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Learning Objectives

At the end of this chapter, the student should be able to:

1. Identify key concepts and theoretical perspectives for the study of Philippine bureaucracy and the system of public management.
2. Describe the transformation of Philippine bureaucracy, the influences upon its structure, functions and processes, and its relationship with the executive and other political stakeholders.
3. Analyze the role of Philippine bureaucracy in facilitating or hindering democracy, development, and governance, given the historical context of Philippine politics and government.
4. Explain the issues and challenges confronting Philippine bureaucracy and its system of public management, considering current trends in globalization, sustainable development, democracy, devolution, and governance.

Introduction

Bureaucracy and administration are necessary elements in the Philippine government's performance of its functions as the operational apparatus or machinery of the state. With democracy as state ideology, the Philippines articulates its aspirations for participation, accountability, equality, rights and liberties, constitutionalism, welfare and development, among others. Over the years, the different Philippine constitutions, legislation, and executive policies have shaped and transformed the bureaucracy in each of the branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. But the principal reference point is "the bureaucracy" under the executive branch of government and its administration or management of the public sector, its interface with the private sector, and recently since 1986, with civil society organizations. The bureaucracy of the executive branch of
government essentially delivers the goods and services of the state, engages in policy implementation and in recent years, has rendered technical and professional assistance in policy formulation.

Understanding Philippine bureaucracy and how it functions via a system of public administration or public management must take into account, not only the state's ideology and constitution, but the society's culture, economy, political dynamics, as well as international factors. At the threshold of the twenty-first century, the Philippines accommodated the pressures for change in the organization, structure and functions of bureaucracy, as well as the shift to new paradigms of public management and governance. The challenges had come from the external forces of globalization and technological innovations, even from internal needs and demands, such as development and participation.

It may be said that the history of Philippine bureaucracy and public management runs along the country's history of democratization and development. From its precolonial and Spanish colonial experiences, the Philippines had followed the strong influences of the United States. But Philippine society, culture and politics have shaped the unique character of political institutions and processes.

This chapter describes the changing character of bureaucracy and public management in the Philippines, in the context of changing constitutions, the structure of government, and dynamics of politics. Essentially, it examines the roles of the government's bureaucracy in the processes of democracy, development, and governance in the Philippines. It takes into account the paradigm shifts that have influenced the practice and study of government, bureaucracy, administration or management. The disciplines of political science and public administration contribute to the understanding of such phenomena.

The first part of the chapter presents an overview of key concepts and theories that influenced the setting up and transformation of Philippine bureaucracy and public management, particularly noting the time frames of application. The second part describes Philippine bureaucracy and public management along discernable historical milestones, namely: 1) precolonial to Spanish and American colonial period; 2) the years of the Philippine Republic under the 1935 Constitution, 3) the authoritarian regime of Marcos from 1972 to 1986, and 4) the contemporary period taking off at the time of the 1986 EDSA People Power Revolution and the 1987 Philippine Constitution till now. The third part focuses on the post-EDSA 1 transformations in line with the national thrusts on democratization, decentralization, development, and governance. This section highlights the directions to face the external forces of globalization, technological innovations, and new paradigms on public sector management, even internal needs, demands, and changing local scenarios.

Chapter 10: Bureaucracy and Public Management in Democracy, Development, and Governance in the Philippines

Overview of Western Influences on Bureaucracy and Public Management in the Philippines

The study of Philippine bureaucracy and of public management inevitably involves the use of concepts, theories, perspectives, or approaches that have been developed in the disciplines of the social sciences, political science, public administration, management science, and policy science. The nomenclature, terms, and concepts used in both praxis and theories of bureaucracy and public management are vital to understanding Philippine bureaucratic structures, functions, and processes. In recent years, there has been a shift to the usage of the term "management" instead of "administration," and for that matter "public management" for "public administration," even an interchange of terms; but it should be noted that there are distinctive nuances and competing paradigms.

An overview of the main concepts and perspectives that underlie Philippine bureaucracy and public management can help set the stage for understanding its setup and practices, as well as the changes over time. Theory to practice and vice versa do not necessarily follow a neat linear or cyclical pattern, as in the Philippine case where certain theories may have influenced the institutional framework and operations of the bureaucracy, just as certain practices have evolved, which can serve the purposes of theorizing. The history and dynamics of Philippine politics set the contexts for both the application and derivation of theories, models, and approaches pertinent to bureaucracy and public management.

American colonization and tutelage of the Philippines on democracy ushered the application of Western theories and practices on bureaucracy and management such that the structure was dubbed as a Western setup in an Asian setting. The "Filipino character" of the bureaucracy has been shaped by the infusion of the people's culture and political behavior, including the legacy of Philippine precolonial society and culture, as well as experiences with the Spanish colonial bureaucracy.

The concept of bureaucracy and the framework of traditional public administration (TPA) provided the foundation in the early years of the Philippine Republic under the 1935 Constitution. The influence of new public administration (NPA) was felt in the 1970s even as the US was embarking on this as a challenge to TPA. But the Philippines as a developing country, in league with other so-called Third World and developing countries, utilized the frameworks of development administration (DA) in the decade of the 70s, throughout the period of the Marcos regime. Attempts to shift to the innovative new public management (NPM) and governance had become evident after the 1986 People Power Revolution, the 1987 Philippine Constitution, and the 1991 Local Government Code.


Bureaucracy and traditional public administration

Spanish colonization gave the Philippines its experiences with centralization, bureaucracy and public management. With the 1986 Philippine Revolution against Spain, the setting up of the Malolos Republic as the first Philippine Republic and the 1899 Malolos Constitution as the first Philippine Constitution, provide the short lived experience with organizing and managing the bureaucracy. Under American colonization and in the years of the post-World War II rehabilitation, the Philippines learned the concepts on bureaucracy and public management, particularly with the setting up in 1952 of the Institute of Public Administration.

Bureaucracy

The concept of "bureaucracy" is traced to Max Weber (1864-1920) who posited it as a distinctive form of organization that is "ideal" for government. In Weber's socio-political theory, bureaucracy is essentially a structured hierarchy of offices and of competent and salaried officials, vested with an impartial authority and, by virtue of rules in the conduct of official business, engaged in carefully defined division of tasks, and rendering rational decisions by application of rules on the situation. Instead of tradition, charisma, and personal discretion, there are rules and procedures on which the rationality of the organization inheres.

Weber's contention was innovative and it offered an alternative to the practices observed in Europe at a time when clerical servants were "agents in the royal household, serving under the personal instruction of the ruler, the monarch." Weber's theory influenced the transition from "patrimonial bureaucracy," involving the "de-personalization of administration as the royal household" with its conversion into public service.

The organization of government is bureaucratic in the sense that jurisdictional areas are fixed officially by laws or rules. There is a hierarchy of offices and a chain of command, the higher over the lower. The people who man the organization are recruited and selected on the basis of merit and competence. The personal gives way to the impersonal since the posts, its tasks, and authority are derived from rules or laws.

In its etymological and literal sense, bureaucracy is "rule by officials" as the word bureau is derived from the French bural—meaning the cloth used to cover a writing desk, while the other half is derived from the Greek kratos, meaning rule.

It is also important to note Karl Marx's alternative perspective, that the state including its bureaucracy is an instrument of class oppression, by those who wield economic, social, and political power over those without. But for Weber, the bureaucracy is useful for large organizations that need written rules, routine work, division of labor, and hierarchy. Bureaucracy has come to be the distinctive organization administered/managed by national and local executive authorities, consisting of human and material resources to achieve the goals of the state.

As a composite of public officials and employees, the "civil service" and the "civil service system" are also the traditional referents of government bureaucracy that operationalize the norms of professionalism, career in government, discipline, merit, competence, and public service. The civil service consists of the ranks of personnel who are recruited on merit, given salaries corresponding to their level, granted tenure—meaning permanent appointment, not subject to the terms of office for political officials, and cannot be removed at the personal discretion of political officials or superiors without due process.

Given that bureaucracy is a type of organization, it should be underscored that there are other types of organizations, including those that may be considered as "non-bureaucratic." In the field of politics, bureaucracy refers to the administrative machinery of the state, inclusive of the hierarchy of government offices and public officials, and ranks of civil servants or public employees undertaking detailed tasks of government and the state. Hence, the reference is appropriately to government bureaucracy and to public bureaucracy, considering that the notion of public is associated with the arena of government and with the use of funds from taxation for its activities. On the other hand, the private sector is not precluded from being bureaucratic although it is generally assumed not to be so. But it is not inconceivable for the government to be non-bureaucratic, as this had been proposed in the 1980s in the reengineering of government.

Traditional public administration

While bureaucracy denotes the organizational domain of government, its workings are associated with public administration, otherwise recently referred to as public management. The practices, theories, and discourses on public management highlight goal orientation, results attainment, and efficient processes of resource use.

In the years since Woodrow Wilson published his "Study of Administration" (1887), Traditional Public Administration (TPA) has dominated government. The TPA tended to be compatible with Weber's model of bureaucracy. Wilson introduced the politics-and-administration dichotomy which distinguished political acts from administrative acts; and reinforced the political neutrality and career system of the civil service. While later discourses proved that the dichotomy is artificial and that politics is inherent in bureaucracy and public management,
Wilson's model pulled away the bureaucracy, civil service, and public management from the "spoils system" practiced then by elected officials, politicians, and political parties. That was the practice, particularly after elections, in which winning political candidates and their political parties place their supporters into the ranks of the bureaucracy. The notion of politics-administration dichotomy was aimed at administrative efficiency and political neutrality by keeping the bureaucracy out of partisan politics. Hence, this school of thought viewed public administration as the execution or implementation of the laws passed by the legislature. "What the executive branch does with the law becomes administration." 10

Traditional public administration stands on the possibility of applying managerial, technical, rational methods in the implementation of laws and policies by the executive branch of government. The political acts belong to the elected political officials particularly as policy makers and in the politics of decision making and lawmaking. On the other hand, public administration is done under the executive branch of government by the civil service or bureaucracy in the implementation or execution of the laws passed by the legislature.

Wilson initiated public administration as a field of study. The academic discipline of public administration has generated knowledge and theories on the practices of government in the execution of its functions. Managerial, rational, and behavioral approaches in organizing and managing government have been derived from different schools of thought, such as: scientific management, human relations, behavioralism, and the systems framework, among others. 11 Given the political systems framework, the public administrative system consists of the structures—namely the executive branch and its bureaucracy, the legislature and judiciary with their respective bureaucracies—the functions of these structures, and the dynamics and process of their interactions.

Within the bureaucracy, the management functions and processes include: planning, organizing, human resources development and management, monitoring, and evaluation. The initial management norms for its performance were efficiency, economy, and effectiveness; but have now expanded to include democratic and governance norms such as participation, accountability, access, equity, and transparency.

Changing perspectives

While to some extent Weber's model continues to hold influence, recent innovations in theory and practice have redefined the presuppositions and limits of government bureaucracy—in its structure, functions, norms, and the system of public management. The attention on public sector organization model and norms had come in the wake of the constraints encountered with the bureaucratic structures and management processes, and in light of new challenges in both the global and home fronts of the states. The "era of change" had been stimulated by the perceived inadequacy of traditional bureaucracy and public administration to cope with contemporary scenarios and the emergence of competing paradigms. 12 Since the '70s, the pressures intensely felt in the Philippines had come from domestic social and economic forces such as population increase, urbanization and development, as well as political pressures for decentralization and democratization. By the 1980s, the struggles against the Marcos regime spawned the rise of activist civil society groups that played a vital role in the downfall of President Marcos in 1986. Subsequently, the Philippines faced the demands for democratization and governance, and for responses to emerging trends of globalization and technological change.

New public administration

The paradigm of New Public Administration (NPA) emerged in the 1970s to address the gaps and problems generated by the traditional public administration model. It was also a response to the changing times with its emphasis on the new norms of equity, access, responsiveness, and participation, compared with and in addition to efficiency, economy and effectiveness of the traditional bureaucracy. The possibility of synthesis and reconciliation of these norms had been considered.

Changes in practices and theories in the West also triggered changes in the Philippine bureaucracy and public management. 13 While rule maintenance, efficiency, economy, and effectiveness were continued, the trend is to make the programs responsive, accessible and affordable to the clientele or beneficiaries. One of the Marcos regime's strategies was decentralization by deconcentration—or the establishment of field offices in the regions to bring the services closer, accessible, and more responsive to the people.

Development administration

But as the Philippines was considered a developing state, among others classified as the Third World, there was a search for an applicable development model. States in transition to self-rule after colonization aspired to become a
democratic polity with a capitalist economy, the Philippines included. Many theories and models were formulated to explain the conditions of development and underdevelopment. Development administration was a catchword to refer to the different theories and approaches for bureaucracy and public administration to achieve development—in its political, economic, and social dimensions.

In 1972, President Marcos declared martial law and worked out a new 1973 Constitution in the attempt to legitimize the regime and pursue its brand of Development Administration. The state pursued various socioeconomic programs to achieve national development under an authoritarian regime, in which democratic institutions such as elections had been set aside. This was a crucial period for Philippine bureaucracy, having been politicized and used for the political purposes of the Marcos regime on the pretext of “bureaucracy for development,” until the 1986 EDSA People Power Revolution ousted Marcos and ended authoritarian rule.

**Governance, democracy, and decentralization**

In post-EDSA 1, the new 1987 Constitution paved the way for democratization of the Philippines. The Philippines accepted the governance paradigm as evidenced by the provisions of the 1987 Constitution. The political and constitutional mandates enabled the new president, Corazon C. Aquino, to initiate changes in the bureaucracy, intended to veer it into the re-democratization process and governance framework. By this time, civil society groups—non-government organizations (NGOs) and people’s organizations (POs) that struggled against Marcos—had moved into the democratic space provided by the new constitution and the Aquino leadership. The 1987 Constitution legitimized the presence of civil society—the NGOs and community-based POs, and their participation in democracy and governance. For their part, civil society groups channeled their track record in development work and advocacy during the Marcos regime into the mainstream of the Aquino government’s service delivery and public administrative system. Consequently, the bureaucracy faced the challenge of working with civil society as the new stakeholder.

Furthermore, the Philippine government and its bureaucracy were influenced to consider other paradigms for the public sector, such as the shift in thinking from “public administration to public management” and from “government to governance.” The discourses on new public management pertained to both government and bureaucracy, with such concepts as public-private interface, reengineering and reinventing government, and entrepreneurial government.

Discourses on governance assert that government has ceased to be the sole decision maker and wielder of social and political power. Instead power is shared by government with civil society—represented by NGOs and POs, and with the market, i.e., private business sector.

**Governance has been considered as related to democracy since it enables various actors in society, namely government, civil society, and private business to participate in decision making.**

By the 1987 Philippine Constitution, the state operationalized the paradigm of governance by enabling the participation of civil society and the business-sector industry in the policy-making process in various ways such as setting the policy agenda, and advocacy of policies and legislation. Policy implementation also saw the participation of civil society groups. Hence, there had been changes in the structure and behavior of bureaucracy, in the dynamics of state-civil society relationship by accommodating civil society participation in policy making, and in public management, by enabling the participation of civil society and private business in policy implementation and service delivery.

Changes have also been effected by the passage of the 1992 Local Government Code that mandated decentralization by devolution. This granted political and administrative authority to local government units and transformed the power relationships between the national and local levels of government. Civil society participation in decision making structures at the local government level has also been mandated. This setup has been described as “democratic, participatory, decentralized governance.”

**New public management**

By the 1980s the possibilities opened for government to assume new organizational and management models. The work of Gaebler and Osborne (1992) made a headway in the discourses that explored the concepts of public sector reform, entrepreneurial government, reengineering government, reinventing government, and new public management. In their work on “reinventing government,” Gaebler and Osborne called for bureaucracy’s transformation to become entrepreneurial, to adopt features of the private business organizations, and to link with the private sector and other sectors in society. They called for the shift to nonbureaucratic structures, processes and norms. Eventually, New Public Management (NPM) became the alternative school of thought as it is called for public sector reform, public accountability, empowerment, as well as quality management and performance of the bureaucracy.

Arguments also pointed out the vital role of bureaucracy in the political processes of policy making, in contrast to the traditional public administration perspective that confined it to policy implementation and service delivery. There
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leadership styles have created the nuances and dynamics of bureaucratic, administrative or management behaviors. Influences have also come from elected officials, political parties, interest groups, civil society groups, and from public opinion. Politics in the Philippines is a complex phenomenon given the country's colonial experience, the transition from the democratic phase of self-rule to an authoritarian phase and then to redemocratization.

The use of the so-called diachronic analysis is applicable in the case of the Philippine bureaucracy because this highlights the historical stages or phases of time within which changes in institutions had taken place. This can be complemented by synchronic analysis that examines the themes, patterns of change, and even comparisons in institutional development. Structuralist-institutionalist analysis focuses on the essential organizational analytic variables, namely, bureaucratic structures, functions, operations and processes, and stakeholders. The behavioral approach can bring out the dynamics in power relations. An essential focus of analysis is the Philippine bureaucracy's performance in democratization and development in the country.

The historical and political contexts generally used to examine Philippine institutions, applicable even for analyzing the bureaucracy, span the following periods: 1) precolonial Philippines; 2) Spanish colonial rule (1521-1898) and the brief period of the First Philippine Republic (1899); 3) American colonization (in the 1900s), including the period of the Philippine Commonwealth and the brief Japanese occupation (1941-1944); 4) the turning point as a republican state with democratic structures and processes (1946-1972), 5) the period of authoritarianism (1972-1986), and 6) the transition and redemocratization stage (since 1986 EDSA 1 and 2001 EDSA 2 people power events).

Precolonial Philippines and Spanish colonization

Historical accounts describe the Philippines before and at the point of Spanish colonization in 1521 as composed of settlements called barangays, each of which was composed of extended kinship. The datu was the acknowledged territorial chief who obtained authority by means of inheritance, tradition, merits, wealth, and capacities compared to the members of the settlement. The datu served as the center of leadership for activities of the community and the focus of loyalty. From various historical accounts, the datu exercised executive, legislative, and judicial authority.

In this setup, the Spanish colonizers laid down a centralized system of government, with the barangays as the barrios, and then the municipalities (pueblos), cities (cabildos) and provinces (provincias) as ascending levels of government. The unity of church and state meant the presence and powers of the Spanish friars of the Catholic Church in the affairs of the Spanish colonial government in the Philippines. The datu became the cabezas de barangay.
Politics involving the *principalia* (upper class) and their roles in the local religious and feasts had laid down the political culture that would prevail even in later times. In the Spanish regime from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, the services of the *gobernadorcillos* (mayors) were compulsory such that the members of the *principalia* tried to avoid this by spending money, according to the observations of Corpus. During fiestas, the upper classes engaged in the competition to take the lead in the celebration.

From the so-called culture and political culture perspectives, the precolonial and Spanish colonial period laid down the values, norms, beliefs, and practices that are observable to this day and characterize Philippine politics and public management. In the literature, studies have pointed to Filipino traits such as personalism, familism or close family and kinship ties, as well as particularism that continue to prevail and shape bureaucratic and administrative behavior. Some Filipino traits—*pakitisama, utang na loob*, and *hiya* were noted to have either positive or negative effects. The observed negative consequences are graft and corruption, nepotism or favoritism, patron-client relations, and conflict between personal interest and public interest. Such Filipino cultural traits have been observed as contrary to the norm of rationality in Western and Weberian type of bureaucratic structures and processes.

The Spanish colonial rule established a centralized system of government, a system of public revenues and public expenditures, managed by a special and privileged class of bureaucrats, mostly Spanish. Public offices were granted as a favor from the king to those who participated in the conquest and pacification of the colonies, up to the present day, but could be dismissed at the pleasure of the king. Further historical analysis point to the process of filling positions by purchase, where offices were sold to the highest bidder for the royal treasury.

The centuries of centralization had positive and negative effects. The push for decentralization and passage of the 1992 Local Government Code found a rationale in the lack of access to the people in many areas of the country to the services of government. For centuries, resources and decision making were concentrated or centralized in the seat of power, in the offices of government located in the historic and primate city of Manila.

Historical accounts show the system of education during the Spanish times, the land tenure system, the monastic corporations, the system of collection of public revenues that were the core issues raised by the Filipino against Spain and embodied in the writings during the Propaganda Movement and Philippine Revolution against Spain. The hacienda system in agriculture and the frater estates shaped the basic features of social class structure and economy and, in turn, the social cleavages and power structure that affected Philippine politics, bureaucracy, and public management until today. In the years of self-rule, the bureaucracy and political leadership were confronted with the issues of lack of access, marginalization of the poor, racial unrest of the peasants, and land tenure problems that were traced to the systems during Spanish colonization.

### From the Malolos Republic to the American colonial period

With the First Philippine Republic in 1898, also known as the Malolos public, and the 1899 Malolos Constitution, considered to be the first constitution in Asia, the Philippines first experienced the establishment of a popular, representative, democratic government with separate executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Mabini distinguished appointive positions from those filled by competitive examination. The bureaucracy consisted of seven departments—Foreign Affairs; Interior; Finance; War, Army and Navy; Public Instruction; Public Communications and Works; Agriculture, and Industry and Commerce. The short-lived Malolos Republic was overtaken by colonization of the United States in America, at the close of the Philippine Revolution against Spain in 1898 and the beginning of Philippine resistance against American occupation in the 1900s. The Americans retained the centralized political and administrative system, while creating new departments, such as National Defense, Labor, Health, and Public Welfare. Corpus writes that old politics flowed into the American colonial period.

The Americans introduced modern bureaucracy characterized by a system of accountability for public resources and the posts of property officer and auditor. Town officials and the public watched the burning of condemned equipment and certifications to that effect. The bureaucracy was engaged in the delivery of services, such as social programs for vocational schools, higher education funded by the national government, general high schools under the provincial government, and elementary schools by the municipal government.

The Philippines had been geared by United States for independence in the period of the Philippine Commonwealth as a preparation, but this was interrupted by World War II and the Japanese occupation of the Philippines. After, with the end of World War II, the defeat of the Japanese, and adoption of the political setup, the Philippines became independent in July 6 as a democratic and republican state with the constitution crafted in 1935.

### Independence and democratization

#### Structuring the bureaucracy

American thinking shaped the theory and practice of Philippine bureaucracy and public management. In 1945, the Government Survey and Reorganization Committee assumed the task for planning administrative reform; in 1946, the Reorganization Committee took over; and in 1952, the Bell Mission from the US government arrived to examine Philippine conditions and recommended the...
establishment of the Institute of Public Administration at the University of the Philippines. Several other reorganization attempts occurred such as in 1954 with its enabling act; then in 1968 under Marcos's first term of office which had been carried out because of the declaration of martial law and the first decree, the Integrated Reorganization Plan.

Philippine bureaucracy experienced its own institutional development and relationship with the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government in the period from 1946 to 1972 under the democratic framework and processes stipulated by the 1935 constitution. In this democratic phase, the norms of merit, non-partisanship or political neutrality, and public service and public trust, were introduced for the ranks of the civil service.

The executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government each had a bureaucracy to undertake their respective functions. But in its strictest sense, the bureaucracy referred to the departments under the executive branch of government, therefore, under the president. Each department had a hierarchy of bureaus and offices. Local government units also maintained their own bureaucracy with the hierarchy of provincial level, then city or municipal level, and the barrio as the lowest and basic unit under the municipal level. Other government agencies were organized under the classification of government-controlled and government-owned corporations; also different commissions, boards, authorities that were either independent bodies or attached to the national departments or directly under the Office of the President.

In this democratic phase, the bureaucracy served under the leadership of respective presidents elected to office. It concentrated on the function of policy implementation, mainly the laws passed by the legislature and policies at the executive level. Although the bureaucracy rendered assistance in the drafting of laws and policies, this was not in the sense of active advocacy for certain policies nor an active engagement in shaping policy agenda.

It was a centralized bureaucracy under the president who was responsible over national agencies and local government units. Decision making occurred at the level of the executive and national offices. From their location in Manila, national offices directed the delivery of public services and implementation of programs by local government units in different parts of the country.

The departments of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Defense, Education, Health, Public Works, Transportation, Industry, and Trade had been the mainstays. The Civil Service Bureau was transformed into the Civil Service Commission by virtue of the Civil Service Act of 1959, with mandates and provisions that evolved from those stated in the Civil Service Act of 1900, Civil Service Rules and Regulations of 1909, Commonwealth Act of 1936 and the 1935 Constitution. The Civil Service Commission had been reorganized under the recommendation of the Bell Commission in 1952. Essentially, the Civil Service Commission looked into the creation of personnel offices and personnel officer positions, managed the performance rating and promotion system, and ensured the observance of public service ethics.

On the other hand, the General Auditing Office established by the 1935 Constitution looked after the auditing and settlement of all accounts using government revenues and receipts. It kept the general accounts of government, called the attention of concerned entities on the expenditures of government funds and property, as well as rendered decisions on such matters.

Presidential style

Besides the bureaucracy's structure, functions, and system of public management, the crucial issues in this democratic phase pertain to the dynamics of its relationship with the president and the president's political and management styles. In effect, the bureaucracy was moving into its own institutional development as part of the democratic system of government; and into the mainstream of values, norms, and practices in public administration.

Generally, the presidents' could avail themselves of the items for casual employees for their appointees but the merit system of the civil service had constrained a large-scale spoils system that used the bureaucracy to reward political supporters. Magsaysay and Garcia called for reorganization. Garcia started the so-called midnight appointment, referring to his action about the closing of his term to appoint some 350 people to senior positions, which the Supreme Court nullified. Macapagal has been cited for his appointment of qualified men and refraining from doing so until the incumbents had finished their term. He was also much restrained in dismissing the casual workers. Under Marcos's first term in 1965, the bureaucracy was filled with the usual casual workers and the qualified appointees in technical and confidential positions that did not require civil service eligibilities. Despite political and administrative constraints, the Civil Service Commission proceeded with the implementation of the civil service examinations for eligibilities in the recruitment and selection into the civil service.

On the other hand, some members of the civil service circumvented the norms of political neutrality or non-partisanship with their engagements in electoral campaigns and personalistic relationship with politicians. Resources of the bureaucracy were perceived to have been discretely used during elections. Perceptions of graft and corruption had become widespread despite the work of the Civil Service Commission, the presidential attempts at reorganization, and the creation during Marcos's first term of the Presidential Agency on Reforms and Government Operations.

The work of the bureaucracy depended on the presidents' programs. Magsaysay is known for his contribution in suppressing the communist insurgency. Garcia had his Filipino First policy that limited foreign control of...
Philippine economy. On the contrary, Macapagal pursued decontrol and liberalization policies while he engaged in social programs and pressed the legislature for social legislation, such as on land reform. The bureaucracy of the mainstay departments carried on its usual program implementation and service delivery, even as Macapagal ushered the role of the National Economic Council for macro planning and the creation of the Program Implementation Agency for micro project planning and evaluation.

Under Marcos's first term in 1965, the pertinent departments focused on programs for rice sufficiency, infrastructure such as roads, school buildings, and other development-oriented programs. The United Nations declared the 1960s as the First Development Decade and the 1970s as the Second Development Decade, which coincided with the years of Marcos's first and second terms of office.

The Marcos authoritarian regime: Politicization and "sublation" of the bureaucracy

Philippine bureaucracy and the system of public administration were reorganized as Marcos's declaration of martial law on September 21, 1972 ushered in his authoritarian regime. Bureaucracy was brought into the ambit of Marcos's political power and control, and used for the purposes of the regime. This situation is referred to as the "politicization of the bureaucracy," "subservience of the bureaucracy," "cooptation of the bureaucracy" and in Carino's term, the "sublation" of the bureaucracy into the political agenda and regime of the executive, then President Marcos. By maneuvering the 1973 Constitution and the Integrated Reorganization Plan, Marcos brought the executive and legislative branches under his clout.

Two scenarios ran under the Marcos regime that have implications on the role and performance of the bureaucracy: 1) the dualism in the bureaucracy's performance on development administration, and 2) the alternative development pursued by sociopolitical movements in the struggle against the Marcos regime.

The first scenario was the government bureaucracy's implementation of development programs along the track of Marcos's political agenda, even while it cooperated with international efforts, including the directions of the United Nations and international aid agencies, for development in the Philippines as in other Third World countries. The "double speak" and "duplicity" of the Marcos regime referred to the juxtaposition of Marcos's rhetoric on government programs for Philippine development with his own personal interests.

The second scenario was the growth of sociopolitical movements in the countryside struggling against Marcos and the regime's development administration, while engaged in people empowerment for alternative development. The course of the Marcos regime paralleled the growth and development of social movements among the peasantry, labor, and even the urban poor. This alternative scenario consisted of so-called cause-oriented groups, social development groups, churches and church-based organizations engaged in conceptualizing and doing alternative approaches to development. Some churches moved out of their institutional domains to engage in alternative development among the people and in the struggle against the Marcos regime. These social groups initiated models for alternative development (in health, environment, livelihood, empowerment and participatory processes, among others) that challenged the bureaucracy's performance under the Marcos regime.

The bureaucracy was construed to have lost its political neutrality as it became an instrument of the Marcos regime. It was described as a dominated, coopted, subservient bureaucracy in its relationship with the executive that exercised authoritarian rule and leadership over just one political party in the Philippines. However, it was also argued that civil servants merely complied with their administrative duties and responsibilities in the tradition of the bureaucracy's subordination to the executive branch.

Under the Marcos regime, the department was called "ministry" and the ministry model was developed. Among the instrumental agencies were the National Economic and Development Authority, the National Housing Authority, the Ministry of Human Settlements, the Ministry of Agrarian Reform, and the Ministry of Local Government and Community Development.

On the official front, Marcos began the process of regionalization by the configuration of areas into specific regions in the country, with Metro Manila as the National Capital Region. The region also initiated administrative decentralization by deconcentration, meaning, the creation of regional offices to unplug the transactions at the central or national offices in Manila, which had been the traditional seat of political power and center of bureaucratic processes. The measures intended to resolve the problem of red tape (bureaucratic delays) and respond to the new administrative norms of equity, access, responsiveness, and participation. Regionalization and administrative decentralization operationalized the processes of bringing down development to the people by regional planning and local participation. With Marcos's pronouncements, the bureaucracy worked toward agrarian reform and programs for social and economic development to address social unrest. The National Economic Council (NEC) was transformed into the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA). The national development plans prioritized social development and the use of the "basic needs" approach, in contrast to the "trickle-down" approach that prioritized economic development as a means to achieve social development.

Development and development administration were the slogans and buzz words of the Marcos regime into which the bureaucracy was drawn. Dubsky described this system as "technocracy." The bureaucracy applied the new trends in development administration, contributed to executive policy
formulation, and implemented socioeconomic programs. However, accounts and evidence showed that in the subterfuges, Marcos's personal interests marshaled the development processes—described as the "politics of plunder"—to serve the personal interests of Marcos and his supporters, including his wife, Imelda Marcos. What ensued was described aptly as the "development debacle." 50

The Marcos regime was toppled for various reasons relating to his authoritarian politics, his control over both the political system, the bureaucracy, and the economy. Contributing to the Marcos regime's downfall were the national public debt incurred in behalf of his cronies and in the name of development, the gargantuan bureaucracy whose services failed to reach the people in remote and far-flung areas of the country but described to have serviced the interests of the privileged class, and human-rights violations.

The 1986 People Power Revolution at EDSA, from February 22-25, saw the downfall of Marcos and the ascendancy of opposition leader, Corazon C. Aquino, who took over the cause of slain husband Benigno Aquino. This event is now referred to as EDSA 1. The events surrounding the 1983 assassination of Benigno Aquino and the 1986 presidential snap elections provide the immediate trigger points for EDSA 1, while political socialization and mobilization of groups against Marcos had occurred in the years of the regime.

EDSA 1, Redemocratization and EDSA 2

In the aftermath of the 1986 EDSA 1 People Power Revolution, the new political leaders led by Corazon Aquino attempted to redemocratize with the drafting and ratification of the 1987 Constitution, after a brief period of the Freedom Constitution. In realpolitik, it was a process of de-"Marcosification," that is, the removal of the vestiges of the Marcos regime. The provisions of the 1987 Constitution restored liberal democratic traditions—the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government, and political parties, among others. But it added new elements, among which, the legitimate participation of civil society—referring to nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and people's community-based organizations (POs).

The post-EDSA 1 presidential terms of Corazon Aquino and Fidel Ramos saw the changes in the processes of government and the bureaucracy. The 1987 Constitution and the 1992 Local Government Code mandated the participation of civil-society groups in decision-making bodies and processes. The 1992 Local Government Code established political decentralization or devolution that drastically changed the power relations between national and local levels of government, and consequently, changes in structure, functions, processes of the bureaucracy. New organization and management perspectives were initiated, such as governance and new public management—including reengineering and public-sector reform paradigms. These were intended to upgrade Philippine bureaucracy and the public management system to cope with the trends of re-democratization after EDSA I and globalization at the international level with its effects on the Philippines.

In dismantling the Marcos bureaucracy, the Aquino reorganization called for the purge of civil servants, the abolition of ten agencies, changes in twenty-two agencies, the increase to twenty regular departments, the sale and reduction of government corporations from 327 to 301.51 The removal of civil servants in the first hundred days caused much confusion over who should be removed and retained; as well as the counterclaims of errors in the removal of deserving employees and retention of the undeserving. By 1990, the reports showed the reduction to 17 executive departments, but the size of manpower even increased to 20 percent compared to 1980, which was attributed to the increase of clientele and to the expansion and specialization of government concerns.52 The military organization proved to be one critical and vital bureaucracy under the president.53

The bureaucracy's encounter with civil-society participation posed a challenge to its capacities. Under the governance framework, which operationalized the provisions of the 1987 Constitution, in recent executive policies and legislation, the bureaucracy faced the imperative of interfacing with civil-society groups in policy formulation and implementation. At the national and local levels, active NGOs and POs achieved success in the passage of laws, and the formulation and implementation of programs that mainstreamed their development models, such as those concerning the environment, indigenous people, health (primary health care), human rights, urban poor housing, and others in their agenda.54

In the plans and programs of respective departments, the bureaucracy incorporated the civil society's successful models of development and people empowerment approaches (examples are primary health care, community-based urban poor housing, and environmental programs). In keeping with the legal mandates and dynamics of the post-EDSA state-civil society relations, the executive bureaucracy (line departments) accommodated civil-society participation in program and project implementation, particularly involving community empowerment and mobilization. Tripartite and multisectoral initiatives would include the agencies of government, civil-society groups, and business and industry organizations. In effect, such encounters became a learning experience for the bureaucracy in the new framework of partnership-based, networking, consultations and multi-sectoral collaboration, and public-private partnerships that were initiated by government or by other social sectors but involving government.

Civil society as a concept and as represented by the so-called NGOs and POs is a long narrative of political socialization and mobilization of new social movements with new frameworks of human development and people empowerment. These groups opposed Marcos and later supported Corazon Aquino for the presidency. The civil society's success in alternative development

52. Cale, "Reorganizing the Administrative System," 410.
53. Ibid., 411.
56. Luis G. Rabutilla, "Politics, Public Policy and Governance" (Conference of the Philippine Political Science Association, "Strengthening Society, the State and the Disciplined" Deveo City, October 23-25, 2000).
strategies offered the new government and the bureaucracy with new perspectives and approaches. The NGOs have had a long experience with people empowerment, community organizing and mobilizing. Alternative non-bureaucratic organizations and systems of service delivery came out of the civil society attempts to empower the people for development. With models to show civil society’s performance achieved more than the government in various areas—health, agriculture, housing, livelihood, education, and other development concerns—among the poor and marginalized farmers, fisherfolk, urban poor women, children, and indigenous peoples.

With strong civil society advocacy, the bureaucracy under the post-EDSA presidential terms of Corazon Aquino and Fidel Ramos brought these development alternatives into the mainstream of the national government’s programs and projects. With devolution, local government bureaucracies are mandated to involve the NGOs in decision-making bodies. In areas with foreign and external funding, and as stipulated, there were collaborative efforts by the national government, local government, and civil society groups to implement development programs.

From the 1990s to the present, the bureaucracy has faced the challenges of the state’s commitments to various international initiatives, such as on environment and sustainable development, health, shelter, and various aspects of human development. Along these areas, the bureaucracy in respective line departments and agencies had been saddled with new legislations incorporating new concepts and approaches, some of which were advocated by civil society groups.

Under President Joseph Estrada’s term, the bureaucracy focused on pro-poor policies and programs, but Estrada’s term was cut short (1998-2001) when EDSA 2 removed him from office and installed Gloria Macapagal Arroyo. With the Arroyo administration, the bureaucracy experienced the push for public sector reform and new public management by way of streamlining and reengineering the line departments and other government agencies, and various programs for development and governance. With devolution in place, the bureaucracy adjusted to new roles and functions vis-à-vis local government in service delivery and policy implementation.

Since 1986, the state’s international commitments in various areas of human development and sustainable development, and the continual demands by the people for services and policy implementation. Devolution is a major change set by the Local Government Code—enacted by Congress in 1991, signed by the executive and enforced in 1992. Furthermore, the trends in the international community on globalization, governance, and new public management call for capacity building and, at most, major transformations. On the downside, perceptions and charges of graft and corruption continue to tarnish the bureaucracy’s image and performance.

This section presents an overview of some of the responses to these challenges since 1986. The literature renders evidence of bureaucratic and public-sector reform, decentralization by devolution, strategies of new public management and governance, and development management.

The civil service and capability building

The civil service represents the human resources component of the bureaucracy. The structure of the bureaucracy, the size and capacities of manpower or human resources, the systems of human resource management and human resource development are major areas for transformation.

With devolution as the form of political decentralization, a percentage of the civil service personnel moved from the national agencies to the local government units. In 1993, the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Budget and Management attempted at an inventory of personnel for an updated and actual headcount. The 1993 data showed 1,195,353 government employees and with four more agencies (Philippine National Police, Department of National Defence uniformed personnel, Economic Intelligence and Investigation Bureau, and the National Intelligence Coordinating Council), the total inventory was 1,447,477 personnel. The legislature’s bureaucracy accounted for 5,098 or less than one percent of total personnel; the judiciary had 22,455 or 1.5 percent; and the Executive, 724,247 personnel or 94 percent of the total. The constitutional bodies (Commission on Human Rights, Ombudsman, Civil Service Commission, Commission on Elections, Commission on Audit) registered 18,381 personnel or two percent of total, and the autonomous regions at 3,388 or 0.4 percent of total personnel.

The employees on the national government payroll constitute 65 percent of the inventory; those in government-controlled and -owned corporations, 11 percent; and local government employees, 24 percent.

The Attrition Law has abolished positions as these have become vacant, unless there is an exceptional case; hence there has been a decrease in personnel. The Local Government Code caused a decrease at the national level and an increase at the local level.
A number of training programs have been conducted to address the issue of professionalism and competencies. Despite inadequate government funding, national departments have provided staff training and rendered technical assistance to local government. NGOs have also included government personnel in their training programs. The funding had come variably from the national government, local government, international funding organizations (examples are Australian Agency for International Development, United States Agency for International Development, Japan International Cooperation Agency, Canada Fund, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit), even from local and international NGOs. Yet, the bureaucracy’s competencies are still perceived as inadequate to cope with new legislation and innovative paradigms in development management. Competencies at local government levels need upgrading as these are crucial to carry out devolved functions.

With the governance framework, the encounters of the civil service personnel with civil society groups had been quite a learning process on alternative approaches to development. The civil service also needed adjustments and training on the recent concepts and norms of new public management—such as client satisfaction, total quality management, productivity, transparency, accountability, and public ethics.

Recognition for performance in the civil service has come by way of individual employee awards and institutional awards. However, the persistent lack of funds for salary upgrading and career development in the government bureaucracy has perennially threatened personnel motivation and efficiency, as well as induced graft and corruption.

The civil service continues to face problems with political interference. Various studies confirm that with devolution, the bureaucracy will have problems with local officials who are oriented toward maximizing votes and who lack the technical expertise for development policies and programs.

Reengineering, privatization, and new public management

Downsizing and reengineering have taken place at national-level offices but some departments have yet to fully work out the processes at their regional offices. The structure of the executive bureaucracy includes the following: President’s executive office, executive line departments, government-controlled and -owned corporations. There are independent agencies, as well as the legislature and the judiciary with their respective internal bureaucracies. The reengineering plan by the Department of Budget and Management aimed at restructuring, supported by rationalization of the compensation and human resource development system, impact mitigation measures, and individual performance accountability system. Other institutional reforms aimed at curbing corruption and unethical practices in strategic agencies and bureaucratic processes. For instance, procurement is one of the critical areas for reform. The change processes had been supported by legislation and executive policies, but the implementation faced obstacles attributed to long-standing negative practices, traditions, and personalistic interests.

Privatization also formed part of the reengineering process for government bureaucracy and public sector reform. Immediately after EDSA 1, Proclamation 50 launched the policy of privatization by the disposition of the government’s nonperforming assets that were private, best-lost loans of government financial institutions. This sought to deal with the proliferation of government corporations and the huge debt burden incurred by the Marcos regime. The Aquino administration targeted 296 government corporations and their subsidiaries for privatization to ease the burden of government and comply with the demand from the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Public enterprise reform called for the abolition, merger, retention, or privatization of government corporations. The record showed seventy-eight retained government corporations out of 301 listed in 1986. In addition, the legislature passed the Build-Operate-Transfer Law that allowed the private sector to participate in the government’s development and infrastructure projects (national and local). In the scheme, the private sector financed, built, maintained, managed the project till fifty years, after which this is turned over to the government.

In addition, the impact of globalization can be seen in the shifts to new public management strategies and methods, including the use of information technology and installation of management information systems. Total Quality Management was introduced in national and local government agencies. The Philippine Quality Award for public-sector organizations served to recognize meritorious initiatives and success based on the selection criteria. The Board of Investments and several local government units such as Marikina and Naga City are examples of TQM Implementation. The introduction of TQM procedures and techniques aimed at developing quality awareness among the workforce, quality production of social goods and services, quality client service orientation, prevention and early detection of defects, people empowerment and participation, and integrated systems. The successful cases proved that public sector organizations and government bureaucracy can achieve improved performance using such innovations in new public management.

Decentralization, governance, and development:
The national-local government interface

The bureaucracy has pursued the government’s national development agenda, which for years since 1986 had targeted poverty alleviation and human development, environment and sustainable development, housing and urban development, health, education, employment, and livelihood, human rights and


62. Ibid., 362.
indigenous peoples' rights, peace and conflict resolution, and economic growth through agricultural, industrial and business development. Global and regional commitments among states and stakeholders along these areas of development have pressed the national government to get things done and to join in local government units to bring these down to their areas for accomplishment. The 1991 UN Conference on Environment and Development is just one international endeavor with strong impact on states, making the Philippines commit to and take action for sustainable development, protecting and conserving environment and natural resources.

Decentralization, governance, democracy, and development have been closely interrelated in the rhetoric, discourse and action of government. With devolution mandated by the 1991 Local Government Code, the national government devolved powers and responsibilities to local government units over basic services in the following areas: health, social welfare services, environment, agriculture, public works, education, tourism, telecommunications, housing, and investment support. Also devolved were certain regulatory powers and licensing. Devolution and governance sought to bring development close to the people and be appropriate to local needs and resources.

For policies and programs, the national government enjoined different stakeholders (business, NGOs, community associations) to participate in decision making and policy implementation. The national government announced that the bureaucracy will harness multisectoral participation and render technical assistance to local government. The bureaucracy, in keeping with the directions of the state and government, will no longer be the sole provider of services but become an enabler. For example, the Community Mortgage Program, a national housing project, requires multisectoral participation— involving different national housing agencies, local government units, NGOs, and community-based associations. Another example is the health sector reform agenda of the Department of Health, which engages the participation of another national agency, the Philippine Health Insurance Corporation, as well as the provincial government, city and municipal government, and even community organizations and private-sector organizations in the program's different components. Similar patterns can be observed in the other departments of government and their areas of responsibility.

At the LGU provincial and municipal-city level, civil society groups are mandated to be members of the local council, the local health board, local solid waste management committees and boards. International funding organizations and donors also participate by providing financial and technical assistance to either or both national agency and local government unit.

The "Galing Pook Award" has been given to LGU initiatives and models of achievement. The awards demonstrate to some extent the positive effects of decentralization, democratization, and governance, and improved capacities of LGUs. There are now many best practices of governance at the local level, led by LGUs with the collaboration of NGOs and POs in different projects. The "Galing Pook" awarded LGUs on the criteria of effective service delivery, socio-economic or environment impact, people empowerment, and transferability. Among the many examples are the innovative cases of hospital services (Negros Oriental), returning insurgents program (Sampilac, Quezon), reforestation (Kalibo, Aklan), and bond flotation for housing project (Vicarias, Negros Occidental).

**Conclusion**

Democracy, decentralization, governance, and development are four essential concepts and frameworks through which the Philippine bureaucracy's performance can be evaluated, reckoning with time and milestones in Philippine political history.

The establishment of the bureaucracy and the administrative system formed part of the democratic and presidential system of government, at the outset of independence from American rule. Within its structure and system of administration, the bureaucracy was the locus of democratization processes as much as it was an agent or catalyst of democratization. The merit system and political neutrality were major indicators of a modern bureaucracy and public administrative system in the service of democracy and political development in the Philippines, considering the pressures from political parties and the influences of political leaders at the time of the young Philippine Republic. Strictly confining the term "bureaucracy" to refer to the "executive bureaucracy," it was able to serve under conditions of subordination to the Philippine president and normal political transitions from one elected official to the next. In the early years of the Philippine Republic, the bureaucracy performed functions of service delivery and policy enforcement for postwar development and rehabilitation, given the centralized setup of government.

However, the bureaucracy's role turned out to be contentious in the period of disruption of the democratic processes and its so-called cooptation, subservience, politicization, and sublation to the powers of an authoritarian executive. Under the Marcos regime, the bureaucracy was at the forefront of the authoritarian regime's vigorous efforts at national development, showing its commitment to the United Nations' directions for development (1970s as the UN Development Decade), and initiating the innovative strategies of development administration. But the Marcos regime placed the bureaucracy's civil service in a quandary concerning its participation in an authoritarian rule and in a development process that placed the state in huge financial debt with the international community.
In post-EDSA 1, the bureaucracy was by itself the target of re-democratization, as it had to be rid of those structures and processes associated with the New Society. Devolution changed its roles and functions, and necessitated its adjustment in pursuing devolution, the bureaucracy was in fact actualizing the notion of "bringing government closer to the people" and enjoining the participation of civil society in policy formulation and implementation at both national and local levels. The bureaucracy has been confronted with the need to transform itself and be able to cope with the new dynamics of relationship with society, as well as demands from the international community for good governance. With globalization and the pressure for sustainable development, the bureaucracy must respond along the directions of public-sector reform and new public management and governance. However, the different departments and other agencies of government under the executive branch face obstacles from within and without. The internal organizational constraints are numerous, including the lack of government funds and strategies to upgrade competencies and to motivate the civil service to deal with negative elements of the institutional political culture, corruption, and unethical practices. The external problems directly affecting the bureaucracy come from various sources in the political system, such as the presidential leadership style, the bureaucracy's relations with the executive, and influences of powerful groups.

The bureaucracy's performance is important as it is attributed to the performance of the executive, that is, the Philippine President. There are signs of positive and negative responses from the bureaucracy to various demands and pressures, based on evaluation studies.

### Glossary

**Bureaucracy** – Max Weber’s ideal organization for government with a structured hierarchy of offices and competent and professional staff vested with authority to undertake defined tasks guided by a set of rules and procedures.

**Bureaucracy**

**Service** – the bureaucracy's hierarchy of professional officials and personnel recruited on the basis of merit and granted tenure of appointment and corresponding salaries.

**Civil society** – the composite of the people and citizens, with representation by nongovernment organizations, people's associations, and community-based associations.

**Decentralization** – accomplished by 1) deconcentration, the transfer of administrative responsibilities from national to regional and satellite offices; and 2) devolution, the transfer of political powers from national government to local government.

**Development administration** – models for a state in transition to higher levels of political, economic, and social conditions.

**Executive branch** – the part of government responsible for implementation of laws and policies.

**Governance** – the participation and sharing of power in society by various groups, including the state, civil society, and market or private business or actors.

**New public management** – the model of a flexible government organization and performance of functions in ways that are responsive to the needs of the public as its clients, are accessible to them and allow participation; the recent paradigm for government and its bureaucracies to be dynamic and oriented toward results, client satisfaction, external forces, and social actors including the market, instead of the traditional model of rule maintenance, inflexible procedures, and hierarchical structures.

**Public administration** – the system of structures, functions, and processes in the government's bureaucracy, particularly in the executive branch, engaged in the main functions of policy implementation, and delivery of goods and services.

**Traditional public administration** – the model of bureaucratic organization, politics and administration dichotomy, and scientific management, emphasizing efficiency, effectiveness, and economy in the government's performance of executive functions.

### Guide Questions

1. What meanings have been given to the concepts of "bureaucracy" and "public management?"
2. What theories influenced the institutional framework of Philippine bureaucracy, particularly its structures, functions, and processes?
3. How did the bureaucracy interact with the executive and other political actors such as the legislature, political parties, and civil-society groups, through the different historical periods of Philippine politics and government?
4. In the processes of Philippine democratization, what has been the role of the bureaucracy? Has it facilitated or hindered the pursuit of democracy in the Philippines?
5. Is the Philippine bureaucracy an obstacle or an active agency for the attainment of sustainable development in the Philippines?
6. How can the bureaucracy and its public management system confront the challenges of governance and decentralization in the Philippines?
7. What are the prospects for bureaucratic reform and new public management?
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The Philippine Legislature: From Pre-Spanish Times to the Eve of Martial Law

Olivia C. Caoili

Our local legislators have become independent of the ordinary means of living. They are sort of divorced from the common suffering of the masses. In other words, they are out of contact with the people they are supposed to represent.¹

— Conrado Benitez

Learning Objectives

At the end of this chapter, the student should be able to:

1. Identify the historical stages of the evolution of the Philippine legislature from the Spanish times to the eve of Martial Law in 1972.
2. Compare the structure and organization of the legislative assembly in the different historical stages of its evolution.
3. Discuss how the electoral process, party politics, and legislative-executive relations had affected the legislative process from 1946 to 1972.
4. Analyze the socioeconomic background of the members of Congress in the postwar period up to the eve of Martial Law.
5. Assess the performance of Congress in legislating agrarian, industrial, rural and urban poverty, and other policies for national development.
6. Discuss the impact of Congress' unimpressive and declining performance in its prestige and influence.

Pre-Spanish Roots

Pre-Spanish Philippines was composed of barangay societies scattered throughout the archipelago. These villages were located along the seashores or along riverbanks, close to the sources of food supply.

From accounts of travelers and early Spanish missionaries,² these societies were ruled by datus or rajahs who either inherited their positions or who were

³ Horacio de la Costa, Readings in Philippine History (Manila: Bookmark, 1965).