

# philippine studies

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

---

## Private Enterprise on the Frontier

Sixto K. Roxas

*Philippine Studies* vol. 8, no. 1 (1960): 170—175

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 30 13:30:20 2008

HANDEL: Organ Concertos, op. 4. Columbia K2S-602 (2 records).  
TCHAIKOWSKY: The Nutcracker Suite (complete). London CSA 2203 (2 records).

TCHAIKOWSKY: Swan Lake (extended excerpts). London CSA 2204 (2 records).

HANDEL. Arias; sung by Richard Lewis, tenor. Capitol SG 7170

SCHUMANN. Symphony No. 3. Paray and the Detroit Symphony Orchestra. Mercury SR 90133.

RACHMANINOFF. Concerto for Piano No. 3, Van Cliburn. Victor LSC 2355.

DVORAK. Serenade for Strings. Kubelik and the Israel Philharmonic. London CS 6032.

Winds in Hi-Fi. Fennell and the Rochester Woodwind Ensemble. Mercury SR 90124.

BEETHOVEN. Symphony No. 2; Ruins of Athens. Beecham and the Royal Philharmonic. Angel S 35509.

The following recent monophonic recordings may also be recommended:

BRAHMS: Variations on a Theme of Handel; Waltzes. Epic LC 3381.

BRAHMS: Piano Concerto No. 1. Epic LC 3484.

BEETHOVEN: Eroica Variations in E flat; Variations in F and C. Vanguard VRS 1032.

Debut (John Browning, pianist, playing Chopin, Debussy, Bach.) Capitol SP 8464.

THEODORE E. DAIGLER

## *Private Enterprise on the Frontier*

I have never ceased to be impressed by the wealth and resources with which nature has so magnanimously endowed the island of Mindanao. Flying over this vast territory and seeing hectares upon hectares of timberland, the wide expanse of grassland for pasture, the rich humus-covered soil, the water power latent in lakes and rivers, I could not help thinking of what one timber magnate once said to me in Manila: "You worry about the international reserves of the country. Well, here are our real reserves."

The problem however is how to convert the rich endowment of nature into the food, clothing and housing that our people need in growing quantities and into the raw materials of industry and the com-

modities of foreign and domestic commerce. This is the problem not only of Mindanao but of the entire country as well. It is a problem that is as tremendous as the resources which must be mobilized on this island. It is a problem that is gigantic, but if we can solve it, rewards will be in proportion.

What is necessary to transform the native resources of Mindanao into income and livelihood for the Filipinos is simply investment, but investment of such great magnitude that it frightens the imagination, at least in our present circumstances. Of the province of Cotabato alone, with its more than 2 million hectares of area, I am told that its lowlands could be made to produce enough rice to feed the entire country, that its rich upland soil offers some of the choicest sites for coffee, cacao, fruit trees in the world. But to transform this promise into fulfillment, think what must be done. We must construct a system of water control; pour money into clearing and preparing land; buy farm machinery and equipment by the shipload; build warehouses, processing and drying facilities, and kilometers of roads to connect centers of production with points of trade and consumption. And then there must be people—people to man the machines and work the implements and to provide supervision and management. Whenever you have people, you must have private and community facilities to serve them; you must have government, education, you must have recreation. All these mean investment.

I have been told by foreign technical people that the area around Lake Lanao is potentially a most suitable region for the initial processing of many of the raw materials of industry. The lake itself can provide the source of cheap power not only as at present in Iligan but in other points as well. Already there are chemical industries in Iligan. Malabang has become a center of cassava planting and milling. In addition, the area is most suitable for the production of paper pulp to feed our increasing number of paper mills. But, in contemplating these potentialities, think once again of the investments that must be undertaken to convert that area into an industrial workshop. Where shall we look for them?

There is a tendency among our people when confronted with tasks of great magnitude to shrug their shoulders and say, "This is so big that only the government can do it." This, in my opinion, is a dangerous attitude and I do not believe it leads to the type of progress we desire. Yet it is only too prevalent today.

It is time to take a long hard look at this attitude and its consequences. We discover that our farmers need credits, and immediately we turn to the government. The government, in response, establishes credit institutions to serve the people; before long, we find that the temptations offered to public officials have become irresistible. We discover that our countrymen need help in trade. We turn to the government. The government sets up trading corporations; before long,

we find that instead of achieving their worthy purposes these corporations have become centers of corruption. We find resources to be exploited and we turn to the government to mobilize the investments to exploit them. Before long, we discover that far from being the efficient contributors to the national economy that they should be, these enterprises have become burdens to the state and the people.

And in the process the government has been induced to expand, to multiply its agencies, to exercise powers which it is impossible for any human agency to wield equitably and effectively, and to require ever increasing financial support from the rest of the nation.

In saying this, I do not intend to criticize any institution or the administration of any party. In fact, I believe the private citizens themselves are to blame for adopting an attitude which pushes their government into activities alien to the purposes of government and fatal to the integrity of public officials. Just as it is primarily the private citizen's responsibility and not the government's to provide an adequate livelihood for himself and his children, so it is primarily our responsibility as private citizens of this country to mobilize and use the resources of this country to multiply sources of livelihood.

We sing the praises of private enterprise. But the real meaning of private enterprise is the very opposite of our characteristic attitude. If it means anything, private enterprise must signify a willingness and an ability of private citizens to take the initiative in the development of a project, to assume the leadership to mobilize the resources required by the project and to establish the organization to plan and implement and operate the project.

If it be asked how far private effort and private resources can take us, particularly in the face of the great tasks involved in developing this country at the pace we must if we are to keep up with our growing population, the answer is simple. It can take us *all the way*.

The history of the development of American industry, of the opening of the American Western frontier, is the story of individual men, entrepreneurs who saw the possibilities of limitless wealth and went after it. Many of these pioneers were immigrants who were penniless and untutored but had the drive and the vision to carve empires of gold and minerals, railroads and real estate—and in so doing gave American industry an impetus which has not yet diminished. So you find in the pages of American economic history a John Jacob Astor, a German butcher's son who landed in New York empty-handed, traded in furs with the Indians "to the wildest outposts of the frontier" and ended up being called "the landlord of New York." You have a Cornelius Vanderbilt, who could not spell and kept no books, but with a combination of energy, enterprise and parsimony became "a leader of men and undertakings" and one of the first "captains of industry." Jay Gould, Jim Fisk, J. P. Morgan, John Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie,

Philip Armour — they built the railroads, founded the banking houses, the iron and steel foundries, the food-packing industries that are household names today.

The United States, at the time when these men were young, was a country in flux and ferment, much as the Philippines is today. The country was being built up, spreading over the continent; gold was being discovered, people were moving, building, making and losing fortunes overnight. The country was wide open, and men saw the opportunities and took them. Their primary aim was to amass personal wealth, but the capital they came to command built the industries that made their country powerful.

I consider this chapter of American history particularly apt since, on a similar scale, Mindanao offers the same environment to the Filipino as the great Western frontier did to the American. Here one finds the almost unlimited opportunity, the invitation to wealth, the challenge to rugged individualism and bold vision. Here also one finds a striking parallel in that this territory is being peopled by immigrants from other parts of the Philippines. An immigrant population seems to be the most capable of meeting the challenge of an undeveloped region.

An immigrant is one who has pulled up stakes in his native community to settle in a new region. He comes therefore with no set conventions, no rigid social inhibitions. He has to make do in a new environment and therefore he is forced to be individualistic. He must rely on his own mettle, he must be the master of his own destiny. He is the private citizen *par excellence*.

Even the shortest visit to Butuan City or Cotabato or Davao gives one the unmistakable flavor of a ferment in the fever among the population quite different from what one finds in the more settled towns of Luzon. This is the spirit which I believe is building the Philippines of the future—the modern productive, prosperous Philippines of our ambitions. It has already achieved spectacular feats of enterprise. But it is not enough. We have made great strides but we cannot rest on our laurels. We are in a race with ourselves, with our growing population. We have to establish new industries and create more jobs in as short a time as possible. Not only that, it is imperative that we increase the efficiency of our productive efforts.

A few simple facts will illustrate why. In agriculture the Filipino can only harvest 27 cavans of palay for each hectare of land he cultivates as compared to the 80 cavans which his neighbor, the Japanese, gets from his land. But the Japanese is aided in his efforts by five times more in equipment and in fertilizers than the Filipino farmer.

In manufacturing, not to say anything about the wider variety of commodities and the higher quality, each person employed in Japan produces nine times more value than the person employed in manu-

facturing in the Philippines. But in Japan each worker in manufacturing is helped by twenty-three times more electric power and twice the capital which his counterpart in the Philippines uses. The contrast of course is sharper by far if we take the United States, where each person in manufacturing produces ninety times more than his counterpart in this country but is helped by one hundred and eleven times more power and fifteen times more capital investment.

The productivity in manufacturing and service industries is much higher than that in agriculture, and in the Philippines 71.0 per cent of our economically active population is in agriculture and only 9.0 per cent and 8.0 per cent are in manufacturing and services, respectively.

Our problem then is not merely to increase employment but to increase also the productivity of employment in this country. This will mean that our population will have to acquire the skills and learn the technology which have made the western countries the granaries of the world. It also means that this country must construct and acquire the plant and the capital equipment which enables human effort to multiply its output beyond the limits which simple unaided human labor can reach.

In a country where labor is unproductive and living levels are low, these are painful steps to take. Precisely because labor is so inefficient, every ounce of it becomes necessary merely to sustain life. Precisely because living levels are already low, every available output must certainly go into consumption. How is such a people to afford the time necessary to acquire new skills? How is such a nation to save the amounts necessary for the acquisition of capital equipment?

Right now the country as a whole is investing an average of only three and half per cent of its total annual production. At this rate, it will take us twenty years to double the total amount of capital available in the country, and a longer time still to increase the capital equipment available for each person employed. And yet, in order to raise the productivity of our people to a level which will be adequate to supply our demands for higher levels of living, we have to increase our capital resources by more than double their present size.

These investments must take the form of roads, irrigation plants, power stations, railroad cars, communication systems, textile mills, canning factories, service establishments of various sorts. One way of envisioning the precise nature of the task before us is to think of all the facilities which make Manila the most progressive industrial and commercial spot in this country. The task of developing a country is really one of multiplying the facilities of this city over the surface of our land.

The task, as I have said, is gigantic. It calls for large and integrated ventures, large capital outlays. We have to think and act "big" and we have to think and act "private". Government has its

place in industrial development, but individuals, groups of them, pooling their talents and capital, have an even more legitimate role in economic expansion. Projects of magnitude have been promoted by private enterprise. It must be done, it can be done—and *we can do it*.

SIXTO K. ROXAS

## Old Testament Problems

To know the answer or to know where to find it, is the whole secret of knowledge.—*Dr. Johnson*

The early chapters of the Book of Genesis continue to provide puzzling problems for even the professionally trained reader. Not long ago a busy parish priest passed on to the local seminary for solution a question proposed to him by one of his parishioners. Does the Old Testament, the inquirer wished to know, reckon years in the same way as we do? The bible tells us that Mathusale lived 969 *years*. Newspapers report that Magsaysay was 49 *years* old when he died. Does the word *years* have the same meaning in both statements? If so, how are we to explain the extraordinary length of Mathusale's life?

Similar problems, derived from the same biblical source, are discussed even in the halls of the national legislature. Between senate sessions one senator recently asked another: How is an intelligent Catholic supposed to interpret the account of Noe's ark? Did the ark include among its passengers animals indigenous to the Philippines? How were they ever captured, cared for, fed? How could an ark have been built big enough to carry two of every known species of animal?

The year for Mathusale was neither notably longer nor shorter than it was for Magsaysay. The Hebrew year contained 12 lunar months, totalling 364 days, 8 hours, 48 minutes, 34 seconds. The problem of the first questioner lies not in the meaning of the word *years*, but in the meaning of the number. Hebrews more often than not used numbers as symbols rather than as exact mathematical quantities. Nothing in Catholic teaching requires us to believe that Mathusale lived precisely 969 years. Nor is it necessary for a Catholic even though he be a senator to maintain that carabaos held a prideful place on the passenger list for the maiden voyage of Noe's ark.

That does not mean that the bible has erred. Catholic *are* obliged to believe in the divine inspiration and inerrancy of the Sacred Scriptures. But it does mean that before we charge the bible with error or absurdity we must make sure we are interpreting it correctly. And that is not always easy. The bible itself warns us of that. "In his (Saint Paul's) letters, there are some passages hard to understand. The unlearned and the unsteady twist the meaning of these to their