for calling the demonstration Communist-inspired. (2) Former Ambassador Mutuc believed that student activism had matured and was now

involved in seeking the solutions to the problems that plagued Philippine society. (3) Three presidents of universities favored student demonstrations without violence for student demonstrations were expressing what was wrong with the society. (4) The NUSP and NSL (National Students League) declared that their organizations' objectives were for reforms through peaceful means. The January 30 incident also polarized the student organizations into two groups: those on the Left advocated reforms through violence and those with the moderate groups sought reforms through peaceful means. The Armed Forces of the Philippines would later identify the following: KM, SDK (Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan), and the NSL as the organizations farthest to the Left. The NUSP, CONDA, College Editors Guild, and the SUCCOR (Students Crusade for Constitutional Reforms) belong to the Right and the rest of the student organizations to the left-of-center.

A mass teach-in was held on February 12 at Plaza Miranda. This was initiated by the MDP (Movement for a Democratic Philippines). The demands were nationalistic and only one dealt with the schools. Most of the participants in the rally belonged to the radical and militant organizations.

There was a sit-in on February 17 staged by the United Youth and Student Front in Congress demanding, among other things, the publications of the assets and liabilities of President Marcos and other high ranking officials of the Armed Forces of the Philippines. That same day, three separate groups picketed Malacanang;

each had its own set of demands.

President Marcos ordered three of his cabinet secretaries to investigate several government offices but the result of these investigations was never revealed.

The so-called "People's Congress" was held on February 18. Planned with other groups--labor, peasantry and market vendors--the teach-in was held in Plaza Miranda. The rally against the ills of the government ended with a march to the American Embassy where vandalism of private and public property was estimated at 500,000 pesos; seventy-two demonstrators were arrested and the American Ambassador Byroade protested to the Philippine government about the destruction made at the floor of the American Embassy. The Philippine government apologized and paid for the damages.

The next "People's Congress" on February 23 began with a legal battle for a permit to rally. The Supreme Court decided in favor of Manila Mayor Villegas that a permit to rally could be denied if there was a present and constant danger to destruction to property. The MDP marched to the American Embassy and there was again a clash between the police and the student demonstrators. This was also the time when the police raided the Philippine College of Commerce in search of demonstrators who had fled and sought the sanctuary of the college. About forty students and employees of the college were arrested but they were released later.

Among those suspected of instigating student demonstrations were the Jesuits, however, they denied the accusations even though

there was some evidence to support the accusation, such as, (1) the presence of former Huk leaders as teachers at the Ateneo de Manila University, (2) a course on the techniques of demonstration, and (3) Ateneo students as leaders of demonstrations. Nothing came out of these accusations.

The so-called "People's March" was held on March 3 and it was participated in by radical student groups led by the KM. The specific reason for the march was vague but it was reported that the march was designed to exhort the masses into deciding the kind of change they wanted. There was again a clash between the police and students when the groups tried to cross the boulevard leading to the American Embassy. During this march an infiltrator, identified as a police agent, was caught and nearly lynched by the students.

The NUSP on March 16 held a demonstration in front of the NACIDA (National Cottage Industries Development Authority) protesting the management of the government office. The administratrix resigned.

The "Poor People's march" and the "People's Court" were student-led on March 17 with speeches against the Establishment given by student, labor, and peasant representatives. When the group attempted to reach the American Embassy, they were dispersed with tear gas bombs used by the law enforcement agents.

The month of April saw two protest graduation exercises. The first one was staged by students from Sta. Scholastica College who refused to take the comprehensive examinations. Instead they

had their own graduation ceremonies with the Secretary of Education. The second one was at the University of the Philippines where the leaders of the protest were cum laude graduates who came with placards and a manifesto criticizing the kind of education they got from the state university. The graduation ceremonies were peaceful.

The months of May and June were vacation months. Some of the student activists were reportedly living with the people so they could get first-hand information about their plight and at the same time explain to them why they were in such condition. A group of students led by the Christian Socialist Movement acted as vigilantes in Congress. The group was able to put pressure on the legislators to enact a bill banning the importation of non-essentials and influenced the solons to come to work regularly.

The June 12 (Independence Day) march was peaceful. The MDP new battle cry was: Release Nilo Tayag. Tayag was the KM chairman who was arrested and charged with violations of the Anti-Subversion Act.

Classes in July were postponed because the private schools wanted to increase their tuition fees and the students threatened to hold massive demonstrations; the government was trying to formulate some remedial measures in arresting the rising cost of education and educational supplies. There was no immediate student demonstration; the private schools increased their tuition fees; and the Congress was unable to come out with a bill favorable to the students. The Tuition Fee Act which was enacted later did not

stop the increase in tuition fees.

September and October were the months when student activism was characterized by a number of separate protests and demonstrations on the university row. The causes were varied: better school facilities, government inaction on the student killing last year at the January 30 incident, salary adjustments for teachers, and lower tuition fees. It was never reported whether all the demands were met by the school administrations concerned. It was also in October when public school teachers and employees of the Philippine Air Lines went on strike.

By November, twelve student councils from Manila universities and colleges and their elected presidents were considered to be radicals. They organized the STAND (Student Alliance for National Democracy), a group which criticized the NUSP and passed resolutions which were anti-Establishment. The fate of the STAND was difficult to determine.

The November elections of the delegates to the 1971 Constitutional Convention was not satisfactory to the NUSP which had worked to make it non-partisan. The results indicated that the delegates were either backed up by the local politicians or were relatives of the political stalwarts and the moneyed class. The NUSP planned to create a strong pressure group so that the delegates, no matter how politically motivated they were, would write a Constitution which was responsive to the needs of the masses. The Constitution was finally finished in November, 1972 and ratified by the Citizens Assembly. This occurred after the martial law was declared by

President Marcos.

In December the reason for student demonstrations was the killing of a scholar of the Philippine Science High School and the black-listing of student leaders throughout the country. For the first time a suspect for the killing was caught, but he posted and jumped bail. Whether the blacklisted students were allowed to enroll in their colleges and universities was difficult to determine.

Student activism in January 1971 was caused by the jeepney drivers' strike. The January 13 sympathy demonstration at Plaza Miranda resulted in three students being killed, forty wounded and twenty others arrested and charged in criminal cases by the police. The biggest number of students arrested came from the College of Forestry and College of Agriculture of the University of the Philippines at Los Banos, Laguna.

Student activists from fifteen colleges and universities in Manila picketed the opening day on Congress on January 15. There was no untoward incident despite the fact that another group identified as pro-Marcos was present. The police and law enforcement agents were almost as numerous as the students.

On January 30, 1971, students celebrated the incident of the previous year. The students again were joined by labor and peasant organizations. They were asking for government action on the four students killed a year before. Although the mothers of the two students spoke before the rallyists, the rally was peaceful.

From February 1 to 8, classes were suspended at the

University of the Philippines. Militant and radical student groups who were sympathizing with the jeepney drivers' strike set up barricades on campus. Each time the police would attempt to remove the barricades, there would be clashes between students and the police. It was only after the police were withdrawn from the school campus that the Diliman commune was ended. A member of the faculty shot a student to death at the height of the demonstration.

Similar incidents happened at the Ateneo de Manila University, De La Salle College, and the University of Santo Tomas, but there were no reports of students from those schools being killed.

By April, the KM, MDP and students from the Philippine College of Commerce staged a rally in front of Malacanang. The issue: justice for a missing KM activist and release of two million pesos for the college. The demonstration was peaceful at first until unidentified persons exploded pill box bombs among the demonstrators. The result was the death of another demonstrator and injury to eleven others.

On May 1, which is Labor Day in the Philippines, a rally participated in by students and laborers ended in tragedy. The police shot the demonstrators who were trying to haul down the Philippine flag in front of Congress, and the police kept on shooting even when the demonstrators were running away. Three of the demonstrators were killed. The Senate passed a resolution expressing its outrage over the use of guns and other deadly weapons during student demonstrations. President Marcos ordered an investigation and he banned

the Metrocom (Metropolitan Command) from the site of the demonstrations. Those who killed the three demonstrators were never apprehended. A demonstration protesting the May 1 killing was held on May 8. Similar rallies were held in Marawi City, Tacloban, Cebu, Pampanga, Tarlac and Baguio. The rallies were peaceful.

On May 15, the Philippine Constabulary Chief directed all the personnel under his command to observe, listen, and record proceedings in demonstrations, teach-ins, and seminars. Those who committed crimes as defined in the Revised Penal Code were to be prosecuted. On the other hand, Manila Mayor Villegas announced that student demonstrators in Manila would not be arrested for the mere use of inflammatory words during the rallies.

In June, students picketed the Manila Hotel where the delegates to the Constitutional Convention would meet for the first time. There were no untoward incidents. In July, students of the Ateneo de Manila University, led by the KM, protested the firing of two professors and expulsion proceedings started against students who led the boycott of classes. It is not known what happened to the professors and to the students who were under expulsion order.

Finally on August 21, a mass arrest of student leaders and individuals identified especially with the KM was made. The immediate cause was the bombing of the Liberal Party rally at Plaza Miranda where nine were killed and 129 were wounded. Among the suspects were the student leaders of the leftist organizations. By 1972 about fifty student leaders were still at large, and

President Marcos ordered the military tribunals to try them in absentia.

The student leaders who were arrested are now in jail. Two former student leaders are working in mainland China, one is in the United States, another one is in Rome. Sison, former KM chairman and reported as the Communist Party chieftain in the Philippines, has a government price for his capture.

Not one of the student leaders identified with the moderate groups was arrested. Jopson is serving his second term as President of the NUSP, Ilagan, a president of the NSL, is a movie actress. Two former heads of the University of the Philippines Student Council are lawyers. One of them, Garcia, was a delegate to the 1971 Constitutional Convention.

The other side of student activism and least publicized was a project of the Department of Education which had been going on for five years. Student volunteers came from the various colleges and universities of Manila. They lived and worked with the farmers.

The MDP (Movement for a Democratic Philippines) helped distribute food, clothing, and medicine to the flood victims of the Central Luzon provinces in July 1972.

Implications for Bicol University. The Bicol University is the only state-supported university in the Bicol Region. Before and after the university was formed and consolidated the first four existing schools did not experience violent student activism.

There are no counterparts of Plaza Miranda, Malacanang,

Congress and the American Embassy in the province of Albay and there was no evidence of violent student activism from the local private schools. The rallies which were participated in by the students from the Bicol University were peaceful.

The four original schools, now colleges, have certain community projects integrated in their curricula. It is also a common practice among these schools to involve student leaders in the planning and implementation of school activities. It might be desirable to adopt the policy of President Lopez of the University of the Philippines of continuing dialogue with students on demands that are negotiable.

A requirement of the Department of Education and Culture for the school year 1973-1974 has some similar characteristics to the original project of the Department and the Community Schools projects. It is mandatory for college undergraduates to work for five weeks among the inhabitants of the villages of the Philippines. The work activities involved are not new to the Bicol University.

Conclusions

1. Student activism did begin in the colleges and universities. For example, the earliest form of student unrest was in 1870 at the University of Santo Tomas, then followed by the students at the University of the Philippines in 1918. In 1969, student activism was found in the Far Eastern University, Lyceum of the Philippines, De La Salle College--all located in Manila.

2. Student activism was not primarily related to college issues. While student groups were found to protest high tuition fees, inferior school facilities, campus autocracy and irrelevant curricula, the other issues which the student groups had demanded such as backpay, amnesty, parity rights, special relations between the United States and the Philippines, Vietnam War, land reform, non-partisan Constitutional Convention, and reform in government offices indicated that the student groups were not primarily concerned about themselves as students. For example, the January 1971 student activism was a sympathy demonstration with the jeepney drivers' strike.

3. There was evidence of more student involvement among private institutions than state-supported institutions. For example, the government schools which were actively involved were the University of the Philippines and the Philippine College of Commerce. Among the private schools were: Far Eastern University, Lyceum of the Philippines, De La Salle College, Ateneo de Manila University and the University of Santo Tomas. In terms of student organizations, the membership of the NUSP (National Union of Students of the Philippines) is composed of more sectarian schools than public.

4. There were two groups of student leaders who have achieved national prominence or notoriety. These were: (1) those who have later on occupied important positions in the government and (2) those who were in jail or wanted by the government for having violated certain laws of the land. More student leaders from 1969

to 1971 belonged to the second category.

Recommendations

1. Law enforcement agents may be needed to maintain peace and order during student demonstrations. A highly trained group of police officers, selected purposely for policing demonstrations might do the job.

2. When student demands and procedures or techniques used in seeking reforms or redress of grievances are legal, appropriate, and reasonable, then these should be supported, but not to the point of alienating other segments of society.

3. School heads should meet with student leaders as soon as possible and be sincere with what can be done about student problems.

4. The Bicol University should (a) continue involving students and student leaders in planning and implementing school activities, (b) continue the practice of meeting all the student leaders from the various units for "gripe" sessions, (c) always keep channels of communication open for students, faculty members, and school administrators, and (d) consider the adoption of the policy of President Lopez of the University of the Philippines of continuing dialogue with students on demands that are negotiable.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. Study the characteristics of the Filipino activists

based on Keniston's findings of other student activists.

2. Study student organizations in the Philippines, especially those which had been identified as national groups.

3. Study the universities in the Philippines on the basis of the five types described by Fischer.

4. Study Philippine colleges and universities based on Keniston's findings of factors on campus that promote student activism.

5. Study Philippine colleges and universities based on the list made by a group of foreign student advisers in the United States to determine that contributions were made to the Philippines by the alumni of those schools who have studied in the United States.

6. Update the list of Philippine colleges and universities prepared by a group of foreign student advisers, adding all Philippine colleges and universities to the list.

7. Study the socio-economic origins of Filipino college students in selected colleges and universities in the Philippines.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

Adams, Walter. The Test. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1971.

Alip, Eufronio M. Philippine History: Political, Social, Economic. Alip and Sons, 1969.

Aron, Raymond. The Elusive Revolution: Anatomy of a Student Revolt. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969.

Baldridge, Victor J. ed. Academic Governance. California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1971.

Bander, Edward ed. Turmoil on the Campus. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1970.

Barzun, Jacques and Henry F. Graff. The Modern Researcher. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1970.

Bazaco, Evergisto. History of Education in the Philippines. Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press, 1953.

Brickman, William W. and Stanley Lehrer, eds. Conflict and Change on the Campus: The Response to Student Hyperactivism. New York: School and Society Books, 1970.

Budig, Gene A. and Stanley G. Rives. Academic Quicksand: Some Trends and Issues in Higher Education. Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications Inc., 1973.

Bureau of Public Schools. Service Manual. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1960.

Califano, Joseph A. Jr., The Student Revolution: A Global Confrontation. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1970.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Dissent and Disruption: Proposals for Consideration by the Campus. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Corpuz, Onofre. The Philippines. New Jersy: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Costa, Horacio de la. The Background of Nationalism and Other Essays. Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House, 1965.

Cruz, Andres Cristobal, ed. Editorials '69: Selections from the Manila Press. Manila: National Library, 1969.

Cutshall, Alden. The Philippines: Nation of Islands. New Jersey: Van Nostand, 1964.

Deconde, Alexander, ed. Student Activism: Town and Gown in Historical Perspective. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971.

Eells, Walter Crosby. Communism in Education: In Asia, Africa, and the Far Pacific. Washington, D.D.: American Council on Education, 1954.

Elevazo, A.O. and T.N. Boquiren, eds. Directions for Philippine Education in the Seventies. Manila: Phil Delta Kappa Chapter and Philippine Association for Graduate Education, 1971.

Erlich, John and Susan Erlich, eds. Student Power: Participation and Revolution . New York: Association Press, 1970.

Fischer, Joseph. Universities in Southeast Asia: An Essay on Comparison and Development. Ohio: A Kappa Delta Pi Publication, 1964.

Fresnoza, Florencio P. and Canuto P. Casim. Essentials of Philippine Educational System. Manila: Abiva Publishing House, Inc., 1964.

Golay, Frank H., ed. Philippine-American Relations. Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House, 1966.

Guthrie, George M., ed. Six Perspectives in the Philippines. Manila: Bookmark, 1968.

Kuhn, Delia and Ferdinand Kuhn. The Philippines: Yesterday and Today. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Lipset, Seymour Martin and Philip G. Altback, eds. Students in Revolt. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. Rebellion in the University. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971.

Manglapus, Raul S. Revolt Against Tradition. Edited by Redolfo Severino, Jr. Manila: N.P., 1964.

Majul, Cesar Adib. Apolinario Mabini: Revolutionary. Manila: National Heroes Commission, 1964.

McGrath, Earl J. Should Students Share the Power: A Study of Their Role in College and University Governance. Philiadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970.

Miller, Michael V. and Susan Gilmore, eds. Revolution at Berkeley. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1965.

Molina, Antonio M. The Philippines Through the Centuries. Manila: U.S.T. Cooperative, 1961.

Philippine Board of National Education. General Education Policies. report of the Board for 1955 tc 1957. Manila: Phoenix Press, 1958.

Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education. Education for National Development: New Patterns, New Directions. Manila: The Commission, 1970.

Reposo, Epifania R. Castro. The Role of Universities in the Developing Philippines. New York: Asia Publishing House, Inc., 1971.

Romero, Ma. Corona and Julita Sta. Romana. Rizal and Philippine Nationalism. Manila: St. Anthony Book Service, 1969.

Schwartz, Edward, ed. Student Power: A Collection of Readings. Washington: United States National Student Association, 1969.

Skolnick, Jerome H. The Politics of Protest. New York: Ballantine Books, INc., 1969.

The Population Council and the International Institute for the Study of Human Reproduction. Country Profile: The Philippines. New York: The Population Council, 1970.

Unesco, Higher Education and Development in South-East Asia. Vol. II.Bangkok: Unesco, 1967.

Unesco/Minedas. Report on Education in the Philippines. Manila: Department of Education (Philippines), 1971.

Wallerstein, Immanuel and Paul Starr, eds. The University Crisis Reader. Vintage Books. New York: Random House, Inc., 1971.

Wilcox, Lee, ed. The Evaluation of Asian Educational Credentials, A Workshop Report: Japan, India, the Philippines, and Taiwan. New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1966.

Zaide, Gregorio F. Philippine Political and Cultural History. Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1957.

B. Magazines and Journals

_____. "14 Per Cent of Colleges Have Students as Trustees," Chronicle of Higher Education, November 13, 1972.

_____. "A Nation Rises Against Fascism," Graphic, May 26, 1971.

Abaya, Hernando, "U.P. Spells Out the Issues," Graphic, April 8, 1970.

Abaya, Hernando, "Marcos Misread the Times," Graphic, February 25, 1970.

Abesamis, Ma. Elena H. "A Confrontation in the Academe," Sunday Times Magazine, February 9, 1969.

Abuang, Benjamin V. "The Storming of Gate 4," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970.

Acosta, Carmencita H. "The First Nationalist Student Group," Variety, February 23, 1969.

_____. "Activist Missing," Philippines Free Press, April 10, 1971.

_____. "Activists Stage Demos at Palace, Congress," Philippines Free Press, April 24, 1971.

Aguilar, Mila D. "Revolt in the Universities," Graphic, October 28, 1970.

Aguilar, Mila D. "January 13: View of the Impending Avalanche," Graphic, January 17, 1971.

Aguilar, Mila D. "The Liberation of the State University," Graphic, February 24, 1971.

Aguilar, Mila D. and Petronilo Bn. Daroy, "The Diliman Commune," Graphic, February 24, 1971.

Aguilar, Mila D. "Who's Afraid of the Fascist Beast?" Graphic, June 9, 1971.

Baledo, Erlinda, "The Case of the Missing Activists," Manila Bulletin, July 30, 1972.

Baluyot, Mario M. "The Movement's Leaders: Where Are They Now?" Graphic, July 14, 1971.

Baun, Wilfredo S. "The Truncheon Prevails," Graphic, May 20, 1970.

Baun, Wilfredo S. "The Nilo Tayag Case," Graphic, October 7, 1970.

Benigno, Teodoro, "Student Activism from the City to Countryside," Sunday Times Magazine, May 14, 1972.

Beo, Juanito M. "Brewing Social Unrest in Bicolandia," Philippines Free Press, April 29, 1972.

Bettelheim, Bruno, "The College Student Rebellion: Explanation and Answers," Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1969.

Bicol Universitarian, March, 1972.

Bicol Universitarian, July-August, 1972.

Bicol Universitarian, Summer, 1973.

Braden, Samuel E. "The Impact of Student Unrest on Teacher Education As Viewed by a President," Contemporary Education, October, 1969.

Bulletin of Information 1971-1972, Bicol University.

Caparas, D.Y. "A Question of Jurisdiction," Sunday Times Magazine, October 26, 1969.

Ces, Manuel H. "Troops, Demonstrators Clash in US Embassy," Philippines Free Press, June 3, 1972.

Ces, Manuel H. "Battle of Mendiola: 1st Anniversary," Philippines Free Press, February 13, 1971.

Cevallos, F.M. "The Youth Have Something To Tell You," Variety, February 9, 1969.

Cevallos, F.M. "The Way To Deal With Student Power," Variety, February 9, 1969.

_____. "Circus for a Revolution," Graphic, June 23, 1971.

Colayco, Aloysius B. "A Bit of a Blast," Philippines Free Press, October 17, 1970.

Constantino, Renato, "The Students and Masses: A Historical Juncture," Graphic, March 18, 1970.

Corpuz, Onofre D. "Student Power in the Philippines, A Perspective," General Education Journal, December, 1969.

Crisostomo, Isabelo T. "The Philippine College of Commerce: A New Center of Activism," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970.

Crisostomo, Isabelo T. "The Making of a Radical," Graphic, July 14, 1971.

Crisostomo, Isabelo T. "Today's Rebels--Tomorrow's Reactionaries," Philippines Free Press, July 19, 1970.

Datuin, Greg M. "Response to Student Outcry," Weekly Nation, March 2, 1970.

Daroy, Petronilo Bn. "The Politics of a New Nation," Graphic, January 27, 1971.

Daroy, Petronilo Bn. "The Government and the Radicals," Graphic, February 25, 1970.

Daroy, Petronilo Bn. "Commune and Communards," Graphic, March 10, 1971.

Daroy, Petronilo Bn. "Two Decisions and the Idea of Order," Graphic, March 18, 1970.

Daroy, Petronilo Bn. "Legitimized Murder and Mass Imprisonment," Graphic, April 22, 1970.

Daroy, Petronilo Bn. "1st of May: Days of Anger, Sounds of Drums," Graphic, May 13, 1970.

Daroy, Petronilo Bn. "On the Eve of Changing of the Constitution," Graphic, May 26, 1970.

Daroy, Petronilo J. "Student Power: A World-Wide Phenomenon," Perspective, March, 1970.

Department of Public Information (Philippines). The New Society. Manila: National Production Center, no date.

Editorial, "The Time Calls for Sincerity, Sobriety," Graphic, February 16, 1970.

Editorial, "When Will the Lackeys of the Law Ever Learn How to Use Their Heads?" Graphic, February 17, 1971.

Editorial, "The Real Confrontation," Philippines Free Press,, February 21, 1970.

Editorial, "For the Students, Prudence is the Word of the Hour," Weekly Nation, March 2, 1970.

Editorial, "Who Hired Them?" Manila Times, March 5, 1970.

Editorial, "The Voice of Reason," Philippines Free Press, March 7, 1970.

Editorial, "Who Can Believe the President?" Philippines Free Press, March 14, 1970.

Editorial, "That Report on Student Demos Was Fine But--What Now?" Graphic, April 1, 1970.

Editorial, "Pickets, Demonstrations, Riots--An Assessment," Graphic, April 8, 1970.

Editorial, "The Voice of Moderation or Violence, Anyone?" Philippines Free Press, May 2, 1970.

Editorial, "Crisis in Education," Philippine Panorama, July 19, 1970.

Editorial, "Student Activism Need Re-Direction in Their Objectives," Philippine Panorama, October 11, 1970.

E. M. M. "Student Organizations and Their Affiliates," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970.

_____. "Exchange of Notes," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970.

Flores, A. O. "Student Militants Through the Years," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970.

_____. "FM Declares Martial Law," Philippines Sunday Express, September 24, 1972.

Formento, Bert, Jr., "Battle's Aftermath," Weekly Nation, February 16, 1970.

Galang, Ros M. "The Day The Campus Exploded," Variety, February 9, 1969.

Garcellano, Edel E. "Protest on the March," Graphic, March 18, 1970.

Garcia, Fr. Ed S.J. "The Battle of Mendiola," Action Now, February 28, 1970.

Garcia, Mila Astorga, "Worker-Student Unity: The New Alliance," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970.

Garcia, Mila Astorga, "Death of Enrique Sta. Brigida Merely Inspires Student Activists To Carry On," Sunday Times Magazine, April 5, 1970.

Garcia, Mila Astorga, "A Gathering of Militants," Sunday Times Magazine, December 13, 1970.

Goloy, Gloria G. "The Student in the Rally," Sunday Times Magazine, March 1, 1970.

Grecia, Dell H. "The Other Side of Student Activism," Weekly Nation, July 12, 1971.

Guerrero, Amadis Ma. "The Establishment and the Left," Graphic, February 25, 1970.

Guerrero, Amadis Ma. "Marcos and the Jesuit Subversives," Graphic, March 18, 1970.

Guerrero, Amadis Ma. "Deaths in U.S. Bases: Who Will Heal the Wounds?," Graphic, October 15, 1969.

Guevara, M. "The Right to Rally Needs No Permit," Weekly Nation, March 2, 1970.

Halleck, S. L. "Hypotheses of Student Unrest," Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1968.

Harvey, William, "College Students Today: Extremists or Activists?," Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1970.

Hentoff, Mat. "Why Students Want Their Constitutional Rights," Saturday Review, May 22, 1971.

Herras, Marcos, "Student Activism: Here and Abroad," Action Now, date of isse, missing.

Hizon, Ray M. "The Left in the Sixties," Graphic, February 25, 1970.

_____. "In the News," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970.

Johnstone, D. Bruce, "The Student and His Power," Journal of Higher Education, March, 1969.

Katigbak, Maria Kalaw, "The Jesuits and the Students," Weekly Nation, March 2, 1970.

Katz, Joseph and Nevitt Sandord, "Causes of the Student Rebellion," Saturday Review, December 18, 1965.

Kreuzer, James R. "A Student "Right' Examined," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, June, 1967.

Kuinisala, Edward, "Crisis and Credibility,: Philippines Free Press, May 2, 1970.

Kuinisala, Edward, "Roots of Discontent," Philippines Free Press, May 9, 1970.

Kuinisala, Edward, "Higher Tuition Fees?," Philippines Free Press, June 20, 1970.

Kuinisala, Edward, "January 25: Demo vs. Demo," Philippines Free Press, January 30, 1971.

Lacaba, Jose F. "The Clash of '69," Philippines Free Press, February 8, 1969.

Lacaba, Jose F. "Look Out, Sir, Student Power's Going To Break More Windows," Philippines Free Press, August 16, 1969.

Lacaba, Jose F. "The January 26 Confrontation," Philippines Free Press, February 7, 1970.

Lacaba, Jose F. "And the January 30 Insurrection," Philippines Free Press, February 7, 1970.

Lacaba, Jose F. "The Plaza Miranda Teach-in," Philippines Free Press, February 21, 1970.

Lacaba, Jose F. "More to Come?," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970.

Lacaba, Jose F. "Days of Disquiet, Nights of Rage," Philippines Free Press, March 7, 1970.

Lacaba, Jose F. "The People's March," Philippines Free Press, March 14, 1970.

Lacaba, Jose F. "The Via Dolorosa of Protest," Philippines Free Press, March 28, 1970.

Lacaba, Jose F. "Rain and Rhetoric of Revolution," Philippines Free Press, June 20, 1970.

Lewey, Guenter and Stanley Rothman, "On Student Power," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, September, 1970.

Lingad, Rep. Jose B. "The Students and the Huk Rebellion," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970.

Lim. Estefana Aldaba, "Filipino Adults Poor Models for Children," Philippine Panorama, November, 1970.

Locsin, Teodoro L. Jr., "No Metrocom, No Cops, Nobody Killed," Philippines Free Press, March 15, 1971.

Locsin, Teodoro M. "The Philippines Leadership and Poverty," Pacific Community, October, 1971.

Lo, Ricardo F. "The Right to be Heard," Sunday Times Magazine, April 19, 1970.

Lu, Nancy T. "The Night of the Truncheons," Sunday Times Magazine, February 15, 1970.

M.A.B.T. "The Anti-Poverty March and the People's Tribunal," Graphic, April 1, 1970.

Macutono, Ernesto, "Sons Against Fathers," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970.

Manila, Quijano de, "A Walk on the Wild Side," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970.

Manila, Quijano de, "The President States His Side," Philippines Free Press, March 7, 1970.

Martinez, Millet C. "The Student Emerge As the Decade's Reservoir of Hope and Energy," Graphic, December 28, 1969.

Martinez, Millet G. "A Protest Against Fascism," Sunday Times Magazine, February 1, 1970.

Martinez, Millet G. "Activists Behind Bars," Sunday Times Magazine, August 20, 1972.

Martinez, Millet G. "U.P. Graduates Stage a Pageant of Protest," Sunday Times Magazine, May 3, 1970.

Martinez, Millet G. "The Barricade Brigade," Sunday Times Magazine, February 28, 1971.

Mayuga, Sylvia L. "The Jesuit Dilemma," Philippines Free Press, July 31, 1971.

McCarthy, Maureen, "Student Power and the University Administration," Philippine Studies, October, 1969.

Methvin, Eugene, "Students Against Campus Violence," Reader's Digest, January, 1971.

Nakpil, Carmen Guerrero, "The Shedding of Innocence," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970.

Neff, Charles B. "The Administrative Challenge of the New Student Activism," Journal of Higher Education, February, 1968.

N.T.L. "Molotovs vs. Tear Gas," Sunday Times Magazine, March 8, 1970.

N.T.L. "The PCC Raid Puts the Academe in Crisis," Sunday Times Magazine, March 22, 1970.

Ohlsen, Merle M. "Dissident Students," Contemporary Education, February, 1971.

Osmena, Sergio, Jr.,"Not I," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970.

Patanne, E.P. "A Forestate of Revolution," Weekly Nation, February 16, 1970.

_____. "People's Congress: The Aftermath," Weekly Nation, March 2, 1970.

Rama, Napoleon, "Where the Demos Went Wrong," Philippines Free Press, March 14, 1970.

Ramos, Ethelwelda A. "The Rebel Graduates," Graphic, May 13, 1970.

Recah, Trinidad, "The Case Against Poverty," Sunday Times Magazine, April 5, 1970.

_____. "Reform or Revolution: Hard Choice in Philippines," U.S. News Digest & World Report,October 16, 1972.

Renner, Richard R. "Student Unrest in U.S. and Latin-American Countries," School and Society, Summer, 1965.

_____. "Revolution and Education in Latin America," Saturday Review, October 17, 1970.

Reyes, Fred, "Demos Fever Hits Campus Anew," Philippine Panorama, October 11, 1970.

Reyes, Fred, "Students Restive, Set More Demonstrations," Philippines Free Press, December 6, 1970.

Roces, Alejandro, "Student Leaders: Rebels With Many Causes," Progress, 1961.

Rockefeller, John D. "We Need Our Young Activists," Reader's Digest, August, 1970.

Ronquillo, B.P. "Uncertainty Over the Student Unrest Outlook and Possible Effects on Local Climate Worries Business," Weekly Nation, February 16, 1970.

Ronquillo B.P. "Student Movement Now a Major Factor in Influencing Business Barometers," Weekly Nation, March 2, 1970.

Rosario, S.D. del, "Who's Behind the Riots?," Graphic, February 16, 1970.

Rosca, Ninotchka, "The Irony of the Tanada-Agbayani Reports," Graphic, April 15, 1970.

Rowan, Carl T. "Storm Warnings in the Philippines," Reader's Digest, November, 1970.

Salanga, Alfredo, "Revolution or the Constitution?," Action Now, February 28, 1970.

Schick, Edgar B. "Campus Ferment and Tranquility," School and Society, February, 1972.

Schrag, Peter, "After Kent State: The First Hundred Days," Saturday Review, August 29, 1970.

Seeligson, R. Leslie, "University Jurisdiction to Discipline Students," Michigan Academician, Winter, 1972.

Sicam, Paulynn P. "Pickets Fail to Dampen Beauty Contest Crowd," Manila Chronicle, July 3, 1970.

_____. "Students Against the World," Saturday Review, August 17, 1968.

_____."Student Demos Restive Again," Philippines Free Press, December 19, 1970.

_____. "Student Leader, Filipino Activists in Red China Homesick," Philippines Free Press, April 29, 1972.

Suarez, Domini, "Education, 1970: At Critical Point?," Philippine Panorama, July 19, 1970.

Sumcad, Edwin, "The Filipino Youth Circa '69," Sunday Times Magazine, March 2, 1969.

Tagle, Mary R. "The Restless Youth of the Halycon Years," Sunday Times Magazine, February 23, 1969.

Tapales, Ramon Sr. "If the Intention of the Students Was to Resort to Violence, Why Did They Not Arm Themselves?," Weekly Nation, March 2, 1970.

Taylor, Harold, "The Student Rebellion," Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1969.

Teodoro, Pedro, "Higher Education Costs Less in Private Schools," Philippine Panorama, July 19, 1970.

Tinsay, Emcy Corteza, "Student Power: Why the Escalation," Perspective, March, 1970.

Tira, Mercedes A.B. "Militarization and Free Speech," Graphic, April 22, 1970.

Tira, Mercedes A.B. "Campus Beauties vs. Commercialized Maria Claras," Graphic, May 13, 1970.

Tira, Mercedes A.B. "The Activist Front: The Moderates and the Radicals," Graphic, June 17, 1970.

Tupas, Rodolfo, "The Rebels on the Campus," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970.

Tupas, Rodolfo, "No End in Sight for Student Unrest," Sunday Times Magazine, March 8, 1970.

Tupas, Rodolfo, "Causes and Effects of Poverty," Sunday Times Magazine, March 8, 1970.

Tupas, Rodolfo, "The Exercise of Restraint," Sunday Times Magazine, March 7, 1971.

Tutay, Filemon V. "What the Demonstrators Want and What the President Has Done So Far," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970.

Tutay, Filemon V. "Charges and Counter-Charges," Philippines Free Press, January 30, 1971.

U.S. News & World Report, January 31, 1972.

Valdepenas, Vicente B. "The Economic Challenge in the Philippines," Philippine Studies, April, 1968.

Vasquez, Cres, "Darkness or New Dawn at Diliman," Philippine Panorama, February 21, 1971.

_____. "When Presidents Answered a Questionnaire on Students," U.S News & World Report, June 19, 1972.

Yap, Emmanuel, "Nationalization: Road to Greatness and Internationalism," Solidarity, February, 1972.

Zapanta, P.A. "The Mentors Speak Out," Sunday Times Magazine, February 22, 1970.

C. Newspapers

"15 Youth Activists Reported Missing," Manila Times, May 22, 1972.

"Enrolment Down in City Schools," Philippine Times, June 30, 1972.

"Private Schools Increase Fees, Face Boycott," Philippine Times, January 15, 1972.

"Record Enrolment Forecast," Philippine Times, June 30, 1972.

"RP Students Attitude to Americans Unfavorable," Philippine Times, February 29, 1972.

"RP Youths Working in China," Manila Times, May 22, 1972.

"Student Activism Assessed," Manila Times, June 10, 1971.

"Tuition Fee Hikes Sets Off Campus Bombing," Philippine Times, January 31, 1972.

D. Unpublished Materials

Ang, Milda L. "A Study of Philippine Education and Its Developmental Role," Unpublished Dissertation, Boston College, 1971.

Boquiren, Telesforo N. "Educational Leadership Handbook for Philippine Public Schools," Unpublished Dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1973.

Medallada, Jacinto Arevalo, "Socio-Economic Development Practices Through the Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Taiwan, Japan, and Mexico and Their Applicability to the Bicol Region, Philippines," Unpublished Dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1968.

E. Public Documents

Charter of the Bicol University.

Code of Discipline, Bicol University.

Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines.

Department Order No. 30, series 1972, October 13, 1972.

General Order No. 1, September 22, 1972.

Letter of Authority No. 1, September 22, 1972.

Presidential Decree No. 6, September 27, 1972.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES IN THE PHILIPPINES, BY SPECIALIZATION SY 1970-1971*

Name and Location	Charter, Date Approved
State Universities	
1. Bicol University Legazpi City	R.A. No. 5521 June 21, 1969
2. Central Luzon State University Munoz, Nueva Ecija	R.A. No. 4067 June 18, 1964
3. Central Mindanao University Musuan, Bukidnon	R.A. No. 4498 June 19, 1965
4. Mindanao State University Marawi City	R.A. No. 3868 June 18, 1955
5. University of Eastern Philippines Catarman, Samar	R.A. No. 4126 June 20, 1964
6. University of Northern Philippines Vigan, Ilocos Sur	R.A. No. 4449 June 19, 1965
7. University of the Philippines Quezon City	Act No. 1870 June 18, 1908
Agricultural Colleges	
8. Don Severino Agricultural College Indang, Cavite	R.A. No. 3917 June 18, 1964
9. Mountain State Agricultural College La Trinidad, Benguet	R.A. No. 5923 June 21, 1969
10. Northern Luzon State College of Agri. Piat, Cagayan	R.A. No. 3104 June 17, 1961

*Source: Maria Milda L. Ang, "A Study of Philippine Education and Its Developmental Role," (unpublished dissertation, Boston College, 1971), pp. 130-134.

11. Palawan National Agricultural College Aborlan, Palawan	R.A. No. 3648 June 22, 1963

Arts and Trades Colleges

12. Bulacan College of Arts and Trades Malolos, Bulacan	R.A. No. 4470 June 19, 1965
13. Cagayan Valley College of Arts and Trades Tuguegarao, Cagayan	R.A. No. 5547 June 21, 1969
14. Philippine College of Arts and Trades Manila	R.A. No. 2237 June 17, 1959

Commercial College

15. Philippine College of Commerce Manila	R.A. No. 778 June 21, 1952

Normal Colleges

16. Central Luzon Teachers College Bayambang, Pangasinan	R.A. No. 5705 June 21, 1969
17. Philippine Normal College Manila	R.A. No. 416 July 1, 1949
18. West Visayas State College Iloilo City	R.A. No. 4189 May 4, 1965
19. Zamboanga Normal College Zamboanga City	R.A. No. 3272 June 17, 1961

Technological Colleges

20. Cagayan Valley Institute of Technology Cabagan, Isabela	R.A. No. 3442 June 18, 1961
21. Central Luzon Polytechnic College Cabanatuan City	R.A. No. 3998 June 18, 1964
22. Leyte Institute of Technology Tacloban City	R.A. No. 4572 June 19, 1965
23. Mindanao Institute of Technology Kabacan, Cotabato	R.A. No. 4127 June 20, 1965
24. Pablo Borbon Memorial Institute of Tech. Batangas City	R.A. No. 5270 June 15, 1968

25. Tarlac College of Technology Tarlac, Tarlac	R.A. No. 4337 June 19, 1965
Still organizing	
26. Naval Institute of Technology Naval, Leyte	R.A. No. 4309 June 19, 1965
27. Palawan Teachers College Puerto Princesa, Palawan	R.A. No. 4303 June 19, 1965
28. Palompon Institute of Technology Palompon, Leyte	-- --
29. Pampanga Agricultural College Magalang, Pampanga	R.A. No. 4576 June 19, 1965
30. University of the City of Manila Manila	R.A. No. 4196 Jan. 25, 1965

LIST OF PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN THE PHILIPPINES: SY 1970-1971

Name and Location	Year Founded	Raised to University
1. Araneta University, Manila	1946	1958
2. Arellano University, Malabon, Rizal	1938	1947
3. Centro Escolar University, Manila	1907	1930
4. Far Eastern University, Manila	1928	1934
5. Feati University, Manila	1946	1959
6. Foundation University, Dumaguete City	1949	1969
7. International Harvardian University Davao City	1951	--
8. Luzonian University, Lucena City	1947	1968
9. Manila Central University, Caloocan	1904	1948
10. Manuel L. Quezon University, Manila	1947	1948
11. National University, Manila	1900	1921
12. Philippine Women's University, Manila	1919	1932
13. Southwestern University, Cebu City	1946	1959
14. University of Baguio, Baguio City	1948	1969
15. University of the East, Manila	1946	1950
16. University of Iloilo, Iloilo City	1947	1968
17. University of Manila, Manila	1913	1921
18. University of Mindanao, Davao City	1947	1968
19. University of Negros Occidental Bacolod City	1941	1957

20. University of Nueva Caceres, Naga City	1948	1954
21. University of Pangasinan, Dagupan City	1926	1968
22. University of Southern Philippines Cebu City	1927	1949
23. University of Visayas, Cebu City	1919	1948
Catholic Universities		
24. Adamson University, Manila	1932	1941
25. Aquinas University, Legazpi City	1948	1968
26. Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City	1859	1959
27. Divine Word College, Tacloban City	1929	1966
28. Notre Dame University, Cotabato City	1946	1969
29. St. Louis University, Baguio City	1952	1963
30. University of San Agustin, Iloilo City	1904	1953
31. University of San Carlos, Cebu City	1595	1948
32. University of Santo Tomas, Manila	1611	1629
33. Xavier University, Cagayan de Oro City	1933	1958
Protestant Universities		
34. Central Philippine University, Iloilo	1905	1953
35. Silliman University, Dumaguete City	1901	1935

APPENDIX B

PHILIPPINE INSTITUTIONS AND LOCATIONS*

Group I

Ateneo de Manila (now university)	Manila
De La Salle College (now university)	Manila
Silliman University	Dumaguete
University of the Philippines	Quezon City

Group II

Adamson University	Manila
Ateneo de Davao	Davao
Centro Escolar University	Manila
Central Philippine University	Iloilo
Far Eastern University	Manila
FEATI	Manila
Holy Ghost College	Manila
Mapua Institute of Technology	Manila
Maryknoll College	Manila
Manuel L. Quezon University	Manila
National Teachers College	Manila
National University	Manila
Philippine Christian College	Manila
Philippine Normal College	Manila
Philippine Women's University	Manila
St. Joseph College	Manila
St. Louis University	Baguio
St. Paul College	Dumaguete
St. Paul College	Manila
St. Paul College	Tuguegarao
St. Scholastica College	Manila
St. Theresa's College	Manila
San Beda College	Manila
University of San Agustin	Iloilo
University of San Carlos	Cebu
University of Santo Tomas	Manila
University of Southern Philippines	Cebu
University of the East	Manila
Xavier University	Cagayan de Oro

*Source: Wilcox, Asian Educational Credentials, p. 46.

APPENDIX C

The groups belonging to the Left were: Kabataan Makabayan, Student Cultural Association, Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan, Student Power Assembly of the Philippines, and the Movement of Democratic Philippines.

Students coming from the University of the Philippines were identified with those of the leftist groups.

The student councils of the following schools were identified with the Student Power Assembly of the Philippines and individual students of the same schools were members of the Kabataan Makabayan:

Lyceum of the Philippines
Philippine College of Commerce
Far Eastern University
Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Maynila
Feati University
University of Manila
Mapua Institute of Technology
National University
University of the East
Adamson University
Araneta University
Arellano University
Manuel L. Quezon University

Some students of the Philippine College of Commerce and the University of the East were individual members of Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan .

The following organizations were identified as "moderates": NUSP (National Union of Students of the Philippines), NSL (National Students League) and CSM (Christian Social Movement).

The student councils of the following schools in this group were reportedly affiliated with the NUSP and individual members of the CSM:

St. Scholastica College
Assumption College
St. Joseph College
Concordia College
Centro Escolar University

---

*E. M. M. "Student Organizations and Their Affiliates," Sunday Times Magazine , February 22, 1970, pp. 32-33.

La Consolacion College
Maryknoll College
College of the Holy Spirit
Philippine Normal College
St. Theresa's College
Philippine Women's University

Some students from the Philippine Normal College were individual members of the Kabataan Makabayan and the National Students League.

The student councils of the following schools were affiliated with the National Students League and some students were individual members of the CSM:

Ateneo de Manila University
De La Salle College
Letran College
San Beda College
University of Santo Tomas
Silliman University
San Sebastian College
Jose Rizal College
Manila Central University
Philippine College of Arts and Trades
Trinity College

Some students from the following schools were individual members of the Kabataan Makabayan:

Ateneo de Manila University
San Beda College
Silliman University
Jose Rizal College

Some students from the University of Santo Tomas were affiliated as individual members of the leftist group, the Student Power Assembly of the Philippines.

APPENDIX D

WHAT THE DEMONSTRATORS WANT AND WHAT THE PRESIDENT HAS DONE SO FAR TO MEET THEIR DEMANDS*

After six deaths, scores injured, and an undetermined amount worth of property destroyed in a series of rallies before Malacanang, Congress and Plaza Miranda, the demands of the student demonstrators have more or less crystallized.

With respect to the Constitutional Convention, the students made the following demands through the National Union of Students of the Philippines and other student groups:

--Non-partisan election of delegates to the Constitutional Convention.

--Non-partisan composition of poll inspectors and provincial boards of canvassers in the election of delegates to the charter convention.

--Public officials who will run as candidates for the convention be made to resign or forfeit their positions in the government upon filing their certificates of candidacy.

--Make the Commission on Elections the watchdog of election propaganda and other election expenses of the candidates to the convention.

--The age requirement for delegates be reduced from 25 to 21.

--That the President issue a hand-written pledge that he would not intervene in the election of delegates to the charter convention.

Heeding the students' demands, President Marcos promised a group of student leaders during a recent meeting in Malacanang that he would ask Congress to work for a non-partisan and non-sectarian Constitutional Convention.

The President likewise promised the student leaders that he would submit a proposal requiring every senator and congressman who runs for delegate to the convention to forfeit his seat in Congress.

President Marcos made his promises even as more and more congressmen responded to the students' call for a non-partisan

*Filemon V. Tutay, "What the Demonstrators Want and What the President Has Done So Far to Meet Their Demands," Philippines Free Press, February 28, 1970, pp. 6, 53-55.

election of delegates to the charter convention.

Some 5,000 student demonstrators from several state colleges and universities, including the University of the Philippines, Philippine Normal College, Philippine College of Commerce, and the Philippine College of Arts and Trades, made the following demands:

--Immediate relocation of the squatters of the NDC Compound on Pureza Street in Sta. Mesa to facilitate the construction and improvement of school facilities at the NDC tenement housing project occupied by the Philippine College of Commerce.

--Immediate and "actual" release of P3.5 million for state colleges and universities and the subsequent release of the balance of P6.5 million as promised by President Marcos last September.

--Increase of the budget for all state colleges and universities as promised by President Marcos.

--Immediate solution to the problems of the students at the Central Luzon State University who live "like pigs."

--Certification of an omnibus bill which would make all student council presidents of state colleges and universities members of the board of trustees or regents of their respective boards.

--Implementation of the provisions of the Students' Manual of Rights and Responsibilities.

President Marcos explained that the suspension of public works releases to state colleges and universities was a "matter of national policy to stabilize the country's economy."

The President said:

"In accordance with the policy decision of the government to stop all public works, except the maintenance of highways and the continuation of unfinished high priority projects, all fund releases for low priority projects such as gymnasiums in public universities have been stopped.

"This has been explained repeatedly to the students as a way to cutting down government expenditures. No amount of demonstration can change the fact that government needs to cut down expenditures, and that such projects as gymnasiums are low priority projects.

"The budget commissioner and the assistant executive secretary have already explained to the student demonstrators that the government had laid down an important policy on this matter and that no amount of threat or coercion can effect a change of this decision because it would involve a choice between the general welfare and the satisfaction of a small group.

"The Administration cannot choose the side of the few against the many, but must always choose the general welfare as against limited welfare.

"The Administration hopes that the student demonstrators will realize that the demands cannot at this time be met without sacrificing the interest of the many, which interests they are

also expected to serve and protect.

"It is hoped that the students will have time to reflect clearly on the position of the Administration, and reconsider their position."

With respect to the problems of the students of Central Luzon State University in Munoz, Nueva Ecija, the President approved the following:

--Temporary appointment of Dr. Jorge Juliano as president "until a permanent president is chosen."

--Appointment of Jose F. Sayson, president of the CLSU student government, as member of the U.P. board of regents with voting rights.

--Allocation of 10 prefabricated schoolhouses for the use of the CLSU.

The following are the other demands of the National Union of Students of the Philippines:

--Immediate prosecution of L. Col. Tomas Diaz, PC provincial commander, for the alleged illegal detention of labor leader Manuel Alabado, union official of the U.S. Tobacco Corporation.

--Disbanding of "goonstabulary" who subvert the free expression of the people's will in elections.

--Immediate investigation of the "tobacco blockade" in Ilocos Sur "which kills the hope for economic progress among the poor in that province."

--Assignment of non-political judges to the scores of vacant salas, especially in Vigan, Ilocos Sur.

--Investigation and prosecution of all sugar planters who have not complied with the provisions of the Minimum Wage Law.

--Investigation of Chinese employers for unethical labor practices and non-compliance with the provisions of the Minimum Wage Law.

--That action be taken against a powerful congressman from the North for alleged interference in the executive affairs of the government and that he be made to resign his position in at least two government corporations.

Acting Secretary of Justice Felix V. Makasiar had ordered the Quezon City fiscal to look into the case of labor leader Manuel Alabado. According to the student leaders, Alabado, was detained and investigated by PC officers and men led by Tarlac Provincial Commander Diaz on the night of the bloody January 30 riot near Malacanang.

Reacting to the student demands for the investigation and prosecution of all sugar planters and Chinese employers for alleged violation of the provisions of the Minimum Wage Law, President Marcos has created a 15-man investigating team to implement all labor laws, especially in sugar haciendas for the protection of some 30,000 sacadas or migratory workers.

The President said the team, under the supervision of Labor Secretary Blas Ople, was under orders to file criminal charges against violators of SSS and Labor Laws.

"I have instructed the investigating team," said the President, "to initiate criminal indictments against these violators, regardless of whether they are aliens, vested interests or persons close to the Administration."

The President added that the team had also been directed to enforce the amelioration fund among the sacadas in sugar haciendas. This would enable the sugar plantations workers to collect bonuses from profits in the sugar industry.

The Confederation of Student Leaders in the Philippines made the following demands through its national chairman, David Odilao, Jr.:

--Retirement of Brig. Gen. Vicente R. Raval as PC Chief.

--Pullout of troops from the Greater Manila area.

--Replacement of Brig. Gen. Hans Menzi as senior military aide to the President by one who is not identified with "vested interests,"

Raval was not retired from the service but he has been replaced as PC Chief by Brig. Gen. Eduardo Garcia. Raval will remain in the active service until April 1, when he will retire.

Obviously, it would be difficult to pull out government troops from the Greater Manila areas because Camp Crame, Fort Aguinaldo and Fort Bonifacio are all within the area. The President Guard Battalion, the official security unit of the President, has its headquarters right behind Malacanang.

Menzi resigned as senior military aide to the President, but he will remain in active duty with the Philippine Air Force. The naturalized Filipino is a rated pilot.

The Movement for a Democratic Philippines, through its spokesman, Nelson A. Navarro, demanded:

The recall of three new cabinet members, namely, Finance Secretary Cesar Virata, Executive Secretary Alejandro Melcor, Jr., and Defense Secretary Juan Ponce Enrile allegedly for being "pro- Americans."

According to Navarro, the three cabinet members "constitute a virtual capitulation to American interests which may be the prelude to the formal emergence of a dictatorship in this country."

Navarro said that Virata, as chairman of the Philippine panel in the renegotiation of the Philippine trade agreement, allegedly caused the insertion of the "national treatment"clause. This clause, according to him, would have the effect of perpetuating a U.S. stranglehold on the Philippine economy even after the termination of parity in 1974.

Melchor as executive secretary, according to Navarro, is at the nerve center of the government and symbolizes its captivity by American interests.

"As former undersecretary for national defense," said Navarro, "who spent most of his life in the United States, Melchor was known as the arch defender of the JUSMAG and the American military bases in the Philippines."

Regarding Enrile, the MDP spokesman said that "as a

congenital anti-nationalist and former lawyer of many American firms, Enrile displayed his hardline instincts when he supported the proposal to declare martial law after the January 30 massacres."

Other demands of the students ventilated through various student groups and organizations included the following:

--Stop President Marcos' "fascist" acts and abolish the PC Special Forces.

--Resignation of President Marcos.

--Restoration to cabinet status of the Presidential Assistant on National Minorities (PANAMIN) under Secretary Manuel (Manda) Elizalde, Jr.

--Immediate disclosure of the financial status of the Philippine National Bank, Government Service Insurance System, Social Security System, Development Bank of the Philippines, and the Philippine Charity Sweepstakes Office, during and after the last elections."

--Resignation of GSIS Manager Benjamin del Rosario "for granting huge loans to non-GSIS members and approving multimillion peso transactions..

--Publication of the assets and liabilities of the President, senators and congressmen.

--Immediate revamp of the Bureau of Customs, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Board of Censors for Motion Pictures, and the Reparations Commission.

--That certain senators, congressmen and other high government officials make public how much they still owe the Reparations Commission and to settle immediately their long overdue accounts.

--Immediate deportation of some 10,000 overstaying Chinese nationals and investigation of the Anti-Dummy Board.

--Revocation of Presidential Proclamation No. 525, dated December 25, 1965, involving the parceling of government lands in Zamboanga City.

The PC Special Forces were ordered disbanded by Brig. Gen. Eduardo Garcia, shortly after he took over as PC Chief. According to Maj. Reynaldo San Gabriel, PC public information officer, all elements of the erstwhile Special Forces have been dispersed and assigned to different PC units throughout the country.

APPENDIX E

GENERAL ORDER NO. 1

PROCLAMATION OF PRESIDENT MARCOS THAT HE WILL GOVERN THE NATION AND DIRECT THE OPERATION OF THE ENTIRE GOVERNMENT

WHEREAS, martial law has been declared under Proclamation No. 1081 dated September 21, 1972, and is now in effect throughout the land;

WHEREAS, martial law has been declared because of wanton destruction of lives and property, widespread lawlessness and anarchy, chaos and disorder now prevailing throughout the country, which condition has been brought about by groups of men who are actively engaged in a conspiracy to seize political and state power in the Philippines in order to take over the Government by force and violence the extent of which has now assumed the proportion of an actual war against our people their legitimate Government; and

WHEREAS, it is imperative for the undersigned President of the Philippines to assume greater and more effective control over the entire Government, to have the broadest latitude and discretion in dealing with the affairs of the nation, and to exercise extraordinary powers in my capacity as commander-in-chief of all the Armed Forces of the Philippines in order to enable me to restores within the shortest possible time and thereafter to maintain the stability of the nation and to safeguard the integrity and security of the Philippines and to insure the tranquility of its inhabitants, by suppressing lawlessness and all subversives, seditious, rebellious and insurrectionary activities throughout the land, with all the resources and means at my command, and by adopting such other measures as I may deem necessary and expedient to take to contain and resolve the existing national emergency and for the interest of the public;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Ferdinand E. Marcos, President of the Philippines, by virtue of the powers vested in me by the Constitution as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Philippines, do hereby proclaim that I shall govern the nation and direct the operation of the entire Government, including its agencies and instrumentalities, in my capacity and shall exercise all the powers and prerogatives appurtenant and incident to my position as such

Commander-in-Chief of all the Armed Forces of the Philippines.

Done in the City of Manila, this 22nd day of September in the year of our Lord, nineteen hundred and seventy-two.

FERDINAND E. MARCOS
President
Republic of the Philippines

APPENDIX F

LETTER OF AUTHORITY NO.1

To: 1. The Press Secretary
Office of the President
Manila

2. The Secretary
Department of National Defense
Camp Aguinaldo, Quezon City

In view of the present national emergency which has been brought about by the activities of those who are actively engaged in a criminal conspiracy to seize political and state power in the Philippines and to take over the government by force and violence. the extent of which has now assumed the proportion of an actual war against our people and their legitimate government, and in view of the fact that privately owned newspapers, magazines, radio and television stations have willingly or unwillingly, consciously or unconsciously, participated in that conspiracy, and pursuant to Proclamation No. 1081, dated September 21, 1972, and Letter of Instruction No. 1 dated September 22, 1972, which orders you to take over and control or cause the taking over and control of all such newspapers, magazines, radio and television stations and all other media of communications, wherever they are, and in my capacity as Commander-in-Chief of all the Armed Forces of the Philippines, you are hereby authorized to permit the operation, under established guidelines, of such newspapers, magazines, radio and television stations and facilities as may be established to have no participation in that conspiracy. You are, therefore, authorized to allow the operation of all the facilities of the Radio Philippine Network (KBS) Kanlaon Broadcasting System, the Voice of the Philippines, Philippine Broadcasting System, and the Daily Express, it having been established that they have not participated in that conspiracy.

Pending the existence of the threat of subversion, communist or otherwise, the operation of all newspapers, magazines, radio and television networks shall remain suspended.

Done in the city of Manila, this 22nd day of September, in the year of our Lord, nineteen hundred and seventy-two.

FERDINAND E. MARCOS
President
Republic of the Philippines

APPENDIX G

PRESIDENTIAL DECREE NO. 6

AMENDING CERTAIN RULES ON DISCIPLINE
OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES

Whereas, under Presidential Decree No. 1, dated September 23, 1972, the Integrated Reorganization Plan was adopted and made part of the law of the land;

Whereas, in the reorganization of the Government it is necessary that we clean the public service of undesirable officials and employees; and employees disposed of in the most expeditious manner;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Ferdinand E. Marcos, President of the Philippines, by virtue of the powers vested in me by the Constitution as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Philippines, and pursuant to Proclamation No. 1081, dated September 21, 1972, and General Order No. 1, dated September 22, 1972, do hereby promulgate the following amendatory rules on the administrative discipline of government officials and employees:

"Section 1. Grounds for disciplinary action. The following shall be grounds for disciplinary action:

a. Dishonesty.
b. Oppression.
c. Misconduct.
d. Neglect of duty.
e. Disgraceful and immoral conduct.
f. Being notoriously undesirable, which is of common knowledge.
g. Discourtesy in the course of official duties.
h. Inefficiency and incompetence in the performance of official duties.
i. Receiving for personal use a fee, gift, or other valuable thing in course of official duties or in connection therewith when such fee, gift, or other valuable thing is given by any person in the hope or expectation of receiving a favor or better treatment than that accorded other persons, or committing acts punishable under the anti-graft laws.
j. Conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude.
k. Improper or unauthorized solicitation of contributions from suburdinate employees and by teachers or school officials from school children.

l. Violation of existing civil service law and rules or reasonable office regulations.
m. Falsification of official document.
n. Frequent unauthorized absences or tardiness in reporting for duty, loafing or frequent unauthorized absences from duty during regular office hours.
o. Habitual drunkenness.
p. Gambling prohibited by law.
q. Refusal to perform official duty or render overtime service.
r. Disgraceful, immoral or dishonest conduct prior to entering the service.
s. Physical or mental incapacity or disability due to immoral or vicious habits.
t. Borrowing money by superior officers from subordinates or lending by subordinates to superior officers.
u. Lending money at usurious rates of interest.
v. Willful failure to pay just debts or willful failure to pay taxes due the government.
w. Contracting loans of money or other property from persons with whom the office of the employee concerned has business relations.
x. Pursuit of private business, vocation and profession without the permission required by these rules or existing regulations.
y. Engaging directly or indirectly in partisan political activities.
z. Conduct prejudicial to the best interest of the service.
aa. Lobbying for personal interest or gain in legislative halls and offices without authority.
bb. Promoting the sale of tickets in behalf of private enterprises that are not intended for charitable or public welfare purposes and even in the latter cases if there is no prior authority.
cc. Nepotism as defined in Section 30 of the civil service law, as amended.

"SECTION 2. Disciplinary jurisdiction. The Department Head shall have authority to remove, separate, suspend and otherwise discipline officers and employees under their jurisdiction, except presidential appointees. Their decisions shall be final, except in the case of removal, In case the penalty imposed is removal, the respondent may appeal the decision to the Civil Service Commission. An appeal shall not stop the decision from being executory, and in the event that the respondent wins on appeal, he shall be considered as having been under suspension during the pendency of the appeal.

Chiefs of bureaus and offices shall investigate and

decide administrative complaints against employees under their jurisdiction. Their decision shall be final if the penalty imposed is suspension without pay for not more than 30 days or fine of not more than 30 days' salary. If the penalty imposed is higher, the decision may be appealed to the Department Head, and pending appeal, the same shall be executory except when the penalty is removal.

An investigation may be entrusted to regional directors or similar officials who shall make the necessary report and recommendation to the chief of bureau or office within five (5) days from termination of the investigation which shall be finished within ten (10) days.

"SECTION 3. Summary proceedings. No formal investigation is necessary and the respondent may be immediately removed or dismissed if any of the following circumstances is present:

a. When the charges is serious and the evidence of guilt is strong.
b. When the respondent is a recidivist or has been repeatedly charged, and
c. When the respondent is notoriously undesirable.

"SECTION 4. Repealing Clause. Any provision of existing laws, rules and regulations in conflict with this Decree are hereby modified or repealed accordingly.

"SECTION 5. Effectivity. This Decree shall take effect immediately."

Done in the city of Manila, this 27th day of September, in the year of our Lord, nineteen hundred and seventy-two.

FERDINAND E. MARCOS
President
Republic of the Philippines

APPENDIX H

REPUBLIKA NG PILIPINAS
Republic of the Philippines
KAGAWARANG NG EDUKASYON
Department of Education
Maynila

October 13, 1972

DEPARTMENT ORDER
No. 30, s. 1972

GUIDELINES UNDER WHOM COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES MAY OPERATE

TO: THE DIRECTOR OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS
THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS
THE DIRECTOR OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

1. His Excellency, the President of the Philippines, has already authorized the reopening of some schools, colleges, and universities. It is expected that in the next few days, all schools in all levels may be authorized to resume the operation of classes.

2. The following guidelines are prescribed for observance and compliance by all schools, colleges and universities that shall resume the operation of classes.

a. Appropriate security measures shall be adopted and enforced so that only students, members of the faculty and other school employees, and such other persons who may have legitimate business to take up with the school administration will be allowed to enter the school premises.

b. Proper identification cards will be issued to all bona-fide students, members of the faculty and other employees in each school, college, or university.

c. Proper screening of all persons entering the school premises shall be conducted at the gates of the school campuses by the security forces or by any other authorized personnel of the school, in order to prevent entry therein of unauthorized persons.

d. No person carrying packages, cases or other containers shall be allowed inside the school premises without prior inspection of the same at the school gates in order to prevent the entry therein of any fatal or incendiary materials.

e. School heads shall take positive steps to remove all members of their faculty or staff, as well as to drop students, who are identified as officers or members of Communist-front organizations, such as the Kabataan Makabayan, the Samahan Demokratiko ng Kabataan, and others.
f. Students facing charges on account of violation of existing laws or rules and regulations issued by the Department of Education and Culture or by the schools themselves shall be dropped from the rolls immediately.
g. There shall be in the meantime a moratorium on the organization and operation of student government or councils and other student organizations as well as the publication of student organs in whatever form.
h. Strikes and the holding of rallies, demonstrations and other concerted activities shall be strictly prohibited.

3. School heads may conduct summary investigations or direct summary investigations to be conducted against undesirable students facing charges as provided under paragraph 2 (f) in order to afford them the essence of fairness and fair play in line with the spirit of the New Society.

In a summary investigation, which is essentially fact-finding, the formalities of a hearing or trial are dispensed with as much as possible; its specific purpose is to determine on the basis or the evidence gathered, the innocence or guilt of the respondent, who should be informed thereof accordingly.

The following steps or process in a summary investigation are suggested:

a. Fact-Gathering. Pertinent evidence in support of a projected action against a student who is believed to have engaged or is engaged in any of the prohibited activities should be gathered.
b. Evaluation. The evidence gathered, relative to the innocence or guilt of the student concerned should be carefully collected, evaluated and analyzed, preparatory to the formulation or promulgation of the decision on the case.
c. Decision. The decision, based on the evidence gathered, as evaluated, shall be reckoned vis-a-vis the standard of preponderance of evidence, i.e., that the presumptions in the respondent's favor are disputed or overruled by the evidence; provided, however, that when there is doubt regarding guilt, the respondent may be called for the purpose of confronting him with the evidence against him, and for him to explain his

side, if possible, after which a decision on the case may be rendered.

d. Notice of decision. The respondent shall be served a copy of the decision in writing, which shall be signed by the school head or his duly authorized representative. The decision on each case shall be final and executory.

4. School heads and other school administration officials concerned shall assume full responsibility for any acts of violence or any violation of existing laws, as well as of Proclamation No. 1081 dated September 21, 1972, and other orders, decrees, and instructions issued as a consequence thereof, committed within their jurisdiction. Failure on their part to take measures to prevent any subversive activities or acts of violence or violations of existing laws in their school campuses shall be dealt with by the immediate closure of their schools and/or by such other measures as the Government may determine.

5. The foregoing guidelines shall be circularized for observance and compliance.

(SGD.) JUAN L. MANUEL
Acting Secretary

APPENDIX I

THE UNIVERSITY*

Its purpose

The Bicol University shall primarily give professional and technical training and provide advanced and specialized instruction in literature, philosophy, the science and arts, beside providing for the promotion of scientific and technological researches.

Its background

On June 21, 1969, Republic Act No. 5521 was enacted which established in the "Province of Albay with a central site and administration office at Regan Barracks, Legazpi City and Municipality of Daraga, a university which shall be known as 'Bicol University' the same being organized as a body corporate under that name."

The Bicol Teachers College, the Daraga Central Elementary School, the Albay Provincial High School, the Bicol Regional School of Arts and Trades, the Roxas Memorial Agricultural School, and the School of Fisheries were hereby converted into appropriate or other units of the University.

At the initial establishment of the University, the Bicol Teachers College, was converted into the College of Education; the Bicol Regional School of Arts and Trades under the College of Engineering; the Roxas Memorial Agricultural School into the College of Agriculture, the School of Fisheries into the College of Fisheries.

The government of the Bicol University is vested in a Board of Regents which is composed of nine members, six of whom are regular members and three are ex-officio members. The former is made up of two known educators of the Bicol Region, two successful businessmen or industrialists or professionals of the Region who have shown and are showing interest in the cause of education in the region, and two successful alumni of any of the school or college incorporated into the University. The latter is made up of the Secretary of Education as Chairman of the Board, Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

The University is headed by a President, assisted by three Vice-Presidents: one Executive Vice-President, one Vice-President

---

*Source: Bulletin of Information School Year 1971-1972, Bicol University.

for Academic Affairs, and one Vice-President for External Affairs.

The instructors of each college constitute its faculty and the presiding officer of each faculty is a Dean appointed by the Board of Regents upon the recommendation of the President of the University.

The University enjoys academic freedom. In the appointment of professors, instructors and other personnel, no religious or political tests shall be required, nor shall their religious or political opinions or affiliations be made a matter of examination or inquiry. However, no professor or instructor or any other personnel in the University shall inculcate sectarian tenets in any of the teaching, nor attempt, either directly or indirectly, under penalty of dismissal by the Board of Regents to influence students or other attendants at the University for or against any political party.

The University is only at its incipient stage; yet, the future holds much promise. Starting with only four college offerings, the University may yet bloom into a multi-college complex and thus become a dream realized, a Pride of Bicolandia.

Facilities

College instruction is carried on in three campuses. The Fishery curriculum is conducted at the Northeast campus in Tabaco, which is the site of the College of Fisheries. Situated along the Tabaco wharf, about eight hectares, the campus is a natural habitat for its curriculum.

The education and engineering curricula are offered at the Regan Barracks campus which is characterized by wide, smooth grounds, ideal for athletic meets, playground games and other similar activities.

The agricultural curriculum is held at the West campus in Guinobatan which has a total of 135.65 hectares.

Every college has its own library and laboratory facilities. The Graduate Library is located at the College of Education. Laboratory facilities as well as an audio-visual center in the same college are also available.

The Northeast and West campuses of the University provide cottages for both faculty and students, rent and light free.

APPENDIX J

ENROLLMENT AND LOCATION OF SOME UNIVERSITIES*

Universities	Enrollment	Location
University of Santo Tomas	24,778	Manila
University of the Philippines	16,000	Quezon City
National University	5,480	Manila
University of Manila	3,019	Manila
Centro Escolar University	5,670	Manila
Philippine Women's University	3,665	Manila
Far Eastern University	43,031	Manila
Silliman University	2,439	Dumaguete
Adamson University	3,881	Manila
Arellano University	4,491	Manila
University of San Carlos	6,869	Cebu
Manila Central University	3,709	Manila
University of the Visayas	9,771	Cebu
University of Southern Philippines	1,876	Cebu
University of the East	48,630	Manila
University of San Agustin	8,906	Iloilo
Central Philippine University	3,091	Iloilo
University of Nueva Caceres	3,857	Naga
Mindanao State University	520	Marawi
University of Negros Occidental	2,778	Bacolod
Xavier University	1,577	Cagayan de Oro
Araneta University	2,864	Malabon, Rizal
Ateneo de Manila University	1,466	Quezon City
Feati University	12,525	Manila
Southwestern University	5,482	Cebu
Manuel L. Quezon University	8,987	Manila
St. Louis University	3,789	Baguio
Central Luzon State University	1,616	Munoz
University of Eastern Philippines	3,827	Catarman
Central Mindanao University	1,194	Musuan
University of Mindanao	5,754	Davao
Divine Word University	4,659	Tacloban
Bicol University	3,591	Legazpi

*Except for the data on Bicol University, the rest were from Epifania R. Castro Resposo, The Role of Universities in the Developing Philippines (New York: Asia Publishing House, Inc., 1971), pp. 189 and 194.

APPENDIX K

Republic of the Philippines
Bicol University

CODE OF DISCIPLINE FOR STUDENTS*

For the guidance of all concerned, the following rules and regulations on the conduct and discipline of students of the Bicol University are hereby promulgated:

Section 1. Basis of Discipline. Students shall at all times observe the laws of the land and the rules and regulations of the University.

No disciplinary proceedings shall be instituted except for conduct prohibited by law or by the rules and regulations promulgated by the Board of Regents or by the President with the authority of the Board.

Section 2. Specific Misconduct. A student shall be subject to disciplinary action for any of the following acts:

(a) Any form of cheating in examinations or any act of dishonesty.
(b) Carrying within University premises any firearms or weapon which is ostensibly intended for offensive purposes.
(c) Drinking alcoholic beverages, or drunken behavior, within University premises.
(d) Illegal possession or evidence of use of prohibited drugs or chemicals such as LSD, marijuana, heroin, or opiates in any form within the University premises.
(e) Gambling within the University premises.
(f) Creating within the University premises disorder, tumult, breach of peace, or serious disturbances.
(g) Intentionally making a false statement of any material fact, or practicing or attempting to practice any deception or fraud in connection with his admission or registration.
(h) Any act or ommission which is prejudicial of the good order of society, which offends the sense of decency and morality, or which is of such a nature as to bring discredit, dishonor or bad name of the University.

*Bicol Universitarian, July-August, 1972, p. 6.

Section 3. Jurisdiction. Violations of the provisions of Sections 1 and 2 shall fall under the jurisdiction of, and shall be dealt with by, the respective deans or principals, or if in his opinion an investigation is necessary such investigation shall be conducted by:

(a) The college investigating committee constituted by the dean or principal, in all cases where the respondent or respondents belong to one college or school.

(b) The inter-collegiate disciplinary committee constituted by the President in all cases where the respondents belong to different colleges or schools.

Section 4. Filing of charges. A disciplinary proceeding shall be deemed instituted upon the filing of a written charge specifying the acts or ommissions constituting the misconduct.

For disciplinary cases falling under the jurisdiction of the inter-college disciplinary committee, the charge or report shall be filed within the President. Upon filing of said charge or report, an entry shall be made by the President in an official entry book kept for the purpose, specifying the person or persons charged, the complaint or complaints, his witnesses, if any, the date of filing, and the substance of the charge.

Section 5. College Investigating Committee. As soon as it shall appear that an investigation is necessary, the Dean or Principal shall constitute a College Investigating Committee to undertake an investigation of the charge or report.

Section 6. Inter-College Disciplinary Committee. As soon as it shall appear that an investigation calling for an Inter-College Disciplinary Committee is necessary, the President shall constitute such Committee to undertake the investigation of the charge or report.

Section 7. Hearing. Hearing by a Committee shall begin not later than forty-eight (48) hours after such Committee shall have been constituted.

Section 8. Comments and Recommendations. The complete records of the case, with the report of findings thereon and the recommendations signed by the majority of the members of the Committee, shall be forwarded to the President through the dean or deans concerned, if it involves students from different schools or colleges as the case may be, within five (5) days after the termination of the hearing. The recommendations shall state the finding of fact and the specific regulations on which it is based.

Section 9. Action by the Dean or Deans. The Dean(s) or Principal(s) of the unit to which the respondent or respondents belong shall, within three (3) days from receipt of the Committee report, transmit such report, together with his/their action or recommendation to the President of the University.

Section 10. Sanctions. Disciplinary action may take the form of expulsion, suspension from the University, withholding of graduation and other privileges, suspension from any class,

reprimand, warning, or demand of expression of apology. The gravity of the offense committed and the circumstances attending its commission shall determine the nature of the disciplinary action or penalty to be imposed.

Section 11. Summary action. Any provision of these rules to the contrary notwithstanding, a Dean or Principal may immediately suspend for a period not exceeding five (5) days any student in his unit for any breach of order or discipline. The order of suspension shall state the ground, the circumstances showing the responsibility of the student and the period of suspension, and shall take effect immediately after it shall have been served. Before the order of suspension is served it may be appealed to the President whose decision on the matter shall be final.

This Code takes effect fifteen (15) days after approval by the Board of Regents and publication of same.

APPENDIX L

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Republic Act No. 5521

AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE BICOL UNIVERSITY, DEFINING ITS POWERS, FUNCTIONS, AND DUTIES, APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1. Establishment. There is hereby established in the Province of Albay with a central site and administration office at Regan Barracks, Legazpi City and Municipality of Daraga, a university which shall be known as 'Bicol University' the same being organized as a body corporate under that name.

Section 2. Conversion. The Bicol Teachers College, the Daraga Central Elementary School, the Albay Provincial High School, the Bicol Regional School of Arts and Trades, the Roxas Memorial Agricultural School, and the School of Fisheries at Tabaco, Albay, are hereby converted into appropriate or other units of the University. The Board of Regents may reorganize them as provided for in Section 6 (e) hereof.

Section 3. Purpose. The Bicol University shall primarily give professional and technical training, and provide advanced and specialized instruction in literature, philosophy, the science and arts, besides providing for the promotion of scientific and technological researches.

Section 4. Powers of the University. The following are the powers of the University:

a) It shall have the general powers as set forth in Section 13 of Act No. 1459, as amended, The exercise of its corporate powers are hereby vested exclusively in the Board of Regents and in the President of the University in so far as authorized by the Board;

b) It shall have the power to acquire public lands for its expansion and/or beneficial use; and

c) It shall be authorized, through its college of engineering, to undertake the construction of its buildings and other permanent improvements and such sums as may be necessary for the purpose shall be included in the Annual General Appropriations Act for the University. All public works appropriations in the name of the Bicol Teachers College, the Daraga Central Elementary School, the Albay Provincial High School, the Bicol Regional School of Arts and Trades, the Roxas Memorial Agricultural School, and

the School of Fisheries are hereby transferred to the University so provided for in this Act: Provided, that the construction of its buildings and other permanent improvements as authorized in the public works Act of the Government shall be undertaken by the college of engineering as herein provided any provision of existing laws to the contrary notwithstanding.

Section 5. Governing Board; manner of appointment. The government of the Bicol University is vested in a Board of Regents which shall composed of nine members, six of whom are regular members and three are ex-officio members. The regular members must be Filipino citizens and residents of the Philippines, two of them shall be known educators in or from the Bicol Region, two shall be successful businessmen or industrialists or professionals of the Region who have shown and are showing interest in the cause of education in the region, and two shall be successful alumni of any of the school or college to be incorporated with and integrated into theUniversity upon recommendation of their respective alumni association, and who will be replaced in due time, when available, by successful alumni of the University and upon recommendation by their alumni association when this shall have been organized. The three ex-officio members shall be the Secretary of Education, who shall be the ex-officio Chairman of the Board, the Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

The regular members of the Board of Regents who shall serve a term of four years, shall be appointed by the President of the Philippines, with the consent of the Commission of Appointments. Of the six regular members of the Board of Regents to be first appointed as above provided, the President of the Philippines shall designate two to serve for two years, two to serve for three years and two to serve four years.

In the absence or inability of the Secretary of Education or when the position is vacant, the other members of the Board shall elect from among themselves a temporary chairman who shall act as Chairman. In case of a vacancy in the regular membership of the Board, the President of the Philippines shall, with the consent of the Commission on Appointments, appoint a new member to serve for the unexpired term only.

No person in the employ of the University or any other educational institution in the Region in any capacity whatsoever, whether as dean, professor, instructor, lecturer or otherwise, shall be eligible for membership in the Board.

The regular members of the Board of Regents shall each receive for every board meeting attended a per diem of one hundred pesos: Provided, That in no case shall the total amount received by each exceed the sum of three hundred pesos for any one month. Besides the per diem, they, together with the ex-officio members shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred in attendance upon meetings of the Board or upon performing other

official business authorized by resolution of the Board.

Section 6. Powers and duties of the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents shall have the following powers and duties, in addition to its general powers of administration and the exercise of the powers of the corporation:

a) To determine and fix the dates and time of their regular meetings, as well as special meetings as the need for same may arise; Provided, That all such meetings shall not be more than three times in any one month, nor less than one time in any one quarter;

b) To recommend the President of the University for appointment by the President of the Philippines with the consent of the Commission on Appointments, and who shall serve for a period of nine years;

c) To fix the compensation of the President of the University and to empower him to sit as ex-officio member of the Board with right to participate in the deliberations but without the right to vote;

d) To receive and appropriate to the ends specified by law such sums as may be provided by law for the support of the University;

e) To provide for the establishment of colleges and schools as it may deem necessary; Provided, That at the initial establishment of the University, the Bicol Teachers College together with the Daraga Central Elementary School and the Albay Provincial High School shall be converted into the College of Education for elementary, high school and collegiate education; the Bicol Regional School of Arts and Trades into the School of Arts and Trades under the College of Engineering; the Roxas Memorial Agricultural School into the College of Agriculture, and the School of Fisheries into the College of Fisheries. It shall be required that the Board of Regents immediately establish a post-graduate course in liberal arts and sciences or in education leading to master's degree. The university shall also be required to possess and maintain a professionally administered library of at least ten thousand bound volumes of collegiate books;

f) To receive in trust legacies, gifts, and donations of real and personal property of all kinds and to administer the same for the benefit of the University or of a department thereof, or for aid to any student or students in accordance with the direction or instructions of the donor, and/or in default thereof, in such manner as the Board may in its discretion determine; all such donations shall be exempt from income tax of the donors; to import duty free commodities for educational purposes as an exception to existing laws;

g) To appoint, on the recommendation of the President of the University, professors, instructors, lecturers and

other employees of the University; to fix their compensation, hours of service, and such other duties and conditions as it may deem proper; to grant them in its discretion leave of absence under such regulations as it may promulgate, any provisions of law to the contrary notwithstanding, and to remove them for cause after an investigation and hearing shall have been had; and to extend with their consent the tenure of faculty members of the university beyond the age of sixty-five, any other provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding, on recommendation of the President of the University, whenever in his opinion their services are specially needed: Provided, however, That no extension of service shall be made beyond the age of seventy; Provided, further, That all heads, professors, instructors, lecturers, researchers and other employees actually employed in the schools and colleges to be incorporated with and integrated into the university shall be automatically retained consistent with the Civil Service rules and regulations;

h) To approve the courses of study and rules of discipline drawn up by the university council as hereinafter provided; to fix the required tuition fees, matriculation fees, fees for laboratory courses, graduation fees, and all special and other fees; to remit the same in special cases; and to utilize the income derived therefrom for the maintenance of the university together with the annual appropriation provided for in Secion 19 hereof;

i) To provide fellowships and scholarships and to award the same to students showing special evidence of merit;

j) To establish chairs in the colleges herein before mentioned and to provide for the maintenance or endowment of such chairs, as well as to provide for such other professors, assistant professors, instructors, tutors, and lecturers as the progress of instruction may make necessary, and to fix the compensation pertaining to such postions;

k) To confer the usual honorary degrees upon persons other than graduates of the university in recognition of learning, statemanship, or eminence in literature, science, or arts; Provided, That such degree shall not be conferred in consideration of the payment of money or other valuable consideration; and

l) To file with the President of the Philippines a detailed report, setting forth the progress, conditions and needs of the university on or before the fifteenth day of September of each year.

Section 8. Administration. The Administration of the

University shall be vested in the President of the University who shall render full time service.

The President of the University shall be assisted by three Vice-Presidents; one Executive Vice-President, one Vice-President for Academic Affairs and one Vice-President for External Affairs, who shall be appointed by the Board of Regents upon the recommendation of the President of the University and whose compensation shall be fixed by the Board.

Section 9. Powers of the President.The powers and duties of the President of the University, in addition to those usually pertaining to the office of the president of a university which are not inconsistent of this law, are the following:

a) To recommend to the Board of Regents for appointment, vice-presidents, deans, professors, instructors, lecturers, and other employees of the university;

b) To promulgate for the government of the University such general ordinances and regulations, not contrary to law, as are consistent with the purposes of the University.

Section 10. The Secretary of the University. The Board of Regents shall appoint a secretary who shall serve as such for the Board of the University, and shall keep such records of the University as may be designated by the Board and the President of the University.

Section 11. The University Council; powers. There shall be a university council, consisting of the president of the university and of all the members of the faculty of the university holding the rank of all the members of the faculty of the university holding the rank of dean, professor, associate professor, and assistant professor. Subject to existing laws, the council shall have the power to prescribe the courses of study and rules of discipline, provided these matters are first approved by the Board of Regents. Subject to the same limitations, it shall fix the requirements for admission to any college of the University as well as for graduation and the conferment of degrees. The council alone shall have the power to recommend students or others to be recipient of degrees. Through its president or committee, it shall have the disciplinary powers over the students within the limits prescribed by the rules of discipline approved by the Board of Regents.

Section 12. The Faculty of the University. The body of professors and instructors of each college shall constitute its faculty, and as presiding officer of each faculty there shall be a dean elected by the Board of Regents on nomination by the president of the university. In the appointment of professors, instructors, and other personnel of the university, no religious or political tests shall be required, nor shall their religious or political opinions or affiliations be made a matter of examination or inquiry: Provided, however, That no professor or instructor or any other personnel in the university shall inculcate sectarian tenets in any of the teachings, nor attempt, either

indirectly or directly, under penalty of dismissal by the Board of Regents to influence students or attendance at the University for or against any particular church or religious sect or for or against any political party during any political campaign. The university shall enjoy academic freedom.

Section 13. Civil Service Requirements. The president, vice-presidents, deans, professors, other regular instructors and employees in the university shall be exempt from any civil service examination or regulation as a requisite to appointment except the classifies employees in the offices of the Comptroller and representative of the Auditor General: Provided, however, That all shall be entitled to the privileges and rights of security of tenure, promotion in positions and salaries for meritorious service, leaves and retirement benefits, as in the government service as now provided for by law.

Section 14. The Comptroller of the University. There shall be a Comptroller of the university who shall be appointed by the President of the Philippines with the consent of the Commission on Appointments. The comptroller shall have the civil service qualification and rank of a provincial treasurer. Subject to the last proviso of Section 6 (g) hereof, he shall have the power to appoint his subordinates who must be civil service eligibles. The size of the Comptroller's staff and the compensations of the same including that of the Comptroller shall be determined and fixed by the Board of Regents.

Section 15. The Auditor of the University. The Auditor General of the Philippines shall be ex-officio auditor of the university and shall designate his representative who must hold regular office in the university to be able to perform his duties efficiently and satisfactorily as a regular official of the university. The designated representative shall have the civil service qualification and rank of a provincial auditor and shall have the power to appoint his subordinates, subject to the last proviso of Section 6 (g) hereof, who must be civil service eligibles. The size of the office staff and compensations of the same shall be determined and fixed by the Board of Regents. The compensation of the Auditor's representative shall also be fixed by the Board of Regents upon recommendation by the Auditor General.

Section 16. Loans or transfers of apparatus or supplies; details of employees for duty in the university. Heads of Bureaus and Offices of the National Government are hereby authorized to loan or transfer, upon request of the president of the university, such apparatus or supplies as may be needed by the university and to detail employees for duty therein when, in the judgment of the Bureau or Office, such supplies or employees can be spared without serious detriment to the public service. Employees so detailed shall perform such duties as are required under such detail, and the time so employed shall count as part of their regular service.

Section 17. Board of Visitors of the University. The President of the Philippines, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Congressmen from the Bicol Region shall constitute a board of visitors of the university, whose duty it shall be to attend commencement exercises of the university, to make visits at such other time as it may deem proper, to examine the property, course of study, discipline, the state of finances of the university, to inspect all books and accounts of the institution, and to make reports to the President of the Philippines upon the same, with such recommendations as it may favor.

Section 18. Abolition and Transfers. The Bicol Teachers College, the Daraga Central Elementary School, the Albay Provincial High School, the Bicol Regional School of Arts and Trades, the Roxas Memorial Agricultural School, and the School of Fisheries at Tabaco, Albay, are hereby abolished and all their personnel, unexpended appropriations, and all their assets fixed and movable are transferred to the Bicol University.

Section 19. Appropriations. The sum of one million pesos is hereby appropriated out of any funds in the National Treasury to be expended in the discretion of the Board of Regents for the establishment and operation of the university. The unexpended balances in the appropriations for the schools and colleges incorporated with and integrated into the university at the time of incorporation shall be added to this sum of one million pesos. Thereafter, funds for the maintenance of the university shall be included in the annual General Appropriations Act of the National Government, the total sum of which shall be recommended by the Board of Regents of the university.

Section 20. Effectivity. This shall take effect upon its approval.

APPROVED: June 21, 1969