

Tracking the Nation

Jose V Abueva

The function of Filipino nationalism has to do with the leaders' and people's sentiments and consciousness, their goals and aspirations, and the actual policies and actions concerning the development of the Filipino nation, state and patrimony. In practice, nationalism — whose avowed end is the pursuit of the national interest and welfare and the common good — is part of the continuing struggle for the control and exercise of power. This essay traces the changing aspects of Filipino nationalism in relation to the imperatives of national survival and global interdependence.

TIMED FOR THIS CENTENNIAL YEAR OF THE BIRTH OF THE Filipino nation and the declaration of independence from Spain are two long anthology volumes entitled *The Making of the Filipino Nation and Republic: From Barangays, Tribes, Sultanates, and Colony* and *Filipino Nationalism, Nation-Building and National Development*. As the editor of these two volumes, I wish to share what I have learned about Filipino nationalism, largely from the authors of the two books, especially of the second one. These two volumes form part of a 20-book series called *PAMANA: The UP Anthology of Filipino Sociopolitical Thought Since 1872* that the University of the Philippines Press will be publishing over the next two years.

Since the birth of the Filipino nation and republic at the turn of the 20th century, the function of Filipino nationalism has had to do with the thoughts, sentiments and national consciousness of the leaders and the people; their collective goals and aspirations; the actual policies and actions advancing the interests and welfare of the Filipino nation-state; and the protection and development of the national patrimony. In practice, nationalism — whose avowed end is the pursuit of the national interest and welfare and the common good — is part of the continuing struggle for the control and exercise of power.

Leaders in government, the private sector and civil society often justify their objectives and actions in terms of selfless, nationalistic ends. In reality, however, protagonists in politics and advocates of nationalism are motivated more or less by their individual as well as collective self-interests. Given this reality, national interest and welfare and the common good which are the professed goals of nationalism and competing ideologies, are served to a greater or lesser degree by the continuing interplay of the selfish and altruistic interests of political actors as they seek state power and influence the content and implementation of public policy.

It may be said that nationalism triumphs over the pursuit of selfish individual or group interests to the extent that a particular nation is continually able to attain social, economic, political, and cultural development which enhance the quality of life of its citizens. Thus it serves the common

good in the long term while enhancing political and social institutions. National development and progress is manifested in the nation's collective and cumulative achievements: the continuing satisfaction of the material, cultural and spiritual needs of the population and the creativity, vibrancy, and effectiveness of institutions. Beneath the rhetoric of diplomacy and friendly gestures,

The well-being of most Filipinos and the image of the Philippines in the world are indicators of the state of Filipino nationalism.

any nation's status in the world community is reflected by the actual and relative influence, respect and recognition it enjoys among its members. In general, therefore, the well-being of most Filipinos and the status and image of the Philippines in the world are indicators of the state of Filipino nationalism.

By applying this stringent, practical standard of self-assessment without minimizing our achievements as a young nation, we can honestly admit that we Filipinos still have a long way to go. We say so from the perspective of the century since the nation and the first Republic were born in 1898. This period spans nearly 50 years of 'colonial democracy' and development under the United States, bracketing three years of Japanese occupation, and the 52 years following the withdrawal of US sovereignty in 1946. This is not a long time in the history of nation-states, but not too short either, for comparing ourselves with other young nations emerging from co-

lonialism in the last half century. It is heartening that in their own struggle for national unity and freedom Malays, Indonesians, Indians, Vietnamese and other colonized peoples, and even the Chinese, looked to the Philippine Revolution and the first Philippine Republic as an inspiring development.

TRACKING FILIPINO NATIONALISM

THE making of the Filipino nation out of the scattered barangays, tribes, and datuships was a struggle that marked some 350 years of centralized Spanish colonial rule and Hispanization. From the mid-16th century, most Filipinos shared a common, unifying experience as colonial subjects, as converts to Catholicism, and as victims of the abuses of the Spanish friars and rulers. They fought numerous local revolts to express their grievances, including the mutiny in Cavite that caused the execution in 1872 of three Filipino priests — Gomez, Burgos, and Zamora — and sparked the feeling of a common historic oppression.

Learning from the Enlightenment in Europe and the American and French Revolutions, Filipino *ilustrado* leaders in Spain and in the islands — among them Jose Rizal, MH del Pilar, and Graciano Lopez Jaena — engaged in a campaign of political propaganda for reforms. While they failed to achieve their goal, they nevertheless succeeded in catalyzing the people's sense of nationhood.

Finally, in a supreme act of nationalist self-determination, the Filipinos waged a war of national liberation: the Philippine Revolution initiated by Andres Bonifacio and carried on by General Emilio Aguinaldo. This ended Spanish colonialism and bore fruit in the founding of the Filipino nation-state, the first Philippine Republic, in 1898. The Moros, it should be recognized and remembered, contributed to nation-building by fighting the Spaniards throughout their rule over most but not all of the archipelago. The Igorots and other highlanders likewise resisted and remained outside Spanish rule.

When General Aguinaldo proclaimed the new nation's independence on 12 June 1898, Commodore George Dewey and his Asiatic squadron had smashed the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay the month before. Secret arrangements would lead to the Treaty of Paris in December in which Spain ceded the islands to the US. Military reinforcements, intent on fulfilling

America's imperialist plans, were secretly on their way to Filipinas. Just two weeks after President Aguinaldo and the Malolos Congress inaugurated the Philippine Republic on 23 January 1899, American soldiers provoked the start of hostilities in what Americans called the 'Philippine Insurrection' but was really the Filipino-American War.

The Katipunan revolution initiated by Bonifacio and the revolution led by Aguinaldo and the *ilustrados* and *principales* both sought independence from Spain. There was, however, an intrinsic difference in the kind of *kalayaan* (freedom/liberty/self-rule) and independence each faction had in mind. Aguinaldo and his upper-class revolutionaries vacillated between reform and revolution and compromised with the Spaniards. They wanted a republic and society in which they would replace the Spaniards as the ruling class because they believed most of the people were not ready or fit for self-governance. The Malolos Congress and the making of the Malolos Constitution reflected this sentiment.

The revolutionaries of the Katipunan and local incarnations of the original secret organization were more inclusive in their view of society. To them, *kalayaan* meant forming an egalitarian and fraternal society; they sought the redemption of the *Inang Bayan* (motherland) through their sacrifice, inner change, and *kapatiran* (brotherhood/sisterhood). They expected all Filipinos to do the same, relying mainly on indigenous values and concepts. Local and smaller versions of the Katipunan (religious-political sects) that continued to fight the Americans after Aguinaldo's surrender carried on in the tradition of Bonifacio. They were branded outlaws, bandits and fanatics by the American administrators and the Filipino leaders who collaborated with the colonial government.

That the Philippine Revolution has been regarded as an Unfinished Revolution is more in the sense of the Katipunan vision of egalitarian change, inner transformation, and liberation through common sacrifice. The songs of peasant rebels and communist rebels in their struggle against the government reflect the Katipunan vision. There are those who also interpret the 1986 EDSA revolution and the continuing struggle for political and social reforms as part of the Unfinished Revolution.

Fighting against the mighty American nation, the small and embryonic Philippine Republic was doomed. Its leaders were on the run. But at the height of the Filipino-American War, 126,000 American troops were

deployed among 639 posts and engaged in battle. When President Theodore Roosevelt proclaimed its end on 4 July 1902, 120,000 American soldiers were still trying to suppress the Filipino revolutionaries. Various revolutionary forces would put up a spirited resistance for a few more years after Aguinaldo's capture. Estimates placed the total casualties at 200,000 to 600,000 Filipinos.

Given this historical background of the making of the Filipino nation-state, it is inevitable that independence would be the consuming goal of Filipino nationalism during American rule, which allowed substantial autonomy and democratic self-rule by Filipinos. The Nacionalista Party captured the sense of Filipino nationalism as a nationalist ideology of independence and democracy in a capitalistic economy. As the unified nationwide organization of local leaders, the Nacionalista Party monopolized Filipino politics from 1907 to 1946 and was able to do so because its goal of independence was based on the national consensus.

**Independence would be
the consuming goal of
Filipino nationalism during
American rule.**

Filipino democratic political development under American colonial rule culminated in the Philippine Commonwealth which was preparatory to the scheduled Philippine independence on 4 July 1946. Thus when the Commonwealth was brutally interrupted from 1941 to 1944 by World War II, Filipinos sided with America in the war against Japan. For its part, Japan sponsored Philippine independence and a Philippine Republic in the hope of winning the Philippines over into a Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere under Japanese hegemony. But unspeakable Japanese slaughter and atrocities against the Filipinos drove them even more to the side of the Americans, now regarded as their liberators.

The establishment of the Republic in 1946, as mandated in the Tydings-McDuffie Act of the US Congress in 1934, ushered in the nation's painful rise from the ashes of World War II. National reconstruction was done with US assistance but the price paid was an amendment to the 1935 Constitution that granted the Americans parity rights in the operation of public utilities and the development of natural resources. We likewise signed the military bases agreement that allowed US forces to use our bases for 99 years. Following the election of Manuel Roxas as presi-

dent, the prosecution of certain Filipino leaders who had collaborated with the Japanese ended with their amnesty. Chronic peasant unrest in Central Luzon was exacerbated by the government's rejection of the legitimate claims of the HUKBALAHAP, the anti-Japanese guerrilla organization in that region.

Some Filipino nationalists sought to rectify what they regarded as our neocolonial status after regaining formal independence from American rule. During the 1950s Senator Claro Mayo Recto criticized Philippine foreign policy for slavishly following US initiatives and warned against our becoming a likely target in the event of an atomic war between the US and the Soviet Union. But Philippine dependence on US loans, aid and defense during the Cold War and the continued presence of US forces in the country that was thought to ensure national security made every president — from Manuel Roxas to Ferdinand Marcos — subservient to US foreign policy.

Understood as a global struggle between democracy and communism, the Cold War was made real to the Filipinos by the communist rebellion at home, the rise of the People's Republic of China, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. However, Philippine foreign relations became more multi-lateral as the Philippines increasingly emphasized its ties with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (Asean) and tried to associate itself with the Afro-Asian Non-Aligned Movement, while Filipino leaders sought better terms from the US in regard to trade, aid, and finance, and on the use of the bases by the US military. Most Filipinos, mainly concerned with domestic affairs, accepted the government's definition of how Filipino nationalism was to be promoted in external relations.

The (Maoist) Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) that supplanted the old (Soviet-oriented) *Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas* in 1968-1969, leftist trade unions, student organizations and intellectuals articulated radical alternatives to the known goals and orientation of mainstream Filipino nationalism. The CPP and its New People's Army (NPA) and National Democratic Front (NDF) would fight the longest communist rebellion in Asia that sought to capture state power and establish a People's Republic of the Philippines. Moro nationalists who formed the Moro National Liberation Front in the 1970s mounted a secessionist rebellion to establish a secular Bangsa Moro Republic in the southern Philippines,

while other leaders joined a Mindanao Independence Movement. Some leaders in the Cordilleras led their own ethnonationalist movement, the Cordillera People's Liberation Movement, for autonomy in northern-central Luzon.

Avowedly in response to the communist and Moro rebellions, Ferdinand Marcos imposed martial law 'to save the Republic and to reform the society' in his image of a 'democratic revolution'. His 1973 Constitution was high-minded and nationalistic on paper. As it turned out, however, all his nationalistic posturing and legalistic governance of the *Bagong Lipunan* (New Society) could not hide the fact that he imposed authoritarian rule mainly because he wanted to govern indefinitely and aggrandize himself. Under his authoritarian regime the communist rebellion grew and spread to more provinces in Luzon and to the Visayas and Mindanao.

For more than 13 years the nation paid the incalculable cost of massive human rights violations, continued poverty and underdevelopment, crony capitalism and corruption, a foreign debt of 28 billion pesos, a ruined economy, and a highly politicized military. The events in February 1986—highlighted by the snap presidential election, military mutiny and the EDSA revolution — demonstrated the people's will to overthrow the self-serving dictator and replace him with Corazon Aquino, to restore democracy and to rebuild the economy.

Since the 1960s, a nationalist rewriting of Philippine history and culture has been undertaken by a number of critical intellectuals, among them Teodoro Agoncillo, Renato Constantino, and Reynaldo Ileto. Having read the works of these intellectuals, many student leaders and activists joined in the criticism of the conservative and reactionary ideas of mainstream nationalism which basically favored the rich and powerful. Mainstream nationalism was also criticized for being uncritically pro-American and for avoiding basic reforms for equity and justice. This elitist brand of nationalism considered demands for reforms as subversive, if not communistic. Aside from the students, there were also members of the clergy who voiced their criticism and protest through their writings, preaching and grassroots organizing. They would become the backbone of civil society's nonviolent resistance during the Marcos authoritarian regime.

In the educational and cultural spheres, contentious issues on nationalism have to do with state policy and support for (or indifference to) basic

and higher education; science and technology; the national language; regional languages and culture; Filipino literature, music and the arts; and Philippine history. Compared to those in industrialized or industrializing countries in Asia, state promotion of educational and cultural development

State promotion of educational and cultural development is given little more than lip service by Filipino leaders and the government.

is given little more than lip service by Filipino leaders and the government. The emphasis is on ensuring equity at the expense of quality. Only lately has the promotion of scientific and technological development received more government support.

The most glaring and damaging neglect is in the promotion and use of Filipino, the national language (along with English)

as the language of government, education, commerce, and the print media. By contrast, the cinema, the broadcast media, and a few leading universities — such as the University of the Philippines, Ateneo de Manila University, and De la Salle University — are developing Filipino as the indigenous lingua franca. English, as the eminently useful global lingua franca, should be taught and learned more effectively as a foreign language; but it can never take the place of Filipino as the people's preferred language of democracy and development. The Philippine government rarely uses the national language in its dealings with the people. The general observation that the Filipino people are indifferent to the celebration of the centennial is related to this chasm in public communication.

On 16 September 1991, the Philippine Senate voted to reject the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Security between the Philippines and the US that would have allowed American forces to remain at Subic Naval Base in Olongapo, Zambales for a further 10 years. Arguments for and against the treaty's ratification revolved on the themes of idealism, pragmatism and nationalism. The debate was held in the wake of the catastrophic eruption of Mt Pinatubo which devastated Clark Air Base and soon after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The rejection of the treaty by a vote of 12 to 11 ended more than 400 years of foreign military presence in the islands. Led by Senate President Jovito Salonga, the victory of the anti-treaty senators was regarded as a high point of Filipino nationalism.

From the 1950s to the mid-1980s, economic nationalism had taken the

form of rent-seeking, crony monopolies, and the protection of Filipino entrepreneurs in trade and industry against its Chinese and foreign competitors. The abuses and excesses of economic nationalism prevented the growth and competitiveness of local industries and the attraction of foreign capital and investments into the country at a time when Taiwan, South Korea, and Singapore, and then Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia, were opening their doors wide to the world. It should be noted that economic nationalism has an anti-Chinese accent on account of the dominance of Chinese-Filipinos in the economy.

During the Marcos presidency (1965-1986), the Philippines was left behind by the tiger economies and newly industrializing countries in East and Southeast Asia. After the EDSA revolution, Corazon Aquino began reviving the economy by undertaking liberalization, deregulation, and privatization; breaking up the crony monopolies; and encouraging competition. Fidel Ramos broadened and intensified the liberalization of industries, trade, investments, and banking, and the privatization of government corporations. By hosting the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meeting in 1996, Ramos also played an active international role in promoting economic liberalization and globalization. In addition to its economic reforms, the Ramos administration concluded peace agreements with the rightist military rebels and the Moro National Liberation Front and pursued talks with the communist National Democratic Front.

The globalism drive of the Ramos administration has been praised by some businessmen and economists as the correct new outlook of Filipino nationalism. The nationalists of the Left and economic protectionists were criticized as inward-and-backward looking. However, the collapse last year of currencies and stock markets and the deepening economic crises at home and in other East Asian countries have triggered reappraisals of the much-vaunted virtues of globalization. Economic policy, financial management, and development strategies are being reexamined. Effective ways of responding to the weakening of national economies and the nation-states are being explored as regional economies rise and globalization engulfs national societies and cultures.

Politically, since 1899, we have had three organic acts and six Constitutions. Each Constitution embodied a political ideology and a virtual definition of nationalism in general: what policies and what manner of gover-

nance would promote and safeguard the interests and the greater good of the Filipino nation. More than any previous Constitution, the 1987 Constitution spells out in considerable detail a nationalist ideal and agenda for democracy and the 'Good Society' which shall be discussed below. But some critics have called for constitutional amendments in response to the changing global environment.

We live in a world in which the sovereignty, autonomy and capacities of the world's nation-states are constrained by their growing interdependence and competition. This is brought about by the regional and global dimensions of human development, the integration of national and regional economies in the world economic order, as well as the planetary

impact of modern telecommunications and certain dominant national cultures. The unending challenge to Filipino nationalism is for Filipinos to respond to the forces of globalization in order to minimize their unwanted effects and to maximize their beneficial effects. Despite the globalizing forces that tend to weaken the Filipino nation-

state, the role of nationalism in ensuring national survival and enhancing national development is of enduring importance.

The unending challenge to Filipino nationalism is for Filipinos to respond to the forces of globalization.

VARIOUS MEANINGS OF FILIPINO NATIONALISM

WHAT is Filipino nationalism? What are its goals and objectives? What are its manifestations and distinctive characteristics? Here we shall try to highlight what the authors of the UP anthologies mentioned earlier reveal about the nature of nationalism in the Filipino context.

Some authors say that nationalism is a sentiment, a consciousness, an inspiration, a motivation, the nation's collective conscience, the primal virtue of the citizen, a manifestation of the national soul or spirit. Others say it is an idea, a concept, an intellectual construct, a state of mind, a habit of the intellect and the will of the citizens, a way of life, the life of the race. Still others say it is an ideology or national ideology. Yet others emphasize that it is a force, a power for good or ill akin to religion; or a people's movement, meaning a social movement. These expressions of the essence of nationalism suggest different meanings, some of which may overlap to a certain

degree. To give some order to their statements or expressions, we shall classify them in various clusters as follows.

As Love of Country and Nation. Filipino nationalism is love of country: a selfless, inclusive love beyond our selfish individual, parochial or partisan interests. It is also love of country and God, or rather love of country next only to, and as an inseparable part of, loving God who protects and blesses our country. It is active concern for *kapwa* or fellow Filipinos and cherishing what is Filipino, what makes us a nation distinct from other nations. It is loyalty to our country, often as *Inang Bayan*, expressed in our willingness to serve, defend, and die for her if need be. It includes loyalty to our institutions and traditions, and appreciation of our history. It extends to our love of freedom, liberty, and democracy as Filipino values and ideals.

To underline somewhat different nuances, Filipino nationalism is our citizens' secular identification with the Filipino nation and national community, the Philippines as our country and homeland — transcending family, clan, tribe, village, town, city, province, region, local culture, and religion. It is being pro-Filipino first and foremost; believing we belong body, mind, heart and spirit to our nation and country. It is pride in being Filipino; pride in our national cultural heritage and way of life, with a realization of their limitations. It includes pride in our heroes; pride in our flag, national anthem, and other symbols of our nationhood. In a word, it is Filipinism.

Filipino nationalism has had a xenophobic strain first directed towards the Spaniards, briefly against the Americans especially during the Filipino-American War, towards the Japanese during their occupation of the country, and towards the Chinese and Chinese-Filipinos to this day. It also contains a mild strain of racism directed at certain nationals. But such xenophobia is greatly compensated by the general openness and friendliness of Filipinos to various foreigners because of Filipino exposure to different peoples throughout their history and especially since independence. In fact, one outstanding example is that many Filipinos have tended to be too appreciative and trusting in the nation's relations with the Americans and to have a lingering colonial mentality in regard to western culture and consumerism. Modern communications, education and travel and massive overseas employment have broadened the Filipino worldview.

In a national survey conducted by the Social Weather Stations in November 1994, respondents were asked this question: 'A long time ago, the Philippines was occupied by Spain, the United States, and Japan. All these countries greatly benefited from the Philippines. Now that the Philippines has been independent for a long time, would you say that you still have much resentment, some resentment, or no resentment of Spain, the United States, and Japan?' Ma Cristina Rodil writes in her report on the survey that:

In general, Filipinos tend not to harbor resentment. Findings reveal that majority of Filipinos (79%) feel no resentment against Spain, 16% feel some resentment, and only 6% feel much resentment....Eighty-four percent (84%) feel no resentment towards the United States, 12% feel some and only 3% feel much resentment....Compared to Spain and the United States, slightly fewer Filipinos feel no resentment towards Japan (73%). Seventeen percent feel some and 10% feel much resentment towards Japan.

As Ideology and Program of Action. Filipino nationalism is a national ideology. More than love of country, it is a concept of what the nation is, what values it embodies and represents, and what policies these values demand or imply. It is a philosophy and program of government, politics and culture to make us Filipinos supreme in our own land, on the premise that as sovereign citizens we alone have the power to direct our internal and external affairs. It is a set of political ideas gained from our historical experience and from our understanding of the nation's problems and interests. Not only is it the embodiment of our collective aspirations, it is also the forceful guide of our actions.

As a political ideology, Filipino nationalism embodies a philosophy of national power lodged in, and exercised by, the citizens in a constitutional democracy. It will help develop a collective contempt for the evils of the status quo and make it into a mighty force for reform to achieve national goals and objectives. It is an expression of national purposiveness devoted to the tasks of achieving national unity, economic, social and political modernization, and development and progress. It also provides us a framework for understanding and interpreting the nation and society in relation to the world.

As a Movement for National Survival and Liberation. Filipino nationalism is also seen as a movement, whether consciously guided by a coherent set of ideas or ideology or a loosely concerted one, to do what is good, right and just for our people and country. It is putting the interests of our nation above those of others in order to survive physically as a nation and to survive as a distinct national/cultural identity. In response to particular nations and the world at large, Filipino nationalism means asserting and enhancing our independence, sovereignty and self-reliance, and rejecting and opposing colonialism, foreign domination, and all forms of oppression and exploitation. It is a movement to shape and control our national destiny, to manage and control our national patrimony and natural resources; a movement for positive change, improvement of our youth, middle class, tenants and small farmers, businessmen, leaders and intellectuals.

The aim of Filipino nationalism as a sustained although loosely concerted movement is the full realization by ethnic Filipinos of their political and economic independence, the rediscovery and assertion of their national and Asian roots and identity, and the realization and satisfaction of their collective welfare and individual well-being as a democratic nation — in a world undergoing profound and rapid change under the impact of globalization and modern technology.

As National Consciousness. Focusing the spirit of nationalism on ourselves as Filipinos, our authors tell us that we should have an intellectual and moral reorientation in the service of and for the good of our country and nation. What is required of us are a deeper national consciousness; greater concern for the public interest and the common good; and more self-sacrifice, self-discipline, and self-improvement towards excellence in all our endeavors. It also requires a positive disposition to accept what is good and beneficial for, and to reject what is prejudicial to, our common interests as a nation — that we be as good as, if not better than, our neighbors.

GOALS AND THEMES OF FILIPINO NATIONALISM

THE anthology authors clearly associate nationalism with certain values and purposes, and goals and objectives. Here, I shall summarize their thinking on the goals and themes of Filipino nationalism. The themes ac-

tually spill over into each other and merge into a diffused, general idea of Filipino nationalism.

Nationalism in General. Filipino nationalism is concerned with such purposes, goals, and objectives as:

Asserting our sovereignty, independence, and self-reliance, and opposing colonialism, imperialism, and foreign domination and exploitation;

Patriotism, love of country/nation, sacrificing for and service to our country/nation, love of God and country or of our country as next only to our love of God;

Fostering nationhood, national identity, peace and unity in the context of pluralism, conflict and cooperation, and massive migration of workers overseas;

Determining and advancing the nation's goals, national security, the national interest, the common good, the public interest, the greater good and welfare of all the people;

Promoting freedom and democracy at home and in the world; and

Promoting nation-building and development vis-à-vis interdependence, humanism, internationalism, and globalization.

Political Nationalism. I put together the following goals and themes: (a) national freedom, liberation, independence, and self-determination; (b) individual freedom, equality, and social justice; (c) democracy and people's power and empowerment; (d) socialism, and national democracy/communism; (e) leadership, citizenship and government; nationalism, education and development; and (f) the military bases, sovereignty and development.

Economic Nationalism. In this dimension of nationalism, the goals and themes I identified are: (a) developing an independent and self-reliant national economy; (b) promoting industrialization, a strong economy, and a better life for all; (c) protecting and promoting Filipino business, industry, labor, and free enterprise for the nation's good; (d) protecting and developing the national patrimony and the environment; (e) furthering the national interest, economic development, and global competitiveness; (f) seeking and pursuing the right economic policy vis-à-vis for-

eign capital, investments, foreign debt, the IMF and the World Bank; and (g) promoting science and technology for development and the people's welfare.

Sociocultural Nationalism. In relation to sociocultural nationalism, the goals and themes I identified in the authors' statements are: (a) colonial mentality as excess baggage, national self-confidence, and national will; (b) language and nationalism: Filipino (*Ang Wikang Pambansa*) and other Philippine languages, English as the global language; (c) education for socio-cultural nationalism; (d) nationalism, culture, literature and the arts; (e) nationalism, the press and media; and (f) religion, the church, morality and spirituality; sports, human and social development; and national unity and pride.

Nation-building and National Development. Here are the themes relating to nation-building and national development: (a) achieving authentic national development and greatness as a nation; (b) building the democratic nation-state: the Republic of the Philippines, and the Good Society and their institutions; (c) promoting equitable and sustainable development, social justice, and people's participation and welfare; (d) caring for and helping one another and the poor, and serving the common good; (e) shaping our values, culture and character as a united and cohesive national community; and (f) assuring and pursuing roles in nation-building of heroes and martyrs, leaders, citizens/people/workers, women, youth/students/children, teachers/scholars and schools/universities, the religious and the Church, journalists/writers/artists/publishers, and the military and police.

THE NATIONALIST VISION IN THE 1987 CONSTITUTION

In 1997 I headed a group of 50 scholars and experts mostly from UP that did a study to prepare *Scenarios for the Future Development of the Philippine Nation-State, 1998-2025*, as an input to the formulation of the Philippine Long-Term Plan (1998-2025). The study was commissioned by the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA). My first problem was to determine the ideological framework and authoritative goals in projecting the country's long-term development. Immediately, I thought of the

1987 Constitution. Being the fundamental law of the land ratified by the people, this Constitution is the most authoritative statement on the Philippines as an ideal or desired 'democratic and republican State' and on the Filipino concept of the 'Good Society'. I use the term 'Good Society' as a concept referring to the idea of a 'just and humane society' in the Constitution, whose meaning is amply described in its various provisions.

How nationalistic is the 1987 Constitution? To what extent is it prescriptive of nationalistic ends? This longest and most detailed Constitution in Philippine history calls for reforms and social transformation towards the building of a free, peaceful, prosperous, democratic, egalitarian, just, and humane society through a dynamic political, economic, social, and cultural democracy.

The 1987 Constitution goes beyond prescribing the form, structure, functions and powers of the Philippine Senate and the limitations on those powers, and ensures the citizens their full human rights, not only their political and civil rights. It differs from the 1899 Malolos Constitution, the 1935 Constitution, the 1943 Constitution, the 1973 Constitution, and the 1986 Freedom Constitution, in having full, separate articles on accountability of public officers (XI); the national economy and patrimony (XII); social justice and human rights — including labor, agrarian and natural resource reform, urban land reform and housing, health, women, and role and rights of people's organizations (XIII); education, science and technology; education, arts, culture, and sports, including language (XIV); and the family (XV).

In its detailed prescription of the ideal Filipino society and democracy and their governance, reform and development, the 1987 Constitution reveals itself to be deeply concerned with the goals of Filipino nationalism in the sense of 'the pursuit of the national interest and welfare and the common good.' It specifically provides that all educational institutions 'shall inculcate patriotism and nationalism, foster love of humanity, respect for human rights, appreciation of the role of national heroes in the historical development of the country, teach the rights and duties of citizenship... (Art. XIV). It would not be an exaggeration to assert that, in fact, the 1987 Constitution articulates a nationalist vision for Filipino society and an agenda for its social, economic, political, and cultural reform and development. Here are the specifics of that nationalist vision and agenda.

The Economy and Economic Development. Economically, the goal of the State is to 'develop a self-reliant and independent national economy effectively controlled by Filipinos' (II.19). This goal implicitly recognizes the historic and continuing dependency of the Philippine economy on foreign capital, investments, technology, and assistance, and the influence and control over our economy by certain foreign governments, multinational corporations, and international financial institutions.

The Philippine economy is in fact integrated into the world capitalist system and global division of labor. Within this framework, the Constitution favors and 'encourages private enterprise' subject to governmental intervention for 'the common good' and 'to promote distributive justice' (II.20; XII.6). Because 'the use of property bears a social function...all economic agents shall contribute to the common good....' (XII.6). Thus the constitutional goals of the national economy are (a) 'a more equitable distribution of opportunities, income and wealth'; (b) 'a sustained increase in the amount of goods and services produced by the nation for the benefit of the people'; and (c) 'an expanding productivity as the key to raising the quality of life for all, especially the underprivileged' (XII.1). The Constitution goes on to provide that 'the State shall promote industrialization and full employment based on sound agricultural development and agrarian reform.... However, the State shall protect Filipino enterprises against unfair foreign competition and trade practices' (XII.1).

Having recognized the Philippines' underdevelopment and economic and political dependency despite its formal independence and sovereignty, the Constitution provides that 'the State shall pursue an independent foreign policy' (II.7). It appears that the transformation of the Philippines' international relations should be in the direction of more vigorous and effective assertions of its national sovereignty, independence, self-determination, and territorial integrity in a world of increasing interdependence among nation-states, international organizations, and multinational corporations.

Inevitably, the constitutional ideal for international relations based on the concept of a sovereign, independent, and self-reliant nation-state needs to be adjusted to the realities of an integrated world economy and globalization. In fact, since the Constitution's promulgation in February 1987, the Philippines has been compelled to make basic adjustments in the direc-

tion of economic liberalization and increased international cooperation in political, social and cultural matters. Nationalism has been redefined and will continue to be redefined in the light of the changing imperatives of national survival and welfare. This includes the protection of the national economy, the people's welfare, and the national culture from the deleterious effects of globalization.

REALIZING THE ASPIRATIONS OF NATIONALISM

THE enormous problem in the actualization of nationalism in everyday life is demonstrated in the persistence in our country of widespread poverty and unemployment, malnutrition and disease, inequity and injustice, corruption and criminality, massive migration of workers and high population growth, the poor quality of education and the lag in science and technology, environmental degradation and low human development in general. It is shown in our elections that are often flawed by fraud, vote-buying and violence. It is found in the weak capacity of the government in ensuring the rule of law in society and mobilizing adequate resources through taxation. It manifests itself in the quality of political and administrative leadership and in the citizens' relative lack of civic efficiency and effective participation in governance. The various dimensions of the problem are of course interrelated.

However, from the fullness and sophistication of articulations about nationalism by succeeding generations of Filipinos, we realize that, collectively speaking, we are not wanting in intellectual and emotional understanding of nationalism. We are quite certain about the various goals and objectives of nationalism in its political, economic, social, and cultural aspects. Many Filipinos have given us a legacy of leadership, heroism, or

martyrdom — for love of country and service to the nation. From the foregoing analysis of the nationalist vision and agenda for the nation embodied in the 1987 Constitution, we can conclude that we have a grand vision as well as basic guidelines for advancing the cause of Filipino nationalism.

Nationalism needs to be internalized as a common ethics of right and wrong.

The problem lies in the actualization of nationalism in the day-to-day choices that we make in shaping, implementing, and revising public policy

and programs. It needs to be internalized as a common ethics of right and wrong and enforced with appropriate, timely and visible sanctions and rewards. The problem also lies in the people's awareness and discharge of their duties and responsibilities as citizens of this nation, as residents in their communities, as workers in various fields, and as members of different organizations. It is also to be found in the the periodic election of leaders and selection of civil servants, and in being able to hold them responsible and accountable for their stewardship and performance.

Based on an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of Filipinos, it has been proposed that value development programs develop in the Filipino: '(1) a sense of patriotism and national pride, a genuine love, appreciation and commitment to the Philippines and things Filipino; (2) a sense of the common good, the ability to look beyond selfish interests, a sense of justice, and a sense of outrage at their violation; (3) a sense of integrity and accountability, an aversion towards graft and corruption in society and an avoidance of the practice in one's daily life; (4) the value and habits of discipline and hard work; and (5) the value and habits of self-reflection and analysis, the internalization of spiritual values, the emphasis on essence rather than form' (Moral Recovery Program 1988).

OUR UNFINISHED REVOLUTION

It was one thing to achieve nationhood and political independence in 1898 and regain that independence in 1946, at the price of so much struggle, sacrifice and heroism. It is another and even more difficult task to build the 'Good Society' (*Ang Magandang Lipunan*) and the Good Government and working democracy envisaged in our Constitutions, and especially in the 1987 Constitution. This great national endeavor, as some authors of our anthology have noted, is 'The Unfinished Revolution' that began as the Philippine Revolution in 1896.

The Unfinished Revolution may be defined in relation to Filipino nationalism, nation-building, and national development whose main themes have been identified and refined here as: (a) the shaping of our values, culture and character as a united and cohesive national community; (b) promoting equitable and sustainable development, social justice and the people' welfare; (c) caring for and helping one another and the poor, and serving the common good; (d) building our democratic nation-state,

the Good Society and our governmental and social institutions; and (e) achieving authentic national development and greatness as a nation that will be reflected in an emerging Filipino civilization.

In our UP study for the NEDA, we concluded that sustained, progressive national development as envisaged in the 1987 Constitution cannot be achieved by 2025. We projected that it would take not one but three generations, or up to 2075, to realize it substantively under our optimistic but realistic assumptions.

In our longer view, we associate the development of the Filipino nation with the achievement of greater unity and cohesiveness of the Filipinos as a national community in a globalizing environment. We visualize the enhancement of their sense of national identity and history; their love and pride of country; their appreciation of things Filipino and the achievements of Filipinos; and their concern for the common good and the national interest. All these qualities are to be expressed in deeds and not merely in words — in the substance of Filipino nationalism.

We see the identities of Filipinos expanding as they relate to and identify with other peoples and communities and humankind. In their widening worldview, they may also regard themselves as 'Aseans', Asians, Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, citizens of the world, and so on. This is to say that they have multiple identities and 'function' at various levels: the local, the subnational region, the national, the regional, and the global.

We associate social and cultural development with the improvement of the people's health, education, housing, welfare and recreation; the nationwide use of Filipino as the national and official language and the continued ability to relate to the world by using English and other foreign languages; the enjoyment and enhancement of the national culture and the regional and indigenous cultures; the development of science and technology; the nurturing of a culture of curiosity, creativity, innovation and life-long learning; and the people's sense of satisfaction, well-being and happiness as individuals, as family and community.

In the process of nation-building and national development that is informed by creative nationalism, our role as leaders and citizens is crucially important. Accordingly, we should become much better educated. We should learn to be more productive, adaptive, critical, and responsible, and to be united and cohesive, working with and through our governmental

and social institutions. We should shun parochialism and open up to a wide variety of ideas and intellectual trends at home and abroad. We should resist uncritical acceptance and indiscriminate imitation of what is Western, as a vestige of colonial mentality reflecting lack of national consciousness and mental laziness.

Our leaders in the government, the political sector, the private sector, and civil society face a great challenge and responsibility. First, they are called upon to provide our institutions and communities and the nation with a vision, with knowledge and understanding, with democratic and participatory governance, and with the capacity for seeking consensus in solving common problems and resolving conflicts, and achieving unity and cohesiveness. Second, they should together help to enhance the nation's creativity, productivity and resiliency and the people's sense of purposiveness, optimism, and national pride, and the feeling that they hold the nation's destiny in their own hands. Our leaders should realize that cultural survival and diversity is as important to human welfare as biological survival and diversity.

In whatever way Filipino nationalism is regarded — as a collective feeling, as an ideology, ideal or aspiration, as the people's collective spirit or soul, as a philosophy or program, as an attitude or a social movement — it seems to be out there in the distance rather than a daily living reality for most of us. We talk and write about it in the illusion that we already possess it, that our words today can replace our deeds of tomorrow, that our wishes can magically turn into truth, and that our disappointments and frustrations would somehow lead us to the fulfillment we so desire, without the effort and sacrifice.

But we also believe in the power of ideas, the inspiration of personal and collective example, the compelling force of heroic events that embody the ideas, feelings and actions of Filipino nationalism. Thus the ample thoughts and emotions and deeds of the past century reflected in the anthology of Filipino nationalism and nation-building, which I have tried to synthesize in this essay, should give us guidance and encouragement that we can prevail and succeed — if we really want to and strive hard enough.

We take pride in seeking development through democratic ways, which sets us apart from many developing nations. But the promise of a better future for our country could be the best inducement for us to con-

sciously become truly good citizens and good leaders in our homeland, serving our people in whatever way we can and contributing somehow to our country's progress. And this, perhaps, would be the simplest definition of Filipino nationalism.

REFERENCES

- Abueva, J (ed). 1998. *Filipino Nationalism, Nation-Building and National Development*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press. (in press)
- Abueva, J (ed). 1998. *The Making of the Filipino Nation and Republic: From Barangays, Tribes, Sultanates, and Colony*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press. (in press)
- Abueva, J (ed). 1972. *Filipino Politics, Nationalism and Emerging Ideologies*. Manila: Modern Book Co.
- Alfonso, O. 1967. Beginnings of Filipino Nationalism. In T Agoncillo & O Alfonso (eds). *History of the Filipino People*, pp. 123-145. Quezon City: Malaya Books.
- Agoncillo, T. 1956. *The Revolt of the Masses: The Story of Bonifacio and the Katipunan*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Agoncillo, T. 1960. *Malolos: The Crisis of the Republic*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Agoncillo, T. 1974. *Filipino Nationalism, 1872-1910*. Quezon City: RP Garcia.
- Arcilla, J. 1991. *Rizal and the Emergence of the Philippine Nation*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Constantino, R. 1975. *The Philippines: A Past Revisited*. Quezon City: Tala Publishing.
- Constantino, R & Constantino, L. 1978. *The Philippines: The Continuing Past*. Quezon City: The Foundation for Nationalist Studies.
- Corpuz, OD. 1989. *The Roots of the Filipino Nation*. Volumes I & II. Quezon City: AKLAHI Foundation, Inc.
- Costa, H de la. 1965. *The Background of Nationalism and Other Essays*. Manila: Solidaridad Publishing House.
- Costa, H de la (ed). 1965. *Readings in Philippine History*. Manila: Bookmark.
- Ileto, R. 1979. *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Maceda, T. 1996. *Mga Tinig Mula sa Ibaba*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Moral Recovery Program. 1988.
- Schumacher, J. 1991. *The Making of a Nation: Essays on 19th Century Nationalism*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Villanueva, A Jr. 1989. *Bonifacio's Unfinished Revolution*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.