

# philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

---

**Leonard Wood, by Onorato**

Review Author: Josefina Dalupan Hofileña

*Philippine Studies* vol. 38, no. 1 (1990) 127–128

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

---

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at [philstudies@admu.edu.ph](mailto:philstudies@admu.edu.ph).

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>  
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

But when Mendes is most virulent, his venom loses its sting. His tirades, especially in the poems attacking the "tyrant" Marcos, only serve to be strident, and not incisive. The poem "Hail Dead" for instance, hones in on its target, but the anger spews forth in all directions, missing its mark. One can only wish Mendes had maintained his musicality throughout.

The brief blurb on Mendes reveals that he is a Brazilian. In his poems, however, he identifies himself with Filipinos, addressing them as "our people." Only once does he let his thoughts go back home. In the poem "Solitary Prayer at Camp Crame," Mendes wonders, in the midst of People Power euphoria in EDSA, why his continent continues to suffer, with the possibility of a similar miracle taking place there only a distant dream.

Why does Peter approve of this revolution  
And not Latin America's?  
(*"Solitary Prayer in Camp Crame"*)

Mendes, we are told, is also a priest. Does this calling, in any manner, take away from his craft?

On the contrary. His firsthand experience as a missionary in Mindanao has certainly enhanced the credibility and impact of his poems. The characters peopling his poems are engraved in his memory just as they cannot be forgotten by those who read of their pain and triumphs. Mendes likewise brings to life the moribund genre of religious poetry while making the experience of Christ a shared, felt reality. In an age where it is easy to slide into despair and disbelief, Mendes chooses to seek the saving light in a manmade darkness. When the times make it acceptable for the heavyfooted to trample the flowers, Mendes harvests hope.

The trapped flower  
Never says  
Despair.  
(*"Like a Child"*)

*Fatima Lim  
English Department  
University of Denver*

LEONARD WOOD AND THE PHILIPPINE CABINET CRISIS OF 1923. Revised edition. By Michael P. Onorato. Marikina: J.C. Palabay, 1988. 86 pages.

The more widely-used college textbooks in Philippine history present the administration of Governor-General Wood (1921-27) as a period of unrelenting conflict between Wood and the Filipino political leadership. Wood is usually portrayed as the intractable pro-consul whose insistence on a rigid interpretation of the provisions of the Jones Law made him an "enemy of Philippine autonomy." This insistence was met by the Philippine Legislature's refusal to

surrender the executive prerogatives already granted to them, precipitating the so-called Cabinet Crisis of 1923.

Michael P. Onorato challenges this commonly-held perception and contends that the Cabinet Crisis was more than just a case of conflicting interpretations of the Jones Law. Rather Onorato shows that the Cabinet Crisis was a political ploy used by then Senate President and Nacionalista Party boss Manuel L. Quezon to ensure himself of complete control over the Philippine Legislature.

To substantiate his claim, Onorato first traces the development of a progressively Filipinized insular government under American tutelage. After a brief introductory chapter on the Taft Era, Onorato focuses on Filipinization under Francis Burton Harrison and the passage of the Jones Law in 1916. He then examines the steps taken by the Philippine Legislature to alter the Jones Law by local legislation and Harrison's baffling inability (or unwillingness) to curb legislative excesses. What emerged then immediately prior to Wood's entry into the Philippine scene was the establishment of a "new government" wherein executive power was transferred to the Filipino elected leadership.

After describing the political atmosphere in which Wood would soon find himself, Onorato traces the events that led to Wood's appointment. In spite of the initial apprehension about the new governor-general, Wood's first year in the Philippines passed without any serious difficulty. In fact, the Philippine Legislature worked hand in hand with him in his efforts to restore bureaucratic efficiency, revive fiscal stability and repair the damages wrought on the Philippines during the Harrison administration. In his analysis of Wood's first year in office, Onorato offers a significant insight that has heretofore escaped many a student of this period. The achievements of the 1920s are usually attributed to Wood and his adherence—in the face of the Filipino leadership's uncooperative stance—to the provisions of the Jones Law. Onorato reminds us, however, that Wood's successes were the successes of the Filipinos as well. The Jones Law had created a government that required executive-legislative cooperation. The Filipinos were not merely the beneficiaries of—but were also responsible for—good government.

If, however, such cooperation and cordial relations were possible during Wood's first year in the Philippines, then why the crisis of 1923? In his analysis of the events before, during and after the Cabinet Crisis, Onorato weaves a fascinating account of Quezon's political astuteness in the face of imminent defeat at the polls. Through a careful perusal of documentary evidence, Onorato shows the interlocking relationship of the Conley Case, the mass resignation of the Cabinet and Council of State, and the political situation confronting Quezon at that time.

Although Quezon emerged as the top Filipino political leader after the 1922 polls, his hold on the Philippine Legislature was far from complete. The NP split of 1921 had allowed the Democrata Party to win a considerable number of seats. The Quezon-Osmena merger so soon after the elections had disillusioned many of Quezon's own followers. To make matters worse for Quezon, the Democratas were poised to win the special senatorial election set for early 1923. What Quezon needed was an issue that could galvanize the Filipino

people behind him, defeat the Democratas at the polls and force his own party to tow the Quezon line. Quezon found that issue in the Conley Case.

The facts of the Conley Case are well-known. So is the fact that Quezon orchestrated the mass resignation of the Cabinet to force a showdown with Wood. However, as Onorato so convincingly proves, the issue at hand was not one of constitutional interpretation but political survival. As the events of 1923 came to a close, Quezon had the Filipino masses behind him, his candidate had defeated the Democratas in the special polls and he had sent a clear message to his party that he was in control. Quezon emerged victorious. And although Wood would continually be attacked by the Philippine Legislature until his death in 1927, Wood was not the loser in this battle. The real loser was Philippine independence.

Onorato's work is a must for each student of Philippine colonial politics in general, and Manuel L. Quezon in particular. From 1922 to the end of American colonial rule, Philippine politics was controlled by one man: Quezon. And it may shock the reader to discover that Quezon would go to the extent of risking even the stability of the entire government to pursue his own political ends. The Cabinet Crisis was one such case.

Onorato's work is a fine historical piece, and it is unfortunate that typographical errors fill its pages. This is not merely a case of misspelled word here and there, although there are a number of these too (e.g., on p. 27, "pesos" for "peso"; on p. 55, "hotile" for "hostile"; on p. 61 "tull" for "full"; on p. 71 "statues" for "statutes"). Rather, whole words are left out (e.g., see the *La Vanguardia* excerpt on p. 31, the last three lines of paragraph 1 on p. 32, and line 9 of p. 46). This carelessness obviously interferes with the reader's understanding and appreciation of Onorato's work.

We look forward to more works by Onorato, and hope that his chosen publisher may be more careful next time.

Josefina Dalupan Hofileña  
Department of History and Political Science  
Ateneo de Manila University

ECONOMIC GROWTH IN MONSOON ASIA: A COMPARATIVE SURVEY. By Harry T. Oshima. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1987. 371 pages.

Confucianist scholars argue that Mencius was no mere transmitter of the ideas of the great teacher Confucius. Rather, they argue that Mencius was a great teacher in his own right who brought Confucian thought to a new height with his insistence on the perfectability of the human person. Perhaps Professor Oshima merits similar acclaim. He has taken the ideas of his former mentor, the Nobel laureate Simon Kuznets, and applied them to explain the challenges of economic growth in monsoon Asia. In doing so Oshima has not only applied Kuznets' ideas to Asia, but expanded upon them. In particular, Oshima force-